

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

January 3, 1884

"The Sabbath-School. 2 Corinthians 7-11:3" *The Signs of the Times*
10, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST-JAN. 12.

2 Corinthians 7-11:3.

THE GRACE OF GIVING.

The eighth and ninth chapters of Paul's second letter to the Corinthian church, contain instruction in regard to the necessity and blessedness of contributing to the support of the cause of God, and especially of ministering to the necessity of the saints. The apostle had been requested by the elders at Jerusalem to remember the poor "which," he says, "I also was forward to do." Gal. 2:10. In his first epistle he gave the Corinthians the same directions for making a collection for the poor that he had previously given to the churches in Galatia, and now he writes to stir them up to activity in this respect. In the seventh chapter he had admirably paved the way for the introduction of this subject. Having commended them for the readiness with which they had accepted his reproof, he closed with the words, "I rejoice therefore that I have confidence in you in all things." Paul never descended to flattery, but he knew that by an honest expression of his confidence he could deepen his influence with the church.

The subject so near to the heart of the apostle is introduced thus: "Moreover, brethren, we do you to wit of [*i.e.*, we make known to you] the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia; how that in a great trial of affliction the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality." Paul does not mean that the Macedonians gave large sums for their deep poverty would make that an impossibility. He means that God had enabled them to give according to their means, and even beyond it, as is stated in verse 3. This was the grace which God bestowed upon them. Selfishness is natural to the human heart, and has two opposite effects,-it finds its possessor, and also enlarges his vision. It makes him blind as to his ability to do good, causing him to think that his means are not sufficient to allow of his giving more than a trifle; and it magnifies his little offerings, so that he imagines that he has given far beyond his means, and is exceedingly generous. The work of the Spirit of God is to remove this selfishness by helping us to see things just as they are,-to realize what a priceless gift has been bestowed upon us, and how undeserving we are.

The ability to give, then, is a special gift of God. Paul says: "Therefore as ye abound in everything, in faith, and utterance, and knowledge, and it all diligence, and in your love to us, see that ye abound in this grace also." We often hear people wish that they had wealth, so that they could give liberally to the poor, or to the cause of God. Now while it is true that prosperity comes from God, and it is

he that has power to get wealth, this is not the gift of which the apostle speaks. What the class just referred to ought to earnestly long for, is not means, but the grace to give according to that which they already possess. The Macedonians were exceedingly poor, yet God gave them grace to give. In their case Paul did not have to do any urging; on the contrary, they urged him with much entreaty to accept the gift.

The fifth first gives the key to their liberality; they had first given *themselves* to the Lord. When a person realizes that he is not his own, and freely acknowledges the fact, giving will be an easy matter. In fact, giving freely will be the natural result of consecrating ourselves wholly to the Lord, so that the readiness with which we give to the cause of God indicates in a great degree the measure of our consecration to him. It may help us to understand this matter if we consider how the apostles regarded themselves. When they speak of themselves as servants of the Lord, they use the Greek word *doulos*, whose primary meaning is, a bondman, a slave. Literally, Phil. 1:1 reads, "Paul and Timotheus, the slaves of Jesus Christ." Now a slave is not able to hold property in his own right; everything belongs to his master, and he himself cannot acquire a title to anything. It is in just this way that we should consider ourselves related to God. The only difference between earthly servants and masters is, that although we do belong to God, whether we acknowledge it or not, we are not compelled to serve him. All our service must be voluntary. To be sure, in the end there will be a punishment for those to defraud the Master of his just dues; but on the other hand, there will be a glorious reward for those who simply restore that to which they have no right at all.

"For if there first be a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not." No doubt many persons take great comfort from this text, for they repeatedly wish they could give, and therefore imagine that they are very acceptable to God. And as if to atone for their not giving anything, they usually wish to give very large sums. But this verse was written with the understanding that the individual had acquired the grace of giving according to his means. If all had this grace, all would give something, for very few are poorer than the widow who had only two mites for her support. When men give in this way, willingly, the gift is valued by the Lord, according to the proportion which it bears to the means of the giver. The poor widow's gift was considered as greater than all the gifts of the rich men, because she gave more in proportion to her means.

This idea is carried out in the following verses. "For I mean not that other men should be eased and ye burdened." He did not design that a few should do all the giving, but that all should share in it. He meant that there should be an equality. This equality would be gained if each gave according to what he had.

"As it is written, He that had gathered much had nothing over; and he that had gathered little had no lack." This quotation is from Ex. 16:18, and has reference to the gathering of the manna. The Israelites were allowed an omer for each individual. This was all that could possibly be used in one day. If one on account of superior activity gathered more, he was to divide it with one whose circumstances did not allow him to gather a sufficient quantity for his daily

support. This begot a feeling of mutual sympathy among them,-such a feeling as should exist among those who are members of the family of Christ.

The parallel that the apostle draws should be well considered. In their case the tendency to hoard up that which they had gathered more than their actual present need, would be checked by the knowledge that on the morrow another ample supply would be given. So in our cases, the same God who supplied them with manna is our Father, and knows that we have need of food and clothing. See Matt. 6:30-34. We are commanded to pray, "Give us this day our daily bread," and that command implies the fact that the prayer will be answered.

Again, those of the Jews who gathered more than they could use, and saved it for future need, had a mortifying check put upon their greed when they found their hoarded provision a mass of corruption. In our case the parallel still holds good, for however much property a man may acquire, he himself can use only a small part. As a certain millionaire said, when envied by a poor man, "You are as well off as I am, for all I get is my board and clothes." In other words, with all his wealth, he could no more than live. Then, too, riches often vanish in a moment. Nothing can be devised that will ensure a man's property from going as quickly as did the Israelites' hoarded manna. And whether this misfortune should come or not, the end will certainly come soon, and then that which is treasured up will, in many cases at least, be worse than nothing. See James 5:1-3.

That this mutual distribution of means is what Paul designed is shown by verse 14: "But by an equality, that now at this time your abundance may be a supply for their want, that there abundance also may be a supply for your want; that there may be equality." We can readily see that in the case of the Jews, such a course was the best one for them to pursue, since if they did lay up provision it would be to no profit, and by their accommodation to a needy friend, they would secure to themselves a like favor, should they be in similar circumstances. If we cannot as readily see that it is the best thing for Christians to do now, it is because we have not the faith in God that we should have, and are blind as to the future.

As we have already stated, Paul did not feel at liberty to make any commands in the matter of giving, but to appeal to their sense of obligation, that what they gave might be a "as a matter of bounty," and not something forced from covetous dispositions. One of his strong points is that he has boasted of the forwardness of the churches in Achaia, and had used their readiness in pledging as an incentive for others. Now, said he, if some persons should come with me from Macedonia, and find that you have done little or nothing, we would both be put to shame. The Macedonians will think that I have deceived them, and they will think slightingly of you. We have here an instance of the remarkable tact which Paul exercised in dealing with the churches.

"But this I say, he which soweth sparingly shall reap all so sparingly, and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully." 2 Cor. 9:6. From this text nothing more or less can be made than that our present welfare, at least, depends largely upon the cheerfulness with which we give. A study of Luke 16:1-12 will convince us that our liberality is not an unimportant factor in determining our fitness for our future inheritance. Not that we can buy Heaven;

but one who has not so vivid a sense of the magnitude of Christ's sacrifice for him, that it will lead him to feel like following the same example, certainly has not much of the love of Christ in his heart.

The apostle continues: "And God is able to make all grace abound for you; that he always having all suffering in all things, may abound to every good work." This is a plain statement that God is able to make that which they sow yield a bountiful harvest. How that will be accomplished is in part stated in verses 12-14: "For the administration of this service not only supplieth the want of the saints, but is abundant also by many thanksgivings unto God; whiles by the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your professed subjection unto the gospel of Christ, and for your liberal distribution unto them, and unto all men; and by their prayer for you, which long after you for the exceeding grace of God in you." The idea is, that their service of love would produce abundant thanks to God, on the part of those who were benefited. It would also produce another result. It would move the saints to pray for their benefactors, and this would be of incalculable value to them. James says that the prayer of the righteous man avails much. The amount of money given, if retained

7

for their own use, would be of far less value to them than would the prayers of the saints whose wants they might relieve. Barnes truly says that "he who has secured the pleadings of a child of God, however humble, in his behalf, has made a good use of his money."

"Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift." This is an appropriate closing to this sermon on giving. The idea in the mind of the apostle was doubtless that expressed in the beginning; that a liberal spirit is due to the grace of God. But the grace of God is manifested in its fullness in giving his Son to die for man; and as Paul was speaking of gifts, his mind would naturally turn to the first and greatest of all of gifts. It is an "unspeakable gift;" no tongue can tell its value; even the angels are unable to comprehend it. And it is the only real gift that was ever made; for whereas our fellow mortals have a claim on our charity, men had no claim on God. "God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Rom. 5:8. "Herein is love, not that we love God, but that he loved us." 1 John 4:10. Compared with God's gift to man, the most that we can do is nothing; and as the contemplation of a gift tends to reduce gratitude, we should stimulate our liberality by constant meditation on this unspeakable gift, and an earnest desire to have as clear a sense of its value as it is possible for the human mind to possess. E. J. W.

January 10, 1884

"The Sabbath-School. 2 Corinthians, Chaps. 11-13" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST-JAN. 19.

2 Corinthians, Chaps. 11-13

Brief Comments on 2 Cor. 11.

"Would to God ye could bear with me a little in my folly; and indeed bear with me." 2 Cor. 11:1. The translators took unwarranted liberty in this case, as in some others, in inserting the word God when there is nothing in the original to indicate it. A literal translation would be, "Would that ye could bear with me;" or, "I wish that ye could bear with me." This would properly represent the apostle, and not make it appear that he was in the habit of making a strong appeal to God on every slight location. This item should be emphasized, and carefully noted, in order that none may think that they have apostolic example for such appeals. Very many persons who would be shocked at any intimation that they are profane, are really guilty of violating the third commandment. That precept says, "Thou shall not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." That is, The name of the Lord must never be spoken unless it is absolutely necessary. Repeating oaths that others have uttered; a light use of the sacred name of the Deity in ordinary conversation; very frequent repetition of this name even in prayer; and an appeal to God in any ordinary occasion,-these are all violations of the third commandment. We may be assured that Paul was never guilty of taking the name of the Lord in vain.

In this chapter and the following one, the apostle enters into a commendation of himself. He was forced to do this for the sake of the cause, and not for any personal consideration. The second and third verses give this reason for this boasting. It was his intense love for those who have accepted the truth under his labors, and his fear that they would be led astray, that moved him to do it. Someone was trying to overthrow the faith of the Corinthians, by setting forth that Paul was an impostor. If the people should lose their confidence in Paul, all his preaching would go for nothing. But he knew that he had been sent by the Lord, and had preached the truth; and rather than have been seduced from their allegiance, he reluctantly vindicated his claim to be an inspired apostle. On verse 2, Dr. Barnes says: "The allusion here, according to Doddridge, is to the custom among the Greeks 'of having an officer whose business it was to educate and form young women, especially those of rank and figure, designed for marriage, and then to present them to those who were to be their husbands; and if this officer through negligence permitted them to be corrupted between the espousals and the consummation of the marriage, great blame would fall upon him.' Such a responsibility Paul felt." There never was a man who had more of which he might boast, than Paul had, and there are few who do less. His humility is apparent even in the midst of his enforced self-commendation, and shows that it was others, and not self, of whom he was thinking.

"For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received, or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him." Verse 4. Most commentators think that this means that if the one who was seeking to supplant Paul could offer to them a more powerful Saviour, and more exalted spiritual advantages than he had done, they would be excusable for following the new comer. But there is no pronoun expressed in the Greek, and the translators have

placed the pronoun "me" in the margin. This, we are inclined to think, should be inserted in the text, so that the last clause would read, "ye might well bear with me." The next verse seems to make this necessary. Even if another Jesus, and another gospel were preached to them, Paul argues that they ought to still bear with him; "for," says he, "I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles." This was a good reason why they should be slow to accept the teachings of another in preference to his.

"But though I be rude in speech, and yet not in knowledge." Verse 6. Paul's traducers had evidently sought to weaken his hold on the Corinthians, by sneering at his manner of speaking. Paul does not deny that his speech was rude, *i.e.*, unpolished, but he claims with truth that his manner of speaking did not in the least affect the truth of what he preached. From his childhood Paul had doubtless been familiar with the Greek language, but it could not be expected that he would speak it with all the polish of a native Greek. Corinth occupied somewhat the same position that Paris does in modern times. Its inhabitants prided themselves on the elegance of their language, and could be easily led to ridicule one whose speech showed that he was not a native of the metropolis. "Critics profoundly acquainted with the Greek language remark that while there is great energy of thought and of diction in the writings of Paul; while he chooses or coins most expressive words, yet there is ever a want of Attic elegance of manner, and of the smoothness and beauty which were so grateful to a Grecian ear."-*Barnes*. This attempt to weaken Paul's influence by ridiculing his straightforward, terse language, shows clearly the contemptible spirit that actuated his opposers. Such men have their successors at the present day.

It is not opposers alone who criticize to their own and others' detriment. Many professors often lose the greater part of a valuable discourse, by letting their minds dwell upon some inaccuracies in the language of the speaker; for they will stop to note some statement that might be construed to mean exactly the opposite of what the speaker intended. And while they are thus engaged, they are oblivious to golden truths which are being uttered. Persons with such a critical turn of mind as that are to be pitied. They feed on husks, and miss the wholesome, nourishing grain. Instead of cultivating such a disposition, they should seek to get rid of it as quickly as possible, and learn to "desire the sincere milk of the word," that they may grow thereby.

"Have I committed an offense in abasing myself that ye might be exalted, because I have preached to you the gospel of God freely?" Verse 7. This verse contains a most delicate yet pointed reproof, and at the same time a vindication of Paul's own integrity. He had not accepted anything from the Corinthians, but had been supported by other churches, especially those of Macedonia, and had also contributed to his own support, by manual labor. It seems that the Corinthian church had been negligent of Paul's wants, and had willingly allowed others to provide for him. But while rebuking the church for this neglect of a plain duty, he declares that he will still keep himself from being burdensome to any; not because he does not love them, but because he is determined that his captious critics shall have no occasion of accusing him of trying to enrich himself at the expense of his converts.

We cannot get the full force of Paul's language in verses 7-9 without reading verses 12 and 13 of the next chapter. Continuing the same subject, he says: "Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds. For what is it wherein ye were inferior to other churches, except it be that I myself was not burdensome to you? forgive me this wrong." From this, as well as from many other passages, we learn that it is a privilege as well as a duty for the churches to contribute to the support of the gospel. Indeed, an absolute necessity, for in this same epistle Paul says that "He which soweth sparingly shall reap all so sparingly." He here has reference to money, and it naturally follows that he who neglects to sow will surely fail to reap. Paul had not urged the Corinthians to the employment of this privilege in his case, and he humbly says, "forgive me this wrong." And now we can see how completely he turns the tables upon his accusers in chapter 11:7. He shows them that the only thing in which he can be said to be inferior to the other apostles is the fact that he supported himself; and while the members of the Corinthian church allowed him to do that which in reality exalted him above all others, they were proving themselves to be inferior to other churches. Most churches are very ready to forgive an offense of this kind on the part of their minister; but if the Corinthians were not more active in supporting the cause of God after this, they must have been obtuse and careless in the extreme. Let modern church-members take good heed to the apostle's delicate reproof, lest they show themselves to be inferior, and thus lose a great blessing.

In verse 13 Paul declares that those who have been seeking occasions against him are "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ." And lest any should be inclined to doubt this statement, thinking it impossible that impostors could so successfully personate true apostles, he adds: "And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness."

Some persons make a great ado when a professor, and especially a minister, is found to be a rascal, and would make the Christian religion responsible for the misdeeds of all who may profess to be its followers. The fact that the fall of a professed Christian, be he minister or layman, is so loudly heralded by unbelievers, is a compliment to the cause which they despise, for it proves that they expect better things of Christian professors. But why should it be thought a strange thing that bad men should be in the church, and even in the ministry? Do men express surprise when they find a wolf in the sheepfold? Do they not expect that the wolf will go, if he can, where he can inflict the most injury on the flock? Would they not be more surprised if he should willingly stay outside? Then why should they marvel that wicked men seek to accomplish their master's work by the same methods? Satan himself appears as an angel of light, and he is able to help his servants to play the hypocrite to perfection also. Every valuable coin is counterfeited, but the base coin does not make the truth any less valuable.

While the gospel ministry is the most exalted of any calling, and the true minister of Christ is worthy of esteem and affection, a man should not be received, nor all that he says believed, simply because he ranks as a minister.

No one need be deceived, if he will only apply the proper test. John says: "Beloved, believed not every spirit [teacher], but try the spirits whether they are of God; for many false prophets are gone out into the world." 1 John 4:1. And the prophet Isaiah gives the rule by which we are to try them: "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8:20. Although it is the office of preachers to handle the word of God, and explain it to the people, we are not to throw away reason, and accept everything that they may teach, simply because they speak with authority.

22

We are to sanctify the Lord in our hearts, as much for the purpose of being able to discern between truth and error, as to be able to tell the reason of our hope.

The minister may be far superior to his flock in intellectual endowments, if God is able to give spiritual discernment so that the humblest may be able to judge correctly as to the truth of what is preached. Many at the present time seek to excuse themselves for observing the first day instead of the seventh day, which God commanded, on the ground that many learned ministers of the gospel teach and practice first-day observance. This excuse is often made as a last resort, when the person is really convinced of the truth. Like the ostrich that hides its head in the sand and thinks itself secure from its pursuers, they seem to imagine that the error of their teachers, whether ignorant or willful, will shield them from the wrath of God. Such ones should remember that Paul's words are as true of lay members as of ministers, that their "end shall be according to their works." See also Rom. 14:10-12; Rev. 20:12; 22:12. E. J. W.

January 31, 1884

"General Meeting at Healdsburg" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

This meeting, continuing from the 3rd to the 13th, was in many respects the best meeting ever held in this State. The attendance was even better than was anticipated, as meetings in California in the winter season are not usually very well attended. However, nearly all the churches in the central and northern part of the State were represented at this one.

Four interesting meetings of the Tract and Missionary Society were held; even this number did not afford an opportunity for transacting all the business that should have been considered. Any one who attends the sessions of our Conference and our Missionary Society year after year, in other States as well as in this, cannot fail to be impressed with the fact that this is a growing work. Every year we are increasing our facilities, and broadening our plans for work, and still we fall far short of the necessities of the case. The progress of the cause within the last year alone, should teach us that God is leading in this work, and that he is only waiting for us to manifest our faith in a practical matter, in order to grant us his blessing in still greater abundance. We must not limit the work of God, for his plans are far in advance of what our feeble faith has been able to grasp.

The resolutions that were passed recognized the fact that the territories adjoining the Pacific Coast States afford a large field for the carrying on of missionary work by correspondence. These territories are being rapidly settled by a good class of people, and there is as yet no reason for those of our people who cannot go into the harvest-field in person, to think that there is nothing for them to do.

Besides this, the representatives of the various churches made earnest calls for help, not alone in the churches, but in the adjoining country. A gratifying feature of these calls was that, with few exceptions, those making the call pledged themselves to care for any minister who might be sent to their locality, and also to give their own time to visiting and canvassing. It is a source of regret that the scarcity of laborers makes it impossible for more than one in twenty of the calls for ministerial help to receive immediate attention. We are not sure, however, but that this is in the order of God, that our people may give themselves individually to the work. Each one must pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers, and must realize the obligation resting upon him to do his part toward answering his own prayer. The work must largely be done by corresponding, canvassing, and Bible-reading, and could all the brethren and sisters in the State have been present as the appeals for help came in, we are sure that the number taking the special course at the College would now be doubled.

A class for practical instruction in the art of canvassing was organized by Eld. W. C. White, which met as often as the frequency of other meetings will allow. Those who attended these exercises came much Bible information as to how to properly present the SIGNS, *Good Health*, etc. Canvassing is getting to be an important factor in the advancement of the Third Angel's Message, and the canvasser needs a special preparation for the work, as well as does the minister. Nothing that can be used to assist in spreading the light of the truth should be lightly esteemed.

There were but eight sermons delivered during the whole ten days' meeting, - one each by Elders Healey and Boyd, two by the Editor of the SIGNS, and four by Mrs. E. G. White. Although these sermons were listened to with great attention by many not of our faith, their object was not especially to unfold doctrine, but to give instruction in vital godliness, and stir up the minds of believers to an appreciation of the importance of the present hour. The fact that we are now living in the antitypical day of atonement, and that Christ, our high priest, will soon cease pleading for sinners, was emphasized, and made a deep impression, which we hope will be lasting. If we could keep this solemn thought constantly in our minds, what carefulness it would produce in our daily life, and what zeal in the Master's work! As in the typical day of atonement, we should afflict our souls, and humble our souls before God.

A noted feature of this meeting was the Bible-readings, of which there were thirteen. These were upon the following subjects: Second Advent, Sabbath, Spiritual Gifts, Tithing, and the Sanctuary. The deepest interest was manifested in these readings, and much good was done. Many who had not previously paid tithes, were fully convinced of their duty in this respect, and publicly resolved to pay to the Lord his dues. An aged gentleman from the East was detained in the

place during the meetings, and attended regularly. At the close he said that although he was at first much prejudiced against the views of Seventh-day Adventists, the constant appeal "to the law and to the testimony," had completely

74

disarmed him. The knowledge that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and expressed his intention to walk in the light. There can be no doubt that Bible-readings, judiciously conducted, are destined to become a powerful auxiliary in spreading the knowledge of the truth. When brought face to face with a plain "Thus saith the Lord" on every point, candid persons cannot do otherwise than yield assent. As the gentleman above-mentioned said, "An infidel might raise objections, but a believer in the Bible certainly cannot gainsay such testimony."

The prayer and social meetings were, from the first, seasons of special interests. Each morning, except Sabbath, a special meeting was held at six o'clock. The first two were simply for the ministers and missionary workers; after that all were invited. Another one was held each day at nine o'clock A.M. At all of the social meetings Sister White was present, contributing largely to the ultimate success of the meeting. Her plain and pointed testimony was well received, and the Spirit of the Lord moved many to make humble confession of past wrongs. Special labor was put forth for the spiritual advancement of the Healdsburg Church. Some difficulties of long standing were happily adjusted, the brethren and sisters resolving henceforth to love not "in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth." All felt that if this had been the only object gained, the meeting would have been a grand success. We hope that the earnest exhortation is to keep the mind fixed upon Christ, that the increase in knowledge of his love may produce corresponding love and humility in the heart, may be acted upon by all.

On the last Sabbath afternoon, after a sermon by Sister White on Love to God, fifty-five persons came forward, asking the prayers of God's people. The number included both backsliders and those making their first start in the Christian life, and of all ages, from the little child to the gray-haired man. These repaired to a side room in the building, where every one bore a good testimony.

The closing social meeting on Sunday morning was one of the best we ever attended. The spirit of thanksgiving to God prevailed, and the meeting was a veritable praise service. "Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me," says the Lord. As Christians we do not praise the Lord enough. The idea seems to prevail that we must overcome all sins before we have any right to praise God. But the truth is, that we cannot overcome the first without the help and blessing of God, and as soon as we feel the least of his blessing, it is our duty to praise him. By praising God for what we have, we keep our hearts warm, and in a condition to receive more of his blessing. Surely "It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord."

At the close of the service, several expressed a desire for baptism, and after the next service, the congregation repaired to the water, where eighteen souls were buried with Christ by baptism. Of this number, ten unite with the Healdsburg Church; of the latter number, seven are College students. The series of meetings closed with a sermon by the Editor of the SIGNS, on "The Rest that remains for the people of God."

Every part of the meeting was possible, and its influence on the cause in this State can never be fully known until the Judgment. We hope that many other churches in this Conference may have the privilege of a like experience. E. J. W.

February 28, 1884

"A Humiliating Confession" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

In a recent number of the *Christian Statesman*, a lecturer for the "National Reform" party, tells of the extreme wickedness of St. Louis, and of the difficulty which the pastors experience in getting even the members of their own churches to attend regular services. The condition of affairs is truly distressing, but as we read in the same article a portion of a conversation with one of the pastors of the city, we could not feel that the fault lay primarily with the lay members.

It seems that the Ministers' Association of the city declined to accept an invitation from the Women's Christian Temperance Union to preach on the subject of prohibition. As an excuse for their course, one of the ministers said:-

"Don't be discouraged because we do not work with you in this reform. Our hearts are with you. It does not require a majority now to turn off a minister. One or two can do it, if they have money. It is unsafe for us to take a higher standard than the lowest in our congregations, for the people say we must be a unit, or the pastor must go. We are like men pulling a sled on slippery ice. We have to be careful or our feet will fly."

How much self-respect can such a man have? How dare not preach that which will displease his hearers. It is safe to say that in every congregation there are some whose taste are exceedingly low and depraved—who attend church and wear the cloak of religion in order to conceal some of their evil deeds; and yet the pastors say, "It is unsafe for us to take a higher standard than the lowest in our congregations." Is it any wonder that the people are not elevated? When ministers of the gospel deliberately pawn their honor for their salary, is it surprising that the people sell their souls for lust and lucre?

Perhaps some of our friends would accuse us of lack of charity if we should say that the course which those pastors pursue is in exact fulfillment of Isa. 56:10, 11, but we ask them to read the text, and see if it is not at least a parallel; and then we ask them to decide whether or not it is safe to unhesitatingly accept the first day of the week as the Sabbath, simply because the popular ministers say that it is. Is it not time for the people to search the Scriptures for themselves, to ascertain if these things are so? If such a course was commendable in Paul's day, and under *his* preaching, is it not imperatively necessary now? E. J. W.

March 13, 1884

"Progress of the Work at Healdsburg" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

The first Sabbath in this month was a day of interest and profit to the church at Healdsburg; of profit not only to the church, but to the College, and through it to the cause throughout the State. In the forenoon, Eld. Corliss preached from Col. 3:2, 3: "Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." The responsibilities resting upon those who profess to be members of Christ's body, were clearly set forth. We belong to the family of Christ, and are individually responsible for the reputation of the family. The danger of becoming estranged from Christ by following the vain and silly fashions of the world, was dwelt upon with earnestness. The true Christian will indeed be dead,-insensible to the allurements of the world.

After the sermon, the congregation repaired to the usual place of baptism, where six souls were baptized, as evidence of their faith in the death and resurrection of Christ, and their determination to be henceforth new creatures in Christ. Four of this number were students at the College,-two of them from Mendocino County, one from Humboldt County, and one a resident of Healdsburg.

In the afternoon some twenty of those who intend to labor in the various capacities in the field during the summer, met in one of the rooms of the College building, together with Elds. White, Corliss, Israel, and Healey, to consider some plans for the coming campaign. So far as a division of labor had been made, all heartily acquiesced in the suggestions of the Conference Committee, expressing themselves as willing to labor to the extent of their ability, in any field to which they might be assigned. As testimonies and exhortations were given, the Spirit of the Lord came into the meeting, and all felt strengthened and encouraged.

We believe that the spirit of love and harmony that exists among the workers, and which seems to be increasing, augurs well for the success of the work. As was stated by one brother, the laborers must press together if they would see the work prosper. But it is God who sends prosperity, and blesses our efforts; in order to succeed, we must draw near to God, and when we all get near him, it follows as a natural consequence that we will be near to one another. We confidently expect to see the cause of God advanced greatly this year. If God is in the work of which there can be no doubt, and the workers go forth accompanied by his Spirit, we certainly may expect great things.

During the past two weeks the missionary class has enjoyed the presence and labors of Bro. White, who has given much Bible instruction in regard to canvassing, doing colporteur work, and preparing a field for tent labor. Certainly those who go into the field with a definite plan of operations in mind, and are fortified, as far as possible, against every objection that can be made, have a far better prospect of success than those who go out trusting alone to their general, unclassified knowledge, and the inspiration of the moment, for the means to awaken the interest of the indifferent, and to answer those who make objections. It is just this definite, practical knowledge that the instructors at Healdsburg College came to impart. Brethren, remember the work, and pray for the workers.
E. J. W.

March 20, 1884

"The Support of the Poor" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

There are many Christians who use their tithe as a sort of charity fund, from which they make all their gifts and offerings, of whatever kind. But the Bible recognizes no such plan as this. The poor are to be supported, but not with the Lord's tithe. In ancient times the following was one provision made for the poor: "And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of thy field, neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest. And thou shalt not glean thy vineyard, neither shalt thou gather every grape of thy vineyard; thou shalt leave them for the poor and stranger: I am the Lord your God." Lev. 19:9, 10. See also 23:22; Deut. 24:19-21.

Some may argue from Deut. 26:12, 13 that the tithe was to be used for the support of the poor, but in this text we see not only the careful provision made for the poor, but the sacredness with which the Lord's tithe was devoted to the one object for which it was designed. We quote the text: "When thou hast made an end of tithing all the tithes of thine increase the third year, which is the year of tithing, and hast given it unto the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, that they may eat within thy gates, and be filled; then thou shalt say before the Lord thy God, I have brought away the hallowed things out of mine house, and also have given them unto the Levite, and unto the stranger, to the fatherless, and to the widow, according to all thy commandments which thou hast commanded me; I have not transgressed thy commandments, neither have I forgotten them." The command here referred to is found in Deut. 14:22-29, where, in addition to the requirement to give to the stranger, the fatherless, etc., this statement is made: "And thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God, in the place which he shall choose to place his name there, the tithe of thy corn, of thy wine, and of thine oil, and the firstlings of thy herds and of thy flocks."

Now when we read in Num. 18:21, "Behold, I have given the children of Levi *all the tenth in Israel* for an inheritance, for their service which they serve, even the service which they serve, even the service of the tabernacle of the congregation," we are forced to the conclusion that the tithe spoken of in Deut. 14 and 20 is not the same as that which was devoted to the Levites on account of their service in the sanctuary, for the stranger could not by any possibility be counted as one of the Levites. We can harmonize the two Scriptures only on the ground that the tithe which the people themselves, together with "the Levites, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow," were to eat, was a *second tithe*, taken after the tithe for the Levites had been given them. This view of the question is taken by all commentators of whom we have any knowledge. And there are some who claim that every third year a third tithe was collected. We quote a few testimonies:-

"Another important privilege enjoyed by the poor was, what was called *second tithes* and *second firstlings*. Besides the tenth received by the Levites, the Israelites were obliged to set apart *another* tenth of their garden field

produce; and in like manner of their cattle, a second set of offerings, for the purpose of presenting as thank offerings at the high festivals. Of these thank offerings only certain fat pieces were consumed on the altar; the remainder, after deducting the priests' portion, was appropriated to the sacrifice feasts, to which the Israelites were bound to invite a stranger, the widow, and the orphan." *Horne's Introduction, Vol. 2, Part II, chap. viii.*

"Besides the first-fruits, the Jews also paid tithes or tenths of all they possessed. Num. 18:21. They were in general collected of all the produce of the earth (Lev. 27:30; Deut. 14:22, 23; Neh. 13:5, 10), but chiefly of corn, wine, and oil, and were rendered every year except the sabbatical year. When these tithes were paid, the owner of the fruits further gave another tenth part, which was carried up to Jerusalem, and eaten in the temple at offering feasts, as a sign of rejoicing and *gratitude to God*. These are called *second tithes*."-*Ib.*, Vol. 2, Part III, chap. iii.

"Every year a tithe was paid to the Levites; and besides that a second tithe, which was carried to Jerusalem and eaten there; and every third year it was eaten at home, in their towns and cities in the country instead of it, with the Levite, poor, and stranger, and was called the poor's tithe."-*Dr. John Gill, on Deut. 26:12*. He gives other testimony to the same effect, in his comments on the succeeding verses, and on Deut. 14:23-28, and Lev. 27:30.

"Let there be taken out of your fruits a tenth besides what you have allotted to give to the priests and Levites. This you may indeed sell in the country, but it is to be used in those feasts and sacrifices that are to be celebrated in the holy city."

"Besides those two tithes which I have already said you are to pay every year, the one for the Levites, the other for the festivals, you are to bring every third year eight times to be distributed to those that want; two women also that our widows, and two children and orphans."-*Josephus' Ant., Book IV., chap. 8, sec 8 and sec. 22.*

These testimonies, and others that might be given, together with the argument previously adduced, show conclusively that the Lord's tithe was not used for the poor; and since it was not used either for building or repairing houses of worship, it must have been solely for those who labored in connection with sacred things. Indeed, how could it be otherwise. We read, "The tithe is *the Lord's*." It was to be deposited in the Lord's treasury. Now if I owe a friend ten dollars, it will not do for me to give any part of it to a poor man, even though I know that my friend would use the money in the same way, if I were to pay it to him. It belongs to no one but to my friend, and it would be highly dishonest for me to get a reputation for liberality, by giving away that to which I have no right. No one can be charitable on another's money. E. J. W.

March 27, 1884

"Systematic Giving" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 13.

E. J. Waggoner

It will be readily seen that so far as tithes are concerned, the Bible plan of supporting the cause is very systematic. Each one gives in the same proportion. There is no fixed time at which persons should set apart their tithe, because it is to be the *first-fruits* of whatever they may receive, at whatever time it may come in. Whenever a man receives any part of his income, his first duty should be to take out the Lord's tithe, putting it in a place by itself. If he should at once credit his cash account with the amount of tithe set aside, he would be doing more nearly right still, for since the tithe does not belong to him, his books show just what money he really has on hand. There would then be less temptation to use the tithe while it remains in his hands, for the fact that it is not his own would appear more real. As to when the tithe should be paid into the treasury, will often depend on circumstances; many churches, however, have an arrangement for the treasurer to visit each member once a month, to collect whatever tithes they may have on hand. This plan has many advantages, but it does not hinder anybody from handing in his tithe during the interval, if he so desires.

The fact can be well-established, I think, that the Bible plan is that men should also be systematic in their offerings. Why should we not think so? "God is not the author of confusion," and there is order and system in his works. But we need not depend on our unassisted reason for the establishment of systematic offerings. A familiar Bible text settles the matter beyond controversy. We quote:-

"Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come. And when I come, whomsoever ye shall approve by your letters, them will I send to bring your liberality unto Jerusalem." 1 Cor. 16:1-3.

It is evident from even a casual reading of this text that the apostle has reference to offerings, and not to the tithes. For (1) that which the churches were to lay aside is called "liberality," a term that, as we have seen, cannot be applied to the tithe. (2) Paul said that this especial contribution was "for the poor saints which are in Jerusalem." Rom. 15:26; but the tithe, we remember, was not used for the support of the poor. And (3) the tithe is the *first-fruits* of the increase, and could not therefore always be paid on any day of the week; for while some might every day be receiving that which they could tithe, others might not receive anything as often as once a month.

The question will arise, Was this order designed to be followed by all Christians, or was it merely a local and temporary arrangement? We answer, that while the necessity for this special collection would soon cease to exist, the plan is one that should be pursued by all. The fact that the apostle made the arrangement, not for one church merely, but for many, and that it was of sufficient importance to be preserved in the inspired writings for all generations, is sufficient evidence of this. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable." We can see nothing more toward profit in this text, than that our offerings to the poor and to various worthy the objects, should be according to a definite plan.

When God gave laws through Moses for the government of his people, he gave direction concerning the poor as follows: "If there be among you a poor man of one of thy brethren within any of thy gates in thy land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not harden thine heart, nor shut thine hand from thy poor brother; but thou shalt open thine hand wide unto him, and shalt surely lend him sufficient for his need, in that which he wanteth." Deut. 15:7, 8. The word "lend" is used here, but the verses following plainly shows that they were to expect no return; and he immediately after follows the statement, "For the poor shall never cease out of the land."

The New Testament bounds in exhortations by Christ and the apostles, to care for the poor, and the quotation last made was reaffirmed by Christ shortly before his crucifixion, when he said, "For ye have the poor always with you." Matt. 26:11.

Now, query: If it is our duty to care for the poor, and they are to be ever-present with us, would it not be negligence on our part, if we did not make constant provision for them? Is it not because people let their offerings depends so much upon impulse, that there is so much suffering among the poor? Much needless suffering would be avoided if all made systematic offerings as a matter of principle. The heart is often touched by scenes of woe, or by appeals for aid, but, because no previous preparation has been made, we have nothing to give, and our sympathy is useless. To say to a brother or sister, "Be ye warmed and filled," or to wish it,

202

and not give them those things which are needful to the body, profits no more at the present time than it did in the days of the apostles.

The text under consideration (1 Cor. 16:1, 2) plainly teaches that our offerings, for the poor at least, are to be made from a fund which is the result of sums of money regularly set apart for that purpose. These weekly deposits are to be made after a calculation of our income, of which they are to be a definite proportion. What that proportion should be, each one must determine for himself. The amount once laid aside, it should be considered as sacred as the tithe. Although it is in our own power to say how much we will give, whether more or less, when the amount to be given is decided in our minds, we have placed the matter out of our own hands. Having once vowed, even though the vow were not uttered a record of it is made in Heaven, and God will surely require it of us. "When thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not slack to pay it; for the Lord thy God will surely require of thee; and it would be sin in thee." Deut. 23:21. As was recommended in the case of the tithe, a good way to do is to not only set the sum apart in a place by itself; but place it to the credit of our cash account; then there will be less danger of temptation to use it for ourselves.

But some one will say, "I don't believe God wants us to give because we feel obliged to; I believe he would better have us give cheerfully; and there is something repulsive in such a methodical way of making offerings." Well, excepting the last statement, we believe just so too. But is it so that God is more pleased with service that is performed fitfully, yea, almost by accident, than with that service which is the result of a settled purpose? Does he take greater delight

in one who gives to his cause or to the poor on a certain occasion, because it happens to be convenient, than in one who *makes* it convenient to give whenever there is need? Most assuredly not. Joshua said, "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord;" and his pious determination stands as a continual rebuke to those who neglect to choose once for all the course they will pursue.

Let us hear the words of the apostles: "Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity; for God loves a cheerful giver." 2 Cor. 9:7. Our giving is to be the result of a *cheerful determination*. God loves a cheerful giver yet he is pleased that we should have a previous "purpose" in our hearts. It is with giving as with any other service, it should be done from principle, yet willingly. Take, for instance, the Sabbath. There is a specific command for its observance, and all our plans in all time, are to be made with reference to it. The commandment is unconditional and unyielding; and yet God requires us to "call the Sabbath a delight." The fact is, if the duty is irksome, our only way is to do it faithfully, and *make* ourselves like it. And if we go about in the duty from principle, resolved to like it because it *is* our duty, God will give us grace to find in it our highest pleasure. The carnal mind is enmity against God, and not subject to his law but it is possible for us to be so changed as to love him, and to delight in his law.

One more thought in regard to systematic giving. Paul desired that the Corinthians should "abound in this grace also." 2 Cor. 8:7. The ability to give, then, is one of the graces, and like all others is bestowed by God. Verses 1, 2. But graces grow only by constant exercise; therefore there should be constant giving, else we shall be lacking in one of the graces, and thus fail of eternal life. The great object to giving is after all more for our own benefit than for the benefit of others. God could miraculously supply the wants of his cause and of the poor, but we would be the losers. We must be like Christ if we would inherit the kingdom of God; and of him we are told that "though he was rich," yet for our sake "he became poor." Perfect unselfishness characterized his whole life. Unlike him, selfishness is that which prompts every act of our natural heart, the only way to overcome is by a determined performance of those things which selfishness would lead us to avoid. As Napoleon said, "Find out what the enemy wants, and then do exactly the opposite." This plan, persistently followed, will drive the enemy from the field, and give us a glorious victory.

The greatest favor God can bestow upon us in this life is to allow us to have a part in giving to his cause, and to the poor. If God should transform us into the divine image, by an act of his mighty power, we would not be the gainers thereby, for we would be liable to fall with the first temptation that presented itself; and if, having transformed us, he should keep us in that condition by the same power, we would be mere machines. God designs that we shall work out our own salvation, in order that we may have a moral character of our own; he will give us assistance, without which we can do nothing, yet we must do the work ourselves.

What has been said concerning systematic offerings is not designed to cut off special offerings. Thank offerings and sin offerings are as necessary now as in the days of Moses, and every Christian will feel called upon at times to make them. This we should do whenever the necessity arises, but should not even

then neglect to "lay in store" our regular contribution. We would again emphasize the fact that the benefit to be derived from offerings is gained only by continuous giving. If our whole contribution would amount to about five dollars, it would be far better to pay ten cents every week than to pay the entire sum at the end of the year. It would be as wise to think of doing all our praying on the first or last day of the year, has to do all our giving for the year at one time, and then think know more about it.

April 3, 1884

"Systematic Giving. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 14.

E. J. Waggoner

(Concluded.)

There is a common objection to the tithing plan, that demands a brief notice. The matter of tithing is not spoken of directly by any of the apostles, nor are any of the churches enjoined by them to pay tithe. But the man who thinks to escape the payment of tithes by such a plea as this has overreached himself; for (1) Christ taught it, as has been shown in the comment on Matt. 23:23. That alone would be sufficient. (2) The commandment to pay tithe having been once made by God himself, it would remain in force, forever, if not countermanded, and the reason for its continuance existed as in the beginning. Therefore if there was no mention made of it in the entire New Testament, it would not affect the case in the least. And, strongest of all, we find (3) that the teaching of the apostles, and of Christ himself, if strictly followed, would lead to the sacrifice, not merely of a tithe, but of *all* our possessions! Let us read and see.

Paul, writing to the Corinthians, says, "Ye are not your own; for ye are bought with a price." We are, as a literal translation of Phil. 1:1 would read, "the slaves of Jesus Christ." Our servitude, however, is a blessed one, for his yoke is easy, and his burden light. But a slave cannot hold property in his own right; all that he may acquire belongs to his master. Therefore since we are Christ's by purchase, all that we have belongs to him. Then if we give him his just due, we will give, not one-tenth, but *all* that we have.

With this conclusion agree the words of Christ: "Sell that ye have, and give alms; provide yourselves bags which lacks not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth." Luke 12:33. When the young man came to him inquiring the way to life eternal, "Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in Heaven; and come and follow me." Matt. 19:21.

We do not wish to be understood as advising all indiscriminately to sell their property. We are to be guided by sanctified reason, and not by fanaticism. "To everything there is a season;" and if we stand at the counsel of God, we shall know when the time comes for us to part with our possessions. We need not hold it all, however, so that it may be sold at once. If we study the lives of the reformers, and the most devoted Christians, we will find that they gave away nearly all they had, in their life-time, and died poor. Had they been intent on

laying up treasure on this earth, they would not have given themselves so unreservedly to the work of preparing themselves and others for a better world; their interest would have been divided.

At the beginning of the Christian era was a time for men to sell all that they had. The cause of Christ had to struggle against fearful odds, to establish itself in the earth. There were but few Christians who had wealth, and those who had, "sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need." Acts 2:45. They had given themselves wholly to Christ, and therefore none of them said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own. Acts 4:32. Since then there has not been so great need, and even true Christians have not felt it their duty to sell out everything, although they held all subject to the disposal of the Lord; the Master did not call for it. "But the end of all things is at hand," and before the end shall come there will be a conflict between truth and error, such as the world has never witnessed. Even now the enemy is coming in like a flood, and the Spirit of the Lord is lifting up a standard against him. Satan is mustering all his forces for a last, desperate struggle; he is determined to deceive the whole world. But the message of the third angel, warning man against the worship of the beast and his image (Rev. 14:9-15), and preparing them for the coming of the Saviour, must go with a loud cry. Means are needed more and more every day, to carry forward the great work; and as the conflict increases, and approaches its consummation, the loyal soldiers of Jesus, realizing that earthly wealth will soon lose all its value, will know that the time has come to sell, and will throw out not only themselves, but all that they have, into the cause of truth.

How soon this time will come, we know not, but it is fast approaching. In ancient times the value of acquired property varied according to the nearness of the year of jubilee. At the year of jubilee all land that had been sold returned to its original possessor. Lev. 25:8-16. If that year were very far off, so that a man might reasonably expect to spend a life-time on land that he should buy, he would have to pay nearly or quite its full value; but if the year of jubilee were near at hand, the land would bring but a small sum, since the buyer would have possession for only a short time. Well, the year of jubilee is just at hand. The redemption of God's people draws nigh, and he will soon "proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof." The earth will then be given to him whose right it is (Eze. 21:27). Those, therefore, who are now putting their money into houses and lands, are being deceived. They are paying full price for that which is depreciating in value every day, and which will be worth nothing to them when the jubilee is proclaimed. In that day those who have still clung to their possessions, will cast their idols of silver and gold to the moles and to the bats, as worthless trash. May God grant, reader, that both you and I, ere that day dawn, shall have laid off all our treasure in Heaven, so that we may hail the expected Lord with joy, and receive an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not a way. E. J. W.

May 1, 1884

"Reasons for Not Observing Saturday" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 17.

E. J. Waggoner

A member of one of our missionary societies has been in correspondence with his friends in the East concerning the Sabbath question. In reply to one of his letters, he received a long letter from his former pastor, a Disciple minister, in which the latter tried to reclaim the wandering member of his flock, by showing the absurdities of Sabbath observance. From this letter we were allowed to make a few extracts, embodying the principal part of the argument, which we herewith give for the benefit of all inquirers after truth. The letter indicated a sincere desire on the part of the writer to win the brother from supposed error, and we are therefore warranted in supposing that the best argument was given that could be found. We quote:-

"The Sabbath,' it is not claimed is a term ever applied in the New Testament, or for many years after [the time when it was written], to the first day of the week. Hence is not claimed by me or my brethren that 'the Sabbath' of the Sinaitic law was changed. Talking about changing the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day is very much like the talk about changing circumcision to baptism."

This is not a bad statement to start with. Now knowing that the first day of the week is nowhere in the New Testament called "the Sabbath," that term being applied exclusively to the seventh day of the week, we call to mind these words of Christ: "But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day." Matt. 24:20. Christ was speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem, which occurred about forty years later. And what was to be the prayer of the disciples during these years? That they might not be obliged to violate the sanctity of the seventh-day Sabbath, and even to secure their own lives. If now the New Testament writers uniformly call the seventh day the Sabbath, "according to the commandment," where shall we look for authority for first-day observance? Is not the one teaching such observance going contrary to the New Testament? and will he not thus, under the anathema of Paul in Gal. 1:8? Indeed it *is* absurd to talk of changing the Sabbath of the Lord's appointments; but the papacy has *thought* himself able to do so (Dan. 7:25), and millions cheerfully acknowledge his claim. Again:-

"Statute law may and does change, but principles never. The basis of *all the law and the prophets* is given by our Lord as *love to God and man*. . . . *Man has no authority to change either*, but with the change of dispensation, God has given different commands as expressive of submission to him."

We ask, What is that which contains the record of the change of dispensation? The answer will be, "The New Testament." But our brother has admitted, as just quoted, that there was no change in "the Sabbath of the Mosaic law," and that, in the New Testament, the term Sabbath" is not applied to any other day than the seventh. Statute law *may* change, but we are not absolved from allegiance to it until that change takes place. But the New Testament contains no record of a change; on the contrary, Christ said "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17. Now since "this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments," how can we

have love to him if we violate one of them? No one can violate any portion of the law, and not violate the principle upon which is based.

Again we quote:-

"It is very easy to see that there is moral obligation to love, adore, and obey the Lord; and it is easy to understand that man's physical, intellectual, and moral good calls for a cessation from worldly occupations for a time, that the mind may be given to contemplation and worship; but that the observance of the seventh day of the week is of necessary moral obligation is a different matter. It was made obligatory by *appointment*. There was, no doubt, good reasons for such command, two at least of which are given in Scripture. 1. The creation. 2. The deliverance from Egypt."

The above seems to us to be an exceedingly cool piece of criticism upon the Creator. Our friend is willing to allow that the Lord had reason for appointing the seventh day as the Sabbath, but does not think we are morally bound to keep it. Let us see. To start with, there are two points upon which we are agreed. 1. That the seventh-day Sabbath is of divine appointment. 2. That the New Testament always recognizes the seventh day, and no other, as the Sabbath. But our friend says that the Sabbath commandment is not of *moral* obligation. How does he know that? By what standard are we to judge of moral obligation? Is the human mind capable of deciding? Hardly. How does he know that to commit adultery is an immoral act? Not from his own consciousness, for thousands of men, as highly gifted by nature as he, have believed such an act to be consistent with the highest virtue, and even necessary in order to attain the highest good. Indeed it was openly advocated in practice by many of the ancient philosophers. The young were taught to lie if it seemed to be their advantage to do so. The sentiments may be found in the writings of classical authors: "When telling a lie will be profitable, let it be told." "There is nothing decorous in truth, but when it is profitable." These are the teachings of those who were esteemed virtuous, and who had no idea but that they were doing all that was required of them.

Now how does our brother happen to be so much wiser than those philosophers, and that he knows such things to be sinful? Because the Lord has said, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and, "Thou shalt not bear false witness." It is in just the same way that we know that it is a sin to violate the Sabbath. It is based on the unalterable facts of creation; and the commandment is placed with the other moral precepts. It may be said that moral principles are eternal, but that there was a time when even the reason for the Sabbath commandment did not exist. Very well; and there was also a time when no reason for the seventh commandment existed. Before man was created there was no necessity for such a commandment, and yet no one questions the fact that it is of moral obligation. But let it be remembered that the earth was created before man was, and that therefore the reason for the fourth commandment antedates that for the seventh.

It is difficult to fitly characterize the idea that the seventh-day Sabbath is not of necessary moral obligation because "it was made obligatory by *appointment*." That is, we are under no moral obligation to keep it, because the only authority for its observance is the word of God! But let us imagine a man with this idea brought before the bar of God at the last day. The Judge, who is also the law-

maker, asks, "Why did you not keep the Sabbath? Did you not know that I had commanded its observance?" The reply comes, "Yes, Lord, I knew that, and publicly taught it, but I could find no reason for keeping the Sabbath, except the fact that you had made a commandment for its observance. I had no doubt but that you had a good reason for giving such a commandment; but since it rested solely on your authority, I did not feel under any obligation to keep it." Certainly the best that could be done would be to punish the man for contempt. We have no desire to be harsh; and we do not believe that our brother feels any contempt for God's authority; yet the above is just what his position amounts to. It is equivalent to saying that God is not the First Cause, but that there is a something called "moral principle" that is superior to him.

There is indeed "no doubt" but that God had "good reason" for setting apart the seventh day, as a reading of the fourth commandment will show. Here it is: "Six days shalt thou labor and all thy works; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in yet thou shalt not do any work. . . . for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore [for which reason] the Lord bless the Sabbath day and hallowed it." Ex. 20:9-11. This is the reason which the Lord gives for appointing the seventh day as the Sabbath. And we ask, Does not the same reason still exist? Is it not still a fact that the Lord created heaven and earth in six days? Is it not as true now as it ever was that he rested upon, blessed, and sanctified [set apart] the seventh day? Certainly. Then if the *reason* for the observance of the seventh day still exists, is it not claimed that the Lord would be *unreasonable*, that is, acting contrary to reason, if he did not still require that it should be kept? Who will dare charge the Lord with folly?

As to the deliverance from Egypt we will simply state that Moses cites that to remind the Israelites of their special obligation to God. Simple gratitude demanded that they should obey the commandment of God. But the reason for the institution of the Sabbath is given in the fourth commandment, which

266

was spoken many years before. To us this reason seems so cogent that we dare not enter into controversy with the Lord on the subject.

Again, our friend says: "The apostles never commanded the observance of the Sabbath." We agree, and going step farther and say that it would have made no difference if they had. The apostles were not law-givers; they had no authority to issue commands. "There is one Law-giver, who is able to save and to destroy." Jas. 4:12. And this Law-giver had issued a command for the observance of the Sabbath, thousands of years before the apostles were born, thus making it unnecessary for them to do so, even if they had been inclined to take matters into their own hands. The apostle Paul, speaking in behalf of his brethren in the ministry, said: "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though Christ did beseech you by us; for we pray you in Christ's stead, be reconciled to God." 2 Cor. 5:20. As Christ's ambassadors they followed his injunction to teach only what he had commanded them. Matt. 28:20. They, as well as we, owed allegiance to a sovereign power. It was left for the pope of Rome to usurp authority, and to issue laws of his own.

The above quotations are the chief reasons given in the letter for not observing the seventh day. It is but fitting that we should hear what the writer has to say for Sunday, which he terms the "Lord's day." Unfortunately his time expired before he could give his authority for that. What he says for it is contained in the following paragraph:-

"Our reasons for observing the Lord's day I have not time to give. I suggest, however, that the New Testament is not so much a book of precepts as of general principles. Even in those ordinances that are usually considered positive in their character, there is but little of the legislation or ritualistic."

It is enough. Why should he desire to say more? The New Testament is not a book of precepts, and therefore he keeps Sunday. Briefly summed up, his position is this: We need not keep the seventh day, because it is simply commanded by the Lord; and we ought to keep the first day, because there is no command for it whatever! Further comment is unnecessary. Reader, are you willing to rest your case upon so sandy a foundation as that? "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. E. J. W.

May 8, 1884

"General Meeting in Oakland" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 1. *The Signs of the Times* 10, 18.

E. J. Waggoner

We can say of this meeting, as of others that have been held in this State within the past two years, that it was one of the best we ever attended. Indeed, each successive meeting of this kind that we attend seems to us to be the very best. At this meeting there was quite a large attendance from abroad, San Francisco being well represented. On the last Sabbath of the meeting there were seventy-eight present from the church in that city.

The entire membership of the Oakland Sabbath-school is 220, but there were more than 300 present the first Sabbath, and 360 pupils were in their places at the opening of the school on the second Sabbath. Notwithstanding this large increase, there was not the slightest confusion, which speaks well, not only of the discipline of the Oakland school, but of the other schools that were represented. The Sabbath congregations numbered between 400 and 400, filling our church building to its utmost capacity. God has blessed the labors of the missionary workers in Oakland, so that our regular congregations are larger than ever before, and additions are constantly being made to our membership.

The interest of the meeting deepened from the beginning to the close. As usual, Bible-readings occupied a prominent place. There were eleven of these, covering the following subjects: Thanksgiving, Conversion, Duties of Church Members, Missionary work, Second Advent, Resurrection, Immortality, Sanctification, and Work of the Spirit. By these readings our people get a definite

knowledge of the Bible, such as could be obtained in no other way. They cannot take the place of preaching, but, if rightly conducted, they can do work that preaching cannot. We regard it as a bad indication when a professed Seventh-day Adventist is not interested in Bible-reading. We must learn more of the Bible itself.

There were eight sermons preached during the meeting. The principal burden of these was for a deeper and more intelligent consecration to God. The difference between true and false sanctification was clearly shown. This was very timely, for the so-called "holiness" movement, which teaches instantaneous sanctification, without any change of habit on the part of the individual, is rapidly gaining ground, and Oakland is the head-quarters of the delusion on this coast. In the discourses, and in the Bible-reading on Sanctification, it was shown that while we are justified freely by the grace of God as soon as we implicitly believe on Christ, the work of sanctification is a life work, a constant gaining of victories over sin, by the aid of the Spirit, and with the light from God's word. This modern "holiness" movement is a deception of Satan, to cause men to be satisfied with themselves while trampling on God's law. Thorough instruction concerning the law of God, and a close adherence thereto, is a sure safeguard against this delusion, and is at the same time the means by which we are to be truly sanctified. John 17:17.

The early morning prayer-meetings, which were attended by Sister White, were seasons of refreshing. If the instruction given by the servant of God shall be remembered and put into practice, there will certainly be a marked growth in grace among those who heard. True Christian experience, and the nature of faith were set forth with a clearness not to be misunderstood. While we are sanctified through the truth, that is, by obeying it, we can do nothing to atone for past sins. Christ knew the work that he had to do, and understood the frailty and sinfulness of human nature, before he undertook our salvation. God does not repulse us because we are sinful, but for this very reason invites us to come to him, through Christ, for pardon. One of the greatest blessings that he can bestow on us is to show us our sins; and when we see them, instead of giving way to discouragement, we must believe that he does pardon, according to his promise. Isa. 1:18, 19; 55:6, 7. Faith in God is so simple that many overlook it. We are to believe, not because of any change in our own feelings, but because of God's promise. We are not to look at ourselves, but "unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith."

The meetings of the Tract and Missionary Society, as it will be seen by the report, were full of encouragement to the workers. The meeting of the stockholders of the Publishing Association was especially interesting. The work has never been so prosperous as during the past year. There has been an increasing demand for our denominational literature, so that all the departments are crowded. It was the general feeling of the stockholders that more room is imperatively needed. We must provide, but simply for growth in the same proportion as in the past, but for a great increase. The work increases in geometrical ratio. The Lord has a great work for us to do in warning the world,

and we must hold ourselves ready to follow at once wherever his providence opens the way.

The special meetings of the ministers and other workers, for prayer and consultation, were seasons to be remembered. The Lord blessed abundantly in giving light on points that seemed dark. After earnest prayer and deliberation it was decided that Elder Ballou, and Brethren Rieck and Kinney should labor during the summer in Nevada. Brother and Sister McClure, and Brother Henry Scott have gone to their field in Humboldt County. Brother Brorsen also goes to that county to work among the Danes. Brother Ings goes to the coast of Oregon shortly, all the churches on the coast will have the benefit of Elder Loughborough's labors. Brethren L. A. Scott and A. LaRue, after spending a few weeks in the San Francisco ship mission work, will go to the Sandwich Islands. Brethren Frank Lamb and Lucius Church have started for Siskiyou County. They go by private conveyance, canvassing and visiting along the road. Besides these, a good core of colporteurs and canvassers have started out into different parts of the field. We feel greatly encouraged in regard to the work on the coast. What increases our courage is the perfect harmony that prevails among the workers. The feeling of brotherly love seems to be deepening. We pray God's blessing upon these dear brethren as they go forth. We believe that he will accompany them, and give force to their effort.

The last Sabbath of the meeting was a good day for all present. Elder Loughborough gave a stirring discourse in the morning from Luke 12:35, 36. We doubt not that many made new resolves to sacrifice

281

in the future for the cause of God, as never before. That must be the one object of our existence here. In the afternoon Sister White took up the same subject—that of consecration to God—and carried it forward, showing how completely we belong to God, and how we rob him by living for ourselves alone. At the close of her discourse, about a hundred came forward for prayer. A large portion of these had never made a profession, and some were backsliders. There was no excitement, but very deep feeling, and the presence of the Lord was iacknowledged by all.

On Monday afternoon, April 28, the large congregation repaired to the Lake Merritt, where the ordinance of baptism was administered to thirty candidates. While the good meeting was the immediate cause of the forward move taken by many, the primary cause was the faithful work that has been done in the past by the missionary and Sabbath-school workers. The most of those who joined the Oakland Church, are members of the Sabbath-school. The teachers in the Sabbath-school should feel that their position is one of sacred responsibility. Although their field is not large, it is second in importance to none. The baptismal scene was very impressive.

At the closing meeting on Tuesday morning, Bro. N. C. McClure and Bro. Wm. Ings were set apart, by prayer and the laying on of hands, to the work of the gospel ministry. The blessing of the Lord was present in rich measure, and all felt that the ordination service was a fitting close to a most excellent meeting. To be permitted to attend throughout the entire meeting was a rare privilege. Many, we

are confident, will make more rapid advancement toward the kingdom, as a result. Will there be any who go backward? May God give us all strength and courage, and protect us from the snares of Satan. E. J. W.

May 22, 1884

"Los Angeles Camp-Meeting" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 20.

E. J. Waggoner

By the time this report issues from the press, this meeting, now two-thirds over, will be closed. Of course we cannot yet speak of results, yet we can make a good estimate of what will be accomplished.

The meeting was appointed in rather an unfavorable time for a full attendance of our people. This county has had three or four times its usual amount of rain the past season, and, as a consequence, farmers have been delayed in putting in their crops. The ground is just now in suitable condition for cultivation, and the people think that if this time is not improved they will raise no crops this year. The attendance of our own people is, therefore, very small. We regret this very much, for those in this part of the State have never before been permitted to meet with others of the same faith in camp-meeting. We cannot but think that if they had had this privilege, and could know the importance of such gatherings, or they can receive instruction concerning the dangers and duties of our time, there would have been a large attendance. Satan knows the importance of these meetings, and will throw hindrances in our way. He is an arch-deceiver, and can magnify a mole-hill into a mountain when it stands between us and duty. Very often it happens that things that seem to be in the natural order of events, perhaps ordered by Providence, have been gotten out by Satan for the express purpose of depriving us of a blessing. We need to be careful not to be deceived.

But notwithstanding the meager attendance of our own people, the meeting has been in many respects a success. We have not attended a camp-meeting in California where there was so large and regular an outside attendance. God has seemed to give us a favor with the people, and a good impression is being made. The daily papers, of which there are four in the city, have been very kind in giving us favorable notices, reporting our meetings, etc. There has not been a word of adverse criticism. The order of the ground is commended, and surprise expressed at the size of the camp which to us seems so small.

We believe that it is in the order of God's providence that this meeting is held. Its effect will be to give character and permanence to the work in this section. There is no better field for labor in the State than Los Angeles; it is indeed a missionary field, and it will now be easier to reach the people than ever before. As we see the abundant opening, we feel constrained to pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers. Would that all our brethren in the State might awaken to the necessity of the time, and be preparing to fill the openings which God is preparing for us. Our College should be more than filled, and it should be so relieved from financial embarrassment that it can provide accommodation for all who may desire to attend. We often pray for the spread of the message, as

though there were some failure on the part of the Lord, and he must begin to work, when the fact is that he is away ahead of us, and is waiting for us to get faith enough to walk out where he leads. God is more anxious for the salvation of souls than we are. Let us all pray the Lord to send forth laborers, and then have a hand in answering our own prayers.

The burden of this meeting has been to entrust the little company present in the practical duties, to give them a familiarity with the workings of the cause, and to awaken living faith and the promises of God. The timely testimony of Sister White has been well received. If it shall be heeded the Lord will work wonderfully for his people in this part of the field. Brethren pray for the work here. E. J. W. *Los Angeles. May 15.*

May 29, 1884

"Southern California Camp-Meeting" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 21.

E. J. Waggoner

There is not much concerning this meeting, to be added to our report of last week. The time was fully occupied with meetings, as is customary at our camp-meetings. The days were devoted to Bible-readings and instruction concerning our important work. Each evening there was a sermon, which was listened to by a large number not of our faith. The interest was good until the close. As an immediate result of this meeting, twenty-two signed the covenant to keep all the "commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus," and eleven presented themselves as candidates for baptism.

The little company at Los Angeles were very much encouraged, and feel determined to take hold of the work with new energy. As proof of this, an old debt which had hung over their missionary Society was lifted, and their club of SIGNS was increased from ten to fifty copies, and the money all pledged. When our people all learn the power of little sums when combined, and adopt the Bible plan of systematically laying aside certain sums, as God has prospered them, we shall see the work increase beyond all our expectations.

Elders Healey, Israel, and Briggs, together with a large corp of canvassers and colporteurs, remain in Los Angeles to carry forward the work, and take advantage of the good impression that has already been made. May the Lord prosper them in all their efforts. E. J. W.

June 5, 1884

"The Sabbath-School. Acts, Chapter 20:24-27:14" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 22.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST.-JUNE 15.
ACTS, CHAPTER 20:24-27:14

Our last lesson closed with Paul's speech before Agrippa. The last two verses of this defense (Acts 26:22, 23), are worthy of more extended notice than the limited space last week allowed. We quote: "Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both too small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show a light unto the people, and to the Gentiles."

These verses alone are sufficient to refute the somewhat prevalent idea that the doctrine of immortality through Christ was unknown to the Old Testament writers. The apostles were not foolish enough to make assertions without any authority to back them up. Paul himself had written, "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord." 2 Cor. 4:5. But their only means of proving Jesus to be the Messiah, were the prophecies. They could testify that one Jesus of Nazareth had been crucified and raised from the dead, but what of it? This would have availed nothing, had they not been able to prove from the Old Testament, the only Scripture then in existence, that these very things were predicted to occur at a definite time, and for a special purpose. Both Moses and the prophets declared, not only that Christ should suffer, but also the reason for his suffering. Even before Moses, we learn that the gospel had been preached to Abraham. Gal. 3:8.

Verse 23 has been the source of much perplexity and controversy. It is certain that many were raised from the dead before Christ was-Lazarus, the son of the widow of Nain, and others-even hundreds of years before he came to earth. Many, to avoid this seeming contradiction of facts, have concluded that the text means that Christ was the first who should rise to immortality. But the text does not say so, and we have no means of proving that such is the case. The Revised Version follows the original more closely in this instance than does the King James. It reads thus: "How that the Christ must suffer, and how that he first by the resurrection of the dead should proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles." Not that Christ should be the first absolutely to rise from the dead, but to proclaim through that resurrection light to the world.

There were many that were raised prior to the time of Christ, but their resurrection gave no pledge that another would be raised. And they themselves were raised only by virtue of the promise that Christ would pass through the gates of death and come forth a triumphant conqueror, bearing the keys of death and the grave. This promise was made before any man had fallen under the power of death; he was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. But God "calleth those things which be not as though they were." A thing promised by him is just as sure as though already fulfilled. With this thought in mind we may even consider that Christ was actually the first to rise from the dead, for his resurrection was as well assured as was his death; and he was "slain from the foundation of the world." And since this promise was the pledge of immortality, it is a matter of no more wonder that man should be raised to immortality before the time of Christ than that they should be raised from the dead at all.

We do not say that all who were raised were made immortal (of this we are not informed), but there is certainly nothing in this text to forbid the idea that

some were made immortal. We know that some, as Enoch and Elijah, went to Heaven without seeing death-were made immortal-but this was only by virtue of the same promise, for immortality is brought to light only through the gospel. 2 Tim. 1:10. Their translation was possible only because the resurrection of Jesus was an assured fact (by promise), and the same power that made them immortal through translation, could make others immortal through a resurrection.

When Paul touched upon the resurrection from the dead, Festus cried out, "Paul, thou art beside thyself; much learning doth make thee mad." This preaching was to him foolishness. There was nothing in philosophy that could explain the fact of a resurrection. He had doubtless seen Paul bending over his rusty parchment copy of the Old Testament, and he concluded that intense application had turned his brain. But Paul courteously replied, "I am not mad, most noble Festus; but speak forth the words of truth in soberness." Well might he say this, for they were the words of the Bible. Philosophy is just as powerless as ever to explain the doctrine of the resurrection; its professed devotees may scoff at the simple faith of the unlearned Christian; but it is nevertheless true that the words of truth and reason are to be found, above all other places, in the word of God. The doctrine of the resurrection is a most reasonable one, not because it can be grasped by human reason, but because it is founded upon the unchanging word of the eternal God. It is consistent with the highest reason to believe what he says, whether we understand it or not.

Paul could appeal to Agrippa as he could not to Festus. "Believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest." Since he understood and believed the prophets, and Paul had shown their accurate fulfillment in the person and work of Christ, his declaration, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian," was almost a necessary consequence. Had it not been for his wicked heart, the source of unbelief, he could have omitted the "almost." We do not believe, with some, that these words of Agrippa were uttered in a sneering manner, but that they were forced from him, even against his will, by the power of the apostle's reasoning.

The reply of Paul showed him to be at once a perfect gentleman and a perfect Christian. "I would to God, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost and altogether such as I am except these bonds." If Paul had passed his life among courtiers, he could not have framed a more delicate and forcible rejoinder. And this shows that communion with God and his word may be depended upon to give men a true polish, not excelled by the most skilled worldly diplomat. But how many professed Christians are there who would dare make the reply that Paul made?

How many are living so near to God, leading such holy lives, as to be able to say to all around them "I would to God that you were altogether such as I am"? I fear that the most of us would hesitate. And yet Paul had attained no height of godliness that is not possible to all. It is not only the privilege but the duty of all to be like Christ, so that when he sits as a refiner and purifier of silver, he may rejoice to see his own image reflected in us, that when he shall appear we may be able to see him as he is. E. J. W.

"Rom. 13:1-10" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 22.

E. J. Waggoner

NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.

JUNE 22.-ROM. 13:1-10.

Verse 1: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers, for there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God." By the "higher powers" is meant those who are in authority in the earth. Submission to authority is one of the chief requisites; it lies at the foundation of all goodness. It is everywhere taught in the Bible. The child that is disobedient to his parents, or the man who despises the authority of the Government, cannot be submissive to the will of God. To teach children perfect submission to authority when they are young, is to prepare them to be good citizens of the State, and humble followers of God.

"The powers that be are ordained of God." That is, God has appointed that there should be governments in the earth. Paul has reference more to authority in the abstract than to individual rulers. God has ordered that there should be government; but it does not follow that the men in authority are always men that he would approve. We read that in the redeemed estate there will be nations and kings, who will bring their glory and honor into the New Jerusalem. Rev. 21. We may learn, therefore, that God has no sympathy with anarchy and confusion. Those who are trying to overthrow existing forms of government are not doing work which God approves; a Christian cannot engage in such a work. And right here it is worth while to notice that socialists, communists, and the nihilists are almost invariably atheists, as much opposed to the government of God as they are to earthly powers.

"Whosoever therefore resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God." These words of Paul are greatly misapprehended by many. They do not teach that we are to obey every human ordinance. No Christian is justified in *resisting* authority, and yet it may be absolutely necessary for him to disobey the commands of rulers. For instance: The apostles were often commanded by those highest in authority not to preach in the name of Jesus, but they paid no attention to this command, saying, "We ought to obey God rather than men." Here was a case where the laws of men work in opposition to those of God. Such laws they were warranted in disobeying, but we will see that they did not resist authority. They said nothing against the rulers, and did not try to create insurrection among the people; they submitted to authority and took their punishment without a word of complaint. When the hearts of the people were with the apostles, in consequence of the wonderful miracles they had performed, they might easily have organized a force that would have compelled the rulers to revoke their unjust decrees, or even to flee from office. In the course which they did pursue, all Christians have an example to follow.

In the ninth and tenth verses we find a statement of our duties as citizens, and of the rights of rulers. The last five commandments are quoted as comprising the whole of the law, with the statement that "if there be any other commandment

it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." To do this, Paul says, is to fulfill the law. Now he has not said anything about idolatry, image-worship, profane swearing, or Sabbath-breaking. Why not? Was it because he regarded these things as of no consequence? No; but because he was writing about our duty as citizens and not concerning our special duty to God. That this is not all the law, we know from our Saviour's words. He places, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," first, as being greater than the one which Paul quotes, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Paul does not repudiate that first and great commandment, as is abundantly shown in his writings elsewhere; but he only quotes so much of the law as it is applicable to the case in hand. And there is a thought here for those who would have special legislation by earthly rulers on matters of religion. If all our duty as citizens of the State is comprehended in this thing, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," then it surely follows that all the power of the rulers of the State are comprised in seeing that the people obey that law. To this extent they are God's ministers (servants). He intrusts to them the enforcing of laws, the violation of which would work ill to man; beyond this they have no right to go.

"He that loveth another [literally, *the* other] hath fulfilled the law." That is, he obeys all the law that relates merely to our duty to man. No one can tell another, steal from him, bear false witness against him, violate the chastity of any of his family, or covet his goods, and at the same time love him. If he loves his neighbor as he does himself, he will not offend in any of these points, and then he will be doing all that human laws can require of him. But after he does this, there yet remains his duty to God, as covered by the first and great commandment. If he does not fulfill this law, he is amenable to God alone; and if those that resist earthly rulers receive to themselves damnation, who can measure the guilt of him who refuses to render to God the honor that is due him? E. J. W.

"Our Sabbath-School Department" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 22.

E. J. Waggoner

It has been our aim to make this department of our paper one of general interest. From the very nature of our work the Sabbath-school department of the SIGNS must be different from that of any other paper. The SIGNS is a missionary paper. Devoted to an exposition of the great truths of the Bible, especially those for the last days, and as such it goes to all parts of the world, and is read by all classes of people. Its circulation is not confined to our own people, but thousands not of our faith, and many with no well-defined belief in Christianity, read it with interest. Of the thousands of readers of the SIGNS, comparatively few study the Sabbath-school lessons upon which it comments, the great majority using the international series; and those who study the lessons published in the *Youth's Instructor*, are so widely scattered that many do not get the SIGNS in time to make the notes of the immediate use in preparing their lesson.

All these things have been taken into account in preparing our Sabbath-school department, and we have endeavored to make the notes and comments

of such a nature as will interest the general reader. The mission of the SIGNS is such that we cannot afford to have any part of it of merely local interest. We have evidence from Sabbath-school teachers and scholars that this department has been useful to them in their work; and we know that it has not been unappreciated by the larger class whom we have had in mind.

But there are many who study the International lessons, who would derive more direct benefit if the SIGNS contained notes on that series also, and we have decided to meet this want. As all doubtless know, the International lessons are necessarily non-sectarian, being simply portions of the Bible selected by the Lesson committee. While all the Sunday-schools in the country study the same portion of Scripture at the same time, each denomination or journal may publish its own notes and comments. Since the SIGNS is a Bible expositor, to comment on these lessons will be directly in the line of our work. We therefore begin this week to add these to our own Lesson notes. To those unacquainted with this series, we will say now for all time, that there are only twelve lessons in each quarter; each school can use whatever it desires for the thirteenth lesson. There will therefore be no notes next week.

As in the past, we will endeavor to make these notes of interest and profit to all; we shall also get them out in time so that those who desire may use them in preparing their lessons. We believe that this move will be appreciated by all our present readers, and by thousands yet to come. E. J. W.

June 12, 1884

"God's Seventh Day Man's First Day" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

There is nothing that can be proved so conclusively that no one can find a chance to cavil, if his inclination or selfish interest prompts him to do so. The infidel Hume once said that if there were anything in the forty-seventh proposition of Euclid that crossed any person's selfish interests, or limited the power of any man or class of men, there would be hundreds who would dispute the mathematical demonstration that the square of the hypotenuse of the right-angled triangle is equal to the sum of the squares of the other two sides. And so it is. It is not difficult, with the mass of mankind, to gain their assent to the most absurd theories, if their passions or business interests lead the way; but it requires more than mere human reason to thoroughly convince a man of the plainest truth, against his inclinations. Only the grace of God can subdue the evil heart of unbelief.

By no other means than by the existence of the principle just cited, can we account for some of the (so-called) arguments against the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. One of the weakest of these is that "the day which is observed by the majority of people is indeed the true Sabbath of the fourth commandment," since "God's seventh day was Adam's first day." We would not think this objection worthy of notice in this paper, had not several correspondents especially requested it.

What is meant by the expression "God's seventh day"? Of course nothing else can be met but the seventh day of time, according to God's count. This, it is claimed, is man's first day, because he could not have any knowledge of time that had passed before his creation! To be consistent, the advocates of this theory should keep as their Sabbath, the seventh day, counting by seventh from the day of their birth. If this chanced to be on Wednesday, then they should keep Tuesday, for how do they know that there was any such thing as time before they were born? It will be replied that others have kept a record of time, and we accept their testimony and reckoning. Exactly so; and is it not possible that the same God who imparted to Adam the knowledge of the Sabbath, could inform him of the fact that there was a measurement of time before he was created? It seems that Moses found out a great deal about things that occurred before his own time, even as far back as the very beginning, because he was willing to take the Lord's word for it; and the first day of Adam's existence is rather early for him to be setting up his own reckoning in opposition to that of his Maker.

But it is strange that none of those who have stumbled at this objection raised by their leaders, have never questioned the truth of the assumed fact. They have never thought to inquire if God's seventh day was indeed man's first day. This point can be settled by reading the first chapter of Genesis, which contains a record of the transactions of each day of the creation week. There we learn that man and the lower animals were created on the *sixth* day of the week. If Adam, then, as is claimed, commenced an individual reckoning of time, the seventh day of his week would have been the fifth day of the week according to God's reckoning. No one can deny this. We know it is claimed that Adam was created late on the sixth day, and that the next day was really his first day. Really, it was no such thing, we are not informed as the exact hour of the day when Adam was created, nor does it matter; we do know that he was created on the sixth day, and, consequently, that was his first day of life. If a child is born on the twelfth of June, the twelfth and not the thirteenth of June in each succeeding year is celebrated as his birth-day, even though he were born late in the afternoon.

Now why do not the advocates of the theory in question stick to the facts in the case? Simply because

361

the facts would demolish their theory. If the facts were adhered to, they would find in them no semblance of an excuse for Sunday-keeping, and it would not be for their interest to advocate the observance of the fifth or the sixth day of the week.

The absurdity of the theory is apparent enough, but we want to consider it a moment in the light of the fourth commandment. That says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in yet thou shalt not do any work." Did God mean by this the seventh day, or the first day? "Both," say our friends; "he meant the seventh day according to his own private count, but the first day according to man's reckoning." We have heard that the Jesuits say a thing that they do not mean, and which is not true, and making mental reservation, or repeat the truth in an undertone; but this theory charges God with the same duplicity. The commandment was spoken to and for man, and must of course, be in the

language to which men are accustomed, otherwise it would be meaningless. Now if God's seventh day was Adam's first day, then man's seventh day must be God's sixth day; and, this theory being true, it follows that the fourth commandment enjoins the observance of neither the first nor the seventh day, but the sixth!

But this, and similar absurd theories, arise from the assumption that the Sabbath is a human institution, and that God has nothing much to do with it, except to advise man to rest when he feels like it. The fact is, that it is God's day upon which we are to rest,-the one upon which he rested, and which he blessed and set apart. It is "*the seventh day*" which is "*the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.*" Man could not make a day holy if he tried; but God made the Sabbath holy, and he commands man not to desecrate it. Man had nothing to do with making the Sabbath; his only duty in regard to it is to keep it.

One word, in closing, to our brethren who may sometimes be at a loss to know how to answer an objector. Do not hold yourselves under obligations to refute at sight every assemblage of words that may be called an argument. Ask the objector first to *prove* his proposition, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred he will demonstrate that there was nothing to refute. In the remaining instance you may need to aid him by quoting a few texts of Scripture. E. J. W.

"Facts Against Supposition" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

In the SIGNS of March 6, the editor, commenting on a sermon on Spiritualism, penned the following words: "We record our emphatic denial of the assertion that the Scriptures give any instances of the spirits of the departed reappearing; and we invite any one to point out to us the texts wherein such reappearing is supposed to be given."

Had the call been for texts which *prove* the return of departed spirits, eternity might pass before a response could be made, the word "supposed" gives the Spiritualist considerable latitude; for there is no limit to what a man may "suppose" about a Bible text, if he only gives loose rein to his fancy. A gentleman from Boston, taking advantage of the above invitation, sends us his supposition as follows:-

"Permit me to call your attention to one of the many to be found in the Bible. Luke 16, verses 9, 12, 14; Luke 24, verses 14, 29, 30, 31, 36; John 20, verses 19, 20, 26, 27, and 29. The latter part of the 29th verse contains the following: 'Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.' To what extent the above will apply to those of the present day, who have the opportunity to see and believe, and won't do either, remains to be seen."

We are willing to give our correspondent credit for believing without seeing, for we doubt much if he has ever seen some of the texts to which he refers. If he had, he certainly would not have used them. We refer to those in Luke 16, not one of which contains even the most indirect allusion to a spirit either present or absent. As we said before, though, there is no accounting for what a man may "suppose," especially if he is wandering in the fog of Spiritualism.

In the references made to Luke 24 and John 20, our friend is equally unfortunate. These texts speak of the appearing of Jesus to his disciples after his resurrection; but they say nothing about the return of his spirit. Jesus was then alive, not dead; and we do not question the fact that living beings may appear to whomsoever they please. Luke 24:36, one of the verses referred to, says: "And as they thus spake, *Jesus himself* [not his spirit] stood in the midst of them." And verses 38 and 39, *not* referred to, plainly declare that it was not a spiritual manifestation. They read thus: "And he said unto them, Why are ye trouble? and why do thoughts are rise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." We are inclined to think that it is far easier to believe some things without having seen them, than after the light of truth has shown clearly upon them.

We are well aware that Spiritualists, and many who are pleased to style themselves orthodox, claim that the resurrection is simply the act of the soul or spirit leaving the body at the death of the latter. In such a case there would be no resurrection from the dead; there would, in fact, be no death. But the Scriptures invariably speak of a resurrection "from the dead." Paul was willing to suffer all things if by any means he might attain unto the "resurrection from the dead;" literally, from "dead ones." Phil. 3:11. When Jesus was transfigured before his disciples, he charged them to tell no man of it until after he was "risen again from the dead." Matt. 17:9. And this resurrection was not the escaping of the spirit at the dissolution of the body, for we are told that "he began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders, and of the chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again." Mark 8:31. Those who claim that the real Christ did not die, or that it was his undying spirit that appeared to the disciples the third day after the crucifixion, must squarely deny the above and many other Scripture texts.

And right here we would drop a word of warning, and urge upon all the necessity of a well-grounded, intelligent faith in the Scriptures. There is no doctrine upon which it is more necessary that we be firmly settled than that of the State of the dead. Error is wonderfully blinding and seductive. We may think that we are proof against temptation on this point, but the human heart is in itself deceitful, and Satan knows how to take advantage of it, if it is left unguarded. Our only hope of safety is in having a *thorough* knowledge of the true teachings of the inspired word, and in being led by the Spirit of God, that when we are brought into the conflict with Satan, we may meet him at every point with, "It is written." We are to resist him steadfast 'in the faith."

Our correspondent says: "Your paper is good in many ways. Pray be good enough to spend half as much time in the investigation of Spiritualism as you have in attacking it, and give the readers the result of your investigations." Why, we have spent a great deal more time in the investigation of Spiritualism than we have in attacking it. But we don't propose to investigate in the way that our friend wishes us to. We do not like to investigate in the dark. We have studied the Bible, and we find Spiritualism there exposed so plainly that we have no need to go nearer. As we said, error is blinding; and those who investigate Spiritualism by going into it, or by going where spiritual manifestations are given, will do so at the

peril of their souls. It is simply putting themselves on the devil's ground and inviting him to try his power upon them. Christ will not accompany us when we needlessly go on to the enemy's ground, and without him human strength is powerless against the prince of darkness.

The man who is groping about blindfolded in a dark cavern does not have nearly so good a chance to know what it is like, as the man does who stands outside with open eyes, and holding in his hand a lamp whose beams shine into its utmost recesses. The man who sinks in the ocean knows nothing of its depth, compared with the one who stands secure in a boat and casts in a sounding line. So the man who ventures into the mazes of Spiritualism, is no proper judge of its real nature; while the man who holds in his hand the lamp of God's word can see all its terrible dangers,-dangers all the more terrible because they are so seductive.

We do not need to take poison in order to know its deadly character. We learn its nature and effects from books, and are therewith content. And so we would say again to all: Study the word of God carefully; and earnestly and continually pray, "Lead us not into temptation." E. J. W.

June 19, 1884

**"The Sabbath-School. Acts, Chapter 28" *The Signs of the Times* 10,
24.**

E. J. Waggoner

"And the barbarous people showed us no little kindness." "The Greeks regarded all as barbarians who did not speak their language, and applied the name to all other nations but their own. It does not denote, as it does sometimes with us, people of savage, uncultivated, and cruel habits, but simply those whose speech was unintelligible. See 1 Cor. 14:11. The island is supposed to have been peopled at first by the Phœcians, afterward by the Phœnicians, and afterward by a colony from Carthage. The language of the Maltese was that of Africa."-*Barnes*.

"And when Paul had gathered a bundle of sticks." This was perfectly in keeping with Paul's character. He was never idle. He was the foremost preacher of the age, commissioned directly by the Lord, yet he was not above engaging in the most menial work when it was necessary. In Paul we find all the characteristics of a true missionary. He was able to adapt himself to all circumstances. His knowledge was varied. He could preach the truth in such a way as to make kings tremble, could direct the management of the ship, and control a mutinous crew, and when shipwrecked, could at once provide for the comfort of himself and companions. He was what we would call a man of resources.

When Paul reached Rome he acted with characteristic promptness. Within three days he called the chief of the Jews together to lay his case before them. Although he was manifestly in the hands of God, he did not think it unnecessary to taking the precaution for his defense. It was best for him to get the goodwill of these Jews as far as possible before the case came to trial, by disabusing their

minds of wrong impressions which they might have gained. He asserts his innocence in these words: "Though I have committed nothing against the people, or the customs of our fathers, yet was I delivered prisoner from Jerusalem into the hands of the Romans." This was all strictly true. He had not done anything against his own nation. On the contrary, he had devoted much time and strength to the collection of alms for the poor of Judea. And he had really done nothing against the customs of the fathers-the special point of which he was accused. It was while he was engaged in the performance of duties enjoined by the ceremonial law that he had been arrested. While it is true that Paul had mingled with the Gentiles, and had held that circumcision was a matter of indifference, he was entirely innocent of the charge brought against him, and it is of this that Paul speaks. It is a common form of speech, when one is falsely accused, to say, "I have committed no crime, nor been guilty of any wrong act." By this the speaker is not understood as claiming that he never did anything wrong in his life-time, but that he is innocent of the thing brought against him.

We would not be understood as intimating that Paul had committed any wrong act at any time, although he had, during his ministry, done many things which a Jew of that age would not have done. But he refers to the fathers, and we have evidence that the exclusiveness which led the later Jews to refuse all intercourse with Gentiles was not shared by them. It is worthy of note, however, that even the Pharisees, those zealous advocates of law, never brought any charge of immorality against Paul. He was never accused of breaking the Sabbath or of any other violation of the ten commandments. This is a strong evidence as is needed to prove that Paul was always a devout Sabbath-keeper. If he had not kept the Sabbath of the commandment-the seventh day of the week-his enemies would have speedily become aware of it. Such a flagrant violation of the law would not be allowed to pass unreprieved. And the fact that when they were clamoring for his blood, and inventing grievous charges against him, they did not accuse him of Sabbath-breaking, shows that Paul had never even technically violated the fourth commandment. He could truly say to the Sanhedrim, "I have lived in all good conscience before God until this day." Acts 23:1. He believed "all things which are written in the law and in the prophets;" and what he believed he acted upon. So we see that when Paul preached in the synagogues of Antioch, Thessalonica, and Corinth on the Sabbath-day, it was not an accidental occurrence, but in perfect harmony with his life-long habit and settled convictions. E. J. W.

"An Important Question" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 24.

E. J. Waggoner

"And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. He saith unto him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, Thou shalt love thy

neighbour as thyself. The young man saith unto him, All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet? Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me. But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions." Matt. 19:16-22.

The question asked by the young ruler is one that has been asked by thousands, and one that should interest every person. Life is a boon of inestimable value; men will spend the earnings of years, and travel to the utmost limits of the globe, in order to prolong their lives for a few years. How eagerly, then, should they grasp anything which will lengthen out their lives to all eternity. It is indeed wonderful that so few manifest an interest in that which pertains to their eternal welfare, while they are so zealous for life and happiness for a short time. In this the majority of mankind manifest only the wisdom of the infant who seizes the glittering toy, and rejects the infinitely more valuable bag of treasure. But there are some who are anxiously inquiring, "What must I do to be saved?" And to such the words of our Lord himself on this subject must be of all-absorbing interest.

The reader will notice that Jesus did not at once answer the young man's question, but asked him one on another subject. "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God." Our Saviour did not mean to intimate by this that he was not good. He himself said that it was his meat to do the will of the Father (John 4:34); and again he said to his disciples, "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love." John 15:10. To the Jews he said, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" (John 8:46), thus demanding the closest scrutiny of his life. Paul says that he "knew no sin" (2 Cor. 5:21); Peter says of him that he "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth" (1 Pet. 2:22); and even the devils acknowledged him to be "the Holy One of God." Mark 1:24. His character on earth was the same that it is now as our High Priest, "holy, harmless, and defiled, separate from sinners." Heb. 7: 26. He was absolutely good; the perfection and embodiment of goodness.

This being the case, we can understand his words, "there is none good but one, that is God," as nothing but a statement of the fact that he himself was entitled to be called God. If there is but one that is good, viz., God, and Christ is good, then Christ must be God. And this agrees with what the prophet had said of Christ: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, *The mighty God*, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." Isa. 9:6. John also said: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." John 1:1. Since he is the Son of God, he partakes of the divine attributes; and so Paul says that he occupies a more exalted position than the angels because "he hath *by inheritance* a more excellent name than they." Heb. 1:4. He was never on probation, as a candidate for life, as are all created beings, but has "life in himself" (John 5:26), being the creator of all things. John 1:3; Col. 1:16.

The Father and the Son are one. John 10:30. Both are worthy of worship. God alone may be worshiped (Rev. 22:8, 9), but Christ did not refuse the adoration of his disciples. Luke 24:52. We are not called upon to explain the mystery of godliness, nor expected to understand it, but Christ has explained to us how he and the Father are one. In his memorable prayer for his disciples, he said: "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, *as we are one*." "And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; *that they may be one even as we are one*." John 17:11, 22. This oneness, then, is that of two distinct individuals having the same thoughts, the same purposes, the same attributes. The Father and the Son were one in creating the earth, and one in the devising and carrying out of the plan of salvation. They never worked at cross purposes; and in harmony with Christ's prayer that union may exist among his disciples, Paul exhorts us to "all speak the same thing," and to "be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." 1 Cor. 1:10.

We understand, therefore, that when Christ addressed to the young man the words found in Matt. 19:17, it was because he saw that this ruler, like Nicodemus, did not appreciate the divine character of Jesus, but thought him to be a mere man. Christ penetrated the young man's thoughts, and by this question and reply revealed to him his own true nature.

Having incidentally settled this point, our Lord immediately answers the question, "What good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?" He did not say, "You must not do anything," but said plainly, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." The young man, greatly surprised, asked, "Which?" Being a ruler of the Jews, he had, of course, kept the law, and prided himself on the strictness with which he had heeded all its requirements. The strictness of the Pharisees, extending even to the minutest forms and ceremonies, is proverbial. The young man, doubtless, like Paul, lived under the "straitest sect" of the Jew's religion. We can therefore imagine the astonishment and assurance with which he uttered the word, "Which?" As much as to say, "Why, are there any other commandments? Have you some new ones that are not written in the law? If so, tell me what they are." Jesus calmly quotes a portion of the ten commandments, as showing that the law to which he has reference. The fact that he did not quote all of them is no proof that he did not design that all should be kept. He did not quote the first nor the third, yet no one would argue from this that Christ meant to indicate to the young man that he could worship idols or indulge in profanity and still be saved. He simply quoted enough to show that he referred to that which was regarded by all as the law, and that he had no new commandment to offer.

Before commenting further on the observance of the commandments as the condition of eternal life, or the truth of the young man's reply in verse 20, we wish to briefly notice what this law is. In a matter of life and death it will not do to make a mistake. If the commandments are to be the test of our fitness for eternal life, we must have those commandments so clearly defined that there can be no doubt. Fortunately, this is not a difficult thing to do. In the third month after the children of Israel left Egypt, they came to the wilderness of Sinai. The Lord told them to make certain preparations, for within three days he would come down

upon Mount Sinai in the sight of all the people. Ex. 19:10, 11. Nehemiah tells us why he thus came down: "Thou camest down also upon mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments." Neh. 9:13. His object, then, in

378

coming down was to give the people laws of truth, good statutes. Besides this, Nehemiah says, "and commandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant." Verse 14. If now we can distinguish between the statutes given by the Lord himself and those given to Moses, we shall have discovered that which we seek-the condition of eternal life.

Returning to Exodus, we find that when the necessary preparations had been completed, the Lord did come down upon Mount Sinai, with fire and smoke, thunders and lightnings, and an earthquake. Ex. 19:16-18. In the 20th chapter, verses 3-17, we find the words which the Lord spoke from the mount. In Deut. 4:11-13, Moses rehearses the scenes of Sinai and plainly says that the words which God spoke are the ten commandments. But may it not be that there is something besides these? Let us see. In the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy, Moses, in the course of his last charge to the people, repeated in substance these ten commandments as recorded in Ex. 20:3-17. When he had finished the recital, he said: "These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice: and *he added no more*. And he wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me." Deut. 5:22.

Of these commandments, Moses said, "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. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes." Deut. 6:7, 8. That these are the commandments, the keeping of which is the condition of eternal life, is proved by verse 25: "And it shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us."

We have now found the commandments to which our Lord referred. We are not now concerned with the particulars of the laws given to Moses, since the keeping of them is not required. "What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" is the question in which we are now interested, and those things not pertaining to this may be passed by. We now know what the law is. Next week we will consider the "Nature of the Law," to see why the keeping of it should be able to confer immortality. E. J. W.

June 26, 1884

"2 Sam. 6:1-12" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.

JULY 13 - 2 SAM. 6:1-12.

"Again, David gathered together all the chosen men of Israel, thirty thousand." Verse 1. The sixth chapter records two great victories gained by the army of David, -one over the Jebusites, and one over the Philistines. Now he once more assembles the chief of his men, but for another purpose. The ark of God was to be brought to the capital of the kingdom.

In order to understand this chapter, it is necessary to go back in the history of the Jews about a hundred years. In the fourth chapter of first Samuel we have the account of a great battle between the Israelites and the Philistines, in which the Israelites were conquered, and the ark, on which they had depended for safety, was captured. At that time God showed the people that the mere possession of the tables of the law would afford them no protection when they were trampling upon the law itself; that to have the thing from which God was accustomed to manifest himself, was a vain thing unless he himself was enshrined in their hearts.

From this overthrow the Israelites did not recover for many years. The possession of the ark, however, proved disastrous to the Philistines, as we learn from 1 Sam. 5 and 6. God showed them that the things pertaining to his worship must not be handled irreverently. They were glad to purchase rest from the afflictions which he sent upon them, by returning the ark. When it arrived at Beth-shemesh, the man of that place were smitten, because they presumed to look into the sacred chest, and they sent to the citizens of Kirjath -jearim, requesting them to come and get it. Here it remained until the time of the present lesson. The reader will notice, by the margin of 2 Sam. 6:2, that "Baale of Judah," from which David sent to bring the ark, is but another name for Kirjath-jearim.

"To bring up from thence the ark of God, whose name is called by the name of the Lord of hosts that dwelleth between the cherubims." Verse 2. The margin of this verse gives the more literal rendering, and the one that makes sense: "To bring up the ark of God, at which the name, even the name of the Lord of hosts, was called upon." "That dwelleth between the cherubim." In Ex. 25:10-22, we have a full description of this ark, and the object for which it was used; there we find the statement that God would commune with the people from between the cherubim that were upon the mercy-seat-the cover of the ark.

"And they set the ark of God upon a new cart." Verse 3. This was contrary to the instructions given by the Lord. How the ark was to be borne by the staves (see Ex. 25:12-14); the sons of Kohath were appointed to carry it and the other holy vessels, but even they were not to touch or look upon any of them. See Num. 4:4-15. In no case was the ark to be placed upon a wagon. Num. 7:7-9.

"And David and all the house of Israel played before the Lord on all manner of instruments made of fir wood, even on harps, and on psalteries, and on timbrels, and on cornets, and on cymbals." Verse 5. As Dr. Clarke says, this place should be corrected from the parallel passage in 1 Chron. 13:8. There it is said that they played *with all their might*, on harps, etc., and that makes good sense. The Hebrew letters of the two passages are nearly identical, which doubtless

accounts for the difference. The Septuagint has in this place the reading as in 1 Chron. 13:8, *with might*.

"And when they came to Nachon's threshingfloor, Uzzah put forth his hand to the ark of God, and took hold of it; for the oxen shook it. And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzzah; and God smote him there for his error;

391

and there he died by the ark of God." Verses 6, 7. In this we have and other illustration of how God, regards his work and worship. It may seem to some that Uzzah's punishment was too severe for so small an act, but such judgment comes from setting up our standard instead of God's. How do we know that Uzzah's error was a small one? From the punishment that followed we would suppose that God regarded it as a great sin. Indeed, we must so regard unless we are willing to admit that God was unjust. God is just to; the punishments which he inflicts are always proportionate to the sin committed; therefore Uzzah's error must have been a grievous one. The whole proceeding was irregular, but Uzzah, in presuming to lay hands on the sacred ark; overstepped all bounds. Had not that swift punishment been meted out to him, the worship of God would have been degraded, as a common affair, and reverence for sacred things would have entirely died out among the people.

What was it that made that little box of wood and gold so sacred? Why was it to be approached with such awe and reverence, and only by persons duly set apart for that purpose? It was because it contained a copy of the law of God. That which God declares to be his own righteousness—a transcript of his own character—was inclosed in that ark. That law is the foundation of the government of God; it is that by which the loyalty of all creatures is tested. When men lose their reverence for that, they lose their reverence for God's Government, and for God himself. It was on this account that God had given such specific directions concerning the ark.

How do we know what is right and what is wrong? It is evident that it is only by being told. And what warrant have we for calling any violation of one of God's commands a little sin? Do we not by so doing become judges of God? The lesson to be learned from this circumstance is that to disregard any one of God's requirements is a heinous sin; that sin of any kind is exceedingly displeasing to God. Familiarity with sin hardens us; we learn to excuse it, and our standard lowerd to correspond with existing circumstances. But God is sinless, and the more sin there is committed the more odious it becomes to him. If we, then, desire to do what is right, and thus displease God, it is evident that we must in all cases accept the standard of right and wrong which God gives. Our feelings are no criterion whatever, for that which we look upon as trivial, may be regarded by God is a terrible sin.

It is by his law that God reveals his will. Two texts will prove this. "I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea by law is within my heart." Ps. 40:8. Here we find that to have the law of God in the heart, is to cheerfully do all his will. Again Paul says: "Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law." Rom. 2:17, 18. Here we learn that those who

know the will of God are those who are instructed out of the law. But God does not change; we have his word for this. His will concerning man is just the same now as it ever was. This being the case, it follows that his law is always the same. And so it is. Christ said: "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17. And what has this to do with the lesson? Simply this: "If God regarded it as so terrible an offense merely to touch the receptacle which contained his law, how much to look upon those who dare to trample upon the law itself? The pope of Rome has impiously presumed to change the law, especially that portion which enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week, and millions of people have accepted his act. It is considered all right to labor upon the day which God sanctified, because "everybody does so." But the Lord says: "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil." We are to make God's law, and not our feelings, or the practice of the multitude, our standard of right and wrong. "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily [as in the case of Uzzah], therefore the heart of the sons of man is fully set in them to do evil." Eccl. 8:11. But judgment, though long delayed, is sure to come, and when it does, it will be according to righteousness, or, in other words, according to the law of God. E. J. W.

"Nature of the Law" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we considered Christ's words, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," and found that the law of God-the ten commandments spoken on Mount Sinai-are the commandments referred to. In harmony with this, we have the words of Christ through the beloved disciple: "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. 22:14. We now want to examine this law, in order to learn its character.

First we quote the words of David: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." Ps. 19:7. A perfect law, if kept, will form a perfect character. If a man has a perfect character, he is a perfect man, and that is all that God requires of any of us; all that he can require of any one. Paul also adds his testimony to that of David, and says that "the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." Rom. 7:12. And this also agrees with the words of Nehemiah, that the Lord, on Mount Sinai, gave "true laws [laws of truth, margin], good statutes and commandments."

This idea of the perfection of the ten commandments is more fully expressed by David in Ps. 119:172: "My tongue shall speak of thy word; for all thy commandments our righteousness." They are not simply good; they are righteousness itself. We remember that Moses said of these commandments, "they shall be in thine heart," and that we should talk of them at all times. But it is as true of a man now as when Solomon wrote, that "as he thinketh in his heart, so is he." Prov. 23:7. Therefore if a man continuously meditates upon a law that is perfect righteousness, he can but become righteous.

David says that the commandments are righteousness, but the Lord, through the prophet Isaiah, gives us a still deeper insight into their perfection: "Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath: for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner: but my salvation shall be for ever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished." Isa. 51:6.

If any reader fails to connect this verse with Ps. 119:172, and thus learn what the righteousness that shall not be abolished is, he can satisfy himself that is the law of God, by reading the next verse: "Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law." Isa. 51:7. Now that we see that the commandments are God's righteousness, it needs no argument to convince us that they cannot be abolished. Abolish the righteousness of God! It would be equivalent to abolishing God himself. The thing is an impossibility.

It is not, however, the fact that God's law cannot be abolished, that we wish to call your especial attention, but that it is God's righteousness. God is all righteousness-perfection-and therefore the law must be a transcript of his character. God wanted man to be like himself, righteous, but how could poor, fallen man know what righteousness is? He must needs have a perfect guide to direct his actions. God could not associate with man, and thus teach them what is righteousness, for they could not stand even his voice, much less the sight of his person. So he wrote out a description of his character, in words suited to the comprehension of human beings, and committed it to us. Christ tells us that the ten commandments hang from the great principle of love, and God is love. By studying them and obeying them we become like them, or what is the same thing, like God. We write this with all reverence. We would not be understood that any human being can approach the perfection of God in any particular; but God himself says, "Be ye holy, for I am holy;" and Christ says, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect." Matt. 6:48. We are to become sinless and pure, and even then God in his goodness will be infinitely above us.

But some one may say, "I do not see anything about the ten commandments worthy to be called a transcript of God's character. It seems like degrading God to say that they are his righteousness." That simply shows that you have not meditated upon them sufficiently to become acquainted with them. Paul says that the law is spiritual, and spiritual things are only spiritually discerned. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him." We see beauty only in that which we love; and Paul says that the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Rom. 8:7. But when the carnal mind has been subdued, and the man has yielded to the requirement of the law, he can exclaim with Paul, "I delight in the law of God after the inward man;" Rom. 7:22; or with David, "O how love I thy law! it is my meditation all the day." Ps. 119:97.

The better acquainted we become with God's law, the greater it appears to us. David thought much on the law, and he said, "I have seen an end of all perfection; but thy commandment is exceeding brought." Ps. 119:96. It is so broad that it covers every act that any rational creature can perform, and every

thought that the mind of man can conceive. For Bible proof of this we read: "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 discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Heb. 4:12. There is no sin either of word, deed, or thought, which the law of God will not search out and condemn. How necessary, then, that we may make it our constant study. As we do not wish to cherish sin, and thus fail of eternal life, we must understand in all cases just what sin is; and to this end let us never cease to pray with the psalmist: "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." E. J. W.

"The Seventh Day Is the Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

A card lately received from Mendocino County, Cal., informs us that the writer was somewhat disturbed by reading what the SIGNS has to say on the Sabbath question, but that after searching the Scriptures, and reading Baptist publications (especially the latter), he is satisfied that we are wrong. The writer also promises to send us papers containing a sermon on the subject of the Sabbath, which he wishes us to read with care, looking up the references, and thinks that it will convince us of our error.

The papers have come, and prove to be copies of the *Tennessee Baptist*, the sermon being by Dr. E. Daniel, a Presbyterian minister, of Memphis, Tenn. We thank our unknown friend for his kindly interest in our welfare, but we are obliged to say that after reading this sermon we are not convinced that we are wrong. The little tract, "Seven Reasons for Sunday-keeping Examined," published at this office, takes up all the Scripture texts referred to in the article, and many more. There are, however, in the sermon, some good things, which serve to counterbalance the errors. We quote a few of them:-

"The Sabbath was not for the Mosaic or Jewish dispensation only, because the Sabbath law was not originally given to Moses; but the institution runs parallel with the history of the human race from the beginning of time. Proof of this proposition is found in the Old Testament, of course. At the end of the week of creation, God bless the seventh day and sanctified it. Marriage and the Sabbath are the two divinely ordained institutions which we can trace backward to Eden. . . . At the gathering of manna we read, 'To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord. Bake that ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seeth, and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning? And Moses said, 'Eat that to-day; for to-day is a Sabbath to the Lord. They shall be gathered it, but on the seventh, which is the Sabbath, there shall be none.' Let it be remembered that this gathering of the manna here referred to was before the Israelites had come to Mount Sinai, and consequently before the typical law was given. How, then, can the Sabbath be of merely a positive and ceremonial nature, to be abrogated as a part of the ceremonial law, when we find its origin in Eden, traces of its observance through all the patriarchal dispensations, and indisputable evidence of its existence before the Israelites had ever received

their ceremonial law? Is not the conclusion irresistible, that it was given originally to the whole race in Eden, and as it did not begin with the Sinaitic positive enactments, so it did not end with them at the coming of Christ?"

That is good, and now besides that we want to place one more quotation from the same sermon:-

"The Sabbath, in its essence, as already defined, is not a part of the ceremonial law, because it is found in the heart of the moral law. It is one of the ten commandments. It belongs to the great decalogue. Whoever may sweep away one of those grand moral precepts, binding all men, as men, Jew or Gentile alike, may sweep away them all. But these words are written on the rock, and while time endures, they shall abide."

The reader may ask, If the Dr. believes that which he has written, as quoted above, how can he agree for first-day observance? We will let him speak:-

"The substance of the Sabbath may be defined as this: The setting apart of one day in seven for purposes of rest and of religious worship. This is substantially all that is to be included as essential in a definition of the Sabbath. All else concerning it, as, for example, which day is to be observed, is a matter of positive enactments, and maybe changed, and has been changed."

Here we disagree with him, no more so than he does with himself. He has said above that the Sabbath originated in Eden, together with marriage. In the record of creation what do we read? That God blessed the Sabbath institution? Not at all, "And God blessed *the seventh day*, and sanctified it." Gen. 2:3. It was the *day* that was sanctified and blest.

Again we come to the gathering of the manna. The Doctor says that this was before the typical, ceremonial law was given. Very good. Now what does Moses say? "*To-morrow* is the rest of the holy Sabbath;" "on the seventh, which is the Sabbath, there shall be none." Here we find that the day is the proper thing; yet it is claimed that the matter of which day is to be observed is ceremonial. We submit to the intelligent reader that if the typical law was not yet given, then there can be nothing typical about the day.

Once more; it is said that the Sabbath cannot be done away, like ceremonial ordinances, because is a part of the Decalogue,-enshrined in the heart of the moral law. We agree. Now let us read a portion of the commandment. "Remember the Sabbath-day [literally, the day of the Sabbath], 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." Here we find the day of the Sabbath clearly specified in the moral law. If the Sabbath is not ceremonial, but as enduring as the rock, because it is found in the heart of the moral law, then the day of the Sabbath must be unchangeable, because that is found there also. Nay, more; if the keeping of a definite day be not necessary to the observance of the true Sabbath,-if that part of the commandment is ceremonial, and has been changed,-then we have no moral precept for Sabbath observance at all; for that being taken out, nothing is left. Will our friends please try to read the fourth commandment, leaving out that part which refers to a definite day? They would have to omit the first clause, for that says, "Remember *the Sabbath day*." The next clause would likewise have to be omitted, for the words, "six days

shalt thou labor," are simply introductory to the definite statement that "*the seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." The next two words, "*in it*," clearly show that something definite has been mentioned; they must therefore be dropped. The whole of the latter part of the commandment is simply historical and explanatory, telling why God gave such a precepts. Leaving out, then, all of the commandment which enjoins the observance of a specified day, we have this much left: "Thou shalt not do any work." This would be indefinite enough for anybody.

Let us try this "indefinite" argument on the first commandment. The Lord says: "Thou shall have no other gods before me." Why may we not say: "Man is a worshipping being; he must have some object of adoration. This commandment recognizes that fact, in providing a deity. The act of reverential worship is all that is essential; all else, as, for example, the specific object to be worshiped, is a matter of positive enactments, and maybe changed." This reasoning is exactly parallel to that which we so often hear concerning the fourth commandment; yet the man who should act upon it would be called a heathen. Now will someone tell us the exact difference between ignoring the Creator entirely by setting up some god in his stead, and refusing obedience to plainly worded commandments, and especially that one of all the rest by which we recognize his creative power? The Saviour says, "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" Let everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord remember that Christ and the Father are one, and then consider that question as addressed directly to him. It will do to meditate upon.

E. J. W.

"The Foundation of Spiritualism" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

Mr. Savage, a Unitarian minister of Boston, preached a sermon a short time ago on "Immortality from the Stand-point of the Modern World," in which he took occasion to speak of Spiritualism as follows:-

"There is nothing in it out of accord with the faith of those who already believe in continued existence. That our friends, if they still live and love us, should want us to know it, is only what we should expect."

That this statement is true, we do not see how anybody can deny. And this is why we do not regard it as a matter of indifference how we believe concerning the state of the dead. We say that no one who believes that man is conscious in death-that his thoughts instead of perishing with his breath goes forth (Ps. 146:4), are more clear and active than ever, has any warrant whatever that he will not become a Spiritualist. Let us see. Spiritualism, pure and simple, is a belief that the spirits of the departed may communicate with their living friends, and may even appear to them. The mass of mankind believe that the essential part of man never dies, but that what is called death simply releases it from its prison house. They believe that it is in Heaven, and conscious of what is passing in this world. Indeed, we have heard more than one "orthodox," minister preach that the

spirits of our departed friends hover around us and protect and comfort us by their influence.

Now we ask, What is lacking to make such ones real Spiritualists? Nothing, but to see and converse with one bearing every feature of a departed friend, having the same tone of voice, and who can recall incidents known only to that dead friend. This has been done to a certain extent, and will be done on a vastly more extended scale.

"But how would you account for such a thing?" We read that Satan is able to transform himself into an angel of light, and this being so, it does not surprise us to hear of his personating a human being. The Bible warns us against wonders that will deceive, if it were possible, the very elect, pointing out that which we have said, that a large portion of the world is in danger of being drawn into Spiritualism. The "elect" will not be deceived simply because they are grounded on Bible truth. So long as a man takes the Bible as it reads on the subject of the state of the dead, he cannot become a Spiritualist. When he holds to the popular theory, he has no safeguard against that terrible delusion. E. J. W.

"A Want Not Gratified" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

In an article in the *Christian at Work*, on "Baptism and the 'Teaching,'" by Rev. F. Oxnard, we find the following:-

"We are perfectly willing to concede that there is no authority in the New Testament for infant baptism. We would like to bring immersionists to admit that there is no authority for the exclusive use of immersion in baptism. We suggest, therefore, that to insist that the word used in the Septuagint for immerse must always be thus used in a Christian ordinance, is open to very reasonable and grave objections, and is not in accordance with the ultimate authority, the New Testament. To insist that a word from classic Greek, used to express a non-sacred act, and similar words in the New Testament, used to express a sacred act, have always the same meaning, is to allow authors who lived hundreds of years before the Christian era to settle the mode of baptism."

We admire the frankness of the author, as manifested in the above quotation. That the New Testament contains no authority for infant baptism there can be no doubt. Few theologians claim that it does. We have no doubt, moreover, that he, in common with many others, "would like to bring immersionists to admit that there is no authority for the exclusive use of immersion for baptism; but we can assure him that he can never do it unless

394

he brings to bear some more weighty argument than that contained in his "suggestion." He claims that to insist that words from classic Greek must have the same meaning when used in the New Testament, is to allow heathen authors to settle the mode of baptism. By this, the reader will clearly see that it is admitted that if we should give them the same signification, immersion would be a settled fact. That is the words as used by classical authors, signifying immersion.

Now is it true that if they are used in the New Testament in the same sense, those authors have determined the meaning of the Christian ordinance? By no means. Christ determined that himself. How? By using in the Christian commission, a term which was in common use, and universally understood to mean immersion. He determined what the ceremony should be, and then described it in language which his hearers could understand. It was for this reason that he was not obliged to make a lengthy explanation as to what he meant by baptism; the name carried the idea. If he had coined a new word to express the act, or if he had used the same word, with a different meaning from that which it ordinarily had, it would have been necessary to define it, so that his followers might not be misled; but this he did not do. Therefore we must insist that the word in the New Testament has the same meaning that it does anywhere else. And there is no more reason for saying that this allows authors who lived hundred of years before the Christian era to settle the mode of baptism, than there is for saying that they settle the mode of celebrating Christ's sacrifice, because Christ, in instituting the Lord's Supper, used the same words for eating and drinking that had been used by them to denote these acts. E. J. W.

July 3, 1884

"2 Sam. 7:1-16" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 26.

E. J. Waggoner

NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.

JULY 20 - 2 SAM. 7:1-16.

"And it came to pass, when the king sat in his house, and the Lord had given him rest round about from all his enemies." Verse 1. At what time this was it is impossible to determine; probably not long after the events recorded in the preceding chapter. "That the king said unto Nathan the prophet, See now, I dwell in an house of cedar, but the ark of God dwelleth within curtains." Verse 2. This is the first mention of Nathan the prophet, who seems to have been David's constant adviser. He must have been considerably younger than David, for we read (1 Chron. 29:29) that he wrote a history of the acts of David, and in 2 Chron. 9:29 that he did the same for Solomon's reign. It is not certain, however, from this latter passage, that he outlived Solomon, for it may be that the writings of the two writers referred to are supplementary. That he was a true prophet is evident from the plain rebuke which he administered to David, as recorded in the twelfth chapter.

It may not be amiss to notice, in passing, the statements in 1 Chron. 29:2 and 2 Chron. 9:29. None of these records by Nathan, Samuel, and Gad, Ahijah, and Iddo, are now extant. Nothing more is known of them than the brief mention in the above verses. Yet there is not the slightest doubt but that they were just as much inspired as were any of the records that we have. Why they were allowed to be lost, we cannot tell, nor does it concern us. The simple fact is that much has been written by inspiration that has not been given to us. In Jeremiah 36 we have

an instance of a message directly from the Lord, which was not preserved for us. Of course these things were not of especial importance to us, else they would have been preserved. God has given us, in his word as committed to us, everything that is necessary to enable us to do his will; until we have put in practice all that we have received, it ill becomes us to find fault with him for not giving us more of the same kind of instruction.

"And Nathan said to the king, Go, do all that is in thine heart; for the Lord is with thee." Verse 3. Nathan was a true prophet, and one who was intrusted with important messages from the Lord; yet on this occasion he gave advice that was directly contrary to the mind of the Lord. This does not show any evil intention on his part, but simply that prophets were not inspired at all times. David's plan was a laudable one, and reasoning from a human standpoint no objections to it could be seen. But Nathan did not know the mind of the Lord on this subject. If there was any blame attaching to him; it was simply in giving his own opinion before asking counsel of the Lord.

At all events we read of no rebuke administered; but that very night "the word of the Lord came to Nathan, saying, Go and tell my servant David, thus saith the Lord, Shalt thou build meet an house for me to dwell in?" The words, "Shalt thou build me an house?" are equivalent to "Thou shalt not build me an

406

house." Thus in Ps. 95:10, margin, we have the literal rendering "If they shall enter into my rest," meaning, "they shall not enter into my rest."

From 1 Chron. 22:5-10, it is evident that much more was told to David than is here recorded. David there tells Solomon that the reason why he himself was not allowed to build a house of the Lord was that he had shed blood abundantly, and made great wars. From the further statement that Solomon, to whom would be intrusted the work of building the temple, would be a man of peace, and that there should be rest and quietness in Israel all his days, we may suppose that it was not simply the wars that David had made, but also those which he was yet to make, that made it improper for him to build the Lord's house. Besides the fact that David had shed much blood, the fact that the kingdom was not yet fully established, was an objection, because he would be liable to interruption in the work by enemies. To him it was given to conquer the enemies of Israel, and settle the affairs of the kingdom on a solid basis, so that his successor might prosecute the work undisturbed.

The readiness with which the prophet recalled his first advice, at the command of the Lord, is worthy of note. He did not let a false pride keep him from telling the Lord's message, even though he was compelled to contradict his previous advice. As we look at the case, we can readily see how much better it was for Nathan to do so than to the demur; for in the latter case he would suffer the additional qualification of having his counsel contradicted by some other prophet, and he himself perhaps degraded from his office. Yet we are not always able to reason so clearly in our own cases. We should ever be thankful to God when he gives us an opportunity to correct our own mistakes, and should esteem it one of his greatest blessings that he points them out to us. E. J. W.

"Condemned and Justified" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 26.

E. J. Waggoner

In the two preceding articles on the law we have considered it simply in the light of Christ's declaration to the young man: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." No one who contemplates the breadth of the law, and believes the inspired statement that it is perfect—the righteousness of God—can feel disposed to deny the statement of the wise man, that to fear God and keep his commandments is the whole duty of man. Obedience to a perfect law must produce a perfect character, and perfection is all that can be required of anybody.

But while we have been making these statements upon the authority of the Bible, some reader has doubtless called to mind the fact that Paul says that "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified;" and he wants this harmonized with what has been said; or, possibly, he may think that it entirely overthrows our argument. We will examine it. The passage in full reads thus: "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. 3:20.

To understand this verse we must take it in its connection. But first, to the verse itself. Why can no flesh be justified in the sight of God by the deeds of the law? The last clause of the verse gives the answer: "For by the law is the knowledge of sin." Well, why does the fact that the law gives the knowledge of sin make it impossible for any one to be justified by it? Read from the ninth verse onward, and you will see. Paul says: "We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." This he has done in the first and second chapters. "As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." Rom. 3:10-12. After particularizing somewhat on this point, the apostle says: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it

409

saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." Verse 19. Then follows the conclusion, "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight."

Now we can see the force of Paul's conclusion. Since the law gives us the knowledge of sin, by pointing it out, it condemns the whole world, for there is no man that has not sinned; all the world are guilty before God. And this is a sufficient reason why no one can be justified by the law. The law that justifies a criminal is a bad law; but the law of God is "holy, and just, and good;" it will not justify a sinner.

Let us illustrate this by a familiar example. Here is a man who has been taken in the act of robbing a store. He is brought into court for trial. Now will he stand up before the judge, and declare that he wants no counsel; that all he desires is simple justice, and then demand that the law be read, and declare his willingness to rest his case upon that alone? Certainly not, unless he desires to live in prison. He knows that the law does not justify any man in committing robbery; and he will therefore seek in every way possible to evade it. But there is no possibility of evading the law of God, and consequently all the world stands condemned. No

one can fail to see that if the law justified sinners, then sin would cease to be sin; theft, murder, and adultery would be legal acts, and anarchy would prevail and be confirmed throughout the land.

If, however, an innocent man is accused of a crime, he may with all confidence appeal to the law. He does not wish to have anybody turn aside the law from its true meaning. He is anxious that his acts be compared with the plain reading of the law. And when that law is read, it justifies him, because he has done nothing but what it commends. By these two examples we see the working of a good law: it condemns the guilty, and justifies the one who has scrupulously obeyed its requirements. That this is the case with the law of God is seen by our Saviour's words: "For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God." John 3:20, 21.

It is plain that under no circumstances can a good law justify crime. The man may say, "This is the first time I ever violated the law." But the judge would reply, "You ought not to have violated it this time; perfect obedience is what the law requires." Or if he professes his determination to keep the law strictly forever afterward, that will not justify his sin, for he never can do more than his duty, and thus make up for past neglect. Whichever way he turns, the law stands in his way condemning him. Now shall we say that because the law thus condemns sin it is unworthy of respect, and ought to be abolished? By no means; no one but a confirmed reprobate would desire such a thing. The fact that it condemns the sinner shows it to be a good law, and lovers of the right will rejoice to see it maintained.

The position, then, thus far, is this: To keep the commandments is the whole duty of man; it is only by keeping them that we can have eternal life. But no man has kept them, neither can any man show a perfect record in this respect. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Rom. 3:23. How, then, it may well be asked, can any one be saved? How can we become justified? The answer comes: "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Rom. 3:24-26.

Christ was sinless; the law was in his heart. As the Son of God his life was worth more than those of all created beings, whether in Heaven or on earth. He saw the hopeless condition of the world, and came "to seek and to save that which was lost." Luke 19:10. To do this he took upon himself our nature, Heb. 2:16, 17; and on him was laid "the iniquity of us all." Isa. 53:6. In order to save us, he had to come where we were, or, in other words, he had to take the position of a lost sinner. Thus the apostle says: "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin." 2 Cor. 5:21. It was this fact that caused him such anguish in the garden. He felt that the sins upon him were shutting him away from God. It was this that caused him, when hanging on the cross, to utter that

cry of bitter agony, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" It was not physical pain that crushed the life out of the Saviour of the world, but the load of sin which he bore. "The wages of sin is death." Rom. 6:23. Sin will cause the death of every one who is not freed from it, for "sin when it is finished, bringeth forth death." James 1:15. And because Christ was "numbered with the transgressors," he suffered the penalty of transgression.

But the suffering of Christ was not on his own account. He did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." 1 Peter 2:22. He was one who could safely appeal to the law to justify him, for he had never violated it. The law had nothing against him. "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities." Isa. 53:5. He alone has done more than his duty-more than was required of him; consequently he has merit to impart to others. This grace is freely given to all who believe in him. Thus: Our past life has been nothing but sin, for whatever good we may have thought to do, it was far from perfect. But we believe implicitly in Christ, and have faith in the efficacy of his sacrifice; and because of this simple faith, Christ will take our load of sins upon himself, and we will be accounted as though we had never committed them. He can take them without fear of any evil consequences to himself, because he has already suffered the extreme penalty of the law for them. And since our sins are taken from us, we are as though we had never broken the law, and therefore it can have nothing against us-it cannot condemn us. So we stand before the court justified. Justified by what? By our works? No; justified by faith in Christ. Our works condemned us; Christ has justified us. And so Paul's conclusion is true, that "a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Rom. 3:28.

We now see that Paul does not contradict himself when he says (Rom. 2:13), "For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified," and when he says (Rom. 3:20), that "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified." Both are true. The doers of the law are always justified, as we have before shown, and the only reason why there is no one who is justified by the law is because there is no one who has done all the law.

In this article we have given only a brief outline of the way by which the sinner is justified. In subsequent articles we shall consider his relation to the law after he is justified, and also how, although no one is justified by the law, our Saviour's words apply with equal force to all, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." E. J. W.

"The Promise of His Coming" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 26.

E. J. Waggoner

That there was once upon this earth a man called Jesus of Nazareth, scarcely anyone will now deny. Whatever conflicting views different ones may hold concerning his nature and office, all agree on this one fact. That he was taken, "and by wicked hands crucified and slain," is quite generally conceded. All, however, are not aware that the admission of these facts is virtually an admission of the inspiration of the Bible, but so it is. Those very things, which no human wisdom could foresee, were recorded by holy prophets hundreds of years before

they occurred. This fact shows that those prophets were inspired, or, as Peter declares, they "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Peter 1:21.

But this much being true, we must admit further that that which they wrote of the mission of Jesus was also true. Paul sums it up in brief when he says that "to him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Acts 10:43. Christ is, then, as all Christians agree, the "only begotten Son of God;" he is "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world;" he is the divine Word that, having been with God in the beginning, was made flesh and dwelt upon the earth. John 1. The incidents of his life, his subjection to his parents, his baptism, his temptation in the wilderness, his wonderful teachings, his marvelous miracles showing at once his tenderness and his power, his betrayal and crucifixion, and finally his triumphant resurrection and ascension to Heaven,-these are familiar to hundreds of thousands.

Aside from his wonderful sacrifice, which demands the unending love of all creatures, the character of Jesus as a man was most lovable. His disciples who had been with him night and day for more than three years, had learned to love him devotedly, both for what he was and what he promised them. On him all their hopes centered. Their feelings were well expressed by Peter, who, when they were asked if they would leave Jesus, said, "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life." We can imagine, then, to some extent, their grief when Jesus said to them: "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." John 13:33. It was the blasting of all their hopes; their hearts were filled with anguish. Jesus, whom they loved, was to go away, and even though they should lay down their lives for him, he would not take them along.

But the compassionate Saviour would not leave his children in torturing suspense. Noticing their despondent looks, 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.

"Ye believe in God, believe also in me." What can these words mean, but that the words which he was about to utter were the words of God himself, true and unchangeable? Whatever this promise means, then, it will as surely be fulfilled as that God is a God of truth. We can rely upon it implicitly.

And now as to the meaning of the promise. How could it be made more clear? The gist of it is contained in these simple words: "I will come again." He was here then, a real being. The word "again," meaning "once more," implies a repetition of the same thing. That is, that he would come in the same form in which he then was,-glorified, of course, as we shall see,-but a real, tangible being,-Jesus of Nazareth. There is a great deal contained in the three verses which we have quoted, but at

present we are concerned only with the simple fact that Christ has pledged his word to come again.

The time which Jesus spent on this earth, from his birth in Bethlehem until his ascension from the Mount of Olives, is known as the first advent, or coming of Christ. There is no question but that he had been upon the earth many times before, but that was his first appearance in connection with the great plan of salvation. And so, although he has since been on earth continuously, by his representative, the Holy Spirit, his second coming must be limited to that one mentioned in the promise, "I will come *again*." This promise cannot be fulfilled by anything except by his personal presence in glory. It will be his second coming in connection with the great plan of salvation-this time to complete the work by taking his people to himself.

That we are not mistaken in saying that Christ in comforting his disciples, gave promise of a second coming, is proved by the words of Paul, in Heb. 9:27, 28: "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the Judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." This places the matter beyond dispute.

This text also settles another much mooted question, that of a future probation. "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the Judgment." How long after death the Judgment takes place must be determined by other texts. The general truth is stated that men die but once, and that after that their future fate is determined by the Judgment. "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." That is, since men have but one life,-one probation,-which ends with their death, so Christ was only once offered. His offering had reference only to men in this present life. If man was to have two or more probations, then it would be necessary for two or more offerings to be made in his behalf; but there was only one offering. At his advent, Christ was offered "to bear the sins of many." The Lord "laid on him the iniquity of us all." Isa. 53:6. "In his own body" he bore our sins on the tree. 1 Peter 2:24. In order to save us from sin, he was made to be sin (2 Cor. 5:21); the innocent One was counted as guilty in order that the guilty might be accounted innocent. The benefits of this sacrifice are now free to all who will accept it, while Jesus is pleading its merits before the Father. But when he comes "the second time," he will be "without sin;" he will then no longer act as substitute for sinners; no longer will he assume any responsibility in their behalf. The sins of the righteous will have been blotted out, and those of the impenitent rolled back upon their own heads. There can then be no more probation for them unless Christ should again take upon himself their sins and make another sacrifice; for there is no salvation in any other. Acts 4:12. And since Christ makes but one offering, it follows that their sins remain upon them, to sink them into perdition.

In the texts already quoted, there is sufficient proof that the promised coming is not at the death of the saints, neither the conversion of sinners. He appears "to them that look for him;" to those who "love his appearing." And this coming is not death, for it is only the "second" coming; if death were that coming, then there would be many millions of comings, for not an instant of time passes in which men do not die. He said that he would come "again;" now we submit that this can

with no propriety be applied to death, unless his first coming was death, and they were all dead when he was speaking for "again" signifies repetition.

But we have an inspired comment on this point in the last chapter of John. Christ had just signified to Peter by what death he should glorify God, when that disciple, turning about, saw John following, and asked, "What shall this man do?" "Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou me." Verse 22. Now if the coming of Christ is at the death of his saints, these words of Christ are equivalent to this: "If I will that he live until he dies, what is that to thee?" But such a substitution makes utter nonsense of the passage. Then when Christ spoke of his coming, he had no reference whatever to death. This will be still more evident as we consider texts that describe the manner of his coming. E. J. W.

July 17, 1884

"The Sabbath-School" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JULY 16

1. On what occasion did Christ deliver the discourse recorded in the fourteenth chapter of John?
2. What had Jesus said that caused the disciples sorrow? John 13:33.
3. Where was he going? John 13:1.
4. Was he going to the Father immediately?
5. With what words did he comfort his troubled disciples? John 14:1-3.
6. What idea is conveyed by the use of the word "again"?
7. What testimony does an inspired apostle bear on this point? Heb. 9:27, 28.
8. For what purpose does Christ appear unto them that look for him?
9. In what different ways will his coming affect the righteous and the wicked? Isa. 66:5.
10. What did Christ's sake he would do for his disciples at his second coming? John 14:3.
11. Then since he comes only the "second time," what must we conclude?
12. When, after Christ's resurrection, Peter asked what John's work would be, what did Jesus reply? John 21:20-22.
13. What saying immediately went abroad? Verse 23.
14. Why did they think he would not die?
15. Does the inspired writer make a distinction between death and the coming of Christ? John 21:23.
16. Can you find in Christ's promise to his disciples, proof that his coming does not mean the conversion of sinners?
17. Will Christ come to earth in person? 1 Thess. 4:16.
18. To what will the manner of his coming be similar? Acts 1:10, 11.
19. How was he seemed to go into heaven? Acts 1:9.

20. Is the one who is coming the same one who was crucified and buried here on earth? Eph. 4:8-10.
21. As Christ's went up, what received him? Acts 1:9.
22. With what will he come? Rev. 1:7.
23. How many will see him when he returns?
24. Is it probable that before Christ comes any one will teach that he has actually come in a secret manner? Matt. 24:26.
25. Should we believe such teaching?
26. How can we prove it to be false? Matt. 26:27.
27. Who will attend the Saviour when he returns? Matt. 25:31.
28. What part will the angels have to act? Matt. 24:31.

L E S S O N F O R A U G U S T 2

1. What doctrine occupies a prominent place in the preaching of the apostle? 2 Pet. 1:16.
2. When had they been eye-witnesses of the glory of Christ's second coming? Verses 17, 18.
3. To what occasion does Peter refer? Matt. 17:1-5.
4. Did they have any strong evidence to present than that of their own senses? 2 Pet. 1:19.
5. How early was Christ's second coming a subject of prophecy? Jude 14.
6. How long after the creation did Enoch live?
7. How long before the birth of Christ?
8. Who are the "saints" referred to in Enoch's prophecy? Jude 14 (Revised Version); Matt. 25:31.
9. What other patriarch of ancient times prophesied of the Lord second coming? Job 19:25-27.
10. What testimony did David bear on this subject? Ps. 50:3-5; 96:11-13.
11. For what purpose did he say the Lord would come? Ps. 50:5.
12. With what words of Christ is this agreed? John 14:3.
13. What did the apostle John say at the thought of Christ in coming? Rev. 22:20.
14. Why did he say this?
15. In the day of the Lord's coming what will be said? Isa. 25:9.
16. Why will the Lord saved these persons?
18. Who are the ones that will be rewarded when the Lord comes? 2 Tim. 4:8.
19. If we do not love to hear of or think about the Lord's coming, of what may we be assured?
20. Would we not naturally expect some revelation to be made concerning the time of so important and event? Amos 3:7.
21. What does Paul say to the brethren? 1 Thess. 5:1.
22. Of what "times and seasons" is he speaking? 1 Thess. 4:15-17.
23. If there was no need for Paul to write concerning the time, what must we conclude?
24. Why are the brethren not ignorant of the time? 1 Thess. 5:4, 5.

25. What makes them children of the light? Ps. 119:105.

26. Upon whom will the day of the Lord, as a thief? 1 Thess. 4:2, 3; Luke 21:35.

27. What will cause men to be blind to the near coming of Christ? Luke 21:34, 35.

28. Can the people of God be called "dwellers" upon this earth? Heb. 11:13; 1 Pet. 2:11.

29. Where is there home? Heb. 11:16; Phil. 3:20 (Revised Version).

The words of Christ in John 14:1-3 are very significant when we consider them carefully, in the light of his previous words. The last Passover supper, Jesus had told his disciples once more that he was about to leave them. He had previously told the unbelieving Jews that they would die in their sins, and that whither he went they could not come (John 8:21). And now to his loved disciples he said: "As I said to the Jews, whither I go ye cannot come; so now I say to you." John 13:30. Peter, ever zealous, declared himself ready to die for his Master, but even that would not give him the desired privilege of being with the one whom he loved. In this time of sadness and gloom the Saviour spoke the comforting words found in John 14:1-3 and onward. He assured them that the separation would not be final, but that he would return to take them to the mansions prepared for them.

What the Saviour promised must be considered in the light of what the disciples wanted. They desired his personal presence with them. Now if Jesus promised them something else, his words could contain no comfort for them. We would therefore expect him to promise a literal return for them. And this is just what he did. "I will come again." This can mean nothing but that he would once more be as really present with them as he was then.

How can we know that Christ is not already come? and if he has not come, how can we tell when that event takes place? These questions have been answered in advance. When he comes it is to execute judgment upon all that are ungodly (Jude 15); his people will be taken to be with him forever (1 Thess. 4:16, 17); but they are yet separated from him. Many will teach that Christ is come, but we need not be deceived. "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Matt 24:27. He will come in the same manner in which he ascended to heaven (Acts 1:11), a real, personal being, "the same Jesus," and "every I shall see him." Rev. 1:7. There will then be no need for one to tell another that the Lord is come, for none can be ignorant of the fact.

Why do we have some much to say about the coming of the Lord? Simply because we find so much about it in the Bible. There is no other subject which occupies so much space. Peter says (2 Pet. 1:16) that the apostles had made known the power and the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, and that they had evidence of that which they declared. Besides their personal testimony, we have, as he says, the "more sure word of prophecy," which speaks with no uncertain sound on the subject of Christ's coming. Indeed that is the principal object for which they were given. They all point to the one event. Peter, after speaking in the third chapter of his second epistle with great positiveness concerning the

coming of the Lord, says that Paul in his epistles speaks of these things (verses 15, 16); this statement we can easily verify by an examination of the writings of Paul. In them the coming of the Lord is spoken of familiarly as a thing well understood.

And why should it not be so? What more natural than that the event which is to be the consummation of all things should be often spoken of? Christ had comforted the hearts of his sorrowing disciples with the promise that he would come to receive them to himself. Now if they had never said anything about that promise, we would say that their love for their Lord, and their desire to be with him was not very ardent. We would measure their love for their Master by the earnestness of their longing for his return. They did love the Saviour with intense devotion, and consequently his return was their constant theme. Does any one say that they were too sanguine, or that they were mistaken? Such a statement is nothing less than charging the Lord himself with deception, for they said nothing but what he had taught them. If they were mistaken in this, we have no warrant that they were not mistaken in everything, and in that case what becomes of our Bible? No, they were not deceived, and we can depend upon what the Holy Spirit has preserved for our instruction.

Only those who love his appearing will receive the crown when the Lord comes. 2 Tim. 4:8. It is only to those who look for him that he appears unto salvation. The mere fact that we talk about the coming of the Lord does not prove that we love his appearing but it is certain that we do not love his appearing if we do not love to think and talk about it. If we love the Lord we shall certainly love his appearing. How may we know that we really love him, and are preparing for his coming? He says, "If ye love me keep my commandments." If we are walking in his footsteps, obeying his voice, we show our love for him. E. J. W.

"A New Creature in Christ" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

We have shown from the Scriptures that the whole duty of man is to keep the commandments, and that only by so doing can we gain eternal life. We have also found that the law, being perfect and holy, condemns the whole world, and that we can be freed from this condemnation only by faith in Christ. The law condemns; Christ has opened the way for pardon. When the sinner has acknowledged his guilt, and has accepted Christ as his Saviour, he can say, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. 5:1. We now inquire, What is his relation to the law from this time on? and, Does this condition of things make any less true the statement that to fear God and keep his commandments is the whole duty of man?

In 2 Cor. 5:17 Paul describes a man in this justified state: "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold all things are become new." We have heard this text quoted to prove that a man in Christ has no more use for the law, that such old things as that are done away. The absurdity of such a claim is manifest on its very face; for if that supposition were true, it would amount to saying that the law is abolished only for Christians,

but that it is in full force until a man becomes a Christian; and since Christians and sinners live side by side in this world, we would have the anomaly of the law being both abolished and in full force at the same time!

But the eighteenth verse tells what the new things are: "And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ." If a man in Christ does all things that are of God, he certainly will not violate God's law. The statement of what Christ did for us, proves this: "Who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation." Verse 19. The act of reconciliation implies that certain parties have been estranged from each other-have been enemies. So Paul, in Rom. 5:8-10, shows that while we were sinners-transgressing the law-we were the enemies of God, and that we are reconciled by the death of his Son. The prophet Isaiah (ch. 30:9) shows very clearly in what rebellion against God consists, where he says that "this is a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the law of the Lord." And Paul also states that the carnal mind is enmity against God, simply because "it is not subject to the law of God." Rom. 8:7.

Since, then, our enmity to God while we were sinners consisted simply in disobedience to his law, it must necessarily follow that when we are reconciled we will keep the law. Indeed, the very act of reconciliation implies submission on our part to the requirements of God. Paul goes on to say (2 Cor. 5:20) that having received the commission from God, "we [that is, the ministers of Christ] are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God."

This means simply that the work of the gospel is to persuade men to keep the law of God. The thing is stated in plain words by the apostle Peter, when he says, "The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away; but the word of God endureth forever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." 1 Peter 1:24, 25.

The point, however, is established beyond all controversy by the closing words of 2 Cor. 5: "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." The turn which some give to the first part of this verse, viz., that Christ was made a sin-offering for us, robs the text of all its force. It is true that Christ was our sin-offering, but that is not what the apostle here states. God made Christ (the sinless one) to be sin for us. He was made in all things "like unto his brethren;" and that means not simply as to the outward, physical frame, but that he bore sin, just as we do. The sins that he bore were not his own, but ours. He "knew no sin," yet "the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Isa. 53:6. Although the sins that he bore were ours, they were counted as his own, and so caused his death. "He was wounded for our transgression, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed." Isa. 53:5.

And why was this done? Why was the spotless Lamb of God made to be sin for us? Paul answers: "That we might be made the righteousness of God in him." What is the righteousness of God? We have already shown from Isa. 51:6, 7 that

it is nothing else but the law of God. Then Paul's words mean that Christ was made to be sin for us in order that, in him, we might be conformed to the law of God. This, then, is what it is to be a new creature in Christ; it is to put away the old life of sin, and to become reconciled to God by keeping his law.

In the second chapter of Ephesians Paul briefly states the change from being dead in trespasses and sins to being quickened, and made to sit in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. This is done because God is rich in mercy. We read: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast." Verses 8, 9. The term "saved" is sometimes used in an accommodated sense. We are really saved only when we are given the victory over death, and are made immortal in the kingdom of God. This salvation is brought to us "at the revelation of Jesus Christ." 1 Peter 1:13. But since this everlasting salvation is given only to those who overcome their sins (Rev. 3:21), we are said to be saved when we are freed from our past sins through the pardoning mercy of God. If we continue in this condition, we will receive our full salvation. In this place the word may be taken in both senses. "Not of works, lest any man should boast." Simply a repetition of Rom. 3:28. God was not under obligation to save us, and we could not atone for past sins, and thus earn salvation. Our salvation is wholly due to the infinite mercy of God through the merits of Christ and consequently we have nothing whereof to boast. Shall we conclude from this, then, that Christ does everything for us, that is, in our stead, and that we have no call to work for ourselves? Paul does not so teach. "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Eph. 2:20. By being "created in Christ Jesus," we are made new creatures in Christ; and for what? That we might be able to perform good works, for that is what God from the beginning designed that we should do, and this is our whole duty.

And now we are able to understand fully Christ's reply to the young ruler who asked the way of life. Matt. 19:18-21. While he said, "if thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments," you will notice that he did not leave him with that. Christ well knew that the man, in spite of his self-righteousness was a sinner. By a simple test he showed that the young man was not only covetous, but that he did not love his neighbor as well as he did himself, and that he did not love God with all his heart. He was selfish, and loved himself and his property more than he did God and his neighbors; and so he was a violator of all the commandments, for he broke the two great precepts upon which they hang. (Matt. 22:36-40.) Christ well knew that the young man could not justify himself, nor even keep the commandments as they should be kept, in his own strength, and so he added the words, "Come, and follow me." What for? That in Christ he might be a new creature; that, whereas by himself he had utterly failed of fulfilling the righteousness of God, in Christ, he might attain to that; in short, that he might be enabled to keep the commandments.

And so it still remains a fact that to fear God and keep his commandments is the whole duty of man and Christ has simply come to our aid, to help us to do our duty. While he assumes the responsibility of the sins which the believer has committed in the past and thus sets him once more in the right way, justified

before God, he tells him that "without me you can do nothing." We are "created in Christ Jesus unto good works," but it is only while we abide in him that we can bear any fruit. Without Christ our efforts to obey God are vain struggles; with the strength which he gives we can do all things, and at last stand "complete in him." And this opens the way for us to understand how it is that Christ is the end of the law, which will next be considered. E. J. W.

"Manner of Christ's Coming" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we gave two texts (John 14:1-3; Heb. 9:27, 28) which contain a direct promise of Christ's second coming. If the subject were mentioned nowhere else in the Bible, these two texts would be sufficient. They are unequivocal statements of a fact, and the promises of God are not yea and nay. From those texts we concluded that the second coming of Christ must be as real and literal as his first. We shall now produce positive testimony to that effect. We would first, however, remind the reader that every text that speaks of the manner or object of Christ's coming, is additional proof of the fact that he will come again.

In his first letter to the Thessalonians, the apostle Paul warns the brethren against indulging in hopeless sorrow for their dead friends, as though they were lost. He assures them, "by the word of the Lord," that those who live until the Lord comes will have no precedence over those who fall asleep in Jesus. We will not be with Christ any sooner than they are. And then he proceeds to tell how this can be. "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.

We shall have occasion to use this text again, and we pass it for the present. Turning to the first chapter of Acts, we read the account of Christ's ascension. In his gospel, Luke had previously written, "And he led them out as far as to Bethany, and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven." Luke 24:50, 51. In Luke's second narrative we have this account: "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." Acts 1:9-11.

There is no mistaking these words. Christ was there in person. In bodily form, while in the act of blessing his disciples, he ascended to heaven. And the angels declared that "the same Jesus"- "the Lord himself," 1 Thess. 4:16-should come in exactly the same manner as had left the earth. Now, as showing the perfect harmony of the Bible narrative, we quote right here the words of John: "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced

him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, Amen." Rev. 1:7. The one who claims that the coming of Christ is death, or conversion, or anything else than a literal return to earth, squarely contradicts these plain texts.

Our Saviour foresaw that before his return many would be engaged in this very work. In order to draw the attention of man away from the real advent of Christ, as described in the Bible, Satan and his angels will transform themselves, not merely into angels of light, but into the appearance of Christ himself, and will "show great signs and wonders; insomuch that if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." Matt. 24:24. They will claim that Christ is already come, and will work miracles to support the claim. How, then, can we be sure that they are not the Christ; here is the sure guide: "Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth; behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Matt. 24:26, 27. The reason why it will be impossible to deceive the elect, is because they will remember and implicitly believe the plain declarations of the Bible.

These texts prove not only that the coming of the Lord is a literal event, but that it is yet future. Do you still say that it took place on the day of Pentecost? We answer that Paul's words in Heb. 9:28 were written many years after that time. None of the apostles had written a line at that time, and, since the resurrection of Christ, had engaged in no public work whatever. Is it claimed that the destruction of Jerusalem answers to the coming of the Lord, we remind you that the book of Revelation was written more than a score of years after Jerusalem was conquered by Titus; and in that book, besides the description already quoted (Rev. 1:7), almost the closing words are these: "And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be." Rev. 22:12. "He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly." Verse 20. These

426

forbid the application of the promise to any event before the close of the first century.

Again, no event has ever yet occurred comparable to the coming of the Lord as described in the Bible. Peter, in answer to those who, professing to be able to see no signs of such an event, derisively asked, "Where is the promise of his coming?" says: "But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." 2 Pet. 3:10.

The psalmist says: "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him. He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that he may judge his people. Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice." Ps. 50:3-5.

The heavens have not departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; not yet as the glorious appearing of the Son of man in those opening heavens dazzled every eye as does the vivid lightning flash. Not yet have "the kings of the earth,

and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, 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." Rev. 6:15, 16. The time is still future when the voice of the Archangel and the trump of God shall call the dead in Christ from their graves, and when the living righteous, with glad accord, shall unite in the exclamation: "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." Isa. 25:9.

That they will not pass and leave saints and sinners alike unconscious of its arrival. The Lord comes, not as an intercessor, but as a king, "without sin." There is thenceforward no more mercy for sinners-they receive according to their deeds; no more trials for saints-he appears to them unto salvation. This being so, it is manifestly fool-hardy in any one to say, "We shall know more about it when it comes than we do now." Yes, we will; but those who put off their knowledge of it until it comes, will learn to their sorrow. While the signs that show that coming near are fulfilling all around us, let us search the Scriptures that we may be children of the light, and, having our lamps trimmed and burning, be able to hail our Lord with joy when he returns. E. J. W.

"Some Modern Criticism" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

The apostle Paul wrote that "whatsoever things were written aforetime [referring to the Old Testament Scriptures] were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." Rom. 15:4. It would seem that the modern expositor reads it, "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our *criticism*." And in his case the word "criticism" means to pull to pieces, and not simply to wait and judge. In the great struggle to make the Bible harmonize with "science," the subject of miracles has of course been much discussed. Now it happens that "science" has no place in its domain for miracles, and it has therefore occurred as a necessary consequence of the intense desire that the Bible shall not be regarded as being behind the age, that its avowed friends have quite generally set themselves to work to explain all supposed miracles in accordance with "known natural laws." The latest effort disposes of the miracle of the sun's standing still at the command of Joshua in the following manner:-

"A writer in the *Church Quarterly Review* maintains that what the Israelitish leader prayed for was not that the sun and moon might 'stand still,' but that they might 'be silent,' that is to say, 'ceased to shine'-*dom shemesh*, as the Hebrew text has it. A storm of hail-stones was the principal cause of the defeat of the allied kings. Joshua, finding that the storm and darkness by which it was accomplished did more toward the overthrow of the enemy than his own troops, naturally prayed that the darkness might continue until the utter ruin of the foe was accomplished. The formidable astronomical objections to the miracle are

thus removed by a simple philological discovery, which the reader may accept or not, at his pleasure."

We are glad that the *Christian at Work*, from which we clip the above, gives us the privilege of accepting it or not, as we choose. We choose to give such nonsense a wide berth. We are greatly surprised that that journal, and others which lay claim to great Biblical knowledge, should quote with approval a theory which is so directly contradictory to the plain Scripture narrative. It is simply a proof that there is a wide-spread desire to strip the Bible of everything which stands in the way of its acceptance by a self-sufficient, unbelieving world,-in other words to make the way of life so broad that all will find themselves in it without making any effort.

How does this explanation agree with the Bible? Let us see. Our critic says that the sun was simply darkening during the day; the Bible says, "So the sons stood still in the midst of heaven and *hasted not to go down about a whole day.*" We have seen many stormy days when the sun did not shine, but the sun always set at the appointed time. In this instance the sun did not go down, according to Joshua's command; but if darkness for were what he wished, he would with more propriety have prayed that the sun might hasten its going down, instead of that its course should be stayed.

Again, the sacred historian declares: "And there was no day like that before it or after it, that the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man." Josh. 10:14. If the answer to Joshua's prayer consisted simply in the Lord sending a storm and darkness, we cannot understand this statement, for there have been many stormy days since then; but we can well believe that never since that time has there been so extraordinary an occurrence as the sun's standing still for a whole day. It will be clearly seen that if a critic had read the entire narrative carefully, his criticism could not have been made.

"But," says one, "how do *you* explain that miracle?" We don't explain it; it is entirely beyond our capacity, and that is why we call it a miracle. There are some wonderful things that we *can* account for, but we do not call them miracles. We believe in a God, and therefore we believe in miracles-things entirely beyond the comprehension of human minds. The desire to find an explanation for all recorded miracles and the Bible, arises from a growing unbelief that such things really occur; and to deny the occurrence of miracles is really the same as denying the existence of God.

Perhaps this last statement may not be self-evident to all; we think it can easily be made to appear. God is greater than man; if he were not, he would be simply a man, and therefore not an object of worship. But he is infinite. "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty and the perfection?" Job 11:7. This question can be answered only in the negative. God is incomprehensible. Then of course his acts must be above the comprehension of man. Paul had thought much on heavenly things, and had been admitted into close communion with the Lord, and he exclaimed, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his waist past finding out." Rom. 11:33. This is only in keeping with what we should expect. Finite minds cannot grasp infinitely. Then of course there must be

miracles. And when many things are recorded, all of which are beyond our comprehension, who shall say that some of these are possible and others impossible? Who will dare to limit the power of an infinite God?

"But," says another, do you believe that God violates laws of nature, in performing miracles? Again we reply, We do not know; it is impossible to tell. We are very certain that he has often done things that directly conflict with any laws known to man. But then there are many things that even scientific men do not know. So long as we cannot understand God, we cannot understand the laws of nature, for they are his laws. Things that seem impossible to us, may be in perfect harmony with laws of which we know nothing. When the Dutch ambassador told the king of Siam that in his country water sometimes assumed such a condition that man could walk upon it, the king said, "I often thought that you were untruthful, but now I know you lie. It is impossible for man to walk upon water." Doubtless the king's scientific men would have said the same thing, and *proved* it by science. It is contrary to the nature of a clock for the hands to move backward, and yet a man can move them backward. The child gazes with wonder upon the steam engine, and cannot comprehend how the engineer can start, stop, or back it at pleasure; but it would be foolishness in him to assert that those things cannot be done. Well, this universe is the great machine which God has made, and which he controls. Between the mind of man and that of the great Architect, there is no more comparison than there is between the ant beside the track, and the man who drives the engine. And so, instead of denying the existence of miracles, we are lost in wonder and admiration of the power that is as infinitely beyond us.

And now a few words by way of application. Some will say, "We did not need this article, for we believed in the miracles of the Bible just as they are recorded." We are glad of that. But would not such an article as the one from which we have quoted shake your faith? "No." Why not? Because it directly contradicts the Bible. "But do you profess to know more about the Bible than a learned D. D., who has spent a life-time in its study, and who understands the Hebrew and Greek? You reply, "I can understand the English language, and I know when a man is contradicting the plain statement of the Bible." Then you are willing to admit that "great men are not always wise," and that even learned men may be led by their prejudices into grievous and palpable errors? "Certainly." Well this is just what we wish to have you bear in mind. And now whenever you hear some wise men say that God did not bless and sanctify the seventh day, but only the Sabbath institution, and that he now requires men to observe the first day instead of the seventh, don't be overawed into acquiescence by the immensity of his learning, but simply ask him for his authority. "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8:20. E. J. W.

"The Sabbath-School" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST. 6AUG. 9

1. What did Jesus say to this disciples as they were at one time pointing out the splendor of the temple? Matt. 24:1, 2.
2. What questions they ask him? Verse 3.
3. Did he rebuke them for making such an inquiry? Verse 4.
4. Why were they to be so careful? Verse 5.
5. Did the Lord and courage his disciples to expect his coming immediately? Verse 6.
6. What terrible things did he say must first come? Verse 7.
7. With those calamities indicate that the end was at hand? Verse 8.
8. What else did he say must be done before the end would come? Verse 14.
9. When did he say that those which were in Judea should flee to the mountains? Verses 15, 16. 10.
10. What is meant by the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place? Luke 21:20, 21.
11. When they sought Jerusalem surrounded with armies, what were they to know? *Ib.*
12. Then to what did Jesus have reference in Matt. 24:15?
13. What had Jesus, on a previous occasion, said should take place at the end of the world? Matt. 13:40-43.
14. At the destruction of Jerusalem to the angels cast all that did even iniquity into a furnace of fire?
15. Rather righteous made to shine as the sun in the kingdom of God?
16. Then can it be that the destruction of Jerusalem was the "end" to which Christ and the apostles referred?
17. To what did he say his coming would be similar? Matt. 24:27.
18. Following the destruction of Jerusalem, what did he say there would be? Verse 21.
19. How great would the tribulation be?
20. What would be the result, if those days were not shortened? Verse 22.
21. For whose sake were they to be shortened? *Ib.*
22. If some of the elect would be saved in consequence of the shortening of those days of trouble, who were they that were to suffer that great tribulation?
23. Who were meant by "the elect"? Acts 10:35.
24. What were the people of God commanded to do when they saw that the destruction of Jerusalem was near? Luke 21:20, 21.
25. If all the Christians left Jerusalem before it was destroyed, could any of them have suffered in the siege?
26. Then can the tribulation of Matt. 24:21, 22 be limited to that at the destruction of Jerusalem?
27. Was a time of trouble for the saints of God foretold in prophecy? Dan. 7:25.

In the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew two subjects are considered—the destruction of Jerusalem, and the coming of the Lord. Concerning these two events only one point is considered, namely, time. There was no question as to

whether those things would occur, for Christ had already assured them of that fact; but the question is, "When shall these things be?" It is this question that our Saviour answers in the discourse that follows. Incidentally, it is true, he imparts additional information concerning those events; but the main point in the chapter is to settle the time of their occurrence.

Although the discourse relates to time, no attempt is made to fix the exact date of either event. Concerning the destruction of Jerusalem he says (we quote the parallel passage in Luke 21:20): "And when ye shall see Jerusalem contest with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh." This is as definitely as that event is located. The disciples are informed as to the events that will show it to be imminent, so that they can escape before the ruin comes. So likewise concerning the coming of the Lord. After relating certain signs, to be considered in detail hereafter, he says: "So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors." Matt. 24:33.

It is popularly supposed that if all men are not ultimately converted, the gospel will have proved to be a failure. This would indeed be the case if it were anywhere stated that the gospel was designed to accomplish the conversion of all men. The trouble is that men make the mistake of expecting more of the gospel than the Lord ever said it would do. He said (Matt. 24:14) that it should be preached in all the world for a *witness*. Now witness may testify *against* a man as well as for him. The work of a true witness is not to favor any one, but to tell the exact truth and let that justify or condemn according to circumstances. James said that God visited the Gentiles to take *out of them* a people for his name. Acts 15:14. God was perfectly willing and anxious that all should be converted, at the same time he knew that many would remain stubborn and rebellious. If all men are permitted to hear the gospel in its purity, then the gospel will have accomplished its work. It is a witness to all men; to some it will prove a savor of life unto life; to others, a savor of death unto death. 2 Cor. 2:14-16.

"This gospel of the kingdom." In these words the gospel in its entirety is brought to view. The Lord was speaking about his coming, and when he said, "this gospel of the kingdom," he evidently meant the gospel which proclaims his coming to set up his kingdom. And this is the gospel itself; for the gospel is the good news of salvation; it brings to view the plan by which condemned rebels may be saved from death, and converted into loyal subjects of the kingdom of heaven. But, as we have already seen, the final salvation of man depends upon the coming of Christ. None are saved until the Lord comes for them. To leave the coming of the Lord out of the preaching of the gospel would be to deprive it of all its force. So we say that the preaching of the gospel includes the announcement that the Lord is coming. The gospel is not complete without this. And therefore it is not enough that all nations have heard of Christ; they must also hear of his second coming in glory to save his people, and must have an opportunity to learn of the special preparation necessary to fit them for the event. When this shall have been done, then the end will come, as stated in Matt. 24:14.

Whatever idea may have been in the minds of the disciples when they asked the question recorded in Matt. 24:3, it is certain that Jesus made a wide distinction between his coming and the destruction of Jerusalem. Christ had

previously said (Matt. 13:36-43), that in the end of the world he would send forth his angels to gather up the wicked and cast them into a furnace of fire, and that the righteous should then shine forth as the sun. This did not occur at the destruction of Jerusalem. Again, we have learned (1 Thess. 4:15-17) that the Lord himself shall descend, and that the righteous dead shall be raised. This was not the case at the destruction of Jerusalem. More than all, in the Revelation, which was written more than twenty years after the destruction of Jerusalem, and in John's Gospel, which was written still later, the coming of the Lord is spoken of as an event then in the future. And, finally, Christians are taught, both by Christ and by his apostles, to look for the coming of the Lord as the consummation of all their hopes; they are taught that they cannot be with him unless he comes again. Now if Christ's coming is in the past, Christians at the present they have nothing to look forward to. But our faith is not in vain, for our King is yet to come with his reward.

"For there shall be tribulation." When? Following the destruction of Jerusalem. To whom was the trouble to come? Upon the people. This is proved by verse 22: "For the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." The elect are the beloved of the Lord, those who serve him. But if the elect were saved from utter extermination only by the shortening of the trouble, then it follows that the trouble was upon the people of God. And this is proof that the destruction of Jerusalem is not referred to in the passage, for before that city was destroyed, the disciples, in accordance with the Lord's instruction in Matt. 24:15, 16, had fled. When the final siege came, there were none of the disciples of Christ in the city. The tribulation referred to in verses 21, 22, must therefore refer to something besides the destruction of Jerusalem. "It is a fact that the early Christians did suffer very much from pagan persecution; but these cannot be all the tribulations referred to, for the promise that certain days should be shortened, indicates that the Saviour had in mind a definite period, during the greater part of which his followers should suffer grievous persecution. This fact is plainly stated in Mark's account, where he says: "But in those days, after that tribulation." Mark 13:24. The question then arises, To what period of persecution did Christ refer?

In the book of Daniel we have two times of trouble brought to view. One is mentioned in chap. 12:1, but that trouble must be for the wicked, for God's people are to be delivered from it. In Dan. 7:25, however, we read of a certain power that "he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws." The term "wear out" is very forcible, indicating slow but sure extermination by torture. The time allotted to this work was "a time and times, and the dividing of time," a definite period. This, then, must be the tribulation to which the Saviour referred as coming upon his people,-a tribulation that failed to entirely "wear out" or exterminate its victims only because it was cut short. E. J. W.

July 24, 1884

"Object of Christ's Coming" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 28.

E. J. Waggoner

We have now established two points beyond controversy. First, that Christ will come again (John 14:1-3; Heb. 9:28); and second, that his second coming will be as literal as the first (Acts 1:9-11; Rev. 1:7), the only point of difference being that it will be more glorious (Matt. 24:27; 25:31). We say that these points have been established beyond controversy, because we have read them directly from the Bible, in words so plain that a child could not misunderstand them. They need no interpretation to make them plainer.

But if the Lord is indeed coming again, it must be for some purpose; he must have some object in view. And if he was so particular to tell us of his coming, and to urge us to prepare for that great event, it must be that he has not left us in ignorance as to its object. We shall find that the Scriptures are very clear upon this point also.

The words of Christ himself demand our first attention. We have quoted the promise of Christ's coming found in John 14:1-3. That promise also contains the reason: "If I go to prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; *that where I am there ye may be also.*" He is coming, then, to take all his followers to himself. Those who mourned at the thought of having him apart from them, will then once more enjoy his presence.

Besides this, there is something else. Paul comforted the Thessalonian brethren in their tribulation with the thought that God himself could give them rest, and this rest he said they would receive "when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, and 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. With those two texts agree the words of Christ: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." Matt. 16:27; and these: "And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me to give every man according as his work shall be." Rev. 22:12.

These texts show plainly enough the object of Christ's second coming. It is to take his people to himself, and to take vengeance on the wicked. This latter part we will pass by for the present, and consider the promise to the disciples. From the words of Christ we would naturally conclude that there is no other way for his people to be with him except by his coming. "I will come again, and receive you unto myself, *that where I am, there ye may be also.*" The conjunction "that" denotes purpose, and is equivalent to "in order that." When we read, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, *that* whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16), we understand that belief in Christ is the only way by which we can avoid perishing. And so when we read the promise of Christ to his disciples, we understand that if Christ were not to come, his disciples could not be with him. Indeed, if it were otherwise, -if the disciples could be with Christ without his coming for them, -what force or comfort would there be in his promise? For the only words of comfort that he had for them were that he would come to take them to himself. Moreover, we cannot

imagine Jesus making an unnecessary promise; but if the disciples could be with him without his coming, he, of course, knew it, and therefore made a promise which was entirely useless. From this text, then, we must conclude that Christ's disciples are not yet with him, for his coming is still in the future. We call the reader's attention to other texts which confirm this conclusion.

Paul exhorts us to set our affection on things above and says: "When Christ, who is our life, *shall appear, then* shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. 3:4. Note the adverb "then." It specifies the time when the saints will appear in glory; it is when Christ appears.

The apostle Peter gives instructions to the elders of the churches, exhorting them to labor faithfully, and says for their encouragement: "And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." 1 Pet. 5:4. The report is sure, but they are not expected before Christ comes.

Again he says: "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, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." 1 Pet. 1:3-5. The saints are kept by the power of God unto salvation; but the salvation is not to be given until the last time. Or, as Peter expresses it still more plainly in the 13th verse of the same chapter: "Be sober, and hope to the hand for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ."

In the third chapter of his second epistle to Timothy, the apostle Paul speaks of the prevailing degeneracy of the last days, and recommends the Bible as the only thing that will thoroughly furnish man to good works. He then continues: "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; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine." 2 Tim. 4:1, 2. Here, then, we find when the Judgment is to take place; in connection with the coming of Christ. But if the dead are not judged until Christ comes, it necessarily follows that they do not receive any reward until that time. And this is exactly what the Saviour said, as quoted from Matt. 16:27; Rev. 22:12.

The apostle continues his exhortation to Timothy, and says, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." 2 Tim. 4:7, 8. The Judge is to give crowns at that day, says Paul. At what day? Why, at the day when he judges the living and dead, "at his appearing and his kingdom." Peter told the elders that they should receive their crown at the appearing of the chief Shepherd, and Paul says that all who love his appearing shall receive their crowns at the same time.

Paul says, "*Henceforth* there is *laid up* for me a crown of righteousness." He had reached the close of his life, and was about to be "offered" as a sacrifice to the truth. He felt that his life-work had been faithfully done. Did he therefore

expect to immediately enter upon his reward? No; he was sure of a crown, but he knew that it would not be given until the appearing of Christ.

We have seen that when Christ comes he will be accompanied by all the holy angels. Matt. 25:31. The work which the angels have to do is described in Matt. 24:31: "And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." And this agrees with the words of the psalmist: "He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that he may judge his people. Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice." Ps. 50:4, 5. By what means the saints are gathered to be with Christ, will be considered in another article. E. J. W.

"Christ the End of the Law" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 28.

E. J. Waggoner

"For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom. 10:4. This is supposed by antinomians to teach the abolition of the law. The text is not usually quoted in full, the objector contenting himself with the statement that "Christ is the end of the law," meaning that Christ abolished the law. This text is so generally quoted in favor of the abolition of the law, that before we consider its real application, we will briefly show the absurdity of the popular interpretation.

1. If Christ abolished the law, then there can be no sin now, for "sin is the transgression of the law," 1 John 3:4, and "is not imputed when there is no law." Rom. 5:13. And if there is no sin, there can be no punishment impending, and all men will be saved. Those texts, therefore, which speak of the "wrath of God," and the "indignation," "torment," and "destruction," to be visited upon sinners, are made of no effect. There is no one so much of a Universalist as he who claims that the law of God is abolished.

2. The text says that Christ is the end of the law "to every one that believeth." The necessary inference is that he is not the end of the law to unbelievers. Those, therefore, who claim that the apostle by the expression "end of the law" means abolition of the law, must teach that the law is abolished only for Christians; that is that the law binds worldlings, but that Christians are under no obligation to it. And so it would follow that while an act performed by an unbeliever might be in violation of the law, and therefore a sin, the same act performed by a believer would be perfectly justifiable. We trust that there is no one who would hold to so monstrous a theory as this, yet that is a legitimate deduction from antinomian claims.

3. If Paul, in Rom. 10:4 means that the law is abolished for believers, it would follow that it has been abolished as many times as there are Christians, being done away every time a man is converted; and further, that whenever any believer falls away, and loses his faith, the law is for him re-enacted! The absurdity of this just conclusion must convince every one of the absurdity of the premise.

4. Again: From the parables of the wheat and the tares (Matt. 13, we learn that both righteous and wicked are to remain together on the earth until the end of the world. We know also that both classes have existed since the fall. It follows, therefore, from antinomian interpretation of Rom. 10:4, that the law of God always has been, and will be until the end of time, both abolished and in full force at the same time! This is the climax of absurdity, and shows conclusively that whatever may be the meaning of Rom. 10:4, it certainly does not teach that any part of God's Law is, or ever will be, abolished, either for Christians or unbelievers.

And now as to what the text really does mean. The word "end" is often used in the sense of "object" or design. Thus in James 5:11 we read, "Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord." No one supposes that this means the end of the Lord's existence, but the object of the Lord in allowing Job to suffer affliction. In like manner we understand Rom. 10:4 to teach that Christ meets the design of the law to those who believe. In order to understand how he does this, we must consider the end or design of the law.

In Rom. 7:10 the apostle says that the commandment (meaning the whole law) "was ordained to life." That is, if man had never violated the law, it would insure his eternal life. This is what the Saviour said to the young man in Matt. 19:17, as previously noticed. In the next verse to the one under consideration (Rom. 10:5) we read the same thing: "For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, that the man which doeth those things shall live by them." But while this is true, the fact presents itself that no man has kept the law (Rom. 3:9, 19, 23), and that in his natural condition no man can keep the law, because "the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Rom. 8:7. How, then, can any one obtain eternal life, which the law was designed to bestow? The answer is, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6:23. The law was "ordained to life;" Christ is our life (Col. 3:4), and is therefore the end of the law.

But this is only the result. It might be asked, "Does Christ accomplish this result for us, by freeing us from obligation to keep the law?" We answer, No; for since only those who do the commandments shall live by them (Matt. 19:17; Rom. 10:7), it follows that no one can receive eternal life if he continues to violate them. Therefore since the object of the law was to give life, it must follow that it was also the design that it must be kept. So we read in 1 Tim. 1:5 that "the end of the commandment is charity," etc. "Charity" is but another name for "love," and this rendering is given in the Revised Version. But "love is the fulfilling of the law" (Rom. 13:10), or, as John says, "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." 1 John 5:3. We might therefore paraphrase 1 Tim. 1:5 thus: "Now the object or design of the commandment [or law, see verse 9] is that it should be fulfilled, or scrupulously kept." This is self-evident; for whenever any law is given, it is certainly the design of the maker that it shall be kept.

We have already seen that no man has attained this end. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." From past sins we are "justified freely by his

grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Rom. 3:21. But being justified through faith in Christ, we are still dependent on him, for without him we can do nothing." John 15:4, 5. It is only by abiding in him that we are able to bear fruit. And this is why the apostle says of the Jews that they have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge. "For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God." Rom. 10:3. The righteousness of God is his law (Isa. 51:6, 7), and the apostle means that the Jews, being zealous toward God, and desiring to serve him by keeping his commandments, had sought to do so in their own strength, and had failed. Their zeal was good, but their knowledge was deficient, in that they did not perceive that only in Christ could they hope to attain perfection.

To all believers, Christ is made "wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." 1 Cor. 1:30. Not by freeing them from obligation to keep the law, for then he would be to them, not righteousness, but unrighteousness, or, in other words, would become the minister of sin. Without him our best efforts are failures; with him to strengthen us, we can do all things; and when at last we stand before God holy and without blemish, "not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing," it will be because we have been made "complete in him."

We think it must be evident to all that Rom. 10:4 can be pressed into antinomian service only by mutilating to the extent of leaving out the statement that Christ is the end of the law to believers only, and to them for nothing except righteousness, or obedience to it. This subject will be considered still further in the light of other scriptures, in another article. E. J. W.

July 31, 1884

"The Sabbath-School" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 29.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST AUG. 16

1. In our last lesson, what Scripture was quoted concerning a time of tribulation?
2. What was this time of trouble to follow?
3. Show that the time of trouble referred to does not mean the destruction of Jerusalem.
4. Prove that the predicted tribulation was to come upon the people of God alone.
5. Repeat the words of prophecy that foretell such a period of tribulation. Dan. 7:25.
6. What power is here referred to as "wearing out" the saints of God?
7. How long were the saints and laws to be given into his hand?
8. To how many days is the sequel? Rev. 12:6, 14.

9. In symbolic prophecy what does a day represent? Eze. 4:5, 6.
10. Then how many days of papal supremacy and persecution were predicted?
11. From what date are they to be reckoned?
12. Then when would they end?
13. How was the papal power broken in 1798?
14. What did Christ say would be done to those days for the elect's sake? Matt. 24:22.
15. What must be meant by this?
16. What great movement produced a sentiment against persecution for conscience' sake?
17. What did the Lord say would immediately follow the tribulation of those days? Matt. 24: 29.
18. How definitely is the beginning of the signs located? Mark 13:24.
19. When did the darkening of the sun and moon take place?
20. When was the prophecy concerning the falling of the stars fulfilled?
21. Is the shaking of the powers of the heavens a sign of the coming of the Lord, or something that occurs in connection with it? 2 Pet. 3:10.
22. Are there to be any signs besides those in the heavens? Luke 21:25.
23. When the signs begin to come to pass, what is near? Luke 21:28.
24. How can we tell when summer is approaching? Luke 21:29, 30.
25. Do the signs here considered just as surely prove that Christ's coming is near? Verse 31; Matt. 24:32, 33.
26. Are we to admit of any doubt concerning it?
27. If the Lord commands us to *know*, is it not a sin to remain ignorant?

In our last lesson we identified the time of tribulation, of Matt. 24:21, 22, with the period of wearing out the saints of the Most High, mentioned in Dan. 7:25. The power that was then to "wear out the saints," is admitted by all commentators to be the papacy. The period of time during which they were to be given into its hand is stated as "a time and times, and the dividing of time." Without entering into any discussion as to the length of a "time," we can very easily determined how long this period of Dan. 7:25 was. In Rev. 12:14 we find the same period given as the length of time during which the "woman" (the Christian church) was nourished in the wilderness. In the sixth verse of the same chapter the same event is brought to view, and the time is said to be "a thousand two hundred and three-score [1260] days." We may therefore read Dan. 7:25 thus: "And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until [or during] a time and times and the dividing of time."

But twelve hundred and sixty days, only three years and a half, would be rather an insignificant persecution; the time would be entirely too short to accomplish the wearing out of the saints; and besides we know that the persecution of the church by the papacy lasted much longer than that. We remember, therefore, that the prophecy in which this prediction occurs, is symbolic, and that the time brought to view is figurative. If we turn to Eze. 4:4-6, we shall find that in prophetic symbols a day represents a year. Substituting this,

we are warranted in reading Dan. 7:25 thus: And he shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into this hand for twelve hundred and sixty years.

This period of papal rule began in 538 A.D., when, by the overthrow of the Ostrogoths Justinian's decree that the bishop of Rome should be head of all the churches, went into effect. Twelve hundred and sixty years from that date would bring us to A.D. 1798, for the close of papal supremacy; and just at that time it was that Pope Pius VI. was taken prisoner by the French, and the temporal dimension of the papacy was destroyed, never again to be restored to its former glory. That the years intervening between these two dates were filled with persecutions which literally "wore out" the people of God, is fully attested by history. The "tribulation" may doubtless be considered as beginning before 538 A.D., for under pagan rule the Christians suffered terrible persecutions; but pagan persecution did not begin to compare in fiendish malignity with those waged by the apostate Christian church against the true followers of Christ.

"But for the elect's sake, those days shall be shortened." What days? Not the days of papal supremacy, for the time of its continuance had been definitely fixed years before. Our Lord must refer to the days of persecution by the papal power. Had that persecution been pushed to the close of the 1260 years with all the relentless rigor that characterized it in its height, none of the people of God (no flesh), as the Bible says, would have escaped. But in the providence of God the Reformation arose. God did not design that his truth and people should be utterly exterminated, so that he could have no witnesses upon earth. So he moved on the hearts of devout men like Luther, to preach the word, showing that man must be justified by faith, and not by penances, pilgrimages, or the payment of coin. Their preaching was accompanied with such power that thousands were constrained to believe the glad message of salvation through Christ alone; and when the rulers of various European States espoused the new light, and refused to yield abject obedience to the commands of the pope of Rome, the persecution was gradually diminished, until about the middle of the eighteenth century, it virtually ceased. So for the elect's sake the days were shortened.

"Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened," etc. As recorded by Mark (chap. 13:24) our Saviour was still more explicit in his prediction. After speaking of the affliction above noted, he said: "*But in those days, after that tribulation*, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light." We must therefore look for the fulfillment of the sign somewhere between the middle of the eighteenth century and the year 1798. Do we find it? The dark day of May 19, 1780, is one of the notable events of history. A brief description may be found in "Webster's Unabridged Dictionary," the list of "Noted Names," etc. The darkness extended over the entire day, after ten o'clock in the morning, and through the greater part of the night falling. Although the moon was then full, not a ray of light was to be seen. Even in the day-time the darkness was so great that no work could be done out of doors, and persons who were out were actually unable to find their way home. Fowls went to roost in the forenoon, as though it were night. History contains no parallel to this wonderful event.

Many have sought to find an explanation for the darkness of May 19, 1780 thinking thereby to destroy its value as a sign of the Lord's coming. None of these efforts have been successful, and so good authority is that quoted above (Webster) says: "The true cause of this remarkable phenomenon is unknown." However, even if it were possible for anyone to explain it on scientific grounds, that would not in the least invalidate the claim that it is a true sign of the Lord's coming. Mark the fact that Jesus did not say that a darkening of the sun should occur, which nobody could account for. What he did say was that at a certain time such an event should occur; its occurrence at the exact time specified establishes it beyond all controversy as a valid sign of the end.

"And the stars shall fall from heaven." This was fulfilled in the memorable meteoric shower of Nov. 13, 1833. It accurately fulfilled Rev. 6:13, which likens the falling of the stars to the falling of unripe figs, when the tree is shaken by a mighty wind. Prof. Olmstead, of Yale College, said:-

"Those who were so fortunate as to witness the exhibition of shooting stars on the morning of Nov. 13, 1833, probably saw the greatest display of celestial fireworks that has ever been seen since the creation of the world, or, at least, within the annals covered by the pages of history."

"When these things begin to come to pass then look up, and lift up your head; for your redemption draweth night." Luke 21:28. That is, the signs show that the Lord's coming is near. Says one, "I don't believe in frightening people with talk about the Lord's coming." Well, the Lord didn't say anything about getting frightened. He was speaking to his disciples (not simply to those chosen twelve, but to all who should believe on him through their word); and he tells them to rejoice. Why should they not? Their best friend is coming to redeem them, and to take them to himself. Does the prisoner tremble at the coming of the one whom he knows will open its prison doors and let him walk at liberty? Does the bondman, toiling in weariness and pain, writhing under the lash of the taskmaster, become frightened at the thought that the time of this cruel bondage is nearly over, and that one is coming who will make him a free man? Then certainly the Christian will only rejoice at the thought that his Saviour is coming to end all his trials and temptations, and to give him an everlasting home in the mansions of light. The Lord saves those who love his appearing, and those who love his appearing will not shrink from it with alarm.

How do we know when summer is approaching? By certain infallible signs. We see the buds begin to swell, the leaves begin to appear, and the tiny blades of grass shoot forth from the ground. When those things begin to take place, we know that summer is not far distant. No one could make us believe differently. "So likewise ye," says the Saviour, "when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand." Luke 21:31. This is a direct command. We are not to disbelieve, nor to be in doubt, nor to guess that he is near, but to *know*. To disregard this command is certainly a sin, as well as to disobey any other injunction. If we study his words carefully, how can we help knowing? How near is it? "Even *at the doors*." The day and hour are not given, nor is it necessary that they should be. When we are informed that a friend is at our door, we do not require a message telling us when to prepare to receive him.

If we are not then ready, we know that we have no time to lose. No expression could more strongly convey the fact that Christ's coming is close upon us.

And how shall we prepare for that momentous event? "Not everyone that saith unto me,

455

Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." Matt. 7:21. If we would be enter into Christ's kingdom, we must obey the laws of that kingdom. There will be none but loyal subjects there. Treason will not be found. Let us then, by the aid of Christ and his Holy Spirit, have the law of God so written in our hearts that we may be found unto praise and honor and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ. E. J. W.

"The Reason Why" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 29.

E. J. Waggoner

For years people were content to keep the first day of the week as the Sabbath because they were taught from childhood that this was right. No one felt called upon to give a special reason for doing that which no one questioned. We say that no one questioned the correctness of their action, not because there were none who condemned first-day observance both by word and act, but because those who kept the seventh day were so few in number as to be practically unknown. And so people kept Sunday because their parents did, and were content. Whenever the good people wished to reason with a worldling who would persist in finding his own pleasure on the first day of the week, they would quote, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy," taking it as a matter of course that "Sabbath" meant Sunday, and that the fourth commandment was gotten up for the express purpose of protecting the first day from worldly toil and pleasure.

But the time came when their quiet was disturbed. Those who read the commandment far enough to find out that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," and had the courage to obey the commandment as it reads, preached the "new" doctrine with such vigor as to attract general attention. To the surprise of all the people who were quietly following custom, and to the disgust of many of them, it was found that the seventh day really is the Sabbath of the Bible, that it was that day that received the divine blessing and sanctification in the beginning, and that unfortunately the Bible writers had omitted to say anything about a change of the day of weekly rest. Some persons very sensibly concluded that if the Lord had wanted men to observe the first day of the week instead of the seventh he would have said something about it, and immediately adopted God's original plan. The reason that God was abundantly able to make known his will, that he had done so very clearly in times past, even concerning matters of seemingly little importance, and that when he had not spoken it was very presumptuous in man to speak for him. See Eze. 13:7.

Others, however, acted on the principle that Sunday-keeping *must* be right because, (1) It has been kept by nearly all the world for many centuries; (2) The leaders of the church do not accept the seventh-day Sabbath (see John 7:47, 48), and they certainly ought to know what is right; (3) It would be very

inconvenient to make a change; and therefore (4) They were determined not to change. Having come to this conclusion, they felt that it was incumbent on them to give some reason for their course of action, especially since they were very strongly urged to do so by those who kept the Sabbath "according to the commandment." Accordingly they promptly gave, substantially, the following "reasons:"-

1. "The Sabbath was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, because Christ rose from the dead on that day."

2. "The first day of the week is the one that was originally sanctified. The Jews were too wicked to be allowed to keep it, so the Lord let them keep Saturday for a while; but there has really been no change at all in the Sabbath day."

3. "We keep Sunday because the world is round, and it is impossible to keep any one day."

4. "The seventh day is indeed the Sabbath, and all men ought to keep it, for it is plainly commanded; but we can't tell which day of the week is the seventh, and therefore we keep the first."

5. "The seventh day was the Sabbath from the beginning, but the Jews lost their reckoning while in Egypt, and since that time nobody has had the correct reckoning of the time."

6. "The Jews lost the correct reckoning during the Babylonian captivity, and consequently no one can tell whether or not the day that they now keep is the true seventh day."

7. "Christ kept the seventh-day Sabbath, and so did his disciples, "according to the commandment;" but during the dark ages of papal supremacy much time was lost; indeed, no reckoning whatever was kept for a long time, and so it is absolutely impossible to tell whether our Saturday is the seventh or the fourth day of the week, or even to tell in what year of the Christian era we are now living."

8. "We keep the first day of the week because, after the resurrection of Christ, the apostles kept it, and from their time to the present we have an uninterrupted record of Sunday observance."

9. "The commandment enjoins the observance of the only a seventh part of time; there is nowhere in the Bible a command to keep a definite day, so we keep Sunday."

10. "The ten commandments are now abolished, and the New Testament is the Christians only guide; but it is not a book of laws, and we don't find in it the express command for Sabbath observance, and we therefore observe the first day of the week."

These are only a few of the many "reasons" given for keeping Sunday rather than the seventh day. As will be readily surmised, they were not developed in council, but were "sought out" by different individuals as occasion required. We but state the simple truth, however, when we say we have heard every one of the above "reasons" given in a single discourse, and that by a minister who was held in high repute as a man of learning. Whenever the above-mentioned "reasons" seemed unsatisfactory, others were given that were equally conclusive!

In spite of all this, people would wonder why the Bible contains no command for Sunday observance. The "new" Sunday-keeping was right, but felt hurt that the Lord had not vouchsafed them one word of encouragement. If only one text could be found, what a relief it would be. Such ones may set their minds at rest. The Rev. J. M. Bailey, D. D., has found out just the reason why the Bible is silent on the subject of first-day observance; and he has given his discovery to the world through the columns of the *Morning Star*, a Free-Will Baptist journal published in Dover, N. H. He says:-

"It appears that the convocation was changed from the seventh to the first on the very day of the resurrection of Christ. *What he said* to the disciples about it to convince them, *we have no means of knowing*. [Italics ours.] He met some of them several times that day, and then appeared in their assembly where they met with closed doors for fear of the Jews, and sanctioned their meeting by breathing on them the Holy Spirit, and sending them forth as the Father had sent him. Probably *for fear of the Jews, what he said* against Judaism, or *in favor of the Christian Sabbath, was not published*."

Do not smile, dear reader. This was written in sober earnest, by a learned D. D., for the express purpose of combating the *errors* of seventh-day keepers. We do not know how he regards his work, but it is our opinion that he leaves nothing more to be said. Before closing we wish to ask, Who was it that was so fearful? Was it Christ, who denounced the Jews to their face, calling them hypocrites? Of course he did not fear personal violence to himself. Was it Peter who feared to tell what Christ did say against the Sabbath and in favor of Sunday?-he who faced the Jewish Sanhedrim, and, charging that body with the murder of Jesus, only declared that "we ought to obey God rather than man." Paul was not present on that night, but he was "not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles" (2 Cor. 11:5), being taught by the Lord Jesus himself. Gal. 1:11, 12. No one can accuse him of fearing to preach the word, and he himself declared that he had not shunned to declare "all the counsel of God." Acts 29:26, 27; but he has left nothing on record concerning Sunday-keeping.

We need not pursue the subject further. We will simply say that we too believe that fear operated to a certain extent to prevent the disciples from preaching that the Sabbath was changed. Not the fear of

458

the Jews, but fear of disobeying Christ's instruction in Matt. 28:19, 20; fear of being found false witnesses of God, and bringing upon themselves the curse recorded in Gal. 1:8, 9. E. J. W.

August 7, 1884

"The Sabbath-School" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST AUG. 23

1. What events did Christ name as signs of this coming?
 2. What have we as to their fulfillment?
 3. How surely do these signs prove his coming to be near?
 4. What expression shows the nearness of the coming?
 5. What did the Lord say would not pass before his words would be fulfilled?
Verse 34.
 6. To what generation must he refer?
 7. Cite another instance where the term "this generation" issues with reference to a people not living at the time. Ps. 98:8-10.
 8. What reason had the disciples for not expecting the Lord's coming in their day? Matt. 24:4-8.
 9. What was Paul's teachings on this point? 2 Thess. 1:2.
 10. What did he say must first come? Verses 3, 4.
 11. Why may we be so confident that the Lord will, in this generation? Matt. 24:35.
 12. Can any man tell the exact time when the Lord will come? Verse 36.
 13. Show how we may know a thing to be near, and yet not know just when it will come.
 14. Are we to expect that all will heed these signs of Christ's coming? 2 Pet. 3:3, 4.
 15. Will the last days be days of quiet to the humble Christian? 2 Tim. 3:1.
 16. What will make the last days perilous? Verses 2-4.
 17. To what time does Christ liken the days immediately preceding his coming? Matt. 24:27.
 18. How wicked were the people in the days of Noah? Gen. 6:5.
 19. Upon what were they wholly intent? Matt. 24:38, 39.
 20. Against what does Christ warn us? Luke 21:34.
 21. In what condition does he say we must be? Luke 12:35, 36.
 22. Can we be said to be waiting for that which we are not prepared to receive?
 23. Since the times are dangerous, and we know not how soon the Lord will come, what are we expected to do? Mark 13:37.
 24. While waiting and watching what else must we do? Luke 21:36.
- There are some things that all men may know. There are others which are concealed, concerning which it is useless for man to inquire. It is written: "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law." Deut. 29:29. This is perfectly reasonable. If the Lord has revealed a thing, it is most certainly for our benefit. Whenever, therefore, we find definite statements in the Bible concerning any event, we may speak of that event with the utmost positiveness to the extent that the statements are made. Now let us apply this to the subject of the Lord's coming. We *know*, (1) That the Lord will come again. We have his own word for that. (2) That his second coming will be as literal as his first,—"this same Jesus,"—and that it will be so glorious, and accompanied with such manifestations that no one can be ignorant of it. Matt. 24:27; Rev. 1:7; 1 Thess. 4:16, 17. (3) That before his coming certain signs will take place. (4) That

these signs, as recorded in Matt. 24, and learned in our last lesson, are the darkening of the sun and moon, and the falling of the stars. (5) That these signs have actually taken place in the exact manner foretold by our Saviour. We do not obtain our knowledge of any of the above things by any process of reasoning, but by plain statements of fact. There is yet one thing more that we may know, that we are commanded to know. The Lord, after having informed the disciples of the signs above-mentioned, said: "When ye shall see all these things, know that it [margin, *he*, that is, Christ] is near, even at the doors." Matt. 24:33. We are to *know* it just as certainly as we know that summer is near when the leaves begin to appear on the trees. There can, then, be no more doubt that the coming of the Lord is near, than there is that the stars fell in 1833.

"Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." Matt. 24:34. There need be no difficulty in understanding this verse. He certainly did not mean to say that his coming would take place before the close of the generation then living, for that would be a contradiction of his own words in verses 4-8, and is directly contradicted by Paul in 2 Thess. 2:1-8. Moreover, whoever claims that Christ did mean that he would come before that generation should pass, must also claim that the dead have been raised and the living translated. 1 Thess. 4:16, 17. The fact that Christ has not yet come is sufficient proof that he did not predict an immediate coming. Then what did he mean? This can be answered by finding out of what time he was speaking. It was not of the time then present, for he was looking forward. He had spoken of the destruction of Jerusalem; he had described the 1260 years of papal supremacy, with its disastrous results to the people of God; and he had minutely described the signs that were to follow; the last of which took place, as we have seen, in 1833. Looking at that time, he said, "This generation shall not pass to all these things be fulfilled." What things? The things recorded in verse. A similar use of the expression "this generation" is found in Ps. 95:10. There are hundreds of persons now alive who witnessed the falling of the stars in 1833. Does anybody doubt that some of that generation will be alive when the Lord comes? Hear what the Saviour says: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." Matt. 24:35.

"But of that day and hour knoweth no man." Here is one of the secret things that belong to God alone. The exact time has not been revealed; therefore we have nothing to do with it; it does not concern us. Yet our ignorance of the exact time does not in the least affect our knowledge of what is revealed, namely, that his coming is near. The farmer knows when summer is near, yet he cannot tell the day when it will be fairly open. We often speak of a friend as coming very soon, yet we do not know the exact time of his coming. After Christ has given us such unmistakable evidences of the nearness of his coming, it is not only foolish but wicked to pay no attention to them, simply because he has not revealed to us the day and hour.

The fact that comparatively few even of religious people believe in and teach the doctrine of the near coming of the Lord, is sometimes urged as proof that the doctrine cannot be true. If no one believed it, that would not invalidate the Scripture record in the least; the Scripture cannot be broken by the unbelief of

man. But the fact that but few are looking for the Lord's coming is one of the signs by which we may know that we are in the last days. Paul says that in the last days perilous times will come, because men shall be lovers of their own selves. 2 Tim. 3:1. Then he gives a list of special sins of which they will be guilty, and to show that he does not refer to the non-professing world, he says, "Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." "They profess that they know God; but in *works* they deny him." Titus 1:16. And this is in *the last days*.

Moreover, our Saviour himself has given a description of the time immediately preceding his coming. He said: "And as it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man." Luke 17:26. To find, then, what will be a characteristic of the last days, we have only to read a description of the time just before the flood. Here it is: "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. 6:5. Here is total depravity. If it had been otherwise the Lord would not have destroyed the people of that time. When the Lord comes it is to destroy the inhabitants of the earth. (The righteous are simply sojourners, and not dwellers.) But he would not destroy them unless they were incorrigibly wicked. We are therefore not to expect any great reformation before the coming of the Lord, or general preparation for that event. Yet the warning is to be given just as faithfully, and people are to be just as earnestly exhorted to repent, as though all were expected to reform. All must hear. "This gospel of the kingdom" must be preached to all the world for a *witness*. The world has not yet arrived at that state of wickedness described by our Saviour. It is the faithful preaching of the word that will call out the few that will turn to God, and harden the others in their rebellion. The preaching of truth always causes a division. Luke 12:52, 53. And when the word shall have been preached in all the world, separating men into the two classes, "*then* shall the end come." It is for this alone that the coming of the Lord now waits. E. J. W.

"Christ the End of the Law" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

In our last article, two weeks ago, we showed how it is that "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." We wish to consider this matter a little further, for, as we then said, there is very much that might be said upon it. Indeed, the whole gospel is comprised in that one sentence; for the gospel is simply the good news of how men who have broken the law may be saved, through Christ, and enabled to keep it. In all our investigations let it be borne in mind that the righteousness of God is contained in his law (Isa. 51:4-7), and that Christ is the end of the law only for righteousness, which is equivalent to saying that he is the object of the law for obedience.

We now call the attention of the reader very briefly to the seventh chapter of Romans. We have space to notice only a portion of the chapter. In that the apostle brings to view, using himself as an illustration, the progress of a man from a state of worldly, carnal security, to that of acceptance with God. Let us follow him in his narrative.

First we notice his statement in verse 7 that the law is not sin. This he proves by showing that it is the law which points out and forbids sin. Then, of course, it must be perfect. We can detect base coin only by using genuine coin as a standard. The parallel to this verse is found in chap. 3:20, where he says: "By the law is the knowledge of sin." He continues, "For without the law sin was dead." Verse 8. This is the statement of verse 7 in another form. Before the law was brought to his knowledge, he did not know sin; it did not trouble him any. Although he did not know the law, he was a sinner, yet his sin, so far as his knowledge was concerned, was dead.

"For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." Verse 9. Without the law ("the commandment") he was in a state of ease and carnal security, perfectly satisfied with himself. But when the law was applied, it made his sin assume hideous proportions. He saw himself just as he was. "And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death." Verse 10. How is this? The commandment (law) was ordained to life: that is, its object was to give life, which it will always do to those who obey it. "The man which doeth these things shall live by them." Rom. 10:5. This was the object of the law, but now that the law has been violated, it cannot fulfill the end for which it was designed; it can only condemn to death. Mark this well; around this fact the whole argument centers.

And how did the apostle regard that law which, by showing him to be such a sinner, had condemned him to death? Said he: "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." Verse 12. He acknowledged the perfectness of the law. And herein he showed his honesty of heart. He did not rail at the law, applying to it all manner of opprobrious epithets, and try to evade it or convince himself that it was abolished. No; he confessed himself a sinner, justly condemned by a perfect law. He recognized the fact that the law had done nothing to him: it had not created in him, but had simply brought to light that which previously existed. The effect of introducing the law is to make sin appear exceeding sinful. It is as a rod thrust to the bottom of a vessel of water, which roils the water by stirring up the sediment that lay in the bottom, yet it creates no impurity whatever. The dirt would be there if the rod were not introduced; therefore Paul did not complain, for he knew that the fault was in himself, and not in the law. So he exclaims: "For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin."

In verse 9 Paul anticipates his argument, when he says, "And I died." This was the final result in his ease. What does he mean by this? In the light of the preceding verse the answer is clear. When he was alive, it was when he was without the law-lawless; a servant of sin. Death is the direct opposite of life; therefore when the commandment came, and he died, it must mean that he yielded to the claims of the law, and ceased sinning. And this will be the result with every one who is as honest with himself as Paul was. This is conversion. But as before said, the apostle anticipates in order to place the effect side by side with the cause; he did not die without a struggle.

We have now the man before us as a convicted sinner, and here is his description: "For that which I do I allow not; for what I would, that do I not; but

what I hate, that do I." Verse 15. This verse is introduced by "for," showing that it is a consequence of something that goes before. The preceding clause is, "But I am carnal, sold under sin." Now what is the condition of a man who is sold into slavery? He is unable to do anything for himself. He may be conscious of the degradation of his position, and long to be free, but he is placed where he cannot help himself; his hands or feet are bound with a chain. Every sinner is in bondage. (See 2 Peter 2:19.) Before the law of God is held up before him, he is unconscious of his slavery; when he sees its claims, he arouses to a sense of his condition. But his struggle to break the galling chain is fruitless, because his long-continued bondage has weakened him. This struggle of the convicted sinner against sin is mentioned in several verses of this chapter.

"If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now, then, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." Verses 16, 17. Here we have the case of a man convicted of sin by the law, conscientiously trying to keep it, and yet continually violating it, even against his will. "It is not I that do it," he says; "I do not design to violate the law; but sin has bound me so long, and has such power over me, that I cannot get free." It is no longer from desire that he sins, but from the force of habit which he cannot break.

And so the fruitless struggle goes on, until the man in an agony of despair, exclaims: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" Verse 24. We cannot imagine a more horrible condition than the one here brought to view. In ancient times a criminal was sometimes chained to the dead body of a man, and forced to drag the putrefying carcass wherever he went, until the effluvium caused him to die a miserable death. Think of the desperate attempts such a man would make to get free, and how frantic he would become as he realized the impotence of his arm as compared with the chain that bound him. How his whole soul would go out in that piteous cry, "Who shall deliver me from this body of death?" How many are there who have felt themselves in such a condition under the load of sin?

It is in this condition the apostle (the representative of a class) finds himself. He feels that sin is about to sink him into perdition, and, convinced of the hopelessness of his struggle, he cries out for deliverance, "Who shall deliver me from this body of death?" Immediately the question is answered, and he again exclaims, this time with transports of joy, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." As soon as he realizes his own inability to meet the demands of the law, Christ is presented to his view, and he at once accepts deliverance from the only one who can give it. Christ strikes off the chain, and sets the prisoner free. Not only does he forgive past transgressions, but he helps us to break the chains of habit, and overcome the love of sin. And then the apostle continues: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." The reason why there is not, is told in the

474

following verses, in which it is said that he who is in Christ keeps the law of God; he "walks not after the flesh, but after the Spirit;" in other words, "he is a new creature."

This argument is not complete without verse 3 and 4 of the 8th chapter: "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." What could not the law do? It could not justify any man, and give him life. Wherein lay its weakness? Not in itself, but in "the flesh." It is the fault of man that the law condemns him, and not the fault of the law. The law cannot give life, because it has been violated. And in this extremity what did God do? He sent his own Son. What for? That the righteousness of the law (*i.e.*, the law in its perfectness) might be accomplished by us. What we could not do while yet in bondage to sin, we may perform when we become free men in Christ.

Righteousness is required of us, and that means that there is something for us to do, for righteousness is simply right doing. But Christ says, "Without me ye can do nothing." Our own righteousness, that is, the good that we attempt to do by our own unaided efforts, amounts to nothing. It is not righteousness at all, but unrighteousness. When, however, we join the strength of Christ to our own weakness, we can truly say, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." E. J. W.

August 14, 1884

"The Sabbath-School" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 31.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—SEPT. 6

1. For what purpose will Christ, the second time? John 14:3.
2. What is implied by the last clause of this verse?
3. When does Paul say that the saints will be with Christ? Col. 3:4.
4. As Paul was about to die, what did he say was laid up for him? 2 Tim. 4:8.
5. When will this crown be given? *ib.*
6. What is the testimony of Peter on this point? 1 Peter 5:4.
7. What, then, is the Christian's hope? Titus 2:11-13.
8. What is his incentive to patience under trials? James 5:8.
9. When will salvation be brought to God's people? 1 Pet. 1:5, 13.
10. How does Paul describe the coming of the Lord and its attendant circumstances? 1 Thess. 4:15-17.
11. What authority does he give for these statements?
12. What is meant by the words, "we shall not prevent them which are asleep"?
13. What was the necessity for such an assurance?
14. Do people nowadays generally think that the living receive the reward before those that have died?
15. What is the first thing that takes place when the Lord comes? Verse 16.
16. What is the next occurrence? Verse 17.

17. Whom did the living saints and those raised from the dead meet in the air?

18. How long do they remain with him?

19. Then when and how are all the saints taken to be with Christ?

20. Show that God did not design that the patriarchs, prophets, and others should receive their reward before we do. Heb. 11:39, 40.

"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 14:3. The thoughtful reader cannot fail to notice that the same text which contains the promise of Christ's coming, is also the reason for that coming. For what purpose is he coming? "*That* where I am, there ye may be also." Now we will make a statement which must be self evident; Christ will not do that for which there is no reason; we cannot conceive of his doing such a thing. Then if he has promised to come to earth for a certain purpose, the necessity for his coming must still exist, else he will not come. But he will come, because his promise stands on record; therefore the reason which he gave for his coming does exist still. So we ask again. For what purpose did he say he would come? Anybody may read the answer in Christ's own words, that it was to receive his disciples to himself. Then it must follow that they are not with him now; for if they were, there would be no reason for him to return for them. It would be the height of absurdity for Christ return to earth for his disciples, if they were already in Heaven. We hope no one is bold enough to accuse Christ of such foolishness as that.

There is another thought on this verse that is worthy of notice. It is this: Since Christ promised to return for his disciples, it must be that he did not contemplate such a thing as that they would go to him before he should return. He could see what was in the future, and if the disciples were going to be with him at any time before his second coming, he knew it. But if such had been the case, he would not have said that the object of his coming was to take them to himself. The fact, therefore, that he did make the receiving of them to himself the object of his coming, shows that he did not know that they could be with him without his coming, and that is equivalent to saying that they could not be with him unless he should come.

Paul adds the weight of his inspired testimony to that of our Saviour. Said he: "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. 3:4. Notice the adverb of time. When Christ shall appear, *then* shall ye appear with him. No comment on this text could make it any clearer than it is as it stands. Read it, and accept it in its most obvious sense, and you have the main facts concerning the second coming of Christ.

Again the apostle says: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me *at that day*; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." 2 Tim. 4:7, 8. He had reached the end of his course, and he had confidence of his acceptance with God. Did he therefore say, I shall therefore receive my reward immediately? No; "*henceforth*," *i.e.*, from this time onward, "there is *laid up* for me a crown of righteousness." Well, how long is it to remain "laid up"? The answer is implied in the closing part

of the verse: "And not to me only, but to all them also *that love his appearing*. We would gather from this that the crowns are given at the appearing of Christ. But we are not left to conjecture an inference in so important a matter. Peter exhorts the elders of the church of Christ to do their duty faithfully, and says by way of encouragement: "And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." 1 Peter 5:4. That is when the crowns will be given. If they are given when Christ appears, they cannot be given before.

It is with this in view that the apostle James exhorts the brethren to patience. "Be ye also patient, stablish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord draweth night." Jas. 5:8. The full force of his exhortation cannot be appreciated unless we read the previous verses. He begins the chapter with an arraignment of certain ones for oppressing the poor. He says to them: "Ye have condemned and killed the just; and he doth not resist you." Verse 6. And then turning immediately to the brethren-the oppressed ones-he says: "Be patient therefore brethren, unto the coming of the Lord." As much as to say, Endure these things patiently, however unjust they may be, for the Lord is coming soon, and then you will receive your reward. And with all this Peter heartily agrees when he says: "Be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." 1 Peter 1:13.

In 1 Thess. 4:15-17 Paul gives a most graphic description of the coming of the Lord. He prefaces his account with the statement that it is "by the word of the Lord;" he did not give it on his own authority. We that remain until the coming of the Lord, he says, shall not go before them that are asleep. The Thessalonian brethren did not comprehend the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and supposed that their departed friends were lost forever; that only those who should be living at the time of the Lord's coming could share in its glory. The apostle comforts them with the assurance that the living shall not have any precedence over the dead. Take particular notice, however, of what Paul did *not* say. He did not say, as many a modern comforter would do, "We shall not go before them which are asleep; on the contrary, they have gone before us, and are now safe in the arms of Jesus." This is what Paul did *not* say. Had he said so, some of his brethren might have inquired if all who go before to the arms of Jesus, spend their time sleeping. If the doctrine that the saints receive their reward at death had been believed in by Paul, here would have been a grand opportunity to present. But he did not do so. Let us see why.

"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. This is what Paul *did* say. The "dead in Christ" shall rise. What did they care about that? Why, he was telling them about their dead friends. Yes, but when he introduced the subject, he was speaking of "them which are asleep;" them "which sleep in Jesus." Exactly; and now he uses this other term in reference to the same class; and so we learn that those "which sleep in Jesus," are "the dead in Christ." They are to "rise" when the Lord comes; and further, they will "rise first;" that is, before the living are taken. As soon as the dead have

been raised, *then* "we which are alive and remain shall be caught up *together with them* in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air." So neither class has the precedence; the living do not go to be with the Lord before those that have died; the dead are not now enjoying the bliss of Heaven while the living are toiling in this world; but at the coming of the Lord both shall together be taken to be with him.

"And so shall we ever be with the Lord." Explicit enough, is it not? How shall we be with the Lord? By the resurrection of the righteous dead and the translation of the living, which will take place at his coming. And notice that this takes in the whole multitude of the disciples of Christ; for it comprises all that are dead, and all who are alive when the Lord comes, and there can be no other class. There is, then, no other means revealed in the Bible, whereby men may be with the Lord except these two of resurrection and translation. A few favored ones, as Enoch and Elijah, and those who came from their graves at the resurrection of Christ, were not obliged to wait until the coming of the Lord; but they were taken only by one of the two ways mentioned-resurrection from the dead and translation without seeing death.

It is interesting to note the harmony of the different portions of the Bible on this point. What we were forced to conclude from the promise of Christ, namely, that his disciples could not be with him until he comes, is stated in plain words by Paul. Besides what we have read above, we have his testimony in Heb. 11. In that chapter Paul speaks of Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Moses, Gideon, David, Samuel, and many martyrs, "of whom the world was not worthy," and says: "And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." vs 39, 40. What stronger testimony is needed? One needs only to read the plain texts of Scripture to be convinced that to the people of God the coming of the Lord is everything. Without that, all their hopes are lost. It is the time of their reward.

"Them which sleeping Jesus." On this clause Dr. Albert Barnes comments as follows:-

"A most beautiful expression. It is not merely that they have a calm repose-like a gentle slumber-in the hope of waking again, but that this is '*in Jesus*'-or 'through' (*dia*) him; that is, his death and resurrection are the cause of their quiet and calm repose. They do not 'sleep' in heathenism, or in infidelity, or in the gloom of atheism, but in the blessed hope which Jesus has imparted. They lie, *as he did*, in the tomb-free from pain and sorrow, and with the certainty of being raised up again."

487

On the expression in 2 Tim. 4:8: "Unto all them also that love his appearing," Dr. Barnes says:-

"That is, all who *desire* his second coming. Faith in the second advent of the Lord Jesus as coming to judge the world, and a desire for his return, became a kind of criterion by which Christians were known. No others but true Christians were supposed to believe in his return to our world, and no others truly desired it. Compare Rev. 1:7; 22:20. It is so now. It is one of the characteristics of a true

Christian that he *believes* that Christ will come again to judge the world; that he sincerely *desires* his return, and that he would *welcome* his appearing in the clouds of heaven." E. J. W.

August 21, 1884

"The Sabbath-School" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 32.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST. 6 SEPT. 13

1. How should we live in this world? Titus 2:11, 12.
2. For what are we to be looking? Verse 13.
3. What is the blessed hope?
4. Why is the coming of the Lord called a blessed hope? John 14:3.
5. By what means are the followers of Christ taken to be with him? 1 Thess. 4:16, 17.
6. Are we to hope for an immediate reward for our good deeds? Luke 14:12.
7. When are we to expect our recompense? Verses 13, 14.
8. When does the resurrection of the dead take place? Give proof.
9. What did Christ promise those who believe on him? John 6:40.
10. When did the prophet David say that he would be satisfied? Ps. 17:15.
11. And when will the saints be in the likeness of Christ? 1 John 3:2.
12. For what was Paul persecuted by the Jews? Acts 26:6, 7.
13. On another occasion how did he define his hope? Acts 23:6.
14. Then what facts do we learn from Acts 26:6, 7?
15. What sustained Abraham when he was commanded to offer up Isaac? Heb. 11:17-19.
16. What comforted Job in his affliction? Job 19:25-27.
17. What did the prophet Isaiah say of a resurrection? Isa. 26:19.
18. At what time did he locate it? Verse 21.
19. Will any but the righteous have a resurrection? Acts 24:14, 15.
20. To what are the righteous raised? John 5:28, 29.
21. What kind of a resurrection do the wicked have? *Ib.*

In the second chapter of Titus, Paul presents the proper manner for the Christian to live. "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." Verses 11, 12. Now what is the incentive which he sets forth for following such a course of life? "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." Verses 13. The apostle James makes the same point, when he exhorts us to be patient unto the coming of the Lord. James 5:7. Then he cites the case of the husbandman who deposits seed in the ground, and then waits patiently. Why does he have patience? Because he expects in due season to reap the precious fruits of the earth. And the apostle concludes: "Be ye also

patient; stablish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." James 5:8. The ground of the Christian's patience is the expectation that Christ will come to crown him with immortal glory.

And this is why that hope is termed a blessed hope. "If I go and prepare a place for you," says Christ, "I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am there ye may be also." John 14:3. There can be no blessedness equal to being with Christ. So the disciples thought, as they were filled with sorrow at the thought of his leaving them. But he promised to come and take them to be with him, and that coming was afterward the object of their longings. It was the one hope that brightened life. What a happy reunion that will be when the disciples once more gather around their beloved Lord. How their hearts must have thrilled at the prospect. "Happy" means "blessed;" and so it was very natural to call the hope of Christ's coming a "blessed hope."

But how is it that the Lord will take his disciples to be with him? Not only the twelve, but hosts of other disciples just as true as they, have died. Compared with the multitude of the faithful that have lived on the earth, those who will be alive at Christ's coming will be very few in number. We have learned in Matt. 24:31 that when the Lord comes "he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other;" but who will be gathered? Let Paul answer: "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.

This tells the story. Who of Christ's followers will be taken when he comes? All; both living and dead. Did the living have any precedence? No; they "shall not prevent [go before] them which are asleep." But when the Lord descends with a shout and a trumpet sound, the graves are shaken open, and the dead in Christ rise. This is the first thing. *Then* the living will be taken, not one year or six thousand years later, but they shall be caught up then, *together with them* (the dead), to meet the Lord. And by this means, says Paul, shall we ever be with the Lord. The apostle is now concerned only to give a sure basis for comfort to those persons whose pious friends had died, hence the case of the wicked does not come into his mind; he says nothing about them. We may learn their fate from other texts. But in this text nothing is taught more clearly than that the disciples of Christ get to be with him only by translation and resurrection, and that both the events take place at the same time, namely, at his coming.

The opinions of learned and pious men always have weight on a subject of this kind, so we quote from Dr. Barnes on this text. The testimony which he gives is all the more strong because the logical conclusion from it is directly the opposite of what he himself believed. He held that the righteous go to be with Christ as soon as they die, yet he did not let his prejudices bias his mind from the plain meaning of this text. He says:-

"We have in the passage before us an interesting view of the *order* in which these great events will occur. There will be (1) the descent of the Judge with the attending host of Heaven; (2) the raising of the righteous dead; (3) the change

which the living will undergo (comp. 1 Cor. 15:52); (4) the ascent to meet the Lord in the air; and (5) the return with him to glory. What place in this series of wonders will be assigned for the resurrection of the *wicked*, is not mentioned here. The object of the apostle did not lead him to advert to that, since its purpose was to comfort the afflicted Christians by the assurance that their pious friends would rise again, and would suffer no disadvantage by the fact that they had died before the coming of the Redeemer."

Our Saviour set before his disciples no other prospect of reward but at his coming. "When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, neither thy kinsmen, nor thy rich neighbours; lest they also bid thee again, and a recompense be made thee. But 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 at the resurrection of the just." Luke 14:12-14. When does the resurrection take place? Paul, in 1 Thess. 4:16, 17, above quoted, says that it is when the Lord himself comes from heaven, and the trump of God sounds. Now Christ knew that those to whom he was talking would not live till his coming; why then did he not tell them to look to the time of their death for their reward? Why did he direct their attention to some point far beyond? Simply because death is not the time when rewards are distributed. If it were, the Lord would have said so. Instead of promising to reward the faithful ones at death, he said: "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; and I will *raise him up at the last day.*" John 6:40.

When Paul was brought before Agrippa (see Acts 26:1, 6, 7) he said: "And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers; unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope's sake, king Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews." From the following verse, "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?" We would naturally infer that the resurrection was the thing promised to the fathers, and the "hope," for which Paul was accused. That this inference is correct we learn from Acts 23:6, where it is recorded that on a similar occasion, but a short time before, and while under the same accusation, Paul said: "Of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question."

The interesting question now arises, How could Paul say that he was called in question for holding the hope of a resurrection of the dead, when none of his accusers had said one word about the resurrection? The answer is, that he was brought to trial on account of his belief in Christ. It was because of this teaching that Christ was the Son of God, and for the vigorous advocacy of his doctrines, and especially for teaching that Christ had risen from the dead, that Paul was apprehended. Now the resurrection of the dead depends upon the resurrection of Christ. His resurrection is the pledge of the general resurrection. Christ says: "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and behold I am all live forevermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death." Rev. 1:18. He gained the keys of the grave when he went into it and came out a conqueror. Having gained them, he will use them to unlock the prison doors and liberate the captives that death has made. In

support of this we have his own words: "Because I live, ye shall live also." John 14:19. And this statement, it will be noticed, was made immediately after his promise to come and take his disciples to himself. So then to deny the resurrection of Christ, as the Jews were doing, was equivalent to denying the general resurrection. And conversely, Paul says in 1 Cor. 15:13-16, that to deny the general resurrection is to deny the resurrection of Christ.

Again; if the Jews were persecuting Paul for his belief in the resurrection, how could he say that the twelve tribes were longing for the hope of the promise? The promise made to the fathers was the inheritance of the world. Rom. 4:13. This was made to Abraham, to Isaac, and Jacob. But we learn that "these all died in faith, by having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth." Heb. 11:13. This proves that they did not expect to have the promises fulfilled in this life; that the promise of God included the resurrection, and that they so understood it. If it were not so, they would have died in disappointment, and not in faith. Now the Jews looked for this inheritance that was promised to the fathers, and longed for it, but in their short-sided rejection of Christ, they were turning away from the only thing that could give them a share in it.

503

That Abraham believed in the resurrection of the dead, we have positive proof. Paul says: "By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac; and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten son. Of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called; accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure." Heb. 11:17-19. That which made it possible for the patriarch to offer up his only son, through whom alone the promise could be fulfilled, was his belief that God would raise him from the dead in order to perform his promise to make of him a great nation. But how did Abraham get such an idea? From God himself. He knew that the promise contemplated a resurrection in order that the multitude of his faithful descendants might be partakers in it; and he accounted that if God would raise all the faithful at the last day, he was able to raise the single individual upon whom the existence of those faithful ones depended. And if Abraham, to whom the promises were made, understood that the resurrection was necessary to their accomplishments, we would naturally expect that all the "fathers" would have correct ideas on the subject.

The fate of the wicked does not come within the scope of this lesson, yet the simple fact is told that they also will be raised. That is what we would be led to expect from the fact that the rewards are not given at death. Every man must receive according to the things he has done, but if the wicked have no resurrection, this cannot be. Paul's hope included this as well as the resurrection of the righteous. We quote his words: "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets; 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 24:14, 15. Add to this our Saviour's words

in John 5:28, 29: "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation," and we have all the testimony that reasonable beings can desire. There are some who affect to believe that none but the righteous will have a resurrection; but to hold such a theory is to deny and throw contempt upon the positive statements of both Christ and Paul. E. J. W.

"The Resurrection" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 32.

E. J. Waggoner

In the preceding articles concerning the coming of the Lord, we have learned that he will certainly come, that his coming will be manifest to all, that it is for the purpose of receiving all his disciples to themselves, and that this is accomplished by the resurrection of the dead and the translation of the living. One or two more texts on the subject of that resurrection will be sufficient.

When Job was suffering the deepest affliction, and at the point of death, he asked: "If a man die, will he live again?" This was a very pertinent question for a man in his situation. Notice the form of the question: Not, "Shall he *continue* to live?" But, "Shall he live *again*?" This expression shows clearly that Job made a plain distinction between life and death. "Again" signifies "another time," and indicates that an interval of time has elapsed since the same thing occurred or existed before. Job anticipated a time in which there would be no life, in which he would not exist, and he asked whether life would ever be restored. But he asked the question only to answer it, for he immediately added: "All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come. Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee; thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hands." Job 14:14, 15.

Now we may ask, When will the Lord call and be answered by those who are dead? Christ himself furnishes the answer: "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." John 5:26-29. And David says that it is at his coming that the Lord calls to his people. Ps. 50:3, 4.

Isaiah said, in prophetic vision, saw the end of the world, and the coming of the Lord. Speaking of the triumph of the righteous, he said: "He [the Lord] 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 from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it." Isa. 25:8. If the Lord has spoken it, it must be done. Paul tells how and when it will be done: "Behold, I show you a mystery; 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." 1 Cor. 15:51, 52.

Here, then, is the "change" of which Job spoke. It is a change from death to life, from mortal to immortal. And in what state did Job expect to be until this

change should come? In death, for it was that of which he was speaking. The apostle also says that the dead as well as the living are to be changed. And here we find death called a sleep. We shall not all *sleep*, but both dead and living 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." 1 Cor. 15:53, 54. Death is not swallowed up in victory till Christ comes. The saints do not shout, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" until the voice of the Son of God calls them forth from their tombs. And what does this prove? That death and the grave have for a time triumph, and held them captives. If it were not so, if the saints had passed to death immediately to a state of the eternal bliss, they would not be obliged to wait until the coming of the Lord to shout their victory. They could at once voice their contempt for its weakness; or, more consistently, they could ascribe to it thanksgiving and praise for having liberated them from the toils of earth, and ushered them into the joys of Heaven.

Now we ask, What is the necessity for a resurrection of the dead? If the faithful of past ages are now "safe in the arms of Jesus," as is so often taught and sung, what more can they need? Of what benefit to them will the resurrection be? None at all. The Bible doctrine of the resurrection is directly opposed to the theory that men are taken to Heaven at death. The Bible writers rested their entire hope in a resurrection; and this proves that they had no idea of the possibility (since they must die) of being with Christ in any other way.

Paul said that he counted all things loss for Christ, and for him gave up everything, and was willing to know the "fellowship of his sufferings," and be "made conformable under his death." And what for? "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Phil. 3:11. Why did he esteem it so all-important to attain unto the resurrection of the dead? Let him answer: "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not?" 1 Cor. 15:32. He had no hope in anything else. Let him once be convinced that the dead would not rise, and all incentive to action would have been taken away from one of the most tireless and zealous men that ever lived. Surely, then, the resurrection is a doctrine of no small importance.

In order to try to harmonize the doctrine of a final resurrection with the theory that the spirits of the good are taken to Heaven immediately upon the death of the body, it is claimed that they do not receive the fullness of their reward until the resurrection. But this theory is overthrown by Paul's words: "What advantageth it me, if the dead rise not?" Is it nothing to be in the presence of God and Christ and the angels? Is it nothing to be exempt from pain, and free from the assaults of Satan? Certainly to gain such a state, even if it were not the fullness of joy, is worth a great deal of effort. Paul's words show that he had no knowledge of any benefit that would accrue to the dead except through the resurrection. And if he taught men to place all their hopes in the coming of the Lord and the resurrection, who shall dare to teach otherwise? If he did not know the exact truth in regard to the matter, to whom has a later revelation been

made? So true are all the words of Paul that even an angel from heaven would bring a curse upon himself if he should teach anything different. Gal. 1:8.

In view of the testimony that has been quoted to show that the resurrection takes place at the coming of the Lord, it is hardly worth while to notice the position that it is at death; that the rising of the soul or spirit from the body is the resurrection. This theory makes the saints be with the Lord at death, and thus makes death to be the coming of the Lord, which we have seen is a false and absurd position. There were some in Paul's day who taught that the resurrection was past, and he said that they had erred concerning the truth, and were overthrowing the faith of some. 2 Tim. 2:18. Nothing could more surely overthrow faith than such teaching, for who that accepted it could have any belief in the promises of a future second coming of Christ? It is as impossible to harmonize the theory of the past resurrection, or a resurrection at death, with the doctrine of the second coming of Christ, as to mix oil with water.

In closing, we will call attention to Rev. 22:4-6. John says: "I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God. . . . and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." "Ah," says one, "that is what I believe; the souls of the martyrs went at once to live with Christ." Let us see; these are not all the dead that John saw. He continues: "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power." Now notice: "The rest of the dead lived not *again* until the thousand years were finished." Then the dead that John first saw were living *again*. And if living again, this must be the second life, which is separated from the first by an interval called death. Then death and life are not the same. And this "living again," after an interval, is called a resurrection. Then what is the resurrection? It is the "living again" of those who have been dead, and not the continued existence of something that has never died. Those who do not have part in the first resurrection, do not "live again" until the thousand years are finished. Then they have a resurrection. Now allowing that "the rest of the dead" died at the very beginning of the thousand years, and we have their death and their resurrection separated by a period of a thousand years. That does not look like a resurrection at death. E. J. W.

"Relation of the Law and Grace" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 32.

E. J. Waggoner

[A sermon delivered in the tent at Oakland, Cal., Aug. 5, 1884.]

The subject of this evening is a question which is prefaced by the following text of Scripture, quoted from the Emphatic Diaglott:-

"Gal. 5:4. 'Whosoever of you are justifying yourselves by law are separated from Christ; you are fallen off from the favor of God. My question is this: Was not the Mosaic law written on stone, given alone to the Jews?'"

Accompanying this question is a letter giving the position of the questioner, some points of which I will notice. In contrast with the Jews, he says of us: "We who are begotten of the Spirit through the belief of the truth are become new

(spiritual) creatures in Christ, and are raised spiritual bodies, like unto his glorious body, for there is a natural body and there is a spiritual body."

This remark contains a very grave error. The "spiritual body" is given in the resurrection. See 1 Cor. 15. The Christian is spiritually minded, but has yet a natural, corruptible body, being subject to decay, which the spiritual body will not be. Again he says: "He who undertakes to do the deeds of the law has fallen from grace, as say the Scriptures." If this assertion be true, I have been in fault in my reading, for I never read any such thing in the Bible. And the Bible has no such saying.

In regard to justification, we have distinctly avowed in this tent that we do not expect it by the law. If there is anybody who seeks or expects to be justified by the law, to him the question will apply: to him this text stands as a reproof. Paul says in Rom. 3 that the justification which we receive through faith in Christ, without works, is "for the remission of sins that are past." But he does not say we can live godly lives, and build up a moral character without works. He exhorts to "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling;" Phil. 2:12; for every man will be judged and rewarded according to his works. Rev. 22:12; Matt. 16:27. I have before said, in this tent, that all our obedience, our tears, our confessions, our prayers, our repentance, will never remove a single sin we have committed. Remission of past sin is by the blood of Christ through faith alone; not by works at all. But as to the future, when we form character it must be by obedience; then "faith without works is dead." It is lifeless, formal, useless.

As to the expression, "a new creature," it does not mean another creature. But the "old man" of sin is destroyed. All things-sinful things, worldliness, etc.-have passed away; but the law of God has not passed away. Mark, the change must all be in man; not in God, nor in his government. Rebellion, sin, does not change God's law, nor does it create the necessity of a change in God's law. It changes our relation to the law, bringing us in opposition

506

to it; and it makes necessary another change in us, a change from sin to obedience; and this is also wrought by faith in Christ, who strengthens us to overcome our sins, and walk in obedience to his Father.

I am also requested, in this connection, to notice Rom. 10:4. It reads thus: "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness, to every one that believeth." There are three points to be noticed in this text.

1. In what sense is Christ the end of the law? Not in the sense of abolishing the law, for if that were the meaning, it would apply to all, both to the believer and the unbeliever. If it means the abolition of the law, then we have the anomalous relation of a law abolished to one class, and not to another class. And not only that, but it is abolished to numerous individuals at one period in the experience of each one, and not abolished at another period in his experience! The word end must be used as in James 5:11: "Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord." Not the abolition of the Lord. End, in both these texts, means the object or intention. Paul says the law was ordained unto life; it was designed to guide people in obedience to their Creator, that they might live. For to disobey, to sin, is death. Since we are all sinners, and we can no longer obtain

life by the law, Christ comes in and meets the design or the end of the law and gives us life.

2. This is "for righteousness." We may learn what righteousness is by the inspired definitions given by John. "Unrighteousness is sin," and "sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 5:17; 3:4. Now if unrighteousness is the transgression of the law, righteousness is obedience to the law. "He that doeth righteousness is righteous." 1 John 3:7.

3. "To every one that believeth." In the unbeliever the object of the law is not accomplished, for he, as Paul says, has "pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thess. 2:12. This text does not teach that the law is no longer of obligation, but it does teach that we are to obey the law through faith in Christ.

The question itself, whether the law was given to the Gentiles or the Jews alone, is quickly disposed of. Was there ever a time when it was no sin in the Gentiles to worship idols, to blaspheme the name of God, to dishonor their parents, to kill, to commit adultery, and to steal? If there is any force to the question, if it has any bearing against our position, it is only because these things were not wrong in the Gentiles. But if these things were sin in the Gentiles-if for these abominations God abhorred the Gentiles-then the law held them, for "where no law is there is no transgression," and "sin is not imputed when there is no law." Rom. 4:15; 5:13.

This sufficiently refutes the idea which appears to be in the mind of the questioner, as far as the Gentiles are concerned as a class. But the question has a more specific application, not to Gentiles at large, but to the believers in Christ from the Gentiles. What we have before said, especially on Rom. 10:4, is to this point; but it must be noticed more particularly.

Paul says more on the subject of justification than all other writers of the Bible; and he says more about it, argues it more particularly, in the letter to the Romans, than in all his other writings together. And it is a suggestive fact that the first time he speaks of *justify* in this letter is in connection with doing the law, while he has never connected, in any man, justification and breaking the law. He never recognizes any such relation. Rom. 2:13 says: "The doers of the law shall be justified." An objector once said to me, when I quoted that text, "You, then, believe in justification by the law: but I would not like to risk my salvation on your word on that subject." I replied. 1. You have not my word on the subject. I quoted Paul's words, and if you have any fault. . . . 2. *You* have nothing. . . text, for Paul was not there speaking. . . , or of any like you. He said the doers of the law; but you are not a doer of the law; indeed, you disclaim any intention to do the law. Therefore you have no claim, and personally no interest in that text. But the text is useful in this: It teaches that justification is in the law, and we would find it there if we had not forfeited it; if we had not transgressed the law. It is a vindication of the morality of the law, and it fully agrees with Solomon's words, that to keep God's commandments "is the whole duty of man." And if man had done his whole duty, if he had never sinned, he would not be condemned; he must then be justified.

Some affect to find a contradiction between this text and Rom. 3:20, which says: "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified." But there is no

contradiction. It may be said that both cannot be true absolutely; one must be qualified to avoid the contradiction. Which shall it be? And the answer generally comes thus: "The first must be qualified, for it is an absolute fact that no one can be justified by the law." But this answer is made under a misapprehension of the facts, and of the principles underlying them. There is an intermediate statement which makes all plain: let us take the three in connection-they are given in the regular form of an argument: 1. The doers of the law shall be justified. 2. There are no doers; all have gone astray: "there is none that doeth good, no, not one." 3. Conclusion: "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified." Thus we see that it is no fault of the law that it does not justify us; it is our own fault; we are sinners and the law would be unworthy of respect as a law if it would justify us. We deserve condemnation, and the law very properly treats us as we deserve.

And then another query is raised. "What is the use," it is asked, "of keeping a law which will not justify us?" But this question shows an unenviable state of mind on the part of the questioner. We should not view the subject altogether in the light of its benefit to ourselves: something is due to the Government of God; his authority is to be recognized, his law to be honored. But if it is necessary to our salvation that past sin should be forgiven, it is equally necessary that future sin shall be prevented. Sin is odious in the sight of God, whether it be past, present, or future. Obedience is better than sacrifice. If all shall be rewarded according to their works, how necessary that our works should conform to the divine will, which we learn only in his law. See Rom. 2:17-23.

To illustrate this let me relate an incident. It is not "founded on fact;" it is the fact itself. Some years ago I was preaching in Wisconsin, and a man gravely informed me that he had learned that we are not justified by the law. I replied that we had learned the same thing; that we did not expect to be justified by the law; the law had no power to justify a sinner, and we did not keep it with the thought of being justified by it. And he then began to laugh. Being inquired of for the reason, he said he could not help laughing that anybody should be fool enough to keep a law which cannot justify him. Laying the compliment aside, I proposed to present the case in such a manner that he could appreciate it.

Suppose you were accused of stealing a horse, and were proved guilty, and the Judge thereupon asks if you have anything to say, and you ask and are answered as follows: "Judge, will the law of Wisconsin justify me?" "Justify you? No; we have not a law in Wisconsin that will justify a man stealing horses? The law condemns you, and I am about to pronounce its sentence upon you?" "Well, Judge, I am not such a fool as to keep a law which will not justify me, and hereafter I intend to steal all the horses that I can." "And," says the Judge, "I will see that you do not have the opportunity very soon to carry your intention into effect, for I shall give you the full time in prison which the law allows." And then I inquired: "Do you not think the Judge would so answer a man who avowed such an intention?" He answered, "Yes," and added, "But nobody would be foolish enough to talk like that! "Of course not; nobody would be foolish enough to treat the law of the State in that manner; but that is exactly the manner in which you have been treating the law of God. If you, and people in general, would grant as

much to the law of God as you require for the law of the State, we would have little need to argue the question. No one ever for one moment supposes that a pardon frees any one from obligation to keep the law of the State which condemns him. But there are thousands who refuse to keep the law of God because Jesus Christ has purchased their pardon by his blood!"

Satan is wily, we know; but it is a marvel that he can so blind the minds of people who appear to be otherwise sensible, as to make them believe that pardon absolves them from allegiance to God and his law! Paul says that "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law." Gal. 3:13. But the curse comes only by transgression. Had man not sinned, he would not have been cursed, for "the doers of the law shall be justified." And the curse invariably, in all cases, follows transgression. Christ redeems from the curse, but not from the duty; he redeems from the condemnation, but not from the obligation.

We say that the curse follows transgression "in all cases," because it is as true now that "the wages of sin is death," as it was before Christ died, or would have been if Christ had never died. It is a narrow view of the method of redemption which leads one to say that obedience to the law is contrary to free grace. And this calls us to notice one more point in the position of the questioner. It is his claim on Rom. 6:14: "Ye are not under the law, but under grace."

But this is only a part of the text. Taken in its connection it clearly teaches that we are not under the law in the sense of being under its condemnation; from this we are released by grace. But it does not teach that we are free from obligation to the law; to the contrary, it teaches that violation of the law is contrary to grace.

Here are two individuals, one a non-professor, and the other a church member, who claim to be released from the obligation of the law. We can more readily represent the position of the latter (which is the position of our questioner) by the way of question and answer. "What is your position?" "I am not under the law, but under grace." "Were you always under grace?" "No; I was by nature a child of wrath, even as others." "When did you come under grace?" "When I was converted." "Then under grace is the condition of a converted man. What was your condition before you were converted, and what is the condition of all the unconverted world?" "Under the law, of course." "Very well; are they who are under the law condemned by the law if they break it?" "Certainly; they are under its curse, as sinners." "But if the law has power to curse them-if they are under it-then the law cannot be abolished; it is still in force?" "No, it cannot be abolished, but I am free from it through faith in Christ." "Are you, then, free from all its claims, so that you are not obliged to keep it?" "I am not under the law; I am entirely free from it, and it has no authority over me." "But when you were under the law you were under obligation to keep it, and therefore it was sin in you to transgress it. Then we are to conclude that it was sin in you to break the law before you were converted, but it is not sin in you to break the law after you were converted. Is that so?" "Why,

there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus?" "We will waive for the present the subject of forgiveness, or justification. But we must conclude from

your declarations that that which is sinful in an unconverted man, is no sin in a converted man!"

This is the doctrine of the old "perfectionists"-a doctrine which we had hoped had disappeared from the face of the earth. According to this doctrine, if a man feels the restraints of the law and wishes to break it, but dare not for fear of condemnation, he has only to be converted and join the church, and he is at once at full liberty to violate the law! This is making "Christ the minister of sin." Gal. 2:17. The way of righteousness is not found in such a sham Christianity as this.

Look again at these two men. One professes to be a Christian, and the other is an acknowledged sinner. How do we know that he is a sinner? Because he transgresses the law (1 John 3:4), for by the law is the knowledge of sin (Rom. 3:20). What, then, is the difference between him and the other man? Oh! this other man is a Christian. But neither does he keep the law; he claims that he is not under its obligation. So, then, one breaks the law, and he is therefore a sinner; the other breaks the law also, yet he is a Christian! And the only real difference between them is that one professes religion and has his name on the church book! Both are sinners according to every authorized definition of sin.

We have here a subject worthy of our earnest consideration. It cannot be too strongly enforced. The idea of the objector is that the law is not now binding; that we are released from its authority by grace. But if that be so, then there is no distinction of classes, for none can be under an abolished law in any sense, and all are under grace. That will answer for Universalists, but Paul says: "For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace." Therefore his words will not apply to all the world, but to those only who are not under the dominion of sin. But as long as we transgress the law, so long has sin dominion over us. Sin brings condemnation, no matter when or where it is found. And therefore the apostle's question and answer in the next verses: "What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the law but under grace? God forbid. Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?" This is a plain declaration that if we sin, or violate the law, after we are justified, or under grace, we again come under the dominion of sin, and the result is death. And the same is shown in the first verses of the chapter. "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" Some say we shall; they affirm that we deny grace if we keep the law, or abstain from sin. But the apostle says, "God forbid;" and he continues; "How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?" Here is an important lesson. That we are dead is proved by our having been buried-in baptism. Dead to what? to sin. But if we live in it-if we still transgress the law-we are not dead to it. Then we are not under grace, but under the law-under condemnation.

That there is a popular prejudice against preaching the law, we are well aware. And we regret that preachers themselves are strengthening this prejudice by conforming to the popular feeling, and moving in this popular current. I was once requested to put away exclusiveness and unite with another in holding

revival meetings; and was told that I must not talk so much about the law; that people did not want to hear it! Now I believe in union as much as any do, and am willing to unite on the same terms that they require. They will unite with me if I will yield my faith and adopt theirs. And, in like manner, I am ready to unite with everybody who will yield the peculiarities of his faith and adopt mine. I am just as liberal as they are. But my inquiry was this: If I drop the law, what shall I preach? "Why, preach repentance; nobody has any prejudice against that." What an idea, that the minister must conform his preaching to people's prejudices. But, if somebody asks me of what he shall repent, what reply shall I give? "Tell him, of course, to repent of sin." Just so; and then if he asks me what is sin, what shall I say? In a hesitating manner he replied: "Why, the apostle says, sin is the transgression of the law." But I thought you were going to set me on a track to get rid of the law, and you have me in the same difficulty still, and yet you tell me I must not preach the law. It thus appears that you think the law is not of sufficient consequence to be preached. But if the law is of no consequence, the transgression of it is of no consequence; and if sin is of no consequence, repentance is of no consequence; and if repentance is of no consequence, then your preaching is of no consequence! This is the logical result of depreciating the law. With such preaching I have no desire to unite.

We believe that the great God is displeased with this easy style of religion which ignores his law which he has so highly honored. It is made void by preachers and by people. Either in whole or in part it is set aside bodily, publicly. And yet the Lord has shown that he who offends in one is guilty of all, for the law is a unit; if we break one commandment we are law-breakers, doers of iniquity. Men will even profess "holiness," entire freedom from sin, and yet transgress the law continually! What definition of sin will they give us? By what rule shall we be made to believe that God approves their course? How shall we determine that their religion is genuine, and not rank fanaticism?

We have a message, which says: "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Paul says that we do not make void the law through faith. Rom. 3:31. They are united in true moral and Christian character. And before our High Priest closes his work, there must be a reform; the commandments of God must be honored, and kept, even as the faith of Jesus.

August 28, 1884

"The Sabbath-School" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—SEPT. 20

1. Shortly after the birth of Christ, what cruel act did Herod perform? Matt. 2:16.

2. What prophets had foretold this event, and its attendant sorrow? Verses 17, 18.
3. Where is this prophecy found? Jer. 31:15.
4. What did the Lord, through his prophet, say to the sorrowing mothers? Verse 16.
5. From what place is it said that the murdered children shall come? *Ib.*
6. What is found in Heaven, in the presence of God? Ps. 16:11.
7. Since the murdered children are now in the land of the enemy, can it be that they went to Heaven at death?
8. Who is the enemy of the human race? 1 Pet. 5:8.
9. Do all who died pass under Satan's power? Heb. 2:14.
10. Who has the keys of Satan's prison house? Rev. 1:18.
11. By whom is the resurrection of the dead made possible? Acts 4:2; 1 Cor. 15:22.
12. What has the Lord promised to do with death? Isa. 25:8.
13. When will this thing be brought to pass? 1 Cor. 15:54.
14. What is the change that shall take place when this same shall be brought to pass?
15. When does this change from corruption to incorruption take place? 1 Cor. 15:51-53.
16. And when is it that the trumpet sounds? 1 Thess. 4:16.
17. Then when is it that God's people gain the victory over death?
18. When will they come from the land of the enemy?
19. Quote two Scriptures to show that both living and dead are made immortal at the same time.

Our lesson this week is introduced by an incident which is familiar to everyone having the slightest knowledge of the Bible, namely, the slaughter of the children at Bethlehem, by order of Herod, improperly called "The Great." Whether many or few infants were slain, the act is one of unparalleled atrocity; for although it was perfectly in keeping with Herod's character, his life having been filled with the murders, we know of no other instance on record, of a wholesale massacre of *infants*, in order to secure the destruction of a possible future claimant of the crown. As to the effect that this barbarous act caused, the evangelist has simply said that there was "lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning." Each mind can best picture for itself the anguish and sorrow that followed.

The point, however, to which we are directed is the fact that this was a direct fulfillment of a prophecy uttered by Jeremiah fully six hundred years before, and recorded in his 31st chapter. Many commentators have thought that Matthew merely states a striking coincidence which he had discovered between the words of Jeremiah, spoken with reference to another object, and the occurrence at the birth of Christ. But a large part of prophecy has a double meaning; that is, two similar things, while near it hand and the other far distant, maybe foretold in the same words. And so Jeremiah's prophecy, although it had immediate reference to the Jewish captivity and restoration, took in also this and other calamities, and the final restoration of God's people. The fact that the prophet had in view the

captivity of the Jews, adds force to the argument which we draw from his words, as we shall see.

"Thus saith the Lord; A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation, and bitter weeping; Rachel weeping for her children refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not. Thus saith the Lord; refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears: for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the Lord; and they shall come again from the land of the enemy." Jer. 31:15, 16. Now notice: These children "were not," that is, they were dead; they had ceased to exist. Again, the command is given, "Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears." This is advice that we have more than once heard given to sorrowing mothers; but the reason for so doing was not the same as that given by the Lord through his prophet. Modern comforters bid the mother to cease weeping, because her child is now happy in Heaven, singing praises before the throne of God, etc. But the Lord gives as a source of comfort the fact that the children shall come again from the *land of the enemy*. Is Heaven the land of the enemy? No one would think of applying to it such a title as that. It is the habitation of God (Ps. 11:4; 33:13, 14), and certainly he cannot be called an enemy. The psalmist, addressing God, says: "In thy presence is fullness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures forevermore." Ps. 16:11. Then certainly those little ones had not gone the heaven. And if they did not go to Heaven at death, who does? for surely they had done no sin, and that there was hope for them is plainly stated by the Lord.

Where, then, did they go? To the land of the enemy, for that is the place from which they are to come again to their own border. Our first inquiry must be as to who is the enemy. Peter says: "Be sober, be vigilant; because your *adversary the devil*, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." 1 Pet. 5:8. An adversary is "an antagonist; an enemy; a foe." He is the enemy not only of the whole human race, but of God. "But," some one may ask, in astonishment, "why should those innocent children go to the land of the devil? What wrong had they done?" Not so fast; let us see what the land of the enemy is. These children were dead; concerning that there is no disagreement. Now death is often spoken of as a land. Job says: "Are not my days few? cease then, and let me alone, that I may take comfort a little, before I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness and the shadow of death; a land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness." Job 10:20-22. And David says: "Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? shall the dead arise and praise thee? Selah. Shall thy lovingkindness be declared in the grave? or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" Ps. 88:10-12. Thus we see that death is spoken of as a land, and that the devil is an enemy; let us see if we have Scripture warranted for connecting the two.

We turn to the second chapter of Hebrews, and there we read: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he Christ 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." Verse 14. Death, then, is under the control of Satan, and is, therefore, the land of the enemy. All who die pass into the

enemy's land, and under the power of the enemy. And now we see the appropriateness of applying Jeremiah's prophecy to the slaughter of the innocents as well as to the captivity of the Jews. The Israelites were taken to Babylon, the land of their enemy and conqueror. They did not desire to go, and it was not a pleasant place for them while there. (See Ps. 137.) They felt that they were in an enemy's land. Now if death be a friend, as it is often called, there is no fitness in applying a prophecy concerning the Jews' captivity to the murder of the children. But when we remember that death is an enemy (1 Cor. 15:26), and that the adversary of the race has control of it (Heb. 2:14), we see perfect harmony in the double application of the prophecy.

In the light of Heb. 2:14, which says that the devil has the power of death, let us consider for a moment the theory that death ushers the good into the presence of God. The old hymn has it that death is "the voice that Jesus sends, to call us to his arms." If that be so, then the devil is Christ's messenger to call his children home. And in that case the devil would cease to be the adversary of mankind, for no kindlier act could be performed than to admit us to the joys of Heaven. Indeed many persons do, although unconscious of the fact, call the devil a friend; for they call death a friend; and if death be a friend, then the one who has control of it and brings it to us must also be a friend. We do not care to thus compliment the devil, and we believe that no one else will who gives the matter serious thought.

Death is Satan's prison house. Were he allowed to have his own way, he would never release one of its captives. But Christ says: "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive forevermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell the grave and death." Rev. 1:18. Satan can still shut up mortals in the grave, but he cannot hold them there. Christ has entered the strong man's house, and having proved himself the stronger, will spoil him of his goods. It is through Christ that the resurrection of the dead comes. It is he, not Satan, that admits the righteous into the mansions prepared for them. He has promised (Isa. 25:8) to swallow up death in victory, and this will be brought to pass, not at death, but when the trumpet sounds, and the dead in Christ are raised incorruptible, and the living are changed. If anyone thinks that death has been swallowed up in victory, let him consider whether the living have been changed to immortality. When that takes place, there will be no more sorrow, nor crying, nor pain, for then we shall ever be with the Lord. E. J. W.

"Under the Law" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

There is no text that is more frequently called into service by those who teach the abolition of God's law than Rom. 6:14: "For ye are not under the law, but under grace." It can hardly be said however that Rom. 6:14 is called into the service, for the whole of the text is seldom given, neither is the context quoted by the opposers of God's law; and we are sorry to say that many forget even to tell where the little that they do quote may be found, thus rendering it impossible for those unfamiliar with the Bible to examine the matter for themselves. We shall

endeavor to set forth the exact meaning of the expression, letting the Bible be its own expositor.

Before entering upon the study of a disputed text it is always well, if possible, to have some definite statements concerning the point in question. Fortunately, on the subject of the law, the Bible is not lacking in explicit statements. We will quote a few in addition to those previously noticed in these articles. Christ said: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Matt. 5:17, 18. But all has not yet been fulfilled. The Lord, through Isaiah, said: "Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth." Isa. 65:17. This prophecy has not yet been accomplished, therefore, according to our Saviour's words, the law has not yet passed away. And to show still more plainly the immutable nature of that law, he said: "And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17.

The words of Christ recorded in Matt. 7:21 bear directly on the text under consideration. It is claimed that Rom. 6:14 teaches that Christians are not required to keep the law. But Christ said: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven." This covers all who will enter Heaven, of whatever class or nation they may be. Calling on the name of the Lord is not sufficient; only those will enter Heaven who have done the will of God. Then certainly the law is binding on Christians.

Again; as we have already seen, the law is God's righteousness: My tongue shall speak of thy word; for all thy commandments are righteousness." Ps. 119:172. Verse 142 reads: "Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and thy law is the truth." Here we have the two facts stated, that the law is righteousness, and that it is everlasting. In Isa. 51:7 the Lord says: "Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law." This again shows that the law of God is righteousness; and the preceding verse says: "My righteousness shall not be abolished." Of course not; who can suppose for a moment that God would abolish righteousness? No one would charge him with doing such a thing, yet that is just what he would be doing if he should abolish his law.

Now we are prepared to consider Rom. 6:14: "Ye are not under the law, but under grace." Who are they that are not under the law? Those who are under grace. Now Paul says, "By grace are ye saved," Eph. 2:5; so, then, those, and those only, who are under grace will be saved in the kingdom of God. But we have already seen from our Saviour's words in Matt. 5:7:21, that only those are saved who do the will, or law, of God. Then it necessarily follows that they who are under grace are the very ones who keep God's law; and therefore the apostle does not mean that we are not obliged to keep the law, when he says we are not under it but under grace.

If we examine the context, we shall find this conclusion confirmed. Going back to the previous chapter, we find the statement that "where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." The grace of God was extensive enough to cover

all sin. The apostle then continues: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?" Rom. 6:1. The idea is, Since God's grace is extended to all, and is exhibited the most clearly where sin is greatest, shall we continue in sin, in order that God may have an opportunity to manifest his grace toward us? "God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?" To sin simply in order that God might have a chance to pardon, would be to tempt him. If such a course were pursued toward an earthly ruler, no one would expect to see a pardon granted.

We have learned, then, that those to whom God manifests his grace must not sin. And what is sin? "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4. So the subjects of grace must not transgress the law. In verses 3-5 Paul introduces the subject of baptism, and says that we were baptized into Christ-planted in the likeness of his death. "We are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." This agrees exactly with what we read in 2 Cor. 5:17, that if any man be in Christ he is a new creature. "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." Verse 6. "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." Verse 11.

In verses 12 and 13 he exhorts to shun sin and to "yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God." And now we come to the fourteenth verse: "For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace." If people would read the whole of this verse, it would scarcely be possible for them to conclude that "not under the law" means freedom to break it at pleasure. Let us notice. What is sin? "Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4. Now Paul says to certain ones: "Sin shall not have dominion over you." Why not? Because "Ye are not under the law, but under grace." Then we learn that those who are not under the law are not under the dominion of sin; and the apostle's words are framed in such a manner as to force us to conclude that those who are under the law are under the dominion of sin. But sin, as we have learned, is the transgression of the law; therefore those who are under the law are those who sin, or break the law. It seems as though no one could fail to see this clearly. Paul's words, then, in verse 14 amount simply to this: That those to whom God has manifested his pardoning grace will not yield themselves to break his law. But this very argument shows that the law is in full force, for if it were not, they could not put themselves under it.

The succeeding verses sustain this point: "What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid." Verse 15. This is simply a repetition of verses 1 and 2. Let us illustrate the apostle's meaning by a familiar occurrence. Here is a man who has stolen a horse. He has been found guilty, and sentenced to a term of years in the penitentiary. He has transgressed the law, and it has its strong hand upon him; he is under the law. It is the law that shuts him up in prison and holds him there. But before his sentence has expired, friends intercede for him and the governor pardons him. He is now a free man;

the law does not hold him any longer. He is indebted, however, to the governor for his liberty. The governor was under no obligation to interfere in his case, and set him free; that was simply an act of favor, or grace. The man is therefore a subject of the governor's grace. Now what will he do? You say that if he appreciates the favor that has been shown him, he will lead an orderly, quiet life, and will never again be guilty of violating the law. It was only with the understanding that he would do so that the governor pardoned him. Suppose, however, he should say, "Now I am a free man; the law held me for a while, but I am not now under it; I am a subject of the governor's special favor. I can now steal horses, or do anything I please." You say at once that if the authorities heard of his words they would have him watched, and should he be found breaking the law again, he would speedily be remanded to prison. The governor in granting him special favor did not give him license to break the law. That act of favor simply placed the man once more in the position that he was before he violated the law, except that his obligation to keep it is greatly increased. If before he was set free he had made known his determination to steal again, the governor would never have shown him any favor at all.

Nobody has any difficulty in understanding a case like the above. Well, we may apply the same principles to men in their relation to God. What we want to remember is that all men have transgressed the law, and brought themselves into condemnation and can get no help except from God. On account of Christ's sacrifice, however, and through his intercession, God is willing to bestow his grace upon all, and thus freely justify them. But he will not save those who are satisfied to be under condemnation; they must have a desire to be free. And how may it be known who wish to become free, and who are satisfied to remain in bondage to sin? Simply by their actions. If they love sin, and are determined not to cease violating the law, no further evidence is needed. Favor shown to such would be favor thrown away. But those who groan, as did Paul, to be free from the load of guilt that rests upon them, may with safety be given their liberty, for they will not use it as a license to sin still more. E. J. W.

"Spiritualistic Theology" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

Two weeks ago a sermon was preached in the Calvary Presbyterian Church, San Francisco, on this subject: "Do the Dead Revisit this Earth, and Take an Interest in Earthly Affairs?" From the brief synopsis of the discourse, as it appeared in the *Bulletin* next day, we quote the following:-

"He thought that there are no dead; that those who have passed away are now living in the full possession of all the faculties possessed here. . . . The speaker went on to say that the spirits of our departed friends and relatives were with us, always hovering near," etc.

We hope that is not a sample of the sermons that are preached. In fact, we know it is not; for we do not think that Spiritualism has yet captured the world entirely. We wish to make one or two comments from a Bible stand-point; but first we will call attention to the inconsistency between the subject and the discourse

itself. "Do the Dead Revisit this Earth?" was the subject, and one of the first statements was that there are no dead. If so, then the only possible answer to his question is, No. The subject was very inappropriate, or else the sermon was all a mistake.

521

As we read the report, we could not help asking, Did the man ever read the Bible? and if so, does he believe it? Even the Revised Version, with all its changes, has not dropped the words "dead" and "death." If there are no dead, what does the Bible mean when it says of each one of the patriarchs, "And he died"? What are we to understand when we read, "It is appointed unto man once to die" (Heb. 9:27); "by one man seventh came into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men" (Rom. 5:12); and many similar passages which speak of death? Does the "Reverend Doctor" wish us to take his "thoughts" in preference to the Bible? And if it is permitted us to believe the Bible, in what Dictionary will we find a proper definition of Bible words? For if we take Webster's definition of Bible terms, the preacher's suppositions are greatly at fault.

Again, he thinks "that those who have passed away are now living in the full possession of all the faculties possessed here." What reason has he for thinking so? When Hezekiah was sick, the Lord said to him, "Set thine house in order; for *thou shall die and not live.*" Isa. 38:1. Christ says: "I am he that live with, and *was dead.*" Rev. 1:18. The Bible recognizes the great difference between life and death. Hezekiah saw so much difference that he wept sore at the thought that he should die and not live. Now, query: If "death" means "life," are not the terms identical? They must be, and therefore "life" means "death," and "living" means "dead." Then why are we not justified in saying that there are no living? that all who are on earth are dead, and "no not anything"? Would we be any farther out of the way than the San Francisco preacher?

The speaker thought that the dead are in possession of all their faculties. We do not. Do you want to know how we dare differ with a man who writes "D. D." After his name? If you have a Bible, open it and turned to Eccl. 9:5. Now read slowly: "For the living know that they shall die [some pretend not to]; but *the dead know not anything.*" Read also the tenth verse: "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, *nor knowledge, nor wisdom,* in the grave wither thou goest." We commend this verse to the preacher above mentioned, with this explanation thrown in, that when Solomon says, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might," he has no reference to preaching sermons the contradicts the Bible. Read once more: "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." Ps. 146:3, 4. Are we not justified in different with the learned doctor? We advise our friend who is looking up these references, to read carefully the last quotation. "Put not your trust in princes," neither in doctors of divinity, but in the word of the Lord, which abideth forever.

Once more, "The spirits of our departed friends and relatives are with us, always hovering near." Again we dissent. Why? Read the preceding paragraph

again, and you will see. But we ask you to open your Bible once more, and turn this time to Job, and read the fourteenth chapter at your leisure. We will together read verses 19-21: "Thou destroyest the hope of man. Thou prevailest for ever against him, and he passeth: thou changest his countenance, and sendest him away. His sons come to honour, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them." Will someone tell us why we should not believe the words of the Bible rather than those of a man?

It is not probable that one of those who listened to that sermon dreamed that it was a Spiritualist sermon. They would be surprised, perhaps indignant, if you should tell them so. "Why," they might say, "Spiritualism is something horrible, but we don't see anything bad about this." Is it not a horrible thing to ignore and deny God's holy word? Read Jer. 5:30, 31, and see what did Lord says about it. Spiritualism is simply the doctrine that there is really no death, but that the (so-called) dead may hold communication with the (so-called) living. The only terrible thing about it is that it is a square denial of the Bible, the inspired word of God, and an acceptance of the words of Satan, the father of lies, who first promulgated the doctrine. See Gen. 3:4. But a more terrible thing than this we cannot imagine. And the most frightful thing of all is that people look upon it as truth, and think that it is pleasant. What is to hinder the whole world from being swamped in this last great delusion of the archdeceiver? Nothing but the plain truth is of God's word, repeated again and again. But, alas! with the majority even this will not avail, for "my people doth not consider." E. J. W.

"Eternal Life" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

From a study of the doctrine of the second advent, and the kindred doctrine, the resurrection, we have arrived at the necessary conclusion that if Christ were not to come there would be no hope of salvation for any of his followers. The leading place which is given to this subject in the Bible, and especially in the New Testament, is enough to convince any one of its great importance; and when we considered Christ's words, that his second coming would be for the express purpose of taking his disciples to himself, we see why it is given so much prominence. We dare not regard our Saviour's word so lightly as to say that his promises mean nothing; but if his followers can be with him before his second coming, then his coming in John 14:3 has no meaning whatever. So, as we said, we are driven to the conclusion that the people of God must wait for their salvation until the Lord comes.

Our reading of the Bible has also shown us that the resurrection is a "living *again*," which implies a previous cessation of life. This would teach us that there is no life between death and the resurrection; for a man cannot "live again" unless he has ceased to live. And since there is no resurrection until the Lord comes, it follows that if he were not to come there would be no life for his people. There can be no escape from this conclusion; we will verify it by the plain declarations of Scripture.

There are no words of the Bible more familiar to the Christian, or more dear to him, than these words of Christ to Nicodemus: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. The love of God to man is beyond all human comprehension. Even the angels, we are told (1 Pet. 1:12), desire to look into and understand the mystery of the plan of salvation. But none but God himself can comprehend the love that prompted that vast scheme. To all eternity it will be the wonder of both saints and angels. Human hearts know something of love, and some can perhaps imagine the anguish they would feel if called upon to give up an only child to suffer cruel torture and an ignominious death. But the love of an infinite God must be as much greater than that felt by mortals, as God himself is greater

522

than man. Yet he gave his only begotten Son,-the one by whom all things were made, whom the angels worship with reverence equal to that which they yield to God,-that man might have eternal life. Then certainly men do not have eternal life, or, what is the same thing, immortality, by nature.

Men often work to no purpose, and spend time and strength for that which is wholly unnecessary; but it is not possible to imagine such a thing of God. Since he knows the end from the beginning, he knows what is necessary to be done, and what means are needed to accomplish it. Would God make such an infinite sacrifice to accomplish something entirely uncalled for? to give to man that which he already possessed? Certainly not. If left to themselves, man would never have had even a hope of eternal life.

And right here is worth our while to consider what this wonderful thing is that was bought for us at such a price. There are few that value it as they ought. If men appreciated it, then there would be a general ascription of praise to God for his love in bringing it to us. In the first place we must remember that it is eternal life and that alone that is brought within our reach by the gift of God's Son. So Paul says: "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life to Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6:23. Eternal life is life to all eternity-life that has no end. Now what is life? It is simply existence. Nothing else is contained in the word. The poor man who drudges for a bare subsistence, the invalid who has no waking moment that is free from pain, the beast that possesses no moral sense, the idiot who is even lower in the scale of intelligence than the brute,-all these live just as certainly as does the man who possesses health, wealth, the keenest perception, and a sense of moral obligation. We can say of one that he has a happy life, and of another that his life is miserable, even a burden, but these ideas could not be conveyed by the unqualified term "life." When we hear that a man lives, we know that he exists, and that is all that we know. He may be ill or well, wealthy or in the depths of poverty, enjoying perfect happiness or suffering extreme anguish, yet we can know nothing of this unless we are told something more than the mere fact that he lives.

What then is *eternal* life? Simply eternal existence. Then it is eternal existence that is brought within man's reach by the sacrifice of Christ. We do not say that the redeemed will not enjoy perfect happiness, but that is not the primary

thing that is given to the overcomer. The happiness of the redeemed is a secondary matter, growing out of the circumstances in which they are placed. That happiness should be the lot of men who spend an eternity in the presence of God and of Christ, where nothing can happen to annoy, is a natural consequence. Unending existence, then, is what is promised to those who believe in the Son of God.

And now we notice that "whosoever believeth in him" shall have eternal life. What shall they have who do not believe in him? Shall it be eternal life? If it is so, that all men have immortality by nature, then what is gained by believing in Jesus? How much better off are believers than unbelievers? None at all. Is it reasonable to suppose that God would hold up to man an unending existence as an incentive for him to accept of Christ, if he were already in possession of it, and if he had it so securely that God himself could not deprive him of it? There is no one who will not say, No, to such a proposition. We repeat: If all men are by nature in possession of immortality, then the gospel holds out no inducement for man to believe in Christ.

It cannot here be argued by those who hold that man is essentially immortal, that the unbelievers will be worse off than the believers in that they will be doomed to hopeless misery, because, as we have seen, it is life pure and simple that is held out as the prize. The text does not say that God gave his Son in order that whosoever believeth in him should not be miserable, but have happiness. We must take the text as it reads, and not attach anything to that that is not contained in it. From John 3:16 we can reach no other conclusion than that those who do not believe in Christ will not have eternal life. And this fact is plainly stated in the thirty-sixth verse of the same chapter: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life."

Eternal life is the grand object for which man was created. This present life is a period of probation, in which we are proved, to see if we would know how to use so great a boon. If we desire eternal life earnestly enough to comply with the conditions, it will at the last day be bestowed upon us; but if we squander this life, and dishonor God, what encouragement will he have to extend our life to all eternity? He will not do it. And since those who disobey God never get beyond this probationary state, the anteroom, as it were, of life, it can be truly said of them that they do not see life. How it is that they who have Christ have eternal life (John 3:36) will be considered next week. E. J. W.

September 4, 1884

"The Sabbath-School" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—SEPT. 27

1. What question did Job ask concerning death? Job 14:14.
2. Until what event did he say he would wait?

3. In what place did he say he would wait for this change? Job 17:13.
4. When does this change come? 1 Cor. 15:51-54.
5. What did Job say the Lord would do? Job 14:15.
6. When does the Lord thus call for his people? Ps. 50:3, 4.
7. From what place does he call them? John 5:28, 29.
8. Then when is it that the saints are changed to immortality?
9. How did Paul regard whatever earthly possessions he might gain? Phil. 3:7, 8.
10. What was he willing to undergo? Verse 10.
11. Why was he so willing to suffer these hardships? Verse 11.
12. Did he have any other incentive to labor and suffer except the promised to resurrection of the dead? 1 Cor. 15:32.
13. What fact gives us the assurance that the dead will be raised? 1 Cor. 15:12, 13.
14. How strong an array of evidence have we that Christ was raised from the dead? 1 Cor. 15:3-8.
15. If we say that there is no resurrection, what do we virtually deny? 1 Cor. 15:16.
16. Why did Paul say that his sufferings for Christ were to no profit if the dead rise not? 1 Cor. 15:18.
17. What is the meaning of "perish"?
18. Then what must be the condition of those who have fallen asleep in Jesus?
19. By whom will they be rescued from this condition? 1 Cor. 15:22.

"If a man die, shall he live again?" Job 14:14. This most important question was asked by Job when he was apparently near the end of his life. The reader will notice that the preceding verses, and the question itself, recognize the difference between life and death. They are dead not living, else the question could not with propriety be asked, Shall they live *again*? If the question should be asked concerning an individual, "Is he coming again?" everybody would understand that the person referred to is not now present; if he were present, or did not design to go away, the proper question to ask would be, "Will he remain?" So of the case in hand. If death is something the direct opposite of life, Job's question was all right; but if the dead are alive, he should have asked, "If a man die, shall he continue to live," or, still more appropriately, "Shall a man always live?" But we will accept Job's question as having the correct form; for we are not to understand the Bible according to our theories, but to correct our theories by the Bible.

The patriarch did not ask the above question because he was skeptical, or in doubt. In the very next verse he says: "Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee; thou wilt have a desire to the work of thy hands." So he expected to die, and expected also that the Lord would call for him. When does the Lord call for his people? Turning to the fiftieth psalm, we read the answer in verses three and four: "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him. He shall call to the

heavens from above, and to the earth, that he may judge his people." The calling of the dead takes place, then, when the Lord comes in power and great glory.

But did not Job expect to be called immediately, as soon as he died, and not be obliged to wait until the coming of the Lord? Let him answer. We quote the remainder of the verse first noticed, chap. 14:14: "All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come." Then he says, as already quoted, "Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee." The "change," therefore, does not take place until the Lord calls, and until that time Job expected to wait. Now in what place did he say he would wait? He gives the answer in chap. 17:13: "If I wait, the grave is my house; I have made my bed in the darkness." He expected to remain in the grave until the Lord should call him forth to his change. And this agrees with the words of Christ concerning the dead, in John 5:28, 29: "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."

"All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come." What is the change of which the patriarch spoke? We have seen that it is to take place at the coming of Christ; and we shall therefore have no difficulty in deciding what it is. Paul says to the brethren: "Behold, I show you a mystery; 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." 1 Cor. 15:51, 52. Here is the change for the dead,- they shall be raised "incorruptible." Will the change for the living be anything different? He continues: "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." Verse 53. That is the change; from mortal to immortal. We have then found that immortality is not the possession of man in this life, neither does it become theirs at death, but that it is to be "put on" at the coming of the Lord; and this is the "change" for which Job expected to wait in the grave.

The apostle Paul was, without doubt, one of the most active, energetic men that ever lived. It is doubtful if any other man ever labored so hard, and suffered so much for the gospel as he did. Read the brief narrative of his life in the Acts of the apostles, and his statement in 2 Cor. 11:23-33. Before he became a Christian he was held in high repute by the Jews, and occupied a leading place in the national council. There was nothing that, with his abilities, he might not have possessed. Yet he says: "But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith; that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death." Phil. 3:7-10. And what was the grand thing to be gained, for which he so willingly suffered the loss of all earthly gain? The next verse contains the answer: "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." This, to Paul, was more than all things else.

From the above we should suppose that the doctrine of the resurrection is one of great importance. We shall see that Paul had no other hope but in the resurrection of the dead. In 1 Cor. 15:32 we read: "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." That is to say, "If there be no resurrection of the dead, all my labor and self-denial has been to no purpose. We might as well get all the enjoyment out of this life that we can, for this life will be the sum total of our existence." His only hope of a future life was based on the resurrection. According to Paul, then, whoever says that there will be no resurrection virtually says that there is no hereafter for man.

In this chapter (1 Cor. 15) Paul bases his argument for the resurrection on the fact that Christ was raised. "If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen." Verse 13. Of course. If one individual has ever been raised from the dead, it is proof that there is such a thing as a resurrection. That Christ was raised, he cites the most conclusive testimony. "He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve; after that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles." 1Cor. 15:5-7. No court could ask for better evidence that a certain thing was done, than that it was seen by above five hundred trustworthy witnesses. There is no effective history better established than is the resurrection of Christ. But if Christ is raised, then all men will be raised, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall be made alive." Verse 22.

Having shown the close connection between the resurrection of Christ and the general resurrection,-a connection so close that the establish one establishes the other,-Paul sums the whole thing up in verses 16-18, and shows the consequence to man if there should be no resurrection. He says: "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; but and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." And this is why so much prominence is given in the Bible to the doctrine of the resurrection.

The word "perish" is defined by Webster as follows: "To be destroyed; to go to destruction; to pass away; to come to nothing; to be blotted from existence; to be ruined; to be lost." Now if there is no resurrection, those that have fallen asleep are perished. Let us take a single case, that of Abraham, for instance. He died nearly two thousand years before Christ. He died in hope of a resurrection, but that hope was based on the fact that Christ was to die and be raised from the dead. Suppose now, for a moment, that Christ had not come, and the dead were to have no resurrection; what would be Abraham's condition? *Perished*, says Paul. But was his condition any different after Christ came than it was before? If the plan of salvation had been overturned, would there have been a change in Abraham's condition in the grave? Certainly not. Then he must now be in exactly the same state that he would be if there were no such thing as a resurrection. And what is that? Out of existence. And this is just the state of the dead until the resurrection takes place. That event marks a great change for the dead, but if it did not take place, they would forever remain in the state in which they are now.

Or, to state the case more plainly, the dead are now in just the condition that they would be to all eternity if there were no resurrection. The only hope for the dead is the promise of God, and that cannot fail. E. J. W.

"Under the Law (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

(Continued.)

Besides Rom. 6:14, which was examined last week, there are several other instances of the use of the term "under the law." We wish to examine these also, to see if we are justified in our conclusion that the expression is used to denote a state of condemnation. We will first, however, take up Rom. 6 where we left off. In the fifteenth verse Paul expresses his astonishment that any one who is a subject of grace should think of again sinning. In the sixteenth verse he says: "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?" Here the idea of service is introduced. If they should yield themselves to sin, they would hereby become its servants. In the two following verses the same idea is expressed. Whereas they were bound by sin, in a bondage that could end only in death, they are now made free, and are the servants of righteousness. But the servants of righteousness,-those who keep the law,-are free men; for the law itself is a law of liberty (James 1:25), and David is authority for the statement that those who keep the law walk at liberty. Ps. 119:45. Christ also says to his disciples: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." John 8:32.

In the book of Galatians the term "under the law" occurs several times, and in such connection as to leave no doubt as to its meaning. We first turn to the fifth chapter and read: "Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lusts of the flesh." Verse 16. The reader will find the parallel to this in Rom. 8:9: "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you." In the seventeenth verse the enmity between the flesh and the Spirit of God is stated. "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." Compare this with Rom. 8:7, 8: "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." Also with the account of the struggles of the convicted sinner, as recorded in the latter part of Rom. 7.

Now read Gal. 5:18: "But if ye be led by the Spirit, ye are not under the law." We have seen that they alone can please God who are led by the Spirit, and here we learn that such are not under the law. Now what is done by those who walk after (or are led by) the Spirit? Paul says that "God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness (requirement) of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. 8:3, 4. If we fulfill the righteousness of the law, we must conform to its slightest requirement, that is, obey it perfectly. That is what it is to be led by the Spirit; and we have read (Gal. 5:18) that those who are

led by the Spirit are not under the law. It is very clear, then, that spiritually minded persons-those who keep the law-are not under the law; and so we again arrive at the unavoidable conclusion that those who do not keep the law are under it.

This may be made still more evident. We have already read that the works of the flesh are the direct opposite of the works of the Spirit. And what are the works of the flesh? Paul answers: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murder, drunkenness, revelings, and such like; of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in times past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Gal. 5:19-21. These things are all forbidden by the law. For proof, see the law itself, and Christ's comments on it in the fifth chapter of Matthew. Now, bearing in mind that doing the works of the flesh make one under the law, we learn that to be under the law one has only to violate it.

Again: "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." Gal. 5:22, 23. That is what is done by those who are led by the Spirit, and Paul says: "Against such, there is no law." The law does not condemn a man who does those things, because he is led by the Spirit; but it is against the things enumerated as the works of the flesh. It condemns the doers of such things.

In harmony with the above are Paul's words in 1 Tim. 1:9, 10: "Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for man slayers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for men-stealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine."

The word "made" in the above text is from *keimai*, to lay, or place, and the meaning is that the law is not laid or placed against a righteous man, but against the lawless. That is, it does not interfere with the actions of a righteous man, but it comes in direct conflict with a wicked man. That this is the meaning, is shown by the preceding argument. Paul says in verse 5 that the end, or object, of the commandment is love. In other words, as has been shown in a previous article, the design of the law is that it should be kept. Now a righteous man is one who keeps the law-fulfills its requirements-and therefore the law has no controversy with him. The man who keeps the law, has no fear of it. But some, the apostle says (verse 6), not having aimed at the law, have turned aside unto vain jangling. Because they have not tried to keep the law, they have got into trouble. "But," he continues, "we know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully." Verse 8. Can this mean that a man's acts will have any effect on the law to make it either better or worse than it was when it was given? Is the law a good law when it is obeyed, and a bad law when it is disobeyed? By no means. Whatever a man may do, the law remains the same,-holy, and just, and good. If a man use it lawfully, that is, if he obeys the law (for that is the only way a law can be used lawfully), it is good to him; it then finds no fault with him. But if a man does not use it lawfully, if he does things that are unlawful, the law is not good to him; it is against him at once. If the law lies against a wicked man, how very natural to speak of man as under it.

Dr. Adam Clarke, speaking of the moral law in his comments on 1 Tim. 1:9, says:-

"It was, therefore, not made for the righteous as a restrainer of crimes, and an inflicter of punishments; for the righteous avoid sin, and by living to the glory of God, expose not themselves to its censure. This seems to be the mind of the apostle; he does not say that the law was not MADE for a righteous man; but *ou keitai* it does not *lie against* a righteous man, because he does not transgress it. But it *lies against* the wicked, for such, as the apostle mentions, have broken it, and grievously too, and are condemned by it. The word *keitai*, *lies*, refers to the custom of writing laws on boards, and hanging them up in public places within reach of every man, that they might be read by all; thus all would see against whom the law *lay*."

In our next article we shall consider a passage that brings out more clearly than anything yet noticed the meaning of the term "under the law." E. J. W.
(*To be continued.*)

"Immortality" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

In all investigation of Bible doctrines it must be borne in mind that the Bible was written by inspiration of God, and must, therefore, be perfectly consistent with itself. If we find passages which seem to conflict, we must conclude that we do not fully understand them. Besides this, we must always interpret those parts that are obscure and indefinite by those that are definite and plain. This is but reasonable. If we have a friend whom we know to be perfectly honest, and two expressions of his that seem contradictory are reported to us, we do not condemn him until he has had an opportunity to explain. We expect that when we learn all that he said, we will find that the two statements agree. Neither would we take a statement definitely and emphatically expressed, and offset it by words from which, taken by themselves, we might infer something directly the opposite. It is thus fairly that we must deal with the Bible. We are not at liberty to draw, from in the passage, an *inference* that is up but opposed to the plain declarations of the word.

Now we have brought forward texts of Scripture that have no double meaning, which prove that God's people are rewarded only at the coming of Christ and the resurrection, and that all men are dependent on Christ for eternal life. There are no doubt other texts from which the reader gathers that men are essentially immortal; these will be considered in due time, but in the meantime we ask the reader to let the plain statements that we quote have their full weight.

Last week we quoted Christ's words: "He that believeth on the Son have everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." John 3:36. This is a plain statement that those who do not believe in Christ will not live eternally. The question now arises, In what sense do those who believe

538

on Christ have eternal life now? Let us read the answer: "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and *this life is in his Son*." 1 John 5:11. Now turn and read the introduction to Paul's second letter to Timothy: "Paul, and

apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, according to *the promise of life* which is in Christ Jesus." Here we have the answer complete. Eternal life is ours by promise, if we believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, through whom alone it may be obtained. If a young man possesses the writings which show that he is heir to a certain estate, he will speak of the estate as his, even though he is not in possession of it, and has no voice in its control.

When many of Christ's disciples became offended and left him, he turned to the twelve and asked, "Will ye also go away question?" "Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of the eternal life." John 6:66-68. The twelve believed as Christ had said, that "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life." If this be not true, what a chance for retort the unbelieving Jews had when Christ said to them: "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." John 5:40. They might have said, "We have no need to come to you for life, for we are immortal by nature." And is not this a logical position for those to take who believe that the essential part of man, the real man, can never die? We may not openly repudiate Christ as did the Jews, yet if we say that we already have that which he came to bestow, do we not thereby signify our independence of him? The only inducement that he holds out for our accepting him is that he can give us life. Now if we proudly insist that we have life, do we not treat his offer with contempt, and so dishonor him? So long as we insist that we are not dependent on him for eternal life, our professions to accept him have a good deal the air of patronizing condescension.

Let us have some more plain declarations. In 1 Tim. 6:12 Paul charges Timothy to "fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life." A man cannot "lay hold" of something that he already has hold of. And how should he "lay hold" on eternal life? By exercising faith: and this again is in harmony with Christ's words in John 3:16, 36. The apostle then charges Timothy to "keep this commandment without spot, and blemish, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ; 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." Verses 13-16. This language must refer to God the Father, for although Christ in Revelation is called "King of kings and Lord of lords," it is he in this instance who is going to make known the "blessed and only potentate;" and further, the one here spoken of is one "whom no man hath seen, neither can see;" but Christ has been seen many times.

But to the gist of the statement. It is that God only hath immortality. So long as the Bible remains, this text will be a standing rebuke to those who claim immortality as theirs by right. That is an attribute of God alone. "But," says one, "is not Christ immortal? and do we not read of the angels that they cannot die?" Yes; and we turn to John 5:26 and read Christ's words: "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." Christ, then, being the only begotten Son of God, partakes of his attributes, and has life in himself. That is, he is able to impart life to others. The text in Timothy does not shut off any one from obtaining immortality, but if it is obtained it must be as a gift from God. It is in this way that the angels are immortal.

Turn now to Rom. 2:5-7. There Paul states that God will render "to every man according to his deeds." "To them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, [he will render] eternal life." "Immortality" means the condition in which one cannot die, and "eternal life" means unending existence; the terms, therefore, are synonymous, and the verse is equivalent to the statement that God will render immortality to those who seek for it. Two points are here made: 1. In order to gain eternal life we must *seek* for it. Then those who do not seek for it will never receive it. 2. The only proper way to seek for immortality is by "patient continuance in well-doing." Then those who do not do well, will not obtain eternal life, even though they may desire it.

Again: In 2 Tim. 1:9, Paul says that the purpose and grace of God, which was given us in Christ Jesus, "is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." Here then we learn the place in which we are to seek for immortality. It is in the gospel. Whoever looks for it in any other place will fail to find it.

Having learned how immortality may be obtained, we have only one thing to consider, and that is when it will be bestowed; when believers in Christ will come into possession of their promised inheritance. This is definitely settled by Paul in the fifteenth of 1 Corinthians, in a text which we have before quoted. We begin with verse 50: "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit in corruption." This statement might raise a query in the minds of some, so Paul adds: "Behold I show you [that is, make known to you] a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump." Verses 51, 52. This, then, explains how we may get into the kingdom of God, even though flesh and blood cannot inherit it. "We shall be *changed*." And when does this change take place? "At the last trump." And what will the change be? "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." Verses 52, 53.

"This *mortal* must put on immortality." The Bible writers never speak of man as being anything else than mortal. "Shall mortal man be more just than God?" Job 4:17. How could they speak otherwise, since God only has immortality? The contrast is sharply drawn in Rom. 1:23. Paul speaks of the heathen, who had "changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image like unto corruptible man." God is immortal, incorruptible; man is mortal, corruptible. But we are to be *changed*, and then we shall be like him, immortal.

"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." 1 Cor. 15:54. And this occurs, as the preceding verses show, at the coming of the Lord.

We have now quoted, besides several texts that speak of "eternal life," every text in the Bible that contains the word "immortality." Let us see what we have found. 1. God alone has immortality. This, of course, applies to Christ, who, as the Son of God, partakes of his nature, and who is entitled to be called God. 2. If

man would have immortality, he must seek for it. 3. The only proper way to seek for it is by patient continuance in well-doing. 4. Man can find immortality only in the gospel, for it is there that it is brought to light. 5. It belongs to everyone who believes in Christ, but only by promise. This life is now in Christ, and whoever has Christ, has eternal life, because he is in possession of that which will bring it to him. 6. This promise of life will be fulfilled, and man's search for the immortality will be crowned with success, when "the Lord himself shall descend from Heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God." Then those who have fought the good fight of faith will be crowned as victors with "a crown of glory that fadeth not away." E. J. W.

September 11, 1884

"How Will They Do It?" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 35.

E. J. Waggoner

We are not entirely alone in the belief that Spiritualism is of the devil, as the following from the *Pacific Methodist* will show:-

"We regard Spiritualism as among the most infernal of Satan's inventions and its absurdness before the bar of enlightened reason is not proof sufficient of its harmlessness, when we reflect that nothing is too preposterous to believe, when the appeal is made through the senses, and is one which accords with the reigning corruption of the soul. . . . We doubt if Christianity has ever before confronted such a monster as this modern necromancy. And this repulsive hybrid from the cesspools of nameless infamy reigns over many, and is spreading its borders. Let the press speak, and the pulpit but cry aloud."

"The voice said, Cry. And he said, What shall I cry?" This is what the "press and the pulpit" might well ask. We are glad when we see any one aroused over the terrible delusion of Spiritualism. But what can they say or do against it? Will they cry out against the corruption that is often associated with it? That would be simply an attempt to lop off some of the other branches, leaving the root untouched. Besides, if that is all that our friend the *Methodist* would assail, he would find his efforts seconded by many Spiritualists themselves. There are thousands of them who outwardly lead moral lives, so far as their fellow-men are concerned. Therefore a person might assail vice and corruption with all his power, and still leave Spiritualism unscathed.

If the *Methodist* really wants to strike at the root of Spiritualism, we will tell it how. Let it teach the Bible doctrine concerning the state of the dead. Let it teach that "the dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down in the silence" (Ps. 115:17); that "the dead know not anything" (Eccl. 9:5);

553

that man's "breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish" (Ps. 146:4); that they "sleep in the dust of the earth" (Dan. 12:2); and that "till the heavens be no more they shall not awake, nor be raised out of sleep." Job 14:12.

He who with all his heart believes these plain declarations of Scripture, can never be a Spiritualist. A belief in the conscious state of the dead is the foundation and superstructure of Spiritualism. He who holds to that doctrine has no warrant that he will not be a Spiritualist; indeed, there is hardly a possibility that he will not, when evidence is presented that appeals overpoweringly to his senses. Nothing but a firm belief in the word of God, *as it reads*, will save man from Satan's masterpiece of deception.

We know that many try to make a distinction, and say that while they believe that departed ones are conscious and active, they do not believe that they can communicate with their friends in the flesh. Well, why do they not? Have they any *reason* for thinking that the dead cannot communicate with the living? "Why, certainly," says one, "the Bible says that they cannot." Exactly; we quoted several passages at the beginning of this article. The Bible says that the dead cannot communicate with the living, because they are unconscious, "they know not anything." And no man can prove that the dead cannot make themselves known to us, without using those texts which declare that they have no conscious existence.

Perhaps there are Christians who see nothing shocking in such teaching. They say, "It is a matter of no *practical* importance how I believe concerning the dead. We could be just as good, even if we believed that the dead could return to us." Do not thus deceive yourselves. For what purpose did Christ come? He says he came "that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. And again, "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." John 10:10. Now if we believe that we shall never die, but that, when that which men call death takes place, we shall go right on just as we do now, only under somewhat improved conditions, where does faith in Christ come in? What inducement can we have to believe in him? Cannot all see that those who hold such a theory leave Christ out of their religion entirely?

And this is just what Spiritualism actually does. It rejects Christ. There is no Spiritualist who believes in Christ as a Saviour; they regard him as a good man, and that is all. They have no room for a Saviour in their system. They repudiate Christ.

With this brief explanation all can see why we are so earnest in our teaching of conditional immortality. It is not as a mere theory which we can adopt or reject at pleasure, but a truth of vital importance. To accept the doctrines of Spiritualism is to reject Christ; and without him we can do nothing. John 15:4, 5. He is "made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." 1 Cor. 1:30. We can be 'complete' only in him.

The *Methodist* truly says that Spiritualism is one of "Satan's inventions;" it was invented by him when there were but two human beings on earth, and formulated in these words: "Thou shalt not surely die." We shall not cease to cry out against this "modern necromancy." We should be rejoiced if we might stand side by side with the *Methodist* in this fight. The Bible, and that alone, will furnish the weapons. E. J. W.

"Under the Law. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 35.

E. J. Waggoner

Before directly considering the remaining passages containing the expression "under the law," we wish briefly to recapitulate some points already canvassed, simply stating propositions, and referring to the texts which establish them.

1. The keeping of the law of God is the whole duty of man. Eccl. 12:13. The fact that the word "man" is unqualified, shows that no particular man or race of men is referred to, but that the wise man intended to include the whole human race. It is the duty of all men to love God and their fellowmen.

2. Those who obey the law will stand justified before God. Rom. 2:13. This proposition follows as a natural consequence of the first; for a just God will never condemn a man who does his whole duty. Nothing more than that can possibly be required of anybody.

3. But no man has done his whole duty, for none have kept the law perfectly. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Rom. 3:23 also verses 9-12. "What things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." Rom. 3:19.

4. "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." Rom. 3:20. This is the direct consequence of the fact stated in verse 19. A good law will never justify evil-doers. And in these two verses we again have proof that the law was designed for the whole human family, and not for any particular class; for the law could not condemn those for whom it was not designed. That is to say, a law cannot condemn those who are not within its jurisdiction. But the law does condemn the whole world; therefore all the world are under its jurisdiction.

5. "Condemnation" is "the judicial act of declaring guilty and dooming to punishment."-Webster. It is the direct opposite of "justification," which is "a showing to be just or conformable to law, rectitude, or propriety."-*ib.* Therefore since the law of God declares the whole world to be guilty before God, and will not justify a single individual, it follows that all the world are under the condemnation of the law of God.

6. The whole world being found guilty, and being condemned by the law, are said to be "under the law." Rom. 3:19. Therefore "under the law" is a synonym for "condemned by the law."

7. Since all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God, we are "justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." Rom. 3:24. We are justified by faith alone, "without the deeds of the law," Rom. 3:28; for no amount of good deeds will atone for one sin. If a man had stolen a horse, abstaining from horse-stealing to all eternity would not in the least clear him from the guilt. If we are freed from past transgressions, it must be solely by an act of favor on the part of God.

8. This justification belongs only to those who believe in Jesus. Rom. 3:26. It is purely a matter of faith on the part of the sinner, and of favor on the part of God. Rom. 3:21, 22, 28. And therefore to obtain justification from past

transgressions, the sinner has only to have sincere faith in Christ. It takes just as long to be justified as it does to have faith in Christ, and no longer.

9. "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Rom. 5:1. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." Rom. 8:1. That is, those who are in Christ—those who have faith in Him—are not under the law; they are the subjects of God's special favor.

10. As a consequence of all the preceding propositions, it follows that all men are under the law until they have faith in Christ; from that moment they are out from under the law, unless they again bring themselves into condemnation by again yielding themselves to sin.

11. The law was ordained to life. Rom. 7:10. That is, if it had been kept perfectly, which is what was designed, it would have given the obedient one eternal life. See Matt. 19:17.

12. But "the wages of sin is death." Rom. 6:23. And since all men have sinned, all men are condemned to death. There is no law in existence by which man in his present condition can secure eternal life. That is the gift of God through Christ. But it is not the fault of the law that it cannot give life. It is just as holy and just and good as it was before. The fault lies in man alone. Rom. 7:12-14.

We are now prepared to consider a passage of Scripture, portions of which have been quoted perhaps oftener than any other part of the Bible, as proving the abolition of the law, but which is one of the strongest proofs of its perpetuity. It is found in the third chapter of Galatians. Verses 24, and 25 are supposed to teach that Christians need not keep the law. We shall consider these verses, as we do all others, in the light of the context. We shall have but little more to do than to refer to propositions already established by the Bible. We have not space to give Paul's argument in full from the beginning of the chapter, but will begin with the twenty-first verse.

The apostle speaks in some of the preceding verses of God's promise to Abraham, and, through him, to all the faithful. He says that the inheritance was simply by promise, through faith in Christ, yet the law was also given and designed to be kept. Then he asks, "Is the law then against the promises of God?" That is a very pertinent question. It opens the whole subject. Is the law against the promises of God? If we keep the law do we thereby manifest our disbelief of or contempt for the promises of God? Do we deny Christ by keeping the law? Paul answers in the same verse: "God forbid; for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." Gal. 3:21. The idea is, The law is not against (in conflict with) the promises of God, because we do not expect to gain the inheritance through the keeping of the law. That this is true is proved by the simple fact that if the law could have given life, righteousness should have come by means of it, and there would have been no need of Christ's sacrifice and of the promises. So the simple fact that promises were given, proves that the law is powerless to give life.

And why is it that there could be no law that would give life? Verse 22 contains the answer: "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the

promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." As we have already shown from the Scriptures, the reason why men cannot be justified and receive eternal life through the law is that "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." And now mark well this point: The existence of the law, instead of being against the promises of God, is so much in harmony with them that they would amount to nothing without it. How so? Because, (1) "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." 1 Tim. 1:15; (2) He can save only those who believe. Mark 16:15; Acts 16:31; Rom. 3:20, etc.; (3) All men are sinners (Rom. 3:23) whether they are conscious of it or not; but (4) No one can know that he is a sinner until he examines the law of God, for "by the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. 3:20, and (5) If a man did not find himself to be a sinner, he could not be induced to believe in Christ for the remission of sins; for if it is true that "they that are whole need not a physician," it is equally true that they

554

that *think* they are whole will not apply to a physician, no matter how sorely they may stand in need of one; therefore, (6) It is absolutely necessary that the law be in the world, in order to lead men to lay hold on the promises. The law of itself could save no one; the promises would be of no benefit to men without the law to show them their need of those promises. The law, by showing all men to be sinners, makes it possible for the promises to be extended to all the world. Whoever, therefore, claims that he is no sinner, puts himself outside the promises of God. And now, as we quote the text again, we shall have a better understanding of it: "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise of faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." Gal. 3:22.

"But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." Verse 23. Right here read once more the propositions at the beginning of this article, and the texts therein cited. In what condition does God's great sin detective,-the law,-show men to be? Guilty before God,-condemned to death. How can they be freed from this condition? By faith in Christ. There is no other way by which men can get free from condemnation. "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. Then how long must they remain in this state of condemnation? Until they can grasp the great truth of salvation through Christ alone, and exercise faith in him. They are "shut up" to this one way of escape.

We wish to call the reader's attention to the forcible figure here introduced. Mr. A has killed a man. In so doing he has broken the law of the State. It may have been his first and only offense; but no matter, he is a law-breaker. And now he is seized by the officers of the law, and taken into court, where, the facts being set forth, the law shows him to be guilty, and he is condemned to death. But sentence will not be executed for several weeks, and what is done with Mr. A in the meantime? He is shut up in prison, possibly with chains on his limbs. Now what is it that holds him there? It is the law of the State. It was the law that seized him, condemned him, and shut him up in jail. The sheriff and the judge were merely the agents of the law. He is then indeed "under the law."

And now Mr. A begins to realize his impending doom, and longs for freedom. How can he get it? The walls of his cell are impenetrable, the doors are securely bolted, and he is chained to the floor. It is very clear that he cannot help himself. Who can? There is only one man, and that is the governor. To him he turns as his only hope. He cannot plead the many good deeds that he may have done, for they do not destroy the fact that he has sinned. It was past transgression that brought him into his present condition. He can only promise obedience for the future, and beg for mercy. Through the mediation of powerful friends, and the clemency of the governor, he at last obtains his freedom.

Now how is it in the case of the transgressor against God's law? There is no hope of escaping, for the law is omnipresent, and as soon as the sin is committed it seizes the unfortunate one. "The wages of sin is death," and since he is clearly a sinner, he is condemned already. Hence he is immediately "shut up." He cannot bribe the jailer, and he has nothing to expect but death. He casts about for a way to escape from his bondage, but every scheme which he devises fails. One hope alone appears, and that is Christ. He has promised to rescue all who believe in him, and the unhappy sinner, believing that Christ is able "to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him," lays hold on the hope thus held out, and becomes a free man. Now Paul says that before faith came we were all "under the law, shut up," in just the condition above described. It is not merely the Jews, not a certain few, who are shut up under condemnation of the law, but all men in all ages of the world's history have been in just that condition. As soon as any one exercised faith in Christ, he obtained his freedom.

The verses that we first referred to, the 24th and 25th, are thus explained; but few more words are needed. As a consequence of the previous statements, the apostle concludes: "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith." In verses 21, 22, the apostle anticipates this verse by showing how absolutely necessary the law is to the carrying out of the promises of God through Christ. See the comments on those verses in the preceding part of this article. Notice that the law does not point to Christ-that office is intrusted to something else-but it brings us, yea, drives and forces us to him as our only hope. And this is just what was done by the individual who is called in our version a "schoolmaster." The proper term would be "pedagogue," a word applied anciently not to one who taught children, but to one who accompanied them to the place where they might be taught, and beat them if they ran away. Of course the law does not bring those who do not wish relief; but when sinners want liberty, and begin to struggle for it, the law allows them no avenue of escape except Christ, who is the "end of the law." It stands as an impossible wall, in whatever way the sinner may turn for escape, until he sees Christ, the Door across whose portals the law throws no bar.

"But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." Verse 25. No; the moment that we implicitly believe that Christ loves us individually, with a love that is able to save us, we are free. The chains that bind us to the body of death are severed, and "there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." We are now

new creatures in Christ, and must henceforth walk in newness of life, no longer "under the law," but "under grace."

We would like to carry these thoughts still further, but this article is already too long. In our next we shall finish our consideration of the term "under the law," and will then pass to some other phases of the law question. E. J. W.

September 18, 1884

"The Sabbath-School" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST OCT. 11

1. What is the meaning of the word "immortal"?
2. What is the appointed lot of mankind? Heb. 9:27.
3. Are any exempt from death? Rom. 5:12.
4. Then can it be that any of the human race are immortal?
5. What exhortation did Paul give to Timothy? 1 Tim. 6:12.
6. Until what time did he charge Timothy to keep this commandment? Verses 13, 14.
7. What did he say that Christ in his times should show? Verse 15.
8. What did he say further concerning this "blessed and only Potentate?" Verse 16.
9. Who is this "blessed and only Potentate" here referred to?
10. Then who alone is possessed of immortality?
11. Does Christ share this attribute equally with the Father? John 5:26.
12. What contrast as the apostle Paul institute between God and man? Rom. 1:23.
13. What is the meaning of the words "corruptible" and "incorruptible"?
14. Since God only hath immortality, what term must be applied to man? Job 4:7.
15. Who has eternal life to bestow? Rom. 6:23.
16. Through whom may it be obtained? *lb.*
17. To what class of persons will it be given? Rom. 2:7.
18. If men have immortality, would they be exhorted to seek for it?
19. How are we to seek for it? Rom. 2:7.
20. Then if none get it but those who seek for it, what can you say of those who do evil?
21. Who is it that has brought immortality to light? 2 Tim. 1:10.
22. By what means is it presented to mankind? *lb.*
23. Then where are we to seek for immortality?
24. What can you say of those who do not accept the gospel?

The definition which Webster gives of the word "immortal" is this: "Not mortal; exempt from liability to die; and dying; the imperishable; lasting forever; having unlimited existence." To say, then, that any being is immortal, is equivalent to

saying that he cannot die. This will be the case with the redeemed saints, for Christ says: "But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; *neither can they die anymore*, for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Luke 20:35, 36. When they obtain the resurrection from the dead, they are immortal, for they cannot die any more. But they did die once, and therefore they were not always immortal. And so Paul says that "it is appointed unto men once to die" (Heb. 9:27), and that "death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Rom. 5:12. To say, then, that the Scriptures teach that men are by nature immortal, is to say that words have no meaning. Death is the appointed lot of mankind; and there only two men (Enoch and Elijah) who have been favored above their fellows, in that they did not see death.

In 1 Tim. 6:12 Paul gives the exhortation to "fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life." If we are already in possession of immortality, it would be impossible for us to heed this exhortation, for we could not "lay hold on" that which we already held; and no matter how earnestly we might fight the good fight of faith, it would have no effect on our immortality, if we already possessed it. Immortality is absolute; no man can be more than immortal. But in the thirteenth and fourteenth verses the apostle says that this charge must be kept until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ. From that we learn that we are to continue the fight of faith until the Lord comes; and since it is by that means that we lay hold on eternal life, we must also conclude that the eternal life will not be gained until that time.

The apostle goes on to say that Christ will show who is "the blessed and only potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality." The reference here can be to no other than to God himself. Nothing, then, can be plainer than this statement that God alone has immortality. That is, he has "life in himself" (John 5:26). Immortality is an attribute of God, just the same as infallibility, omniscience, omnipotence. Christ, as the Son of God, possesses the same attributes, and is therefore equal with God and worthy to be called God. But man has no more right to claim one attribute of God than all; he may as well put himself on a level with God in respect of knowledge, as to claim equality with respect to life. The simple fact is, as the text shows, that God alone possesses immortality; and therefore if man ever gets it, it must be as a gift from God.

The distinction between God and man is clearly defined through the Bible. Paul, in showing the depth to which they even have fallen, says that they "changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man." Rom. 1:23. This might with equal propriety be translated: "Changed the glory of the immortal God into an image made like to mortal man." In Job 4:17 the question is asked, "Shall mortal man be more just than God?" In Isa. 51:12, the Lord, through the prophets, asked: "Who art thou, that thou shouldst be afraid of a man that shall die, and of the son of man which shall be made as grass?" In contradistinction to this, God is ever and ever spoken of as "the living God," that is, the one who ever lived, who can never die. If man were

possessed of immortality, then he might with propriety have the same titles applied to him that are applied to God.

"For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life to Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6:23. Here we have the statement that eternal life comes alone from God, and the additional fact that it comes only through Christ. In Rom. 2:7 we learn still farther that God will give it only to them who "seek" for it, by patient continuance in well-doing. And in 2 Tim. 1:10 we learn that we are to seek for it in the gospel. The apostle says the Christ has "brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." From these three texts we are forced to the following conclusions: No sinner can have eternal life, for "the wages of sin is *death*." No one can have eternal life unless he *seeks for* it, and the proper way to seek for it is by patient continuance in well-doing. Again; since it is only through the gospel that immortality is brought to light, and eternal life comes only through Christ, it is evident that no one who rejects Christ and the gospel can have immortality.

It may be argued by some that, while it is true that immortality comes from God alone, and he alone has life in himself, he has implanted it in all human beings. But this will not harmonize with the Bible. If men were *by nature* immortal, then it would not be true that immortality, comes through Christ and the gospel. If we accept the Bible as authority, then immortality cannot be bestowed until it is seen who have accepted Christ, and have persevered in well-doing. And this cannot be seen in this life, for there is always a possibility of the best man's falling from his steadfastness. And still further, if it be true that all men have in them an immortal principle, then there can be no such thing as sin. For immortality means exemption from death. Whoever is immortal cannot die. But "the wages of sin is death;" that is, whoever sins will die; and no one will die except those who sin. Now, then, if we claim that all men are immortal, and that none can die, the logical conclusion is that none are sinners. In other words, wages will be given where due; and if death, the wages of sin, is given to no man, then it follows that no man is deserving of it. Thus immortal-soulism is pure universalism.

The following extracts from standard commentaries will be read with interest, and will show that the conclusions which we have drawn from the texts used in the lesson, are warranted by the best scholarship.

On 1 Tim. 6:16 Olshausen says: "'Who only hath immortality.' He is therefore the source of immortality to all who are partakers in it; out of him is *death*."

Dean Alford quotes Justin Martyr as follows: "God is said only to have immortality, because he hath it not by the will of another, as the rest who possess it, but by his own proper essence."

Dr. Bloomfield says: "'*ho monos echon athanasian*,' i.e., immortality self-derived; by which it is implied that he alone can confer it."

Dr. Barnes says: "'Who only hath immortality.' The word here-*athanasia*-properly means *exemption from death*, and seems to mean that God, in his own nature, enjoys a perfect and certain exemption from death. Creatures have immortality only as they derive it from him, and of course are dependent on him for it."

On Rom. 5:12 Dean Alford says: "Literally 'on ground of,' 'on condition that,' which meaning, if rightly applied, suits the case in hand. *Life* depended on a certain conditions, viz., obedience; *death*, but on another, viz., disobedience. Mankind have disobeyed; the condition of deaths and entrances and diffusion has been fulfilled; death extended to all men, as a consequence of the fact that all have sinned."

On Rom. 2:7 Dr. Barnes has the following: "The word *immortality* means that which is not corruptible, where subject to decay. It is applied to Heaven as a state where there will be no decay or death, in strong contrast with our present condition, where all things are corruptible, and soon vanish away. These expressions are undoubtedly descriptive of state of things beyond the grave. . . . 'Eternal life.' That is, God will 'render' eternal life to those who 'seek' it in this manner."

"Shaking of the Powers of Heaven" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

A subscriber asks a question concerning the shaking of the powers of the heavens, spoken of in Matt. 24:29. In the Sabbath-school lesson, as he says, the idea was conveyed that this is to take place in connection with the coming of the Lord, and is not one of the signs of that coming. We give the substance of his query below:-

"In three of the Gospels, where events seem to be named in their proper order, so far as they have been fulfilled, the 'shaking' is made to precede his coming. Now can it be proved that the 'shaking,' of Matt. 24:29 and the passing away of the heavens (2 Pet. 3:10), are identical? May not this prediction of our Saviour be fulfilled in the disastrous storms of the present time, or in the great conflagrations upon the sun's surface, as is evident from the sun spots, or in the perihelion disturbances of the solar system, or in all these combined? May not this prophecy be double in its signification, and be fulfilled before his coming, and again in connection with that event."

ANSWER.-In Heb. 12:25-27 we read: "For if they escaped not who refused Him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from Heaven; whose voice then shook the earth; but now hath he promised, saying, yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven. And this word, Yet once more, signifies the removing of those things that are shaken," etc. From this we learn that as the voice of God at Sinai shook the earth, so *once more* it will shake both earth and heaven, and but once more. This then would preclude the possibility of there been two "shakings."

The question then remains, when will the shaking occur? Peter says that in the day of the Lord "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise?" (2 Pet. 3:10); the prophet says, "And the heavens departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places." Here is the shaking of both earth and heaven; and it is in connection with Christ's coming, for all the wicked hide themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains, and say to the mountains and rocks, "Fall on us and hide us from the

face of Him that sitteth upon 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?" Rev. 6:14-17.

We think our querist mistakes the meaning of the expression, "precede the coming of Christ." Nothing can properly be called a "sign" of Christ's coming except that which is given to show the nearness of that event, so that men may prepare for it. Those things that take place after the close of probation are not really signs of the coming, because there is then no need of them.

Again, the second coming of Christ, like the first, is an event covering a period of time. The whole time of Christ's earthly ministry is called the first advent. There are many events then spoken of as taking place when the Lord comes, such as the resurrection of "all that are in the graves" (John 5:28), the translation of the righteous, and the punishment of the wicked with everlasting destruction (2 Thess. 1:7-9). But we know that the resurrection of the wicked, and their final destruction does not take place until a thousand years after the translation of the righteous. We therefore say that the "second coming of Christ," with all its attendant phenomena, is not an instantaneous event taking in simply the moment of his first appearing in the clouds of heaven, but one which, like his first advent, covers a period of time.

Of course the shaking of the powers of the heavens precedes the manifestation of Christ in the clouds, yet it occurs "in connection" with that event. And that is in the regular order of events as mentioned by the evangelists.

Concerning the storms, conflagrations on the sun, etc., we would say that they are not such events as would meet the requirements of 2 Pet. 3:10 or Rev. 6:14-16 and other passages. And as for "the perihelion disturbances of the solar system," the worst result we have seen from the perihelion is the overwhelming lot of trash that has been published concerning it in certain would-be scientific journals. E. J. W.

"Under the Law. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

(Concluded.)

There is yet one more instance of the use of this term, and though the text is probably not so often quoted in opposition to the law of God as are the others, we will examine it, because it adds strength to the position that the law is unchangeable. In the fourth chapter of Galatians Paul continues the argument of chapter three. He starts out with the statement that the heir, so long as he is a child, must be under tutors and governors, even though he be lord of all. He cannot come into possession of his inheritance until he is of age. "Even so we," says the apostle, "when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world." Gal. 4:3.

In this figure the child is used to represent the sinner before he accepts Christ. Until that time, as has been repeatedly shown from the Bible, every man is in bondage, in prison; we are at liberty only when we are in Christ. That the bondage here referred to is indeed the bondage of sin, may be seen by an examination of verses 8 and 9. In verse 8 the apostle says: "Howbeit then, when

ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods." This language shows to whom Paul was writing. The members of the Galatian churches had been heathen, doing service to "them which by nature are no gods," and not to the God who created all things; that is, before they knew the true God they worshiped idols. And Paul's language to them will apply equally well to us, for, whether a man be brought up in a Christian or a heathen land, so long as he does not know God, he is virtually a heathen; he may not be a worshiper of images of wood or stone, but he has other gods before the one, true God. And no man who is not in Christ can know God, for Christ says: "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." John 14:6. So then, although Paul addressed his words directly to those who had been idolaters in the commonly accepted sense of the word, they apply to all.

The apostle continues in verse 9: "But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?" To what were they once in bondage? To sin, for they had been practicing idolatry, with its accompanying vices, in direct violation of God's law. Then sin, in its various forms, constitutes the "elements" under which they had been in bondage. It is justly termed "the elements of the world," because it is of the earth, and not of Heaven. It is the same term which Paul uses when, in writing to the Colossians, he warns them not to be spoiled by "philosophy and vain deceit," by the "tradition of men," by the rudiments of the world." Col. 2:8, 20. They are weak in that they can give no liberty or peace even though they promise it (2 Pet. 2:19); and the term "beggarly," fitly expresses the despicable nature of sin.

We find, then, the same statement in Gal. 4:3 that is made in Rom. 3:19; Gal. 3:22, etc., namely that all the world are by nature in the bondage of sin, "under the law." What next? "But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Gal. 4:4, 5. Whom did Christ come to redeem? "Them that were under the law." Compare this with 1 Tim. 1:15. "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief;" and again this: "For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost" (Luke 19:10), and you can have no doubt as to the meaning of the term, "under the law." The plan of salvation has no reference to any but to those who were "lost," who were "sinners," or, in other words, "under the law." The name "Jesus" was given to Christ before his birth, because, the angel said, "he shall save his people from their sins." Matt. 1:21. He saves us from nothing but sin and its penalty.

This point will be made still more clear when we consider the position Christ had to assume in order to accomplish our salvation from sin. The text under consideration (Gal. 4:4) says that he was "made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law." That is, he had to put himself in the exact condition of those whom he would save. In Heb. 2:16 we read of Christ, "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham." The meaning is, as indicated by the marginal reading, that he came not to redeem angels but men. "Wherefore," the apostle continues, "in all things it behoved

him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." Heb. 2:17. He was made "in all things" like those whom he came to redeem.

Some one may exclaim, "What! do you think that Christ was a sinner?" By no means; he was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. 4:15); he was absolutely good, the embodiment of goodness, yet he was counted as a sinner. In no other way could he be made "in all things" like his brethren, for they were sinners. In proof of this we quote 2 Cor. 5:21: "For he (God) hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." As a parallel to this read Isa. 53:6: "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him (Christ) the iniquity of us all." He bore the sins of the world as though they were his own. If it were not so, he would not have died; for "the wages of sin is death." None can die except those in whom sin is found; our sins were laid on Christ, and accounted as his; and so, although personally "he knew no sin," he was made to suffer the penalty of the law as a transgressor. And herein is the unspeakable love of Christ, that the innocent should assume the crimes of the guilty, and die in his stead. It was because Christ had taken upon himself "the form of a servant," that he became obedient unto death. Some have thought it nothing less than blasphemy to speak of Christ, the sinless one, as being made a sinner, and suffering the penalty for sin, but it is from this very thing that he derives his highest glory. We simply state the fact as we find it in the Bible. This is the unfathomable mystery which angels desire to look into, and which will to all eternity call forth the love and adoration of the redeemed hosts.

We think a careful reading of the above, together with many Scripture texts for which we have not space, will convince all that to say that one is "under the law" is equivalent to saying that he is subject to its penalty as a sinner. Gal. 4:4, 5, then, teaches the simple fact that in order to save those who, on account of having violated the law, were under the condemnation of death, Christ put himself in their place and suffered the penalty of the law. And what is the condition of those who are thus redeemed from under the law? They "receive the adoption of sons" (Gal. 4:5, 6); and in harmony with this, Paul says in the eighth of Romans that those who "walk not after the flesh," but are led by the Spirit of God, are the sons of God.

Before leaving this text, we wish to apply it to the theory that the law of God was given solely to

Jews, and that "under the law" means subject to the law; the theory that would make the law binding upon the Jews alone. If this theory be true, what is the result? Since Christ came to redeem only those who were under the law, it would follow that all the Jews will be redeemed, and no others. This would be making salvation not only "of the Jews," but for the Jews. This conclusion cannot be evaded. Christ came to save the "lost," those who were "under the law." Now none can be under the law, that is, transgressors of the law, but those to whom the law was given; and therefore if the law was given for none but the Jews, then

none but the Jews will be saved. But this is not true, because Christ died for all. A man should think at least twice before he takes a position that not only contradicts the Bible but shuts him out from an interest in the plan of salvation. Christ died for those who were under the law; and that all men were under the law, is shown by the fact that "whosoever will," may avail himself of the provisions of the gospel.

At the risk of making this article too long, we notice one more passage, which should be considered in this connection. It is Gal. 3:13: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, cursed be every one that hangeth on a tree." This is an exact parallel to Gal. 4:4, 5. Christ was made a curse, in order to redeem us from the curse. Now what was the curse which fell upon Christ? It was death, as the remainder of the verse shows: "For it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." "The wages of sin is death." Death is the curse which the law pronounces upon every transgressor; but from this Christ has delivered us (if we believe on him), by voluntarily becoming our substitute. Take this verse in connection with the preceding: "And the law is not of faith; but the man that doeth them shall live in them." The man that keeps the commandments of God shall live. See Lev. 18:5. But no man has kept them; consequently the curse has fallen upon all. "Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Rom. 5:12. From this curse we can be redeemed only by Christ. And the person thus redeemed from the curse must keep the law, or else he will again bring himself under the curse; for those only have life who keep the law.

In each of these texts that we have considered we are brought to the same point, namely, that Christ is our only hope of escape from the penalty of universal and immutable law. And knowing with what an inexorable grasp the law holds its victims, we can glory in the fact that Christ is "made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." E. J. W.

October 2, 1884

"The Sabbath-School" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 37.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST OCT. 18

1. Upon what did Paul exhort Timothy to lay hold? 1 Tim. 6:12.
2. By what means was he to lay hold of it? *lb*.
3. Would it be consistent to exhort one to "lay hold" of the eternal life if he has it by nature?
4. To whom must we come in order to have life? John 5:40.
5. For what purpose did Christ say he came? John 10:10.
6. Then if men possess immortality by nature, did not Christ come in vain?
7. What is proved by the fact that he came to give life?
8. Who does Christ say have everlasting life? John 3:36.

9. In what sense do we have it now? 2 Tim. 1:1.
10. In whose keeping is this gift? 1 John 5:11.
11. Can one do anything more for Christ than to give up everything for his sake?
12. What does Christ say that those who do so shall receive in this present time? Mark 10:29, 30.
13. What shall they receive in the world to come? *Ib.*
14. Then when will eternal life be enjoyed?
15. At what time will immortality be bestowed? 1 Cor. 15:51-54.
16. How is it that we receive immortality? Verses 52, 53.
17. Can a person "put on" that which he already has on?
18. Then what can you say as to man's present possession of immortality?
19. What is due to Christ from all men? John 5:23.
20. How much honor is due him? *Ib.*
21. What does Christ alone have? John 6:68.
22. Through whom does eternal life come? Rom. 6:23.
23. If men were by nature in possession of immortality, would they be dependent upon Christ for it?
24. Then is it not robbing Christ of the honor due him, to say that man possesses immortality whether they believe in him or not?

LESSON FOR OCTOBER 25

1. Concerning what did Paul wish the brethren not to be ignorant? 1 Thess. 4:13.
2. What is sleep often used to represent? John 11:11-14; Ps. 13:3.
3. What is the condition of a man in a sound sleep?
4. Then what must we conclude as to the Bible idea of the condition of man in death?
5. In what place are the dead sleeping? Dan. 12:2; Job 7:21.
6. What does Paul say that God will do for those who sleep in Jesus? 1 Thess. 4: 14.
7. When will he do this? Verses 15, 16.
8. From what place will he bring them? John 5: 28, 29.
9. In what sense, then, is it that God brings them "with him," *i.e.* with Christ? Heb. 13: 20.
10. Who are they who go into the grave? Ps. 89: 48.
11. What kind of a place is the grave? Job 10: 20-22.
12. How is it described by the psalmist? Ps. 88:11, 12.
13. What does Solomon say as to the activity of those who go to the grave? Eccl. 9:10.
14. Are we to understand, then, that the dead are entirely unconscious? Verse 5.
15. Do they not feel any of the emotions which sway the living? Verse 6.
16. Are they not affected even by the success or adversity of their best loved ones? Job 14: 21.

17. If a tree is cut down, what may happen? Job 14: 7-9.
18. What is said of the death of man? Verse 10.
19. How complete is the "wasting away" of man when he dies? Verses 11, 12.
20. How long will it be before the dead shall be raised out of their sleep?

Verse 12.

21. When is it that the heavens shall pass away? 2 Pet. 3: 10.
22. Then at what time did Job locate the resurrection?
23. Where did he expect to stay while waiting for this event? Job 14:13; 17:13.

Since there was no paper last week, we this week print the questions for two Sabbaths, in order that those who are following the series may not lose the connection.

In John 10:10 we have Christ's statement of the object which brought him to earth to die: "I am come that they [believers in him] might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." Compare this with his words in John 3:16. He came into the world to save sinners (1 Tim. 1:15); and since the wages of sin is *death*, it must follow that he gives life, as he says. And this statement cannot be turned aside from its literal meaning by saying, as Dr. Barnes does, that the word "abundantly" "denotes that which is not absolutely essential to *life*, but which is superadded to make life happy;" for it is not merely the 'abundance' of life which he came to bestow, but *life* itself. "I am come *that they might have life*, and [something else] that they might have it more abundantly;" that is, to all eternity. But the fact that Christ came to give life, proves conclusively that we cannot have it without him, unless we are willing to admit that he came in vain-for a purpose wholly unnecessary.

The fact that life comes only through Christ is again and again repeated in the Bible. "He that believeth on the Son have everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." John 3:36. Here we have a most positive declaration; a plainer statement of the case could not be made. There are some, however, who misapply the first portion of the verse, and claim that even now, in this present life, Christians have the eternal life. But the beloved disciple, in repeating the words of Christ, says: "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." 1 John 5:11. And this is how it is that "He that hath the Son hath life." We have it in Christ. It is not ours in the sense of actual possession, but by promise. See 2 Tim. 1:1; Titus 1:2.

And when shall we receive this promise? Christ himself tells us. Said he: "There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel's, but he shall receive an hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions." This will be the portion of a follower of Christ in this world; but this is not all. He continues: "And in the world to come eternal life." Mark 10:29, 30. So the eternal life is ours in this world only by promise; in the world to come it will be ours in fact. But so surely does Christ give life, that if we have him, we may say that we have life.

One word of explanation on John 3:36. "He that hath not the Son shall not see life." Of course this can have no reference to this present life; it must refer to

eternal life. That is the object for which man was created. This brief existence is but a preparation for eternal life. The Lord gives us a little period of time to see how we will use it. If we are faithful, he will at his coming give us that for which he has designed us. But if we do not appreciate this life, if we are not faithful in that which is least, what object could there be for him to give us that which is greatest, eternal life? None at all. If we do not gain that, our lives will have been spent in vain. The wicked will "be as though they had not been" (Obadiah 18), and so it can be said of them that they do not see life.

The great reason that we urge why men should accept the doctrine of conditional immortality is that it honors Christ. If we say that we possess immortality by nature, we deprive Christ of his highest honor. We virtually make ourselves independent of him. "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6:23. Now if we claim immortality as ours by birthright, we may not deny the first part of this text, but we do the second. We may admit that immortality is the gift of God; but we must honor the Son even as we honor the Father. We must also admit that it comes only through Christ.

Few people realize it, but it is a fact that the doctrine that men are by nature immortal is really a denial of Christ. If Christ came to give life, and we claim to have it without him, do we not thus cast him off? Spiritualists have carried the doctrine of inherent, unconditional immortality to its legitimate conclusion, and openly repudiate Christ as a Saviour. If we hold the same doctrine, what warrant have we that we will not go to the same lengths as they? The doctrine of conditional immortality is the only safeguard against Spiritualism. Can anyone say that it is not a practical doctrine?

Having learned that man is mortal and possesses no principle of immortality until the coming of the Lord and the resurrection, when he puts on immortality, we would naturally conclude that the dead are unconscious, extinct. And so the Bible represents them. Sleep is a common symbol of death. David says that when Michael stands up, "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." Dan. 12:2. Christ said when Lazarus was dead, "our friend Lazarus sleepeth." John 11:11-14. David prays the Lord to remember him lest he "sleep the sleep of death." Ps. 13:3. And Paul says of David after he had served his own generation, he "fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption." Acts 13:36. Sleep is thus defined by Webster: "A natural and healthy, but temporary and periodical, suspension of the functions of the organs of sense." Of the verb he says: "To take rest by a suspension of the voluntary exercise of the powers of the body and mind, an apathy of the organs of sense; to become unconscious." Sleep is a synonym for unconsciousness. When a man is in a perilous position and knows nothing of it, we say that he is asleep to his danger. So death, in order to be fitly represented by sleep must be a total suspension of the functions of the organs of sense, and of all the powers of body and mind. And such we shall find the Bible declares it to be.

The dead go to the grave. They are said to "sleep in the dust." It is a place to which both good and bad go. This of itself would prove that men do not go to Heaven at death. The following description of the place of the dead also shows that it is not Heaven: "A land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow

of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness." Job 10:22. It is the "land of forgetfulness." Ps. 88:12. It is from this place that the Lord will bring his faithful ones when he comes. Paul says concerning them that sleep: "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus shall God bring with him." 1 Thess. 4:14. This does not mean that he will bring them from Heaven, but from the grave. See John 5:28, 29. The apostle in verse 14 has not yet introduced the coming of the Lord from Heaven. He has simply spoken of the death and resurrection of Christ. It was God who "brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ" (Heb. 13:20), and if we believe in Jesus, he will bring us from the dead also, even as he did him.

But until the coming of the Lord, the dead remain in their graves, unconscious of passing the events. Read Solomon's statements concerning them in Eccl. 9:5, 6, 10. They "know not

583

anything." "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave." Even the prosperity or adversity of their best loved relatives, produces no emotion either of joy or sorrow. "His sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them." Job 14:21. The utter extinction of man in the grave is brought out in this fourteenth chapter of Job. If we cut a tree down, there will be enough life left in the stump to cause it to sprout again; "but man dieth, and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?" Verse 10. This is equivalent to saying that he has no existence. But this extension is not final; it lasts until a fixed time. "As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up; so man lieth down, and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." Verses 11, 12. We can here only refer to the texts which locate this time. Peter says (chap. 3:10) that in the day of the Lord the heavens shall pass away with a great noise. It is the voice of God, which at Sinai shook the earth, which is yet once more to sound, and shake the heavens. Heb. 12:26. And this voice is (the trump of God) that is to arouse the sleeping dead. So Job's words are equivalent to the statement that at death man becomes utterly extinct, and remain so until the coming of the Lord. E. J. W.

"Is a State Religion Contemplated?" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 37.

E. J. Waggoner

In the thirteenth chapter of Revelation two beasts are brought to view, representing two earthly powers. The first beast, having seven heads and ten horns, the body of a leopard, the feet of a bear, and the mouth of a lion, can be no other than the papal power, and so commentators have generally regarded it. It combines the characteristics of all the beasts of Dan. 7, showing that its dominion has extended over all of the territory occupied by the powers represented by those beasts, that is, nearly all of the Old World. It speaks great things and blasphemy; it blasphemeth God and his name; it makes war with the saints and overcomes them, and continues forty-two months, or twelve hundred and sixty years, when it goes into captivity. All of these specifications are met in the papal power, and in no other. Its going into captivity was in A. D. 1798, when

Pope Pius VI. was taken prisoner to France, and the papacy for two years had no head. This was indeed a deadly wound, which, however, in accordance with the prophecy, was healed by the enthronement of another pope, and the restoration of the papacy to at least the semblance of its former power.

Just at this time "another beast" was "coming up but of the earth." Since all of the Old World was already occupied, it is evident that we must look to the New World for the rise of this other power. In 1798, when the papacy went into captivity, the United States of America was just "coming up," and there was no other power then establishing itself. The first president had, at that time, barely completed his term of service, and the eyes of the world were being tuned to this new nation, which was so rapidly and yet unostentatiously arising to take its place among the foremost nations of the earth. Its peaceable, lamb-like appearance has always been preserved, and even the dragon voice (*i.e.*, the persecuting disposition) has been heard to a slight degree. If space allowed, we might go on to show many more reasons why this two-horned beast must represent the United States. This much we can say, that if this beast does not symbolize the United States, then there is one symbol of prophecy for which no place can be found.

This power is to make an image to the first beast. That beast, the papacy, was simply an ecclesiastico-civil power,-a union of church and State. The State existed to serve the ends of the church, and to enforce its dogmas. The church itself never put heretics to death; it simply decided who were heretics, and then handed them over to the civil power, over which the church had supreme control, to be punished. An image to that beast must be something like it-another union of church and State. All that is required to effect such a union is for the civil power to enforce, under penalty, some practice which the religious leaders declare ought to be observed. This is just what must be done in the United States, if we are correct in our application of the prophecy. And this is what Seventh-day Adventists have for thirty years declared would be done in this country.

It is well known that for about twenty years a party has been in existence, known as the "National Reform Party," whose avowed object is to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will "place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land." To show that this movement contemplates "sufficiently practical ends," the leaders make no secret of the fact that the observance of Sunday is one of the "Christian institutions" which they desire to see enforced by the laws of the State, declaring that when the desired amendment shall be obtained, no one who violates the Sunday shall be eligible to any office. They openly declare, also, that the State should exist only as the servant of the church, to carry out its decrees. When, therefore, a national Sunday law shall have become an actual fact, the image to be papal beast will be fairly set up in the United States.

The New York *Independent* has been very outspoken against such a movement as this. Although advocating the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath, it has deprecated any attempt to make such observance compulsory. We will quote from its pages to show that we are not alone in regarding legal enactments for the observance of Sunday as a union of church and State. The

reader will please bear in mind that in these quotations the word "Sabbath" is used for Sunday. In its issue of Dec. 14, 1882, in an article concerning "Sunday laws," the *Independent* said:-

"There is no doubt that much of the earlier Sabbath legislation of this country, the relics of which still remain to some extent in the law, and to a larger extent in the minds of some of the earnest advocates for the sanctity of the Sabbath, was based upon the principle of a State religion, and that Christianity, with its Sabbath, was that religion. This theory, however, has been thoroughly exploded by judicial decisions in later and wiser times; and it cannot stand a moment without surrendering the fundamental principles upon which the American governments are organized. The State has nothing to do with the Christian Sabbath as a religious day, except to protect from improper disturbance those who, on religious grounds, keep it as holy time. It has no right to pass to the breadth of a hair beyond this point, any more than it has to enact a doctrine of God or the Trinity, which the people shall believe. The moment the State exceeds protection, and undertakes the work of direction, it becomes a trespasser upon the rights of conscience, and assumes a function for which it is not adapted, and for which it has no warrant. The State has no right to compel a man to treat the first day of the week as 'holy time.' Whether he shall do so or not is for him to determine, and not for the State to determine for him."

To all of this we give our consent; we believe it is in accordance with sound reason and strict justice. In its next issue, that of Dec. 21, 1882, the *Independent* says further:-

"The State has nothing to do with Sunday as a purely religious day, or with the reasons which demand and enforce its observance as such a day. Its sole function is to regulate it as a rest day, and that, too, for reasons that apply equally to all the people, and not particularly to Christians, who keep it as 'holy time.' Christians have an unquestionable right so to keep the day, and by moral means to persuade others to keep it in the same way, and to be fully protected in so doing; but they have no right to demand that the State shall compel others to adopt either their creed or their practice in regard to the religious sanctity of the Sabbath. It should be enough for them if the State, for its own reasons, and not theirs as religionists, makes Sunday a rest day within the limits of a reasonable propriety. When they ask the State to do more, they virtually ask it to establish a *State religion*."

The *Independent* seems to be a little confused in this quotation, in that it says that the function of the State is to regulate Sunday as a rest day. But whatever it may mean by that statement, it is clear enough when it says that Christians have no right to ask the State to compel others to adopt either their *creed* or their *practice* in respect to the religious sanctity of the Sunday. So long as the State does not seek to compel us to adopt the *practice* of the majority of professed Christians in regard to Sunday, we care not how much it legislates concerning it. To say that the State has no right to compel anyone to adopt their *practice* in regard to Sunday, is equivalent to saying that it shall not *compel* anyone to rest on that day. In this it is correct, as it is also in the statement that such compulsion

would be the establishment of a State religion. Again, in its issue of Dec. 28, 1882, in an editorial on "The Sabbath and Railroads," it says:-

"We would resist to the very last any attempt to put the civil statute behind the Sabbath [Sunday] as a religious institution, since this cannot be done without involving in principle the whole doctrine of religion and State. It is, however, not less a duty

586

of the church, and of Christians in their individual capacity, to do what the State cannot properly do, and, therefore, should not do; and that is to enforce the Sabbath as a sacredly religious day, and by moral means, by example, and by precept."

With this we have no fault to find. We do not question the right of Christians, *as individuals*, to enforce the observance of Sunday by example and by precept, nor of anybody to keep the Sunday of their own free will. What we do protest against is a State religion,-the compelling of individuals to rest on Sunday against their will.

But since 1882 the *Independent* has undergone a radical change, and now approves what it once condemned. The issue of Aug. 28, 1884, contains an editorial on "The Working Man's Interest in the Day of Rest," in which it says that all legislation which *allows any work* to be performed on Sunday is a failure, and they move to deprive the laborer of his right. This wrong to the working man, it says, can be relieved by nothing but the religious observance of the day. From this article we quote a few paragraphs:-

"The net result [*i.e.*, of laws which *permit* any person to labor on Sunday] is to put more terror into toil, and to add so much more of burden to the existence of a class of people whose life is already hard enough, and who, without the powerful arm of the law and of social custom to protection, are unable to vindicate themselves.

"There is no secular nor semi-secular theory of the day that can meet this abuse. If it is handed over to the amusement, money-making enterprise will only lay itself out on that day in another way, and drive its wheels and push its methods so much the harder as the time is shorter.

"The only possible protection lies in *supporting by law* and by social observance the *religious character* of the day. In the name of religion a halt may be called, and the weary to be ended. Religion is rest in peace. It is still and recuperative to the body and mind. It keeps a people in their homes, and engages them in a wholesome thought, and it speaks in the name of an authority which is sacred enough to rise superior to the pressing claims and urgency of business."

It then states that the right of the laborer to his rest holds good for domestics, for coachmen and stable-boys, in the railway and the steamer, as well as in mills and manufactories, and says further:-

"It is a right on whose recognition the religious observance of Sunday depends. If Christian people will not consent to some sacrifice in matters like these, they cannot hope to retain the great boon to themselves and to the world

around them of a religious state. If they consider that price too high, they cannot have their jewel of a well-kept Sabbath."

The article closes with these words. "A religious Sunday gives the only hope a weary world can have a regular day of rest."

We do not give these quotations in order to take the *Independent* to task for its change of base; that is its own affair, not ours. But we give them to show how public sentiment is shaping. When the strongest opponent of the "National Reform" movement, the most influential popular religious journal of the country, favors that movement, it indicates no little progress toward the end sought by that party. That that end is in reality a union of church and State, no thinking person, least of all the *Independent*, can deny. The agents of the so-called Reform Party are not idle, and the prejudice which they have to overcome is only nominal. The friends of the Sunday feel that something must be done since there is no divine command for Sunday observance, nothing by which they can appeal to the conscience of the people, Sunday desecration is increasing rapidly. In their desperation they see no remedy but to adopt a plan which, as the *Independent* says, is the surrender of the fundamental principle upon which the American government is based .

The student of prophecy and of the signs of the times can see clearly that the time is near it hand when the people of the earth will respond with alacrity to the demand "that they should make an image to the beast which had the wound by the sword, and did live." When that time comes, may we be found among those who are heeding the command from Heaven, to "worship Him that made Heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." E. J. W.

October 9, 1884

"The Sabbath-School" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 38.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST OCT. 25

1. When King Hezekiah was sick, what message came to him from the Lord? Isa. 38:1.
2. When he received this message, what did he do? Verse 2.
3. How did he feel at the prospect of death? Verse 3.
4. In answer to his prayer, what did the Lord promise? Verse 5.
5. When he had recovered, what reason did he give for the sorrow he manifested? Verses 9, 10.
6. Of what did he say he was about to be deprived?
7. What do you conclude from that statement?
8. What further reason did Hezekiah give for his sorrow at the prospect of death? Verse 11.
9. Where does the Lord dwell? Ps. 11:4; 33:13, 14.
10. Then if Hezekiah had gone to Heaven, would he not have seen the Lord?

11. What had been the character of Hezekiah? Isa. 38:3; 2 Kings 18:1-6.
12. Then what must we conclude from his statement that if he died he should not see the Lord?
13. To what place had Hezekiah expected to go if his life was cut short? Isa. 38:10.
14. Was it simply his body that was about to go into the grave? Verse 17.
15. What did he give as the final reason for not desiring to die? Verse 18.
16. Who alone can praise the Lord? Verse 19.
17. How positively does David speak on this point? Ps. 150:17.
18. Why is it that men who have praised God all their lives cease to do so at death? Ps. 6:5.
19. Why do they so soon forget God? Ps. 146:3, 4.
20. If their thoughts perish, how much to the dead know? Eccl. 9:5.

The texts quoted in our lesson this week are so clear that scarcely any comment is needed. The interesting story of Hezekiah's sickness and recovery is presented to us, and certain doctrinal lessons are drawn therefrom. These cannot be misunderstood by any who study the text. We would notice, in the first place, the popular fallacy that peace of mind in view of death is a sure test of piety, and a token that all is well with the departing one. We are told concerning the wicked that "there are no bands in their death; but their strength is firm" (Ps. 73:4); and in the lesson we find that righteous Hezekiah "wept sore" when he heard that he must soon die. While all good persons do not express deep sorrow, as did Hezekiah, we have no example in the Bible of one who expressed anything like joy at the prospect of death. Without exception, the Bible writers looked upon death as something to be dreaded. It is represented as an enemy; and Solomon could find no better example of cruelty than the grave: "Cruel as the grave." Cant. 8:6. Why, then, should it not be feared?

The modern popular ideas of death are all upset by the statements of the Bible. We are taught that death is a friend, and that "'tis but the voice that Jesus sends to call us to his arms." If this were true, death would indeed be a friend; but it is positively false. Hezekiah's grief was entirely consistent with his previous upright and godly life, for, said he, "I shall not see the Lord, even the Lord, in the land of the living." "For the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth." Instead of death being the voice of Jesus, calling his loved ones to his arms, it is the cruel weapons of Satan, with which he seeks to destroy the human race, and deprive them of all happiness and good.

"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." Isa. 38:10. Even if it were true that good men go to Heaven as soon as they die, this language shows plainly that Hezekiah knew nothing of any such doctrine. He regarded death as the cutting off of his days, the deprivation of the residue of his years, and not a lengthening of his existence to all eternity. The language that he used is utterly inconsistent with the idea of continued existence after death.

Without doubt many whose attention is specially called to the chapter relating the story of Hezekiah's illness and recovery, will query in regard to the sign that

was given him by the Lord. We have no explanation to offer; we do not think that one is needed. There are some who think to rid the sign of the appearance of a miracle by saying that the shadow went backward on account of the extraordinary refraction of the sun's rays. They do not seem to think that this would also require miraculous interposition. For our part, it is no more difficult to believe that God could, if necessary, move the sun itself backward, than to believe that he could cause it to stand still, or created it in the beginning. We have no sympathy with that spirit which attempts to bring the acts of an infinite God within the comprehension of a finite mind. That which is necessary for us to understand, -our duty to God and our fellows, and the blessings promised to the obedient, are clearly set forth in the word. To these things we should give earnest and reverent heed, and pray the Lord to increase our faith. E. J. W.

"Seventh-Day Keepers and the Teaching of the Apostles" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 38.

E. J. Waggoner

The above is the heading of a short article which appeared in the *Advance* not long ago, and which a subscriber wishes us to notice, as it is being circulated quite extensively, and is considered by many to be a fatal blow to the teachings of Seventh-day Adventists. It is, perhaps, unnecessary to state that the "Teaching of the Apostles" does not refer to that found in the New Testament, but to a recently discovered document bearing that title. We will give the *Advance's* article entire, and then proceed to make such comments as may seem necessary. We will first say, however, by way of preface, that the number of Sabbath-keeping churches, ministers, and people, as given by the *Advance* is too small.

"The Seventh-day keepers in this country, composed of Adventists and Baptists, number 761 churches, 270 ministers, and 25,780 members; and they claim to be rapidly increasing. The Adventists are much larger body. The recently discovered 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles' will sooner or later weaken, or annihilate, the view that the seventh day is still the sacred one of the week. Its fourteenth chapter begins thus: 'But on the Lord's day do ye assemble and break bread, and give thanks, after confessing your transgressions, in order that your sacrifice may be pure.' This is a direction to observe the Lord's supper on the Lord's day. Was that day the seventh or the first day of the week? Much depends upon the answer. First, all must admit, according to Acts 20:7, that disciples at Troas, with the apostle Paul, assembled on the first day of the week to 'break bread,' to observe the Lord's supper; and that they chose the first day of the week out of the whole seven during which they were there together.

"Second, all admit, who know the case, that, according to Justin Martyr, a reliable witness, the Christians were accustomed to hold religious services and observe the Lord's supper, on Sunday of each week, which was the first day, called 'Sunday' by Justin, because that was the Roman name, and he was addressing the Roman Emperor and Senate.

"Two things, then, are fixed: First, that the primitive Christians of the apostolic age observed the Lord's supper on the first day of the week; second, it is fixed by

the 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles' that that first day was the 'Lord's day.' As a deduction, a third thing is fixed, that the apostle John, when he said he 'was in the spirit on the Lord's day,' meant that it was on the first day of the week. The day bearing the sacred name of the Lord Jesus was certainly the *sacred* day at that time. This all agrees with a great amount of other evidence, too much to be here presented. It all tends strongly to make keepers of the seventh change their observance to the first day, and to make keepers of the first day more confident of their position than heretofore."

But very little mention has been made in the SIGNS concerning this so-called "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," and we will therefore state a few facts in order that our readers may know the truth of the matter, and understand just how much effect it has on the teaching of Seventh-day Adventists. We are the more anxious to do this because the "Teaching" has been widely circulated, and has received an immense amount of attention from religious journals since its discovery. Indeed its discovery has created a great furor in the religious world. The New York *Independent* regard it as "by all odds the most important writing, exterior to the New Testament, now in the possession of the Christian world;" and many other journals and teachers regard it as inferior to the New Testament. It is very certain that since the "Teaching" was discovered, religious journals have devoted more attention to it than they commonly do to the Bible itself.

The document itself is a portion of a Greek manuscript that was discovered in the monastery of the Most Holy Sepulchre, in Constantinople, by Philotheos Bryennios, bishop of Nicomedia. Of course it is not claimed even by the most enthusiastic supporters of the "Teaching" that it was written by the apostles themselves. Learned men are divided in their opinion as to a date, some placing it as early as the beginning of the second century, and others claiming that it was composed no earlier than the third or fourth century. In the absence of any positive proof for a date, and to save controversy, we are willing to grant that it was written at the earliest date claimed for it, in the second century.

The first question that will now rise in the minds of many will be, "Why should we take this document as an exponent of the belief and teaching of the apostles, rather than the writings of the apostles themselves?" And such a question would be very pertinent. It seems far more reasonable that we should go to the well authenticated writings of the apostles, to find their doctrine, than that we should appeal to the production of some unknown writer who did not even live contemporaneously with them. If I wish to become acquainted with the teachings of John Wesley, I go to his own works, instead of taking up what some anonymous writer may have said concerning his doctrine. So we should go to the New Testament to ascertain what was the "teaching" of the apostles. The whole affair looks as though there was a case to be sustained that could not be sustained by an appeal to the real teaching of the apostles.

But before we proceed further to impeach a witness, we will hear his testimony. The fourteenth chapter entire is as follows:-

"Coming together on the Lord's day break bread and give thanks, confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. And let no one who has a dispute with his fellow approach with you until they be reconciled, lest your

sacrifice be profane, for this is the sacrifice spoken of by the Lord: In every place and time bring to me a clean sacrifice, for I am a great king said the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the nations."

It will be noticed that no clue is here given as to what day is referred to by the term "Lord's day." That most important matter is left out entirely. How, then, can this passage be made to do service in the Sunday cause? Easily enough; all that has to be done is to *assume* that the day here referred to is Sunday, and presto, the thing is accomplished, and we have "strong evidence" to prove that Sunday is the Sabbath. Concerning this assumption as made in the quotation from the *Advance*, we shall speak hereafter; we are at present dealing only with the "Teaching" itself.

Thus far, then, we have found that the so-called "Teaching," whether genuine or otherwise, affords not the slightest real testimony in favor of Sunday observance; the "evidence" has to be assumed. But this is not all. We have before us, not only the English translation of the "Teaching," but the Greek text itself. We therefore know whereof we affirm when we say that the word for "day," namely, *hemera*, does not once occur in the entire chapter. Neither is there any word corresponding to it, nor anything to indicate that the word "day" should be supplied. Why, then, was that word supplied by the translators? We leave the reader to answer that question to his own satisfaction. We have no fears, however, that any intelligent seventh-day keeper will change to the first day on the strength of so palpable and weak a forgery as this.

When the lawyer told the judge that he could give fifty good reasons for his client's absence from court, the first of which was that the man was dead, the judge decided that it was unnecessary to produce the other forty-nine. So we might leave the matter here, having shown that the "Teaching" cannot affect seventh-day keepers in the least, because it contains no hint concerning rest on any day of the week. But we wish to pay our respects to the document a little further, now that we are on the subject. Inasmuch, however, as it has not the slightest connection with seventh-day keepers

600

either to uphold or to contradict their teaching and practice, we shall drop the first part of our heading, and pursue the subject farther under the simple heading, "The Teaching of the Apostles." E. J. W.

October 16, 1884

"The 'Teaching of the Apostles'" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 39.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we found that "evidence" from this document in favor of Sunday-keeping proves to be no evidence at all, being nothing but a stupid forgery that is of itself indefinite. We wish to call the reader's attention still further to chapter fourteen of the "Teaching," in order to prove our statement made last week, that there is nothing in the passage which requires the insertion of the word "day." For this purpose we once more quote the chapter:-

"Coming together on the Lord's day break bread and give thanks, confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. And let no one who has a dispute with this fellow approach with you until they be reconciled, lest your sacrifice be profane, for this is the sacrifice spoken of by the Lord: In every place and time bring to me a clean sacrifice, for I am a great king said the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the nations."

Now if this document is to be accepted as embodying the correct teaching of the apostles, it must be accepted as a whole. As soon as we discriminate against any portion, as being incorrect, we throw discredit upon the whole. If the above references is to be taken as proof that the apostles observed the first day of the week, and thus mark out our duty for us, it also proves just as conclusively that they partook of the communion every Sunday, and that all Christians should do likewise. The fact that those who laud the "Teaching" the most highly do not follow its injunction in this respect, is proved that they do not attach any real value at all to the document. They will follow it just so far as it seems to support their preconceived opinion; and they find it very convenient to have even a forgery to which to appeal in support of the practices which they are determined to follow.

It will be asked, "If you throw out the term 'Lord's day,' what word or words should be supplied to make the sense complete?" Read the passage once more carefully, and you will see. Of what does it treat? Of the Lord's Supper, and that alone. And what is there in connection with that ordinance, of which it would be proper to say to any individual, "You must not approach it"? The table. And the Greek word for table agrees exactly with the adjective *kuriakeen*. Now read again: "Coming together to the Lord's table, break bread and give thanks, confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. And let no one who has a dispute with his fellow approach [the Lord's table] with you until they be reconciled." This makes the passage consistent with itself, and also in harmony with the *real* teaching of the apostles.

Thus much for the "Lord's day" evidence. It has vanished into nothingness. Having shown this conclusively, we will now state that even if the "Teaching" did contain the expression "Lord's day," and that many times repeated, and even if it expressly stated that Sunday was the Lord's day, and contained a positive command for its observance, it would have no effect whatever on seventh-day keepers, for the simple reason that such a command would conflict with the Bible. We will also say that we are very much surprised at the modesty of those who made the translation (?) from which we have quoted. It is a marvel to us why they did not make the "Teaching" state positively that the first day of the week is the Lord's day, and should be secretly kept. Such testimony as that would have had great weight with many, and could have been used very effectively to deceive the wary. If we are going to commit a forgery, we would do it in such a manner that it would count for as much as possible.

And now as to the authenticity of the document in question. Its surroundings and companionship are all against it. First, it was found in the Library of the Monastery of the Most Holy Sepulchre, in Constantinople. Not exactly on Catholic ground, but on that of a relative so near of kin as to merit the title of

sister rather than a daughter of the mother of harlots. A section for chapter eight will serve to show the proclivities of the unknown writer of this now famous document. It is as follows: "And let not your fasts be with the hypocrites, for they fast on the second day of the week and the fifth, but do you fast on the fourth and on the Friday." Now here is a plain command, and we are waiting to see how many of those who are almost willing to swear by the "Teaching" will obey it. As yet we have seen no indication of any such design on the part of any one. Nobody seems to have a special interest in this portion of the precious relic. And this again proves our statement that nobody really believes that the "Teaching" carries with it any weight of authority. It simply gives the modern Athenians something new to talk about, and a new chance to exercise their wits in finding excuses for not obeying the commandment of the Lord. It would be impossible to convince the religious world that they ought to fast on Wednesdays and Fridays; if such a thing were attempted, they would immediately ask for Scripture proof. And yet there is more reason for fasting regularly on those days, or even for keeping them holy, than there is for keeping Sunday. If we wish, we could show that the seventh day was regarded as the Sabbath by the one who wrote the "Teaching," but it is not worth the while; for even it would not make a seventh-day keepers one whit more confident in their position. We do not depend upon the words of a man, but upon those of God himself, and his Son Jesus Christ.

Nor does the supposed fact that the so-called "Teaching of the Apostles" is a product of the second century, add much to its value. The mystery of iniquity had begun its work of opposition to God, even while Paul was living (see 2 Thess. 2:3-7); and Peter warned the brethren that there should be false teachers among them, who privily would bring in damnable heresies. 2 Pet. 2:1. History bears record to the fulfillment of this prophecy. Mosheim, the learned church historian, after speaking of the mystical interpretations of the Bible, which prevailed quite largely even in the second century, says:-

"To this great error of the Christians may be added another, not indeed of equal extent, but a pernicious one, and productive of many evils. The Platonists and Pythagoreans deemed it not only lawful but commendable to deceive and to lie, for the sake of truth in piety. [!!] The Jews living in Egypt learned from them this sentiment, as appears from many proofs. And from both, this vice early spread to Christians. Of this no one will doubt who calls to mind the numerous *forgeries of books* under the names of eminent men, the Sibylline verses, and other similar trash, a large mass of which appeared in this and the following centuries. I do not say that the Orthodox Christians support all the books of this character; on the contrary, it is probable that the greater part of them originated from the founders of the Gnostic sects. Yet that the Christians who were free from heterodox views were not wholly free from this fault, is too clear to be denied."-*"Ecclesiastical History," Book I, Century II., Part II., chap. III., section 15.*

Thus it appears that they who place their confidence in a certain book, simply because it was written early in the Christian era, are depending upon something that is even worse than a blind guide. For even though the book contains nothing positively false, how much spiritual instruction can we expect to gain from the

writings of one who will lie for the sake of "truth in piety"? This practice grew more common in the latter centuries, and finally culminated in the establishment of the papacy, with all its abominable practices. Some of these forged documents contained the most errant nonsense, and well deserved the title which Dr. Mosheim has given to them,—"trash." Others were only slightly tinged with error.

The reason for these forgeries is easily seen. Obscure persons, in order to secure recognition for their productions, would credit them to some well-known and highly-esteemed person. Many of these documents, as has been said, contained nothing seriously wrong. The weak productions, which, if it had not been for the famous names appended to them, would have sunk into oblivion centuries ago. The "Teaching of the Apostles" is one of these. It is for the most part a poor paraphrase of Scripture precepts, with some human additions, modeled as nearly as possible after the style the Scriptures. The writer was no doubt an inoffensive sort of person, with no original ideas except a few vagaries, and whose worst fault consisted in labeling his platitudes the "Teaching of the Apostles." There have been far abler exponents of the apostles' doctrine and practice, who were a great deal more modest than he. Whether this little pamphlet was accepted as genuine at the time it was written, we have no means of knowing; it is not probable that it was by any; yet without doubt there were people then as well as now who were more willing to take their religion at second-hand than to search for themselves at the fountain head.

Next week we shall consider farther early writings in general, and the right of the "Teaching" to claim respectability, in view of the company in which was found.
E. J. W.

October 23, 1884

"The Sabbath-School" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST NOV. 9

1. Of what substance did God create man? Quote proof, and give reference.
2. What was given him to make him live?
3. In what part of man is this breath of life located?
4. When man's breath is taken away, what takes place? Job 34:14, 15.
5. What then becomes of the breath which causes him to live? Eccl. 12:7.
6. Is man the only creature that has this breath or spirit of life? Gen. 7:14, 15.
7. In what part of the beast is this breath placed? Gen. 7:21 22.
8. When God takes away their breath, what becomes of them? Ps. 104:29.
9. Is the breath of the man any different from that of the beast? Eccl. 3:19.
10. Of what are both beast and man composed? Verse 20.
11. In what do both classes alike return at death?
12. Is there any difference between a wise man and the fool in the matter of death? Ps. 49:10.

13. Does David agree with Solomon in saying that the death of man is the same as that of beasts? Verse 14.

14. If this is the case, what hope can a man have in life? Isa. 26:19; Job 19:25-27.

15. If there were to be no resurrection, would man be justified in living as the beast does? 1 Cor. 15:32.

16. Then in what does man have the pre-eminence above the beast?

17. Where do we find a graphic illustration of the resurrection? Eze. 37:1-12.

18. What did the prophet see? Verse 1.

19. Were the bones living? Verses 2, 3.

20. By what means did the Lord say he would cause them to live? Verses 5, 6.

21. When the prophet prophesied, what took place? Verses 7, 8.

22. When the bones, sinews, flesh, and skin were all in their proper place, what was still lacking? Verse 8.

23. What was the prophet next directed to say? Verse 9.

24. How were the bodies made to live? Verse 10.

25. Then for what purpose does God receive a man's breath or spirit of life when he dies?

In Gen. 2:7 we are told that "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." It does not say that a soul was put into man, whereby he might live, but that man himself *became* a dual being, composed of body and soul, and that the first was formed of the dust, but that the latter is pure spirit. Without entering into a discussion of the subject of the soul, what it is, we are warranted, by the text just quoted, in saying that whatever different elements combine to form "man," were made of the dust of the ground. When the catechisms tell us that man is composed of body, soul, and spirit, then they must also claim that all these were formed of the dust, for "man" was born of the dust. But the fact is, that which was formed of the dust was "man" before the breath or spirit of life was bestowed. He was a lifeless soul; but when the breath was given, man *became a living* soul.

This conclusion is verified by Job 34:14, 15. The patriarch, speaking of God, says: "If he set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." After the breath is taken away, then man turns again to dust. That this breath may be called a spirit is shown by Job 27:3, 4, quoted in last week's lesson: "All the while my breath is in me, and the spirit of God is in my nostrils; my lips shall not speak wickedness, nor my tongue utter deceit." Here the spirit (called the spirit of God, because it came from God) is said to be in the nostrils, and that, it will be remembered, is where God placed the breath of life, which is the same thing.

In the light of the above texts, we can readily understand Eccl. 12:7, where, after having spoken of death, the wise man says: "Then shall the dust return to the earth, as it was; and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." This is no more than a repetition of Job 34:14, 15: "If he [God] gather to himself his [man's] spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again to dust." Both texts teach simply this: that at death man returns to his original

elements; that which was born of the dust-the whole man-returns to the dust, and the spirit or breath, having come directly from God, returns to his keeping. There is no more reason for supposing that the spirit, as it returns to God, is conscious, than there is in supposing that the dust is conscious, or that the spirit was conscious before God bestowed it upon man, or that the breath, while in man's nostrils, was conscious. The dust of which man was formed was inanimate; man, after he was formed by the Creator, was inanimate, unconscious; and the spirit while yet in the hands of God was likewise without consciousness; but when the man and the spirit were brought together, conscious existence was the result. How this result was obtained is a secret known only to the Author of life.

This breath of life is something that man shares in common with the beasts. In the description of the flood we learn that every beast and creeping thing-"all in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died." Gen. 7:21, 22. It is not the possession of the breath or spirit of life that distinguishes man from the beast. In Ps. 104:28-30 we learn that their creation is effected by God sending forth his spirit, and that, as we learned concerning man, when he takes away their breath they die, and return to their dust. More than this, we are expressly told that there is no difference between the formation of man and lower animals, nor in the elements composing them. We read: "For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no preeminence above a beast: for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." Eccl 3:19, 20. This language is plain, and no apology is needed for it, because it is the language of inspiration. Let it be remembered that when the wise man says that a man has no pre-eminence above a beast, he is speaking of death. In that event all are alike. Here the parallel ends, for to man a resurrection is promised. In this life man has pre-eminence above the beast, because he is gifted with a moral nature, the faculty of distinguishing between right and wrong, and the power of loving the right because it is right. This the beast does not have. To all men a resurrection is promised, but not to beasts. If, however, it shall then appear that a part of mankind have died as do the beast, without regard to the future, they will die the second death, and then they will indeed be like the beasts that perish, for with that death their existence will forever end. Man's hope is in the resurrection; but he cannot have a well-grounded hope even in that, unless he seeks those things which are above.

Ezekiel 37:1-14 brings to view the literal resurrection of the dead. First the bones, sinews, muscles, and skin are arranged in proper order. At death these return to the earth, but now they are re-formed. There are the complete bodies; but there is no breath in them. They are just as Adam was before God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. But at the command of the Lord the breath comes into the inanimate bodies, and they stand upon their feet, an exceeding great army. Some choose to apply all this to the bringing of literal Israel from the Babylonian captivity, but such an interpretation is of their own choosing, and not by divine authority. God himself (verse 12) says that it is the bringing of his people out of their graves, and this takes place when the Lord comes. 1 Thess.

4:15-17; John 5:28, 29. And thus we learn that when the spirit-that which causes man to live-returns to God at the death of the man, it is that he may bestow it again at the resurrection, when man shall live *again*. E. J. W.

"The 'Teaching of the Apostles'" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

CHARACTER OF EARLY WRITINGS IN GENERAL

The admirers of this document have been led to put unlimited confidence in it, as a production fully equal to the New Testament, because the same manuscript in which it was bound contains the two epistles of Clement of Rome, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the epistles of Ignatius. We shall therefore devote a little attention to them to see if proximity to them materially enhances its value. But first we wish to show the general character of the writings ascribed to the early Fathers.

In the preceding article we quoted testimony from Mosheim, which showed that forgery, interpolations, and the palming off of spurious writings, were common practices even in the early part of the second century. So, then, however much credit for honesty and orthodoxy we may be inclined to give to the Fathers themselves, we cannot depend with any certainty on their perverted writings. It is impossible to distinguish the genuine from the false. But this need not cause us any concern, since they were not inspired, and, consequently, their testimony is of no more authority on any subject than that of anybody else. When we want information concerning the question of morals or of Christian duty, we must go to the Holy Scriptures-the inspired word of God. That alone is a sure guide.

In his "Ecclesiastical History," Book I., Cent. II., Part II., chap. III, sections 5 and 6, after having spoken of the works of several of the Fathers, among which he mentioned certain writings of Clement of Alexandria, Tatian, Justin Martyr, and Theophilus of Antioch, Dr. Mosheim says, "All these works are lost." He then continues:-

"But this loss is the less to be regretted, since it is certain that no one of these expositors could be pronounced a good interpreter. They all believed the language of Scripture to contain two meanings, the one obvious, and corresponding with the direct import of the words, the other recondite, and concealed under the words, like a nut in the shell; and neglecting the former, as being of little value, they bestowed their chief attention on the latter; that is, they were more intent on throwing obscurity over the sacred writings by the fictions of their own imaginations, than of searching out their true meaning."

In the next section he says: "It is therefore not strange that all sects of Christians can find in what are called 'the Fathers,' something to favor their own opinions and systems." And in section 8 of the same chapter, after having mentioned several other writers, among them Irenaeus and Tertullian, Mosheim says:-

"In these disputants there was something more of ingenuousness and good faith, than in those who undertook the support of truth in the following centuries. For the convenient wiles of sophistry, and the dishonorable artifices of debate, had not yet gained admittance among Christians. Yet a man of sound judgment, who has due regard for truth, cannot extol them highly. Most of them lacked discernment, knowledge, application, good arrangement, and force. They often advance very flimsy arguments, and such as are suited rather to embarrass the mind than to convince the understanding."

This is the character of the writings which contain the strongest arguments that can be found for the observance of Sunday. But we quote Mosheim once more. In the tenth section of the chapter above referred to, he states that learned men are not agreed as to the estimation in which these Fathers should be held, and says:-

"To us it appears that their writings contain many things excellent, well considered, and well calculated to enkindle pious emotions; and also many things unduly rigorous, and derived from the Academic and Stoic philosophy; *many things vague and indeterminate*; and *many things positively false*, and inconsistent with the precepts of Christ. If one deserves the title a bad master in morals, who has no just ideas of the proper boundaries and limitations of Christian duty, nor clear and distinct conceptions of the different virtues and vices, nor a perception of those general principles to which recurrence should be had in all discussions respecting Christian virtue, and therefore very often talks at random, and blunders and expanding the divine laws, though he may say many excellent things, and excite in us considerable emotion; then I can readily admit that in strict truth this title belongs to many of the Fathers."

Much more of this sort of testimony might be cited from Mosheim, who certainly cannot be called a prejudiced witness, but this is sufficient. And writers of this class are they whom we are asked to accept as authority for Sunday-keeping, and as competent expositors of the teaching of the apostles. We beg to be excused. When we can find no better authority for the observance of the day of rest, than they are, we will be our own authority. We cannot close this article with anything more to the point, and more worthy of general acceptance, than the following paragraph from "The Ancient Church," by Dr. Wm. Killen, professor of the Ecclesiastical History and Pastoral Theology to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. After having noticed the erroneous and absurd expositions of the Fathers, he says:-

"It would seem as if the great Head of the Church permitted these early writers to commit the grossest mistakes, and to propound the most foolish theories, for the express purpose of teaching us that we are not implicitly to follow their guidance. It might have been thought that authors who flourished on the borders of apostolic times, knew more of the mind of the Spirit than others who appeared in succeeding ages; but the truths of Scripture, like the phenomena of the visible creation, are equally intelligible to all generations. If we possess spiritual discernment, the trees and flowers will display the wisdom and the goodness of God as distinctly to us as they did to our first parents; and if we have the 'unction from the Holy One,' we may enter into the meaning of the

Scriptures as fully as did Justin Martyr or Irenaeus [and far more]. To assist us in the interpretation of the New Testament, we have at command a critical apparatus of which they were unable to avail themselves. Jehovah is jealous for the honor of his word, and he has inscribed in letters of light over the labors of its most ancient interpreters-'CEASE YE FROM MAN.' The 'opening of the Scriptures,' so as to exhibit their duty, their consistency, their purity, their wisdom, and their power, is the clearest proof that the commentator is possessed of 'the key of knowledge.' When tried by this task, Thomas Scott or Matthew Henry are better entitled to confidence than either Origen or Gregory Thaumaturgus. The Bible is its own safest expositor. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple."-*Period II., Section I., Chapter I., last paragraph.*

In our next article we shall notice the writings in whose immediate company the "Teaching" was found. E. J. W.

"What Constitutes a Christian?" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

A short time ago the Chinese of San Francisco had a grand celebration in honor of one of their gods. The *Chronicle* gave a full account of this heathen festival, and of the procession through the streets, which, with the idol at the head, was marked by all the gaudy display peculiar to the Chinese. The *Pacific* (Congregationalist) copies the *Chronicle's* report, and adds the following comment:-

"This is still called a Christian country, and there are still some who teach their children, 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me,' and 'Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image.' What do these boys and girls think as they see the regular sacrificial smoked hog carried in procession to the joss-house, and placed before the idol?"

We are glad for this testimony of the *Pacific* as to what makes one a Christian. Not because it is anything new, but because it is in harmony with the Bible. "This is still called a Christian country," it says. Why? Because parents still teach their children the commandments of God. A more direct and truthful statement of the case could not have been made. Let us see how well it is sustained by the Scriptures.

The definition of Christian as "one who believes the doctrine of Christ," will be accepted by all. He said, "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love." John 15:10. That these commandments are not something peculiar to Christ, and distinct from the Father's law, we learn from John 17:14, where Christ says to the Father, "I have given them thy word;" and again: "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." John 7:16; and yet again from John 6:38: "For I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." From these declarations we should understand that Christ came to declare the righteousness of God's law, and to enable men to obey it. In this he set the example, and

whosoever walks as he walked, *i.e.*, keeps the commandments of God, is a Christian.

This conclusion is verified by Christ's statement concerning the law, in the sermon on the mount. "Think not," he says, "that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be

633

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." Matt. 5:17-19. Some affect to understand from verse 19 that breakers of the law may gain an entrance into Heaven, but that they will occupy a low place; but that is not the meaning of the text. The true force of the verse is grasped by Dr. Clarke, who says:-

"He who by his mode of *acting, speaking, or explaining*, the words of God, sets the holy precept aside, or explains away its force or meaning, shall be called least-shall have *no place* in the kingdom of Christ here, nor in the kingdom of glory above. That this is the meaning of these words is evident enough from the following verse."

Christ, then, kept and taught the commandments and he expressly declares, what the *Pacific* implies, that none who do otherwise can be followers of him. "Why call ye the Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" Luke 7:46. Now read a few testimonies from the apostles. John says: "He that saith he abideth in Him, ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked." 1 John 2:6. Peter contrasts the frailty of man with the enduring nature of the word of God, saying that all flesh shall wither as the grass, "But the word of the Lord endureth forever." "And this," he says, "is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." 1 Pet. 1:25. The gospel, then, proclaims the righteousness and stability of God's law. How could it be otherwise? The gospel brings the good news of pardon for sin. But sin is the transgression of the law, and the very act of announcing a pardon bears witness to the existence of the law; for without the law there can be no transgression, and consequently no necessity for pardon. To offer a pardon to a man after the abolition of law which condemned him, would be an insult.

As the gospel of Christ preaches obedience to the law, so it carries with it that assistance which makes it possible for man to keep the law. Paul says: "For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh [it could not justify a sinner], God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness [requirement, or precept] of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Rom. 8:3, 4. All these witnesses agree that a Christian is one who follows Christ in obeying the commandments of God, using the strength which Christ bestows.

One more testimony we will add. Paul, as the representative of the Christian ministry, says: "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God. For

he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." 1 Cor. 5:20, 21. What is it to be made "the righteousness of God"? If "all *unrighteousness* is sin" (1 John 5:17), then *righteousness* is the exact opposite of sin; but "sin is the transgression of the law," and therefore righteousness is the keeping of the law. So then 2 Cor. 5:21 simply states that Christ's work was in order that we might be brought into perfect harmony with the law of God.

It is true that the *Pacific* did not mention the entire law as requisite to constitute one a Christian; it only mentioned the first and second precepts of the law. But we recall the Saviour's words, that "it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17. Also the words of James: "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." Jas. 2:11. The *Pacific* will, no doubt, readily admit that the keeping of these two commandments (the sixth and seventh) is as necessary to protect Christianity as is the keeping of the first and second. Very well, then we will try again: For he that said, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," and "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image," said also, "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." Now if thou make no graven image nor worship any false god, yet if thou labor on the seventh day, thou art become a transgressors of the law. The law being a unit, incapable of being divided, we cannot see why keeping and teaching the fourth commandment is not as necessary to constitute one a perfect Christian as is the keeping of the first or second. Will the *Pacific* accept this conclusion, and act accordingly? If not, why not? E. J. W.

October 30, 1884

"The Sabbath-School" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST NOV. 22

1. What is the meaning of the word "immortal"?
2. Quote three texts which prove positively that man is not immortal.
3. Who alone has immortality?
4. May man ever become immortal?
5. What must he do in order to receive immortality?
6. Can we earn immortality, or do we receive it as a gift? Give proof.
7. Where must we look for immortality?
8. Can you prove from the Bible that eternal life will not be given to the wicked?
9. For what purpose did Christ come to earth?
10. Who alone does Christ say have everlasting life?

11. In what sense do we have it now?
12. When shall we come into possession of it? Give proof.
13. In the Bible, by what figure are the dead often represented? Give instances.
14. In what place are they asleep?
15. Until what time do they sleep?
16. Is there any business carried on in the grave? Quote proof.
17. Do the dead know what their friends on earth are doing?
18. Do any of the dead praise the Lord?
19. State in Bible language just how much the dead do know.
20. At what point of time do men thus lose all consciousness?
21. From what does this breath of life come?
22. To whom does it return at death?
23. What is the difference, if any, between the breath of man and that a beast?
24. Of what is man composed?
25. To what does he return at death?
26. What is the difference between the death of man and that a beast?
27. Then what is it that makes a man's life so much more valuable than that of a beast?
28. Give two texts of Scripture that you have already learned, which prove that man can derive no benefit from praying to the Virgin Mary.

The lesson for this week being a review of the subject of immortality, it will be in place to make the notes of a general nature. From our previous study we have learned that the terms "immortal" and "immortality" do not occur in the Bible so frequently as is so commonly supposed. In hymns and sermons and essays we find such expressions as "immortal soul," "immortal spirit," "undying spirit," "death blessed soul," "the immortal part of man," etc., very frequently. In the Bible we look for them in vain. Query: If the Bible does not contain any of these expressions, by what authority do Christian teachers use them? Where are we to look for information concerning the nature of man? Shall we look to our own experience and observation? That would lead us to conclude that man is mortal, for we see death on all sides. We do not need the words of inspiration to convince us that man's life is "even a vapor, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away." Death and decay are the lot of all earthly beings. If we turn history, we find that such has ever been the case. The biographies of all men end with the statement, "And he died." Shall we go to the heathen authors? If we do we shall find them contradicting one another, one affirming that man has a principle within him that cannot be destroyed, another declaring that death ends all; and by this very diversity of opinion they proclaim their own ignorance of the subject. And yet these very heathen "philosophers" are the ones to whom Christianity is indebted for its dogma of inherit immortality.

It is indeed strange that professed followers of Christ should turn from the statements of "holy men of God," who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," to the conjectures of men who "when they knew God, glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their

foolish heart was darkened;" to those who, while professing themselves to be wise, became fools; who, because they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, were given over "to a mind void of judgment." Yet this is what is done. The words of Plato and Socrates are preferred above those of Job, Isaiah, David, Luke, Peter, and Paul. For when we turn to Holy Writ, where alone wisdom dwells, we find no record of "the immortal part of man," but perfect unanimity in declaring that "it is appointed unto man once to die," that there is no man that liveth that can deliver his soul from the hand of the grave, and that God only hath immortality.

If we look for the origin of the anti-scriptural doctrine of natural immortality, we find that it sprung from the mind of Satan, the father of lies. The archdeceiver said to the mother of the race: "Ye shall not surely die," but "ye shall be as gods," or, as God. The same trait that prompted the acceptance of this doctrine, has perpetuated it. Vanity, love of self, is that to which Satan has deceived the world. It was flattering to Eve's vanity to be told that she had the principles of life within herself, so that she could maintain her own existence as well as God can. It was for this reason that heathen philosophers seized upon the idea, and is largely for this reason that the Catholic Church adopted it from them. From the Catholic Church, Protestant bodies have received it as a sacred legacy. When we realize the practical effect of the doctrine-to make one self-confident, and regardless of God as the Author of life, and of Christ, as the one through whom it is vouchsafed to man, we can understand something of the far-reaching policy of Satan.

There are but a few Catholic abominations for which this dogma is not responsible. Out of it grew purgatory, and the sale of indulgences, by which the pope of Rome waxed rich at the expense of the purses and the morals of the people of Europe. Without that doctrine, the worship of so-called saints, and of the Virgin Mary, would find no place in the Catholic Church. And Spiritualism, that masterpiece of deception, would make no headway but for the prevalence of the belief that departed ones are not really dead. It is a fact that so long as Protestants hold to the doctrine of inherent immortality, they have no weapon with which to successfully meet the errors of Catholicism, or the deceptions of Spiritualism. But the unlearned peasant, who relies on the Bible as God's holy word, and who understands its simple and harmonious truths, may, with the help of God, withstand the assaults of learned prelates or blasphemous infidels. E. J. W.

"The 'Teaching of the Apostles'" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

COMPANY IN WHICH IT WAS FOUND

Last week we quoted some testimony to show the untrustworthy character of the writings ascribed to the Fathers in general; in this article we propose to examine the character of those particular writings whose reflected light add so much to the so-called "Teaching of the Apostles." These are the two epistles of

Clement of Rome, the "Epistle of Barnabas," and the "Epistles of Ignatius." The first in order is Clement of Rome. Of him Mosheim says:-

"Next after the apostles, Clement, bishop of Rome, obtained very high reputation as one of the writers of this century. The accounts we have at this day of his life, actions, and death, are for the most part uncertain. There are still extant two epistles to the Corinthians, bearing his name, written in Greek; of these, it is generally supposed that the first is genuine, and that the second is falsely palmed upon the holy man by some deceiver. Yet even the first epistle seems to have been corrupted by some indiscrete person, who was sorry to see no more marks of erudition and genius in the works of so great a man."-*Eccl. Hist. Book I., Cent. I, Part II, chap. III, section 18.*

Of one of the epistles of Clement, Neander says:-

"This letter, although, on a whole, genuine, is, nevertheless, not free from important interpolations."-*Rose's Neander, p. 408.*

It will be remembered that "the two epistles of Clement" are included in the manuscript which contains the "Teaching." M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia says of the writings of Clement:-

"The only genuine document in his Epistle to the Corinthians, commonly called the first, but improperly, since the so-called second epistle is not his, and is not an epistle, but only the fragment of a homily, later, perhaps, by nearly a hundred years."

We quote one more testimony concerning Clement. The "Religious Encyclopedia" of Herzog, edited by Schaff, says:-

"Clemens Romanus, one of the most celebrated names of Christian antiquity, but so overgrown with myths that it has become next to impossible to lay bare the historical facts which it represents, occurs in all lists of the first Roman bishops, but not always in the same place. . . . Of the numerous writings which bear the name of Clement, most are evidently spurious. . . . The first epistle is an official missive from the Roman congregation to the Corinthian, occasioned by some dissensions which had arisen in the latter. As it was written in the name of the whole congregation, *it bears no author's name.* . . . The second epistle is not an epistle at all, but a homily; and, as is the oldest existing sermon, it is, of course, of great interest. Where, at what time, and by whom it was written, are questions of great difficulty; and of the many hypotheses which have been offered as answers, none have proved fully satisfactory."

This little item is, however, conveniently forgotten by those who wish to pile up all the "evidence" possible in favor of the genuineness and authenticity of the "Teaching." For our part, it is impossible to see why the "Teaching" should be considered any the more reliable because it is in the same manuscript with the "two epistles of Clement," when one of those epistles was not written by Clement, and the other, if written by him, has been grossly tampered with.

We now come to the so-called epistle Barnabas. It will not take as long to find out the little that is known of this writing. Mosheim says:-

"The epistle of Barnabas, as it is called, was, in my judgment, the production of some Jewish Christian who lived in this century [the first], or the next, who had no bad intentions, but who possessed little genius, and was infected with the

fabulous opinions of the Jews. He was clearly a different man from the Barnabas, the companion of St. Paul."-*Book I, Cent. I, Part II, chap. II, section 18.*

The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia says of this epistle:-

"The opinion to-day is that Barnabas was not the author. The epistle was probably written in Alexandria, at the beginning of the second century, and by a Gentile Christian."

Dr. Killen, in "The Ancient Church," says:-

"The tract known as the epistle of Barnabas was probably composed in A. D. 135. It is the production apparently of a convert from Judaism who took special pleasure in allegorical interpretations of Scripture."-*P. 367.*

M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopeda says:-

"An epistle has come down to us bearing the name of Barnabas, but clearly not written by him. . . . The writer evidently was unacquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures, and has committed a blunder of supposing that Abraham was familiar with the Greek alphabet some centuries before it existed."

And, finally, Dr. Kitto, in his "Cyclopedia of Religious Literature," says of the writer of this tract that:-

"He makes unauthorized additions to various parts of the Jewish Cultus; that his views of the old economy are confused and erroneous; and that he adopts a mode of interpretation countenanced by none of the inspired writers, and at variance with every principle of sound criticism, being to the last degree puerile and absurd. The inference is unavoidable, that Barnabas, 'the son of prophecy,' 'the man full of the Holy Spirit and of faith,' was not the author of this epistle."

We now turn to the epistles of Ignatius. To save space, we will quote from only two authors. Mosheim says:-

"A regard for truth requires it to be acknowledged that so considerable a degree of obscurity hangs over the question respecting the authenticity of not only a part, but the whole of the epistles ascribed to Ignatius, as to render it all together a case of much intricacy and doubt."-*"Historical Commentaries," Vol. I, Cent. I. Section 52.*

We have before quoted from Dr. W. D. Killen, Professor of the Ecclesiastical History and Pastoral Theology to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. In his book, "The Ancient Church," he devotes two chapters to the so-called epistles of Ignatius, considering at length the testimony for and against their genuineness. In his preface he says:-

"If we accredit these documents, the history of the early church is thrown into a state of hopeless confusion; and men, taught and honored by the apostles themselves, must have inculcated the most dangerous errors. But if their claims vanish when touched by the wand of truthful criticism, many clouds which have hitherto darkened the ecclesiastical horizon disappear, and the progress of corruption can be traced on scientific principles. The special attention of all interested in the Ignatian controversy is invited to the two chapters of this work in which the subject is investigated. Evidence is there produced to prove that these Ignatian letters, even as edited by the very learned and laborious Dr. Cureton, are utterly spurious, and that they should be swept away from among the genuine remains of early church literature with the besom of scorn."

In chapter 3 of section 2, first paragraph, the history of the Ignatian epistles is stated so clearly that we quote it entire. He says:-

"The history of the Ignatian epistles may well remind us of the story of the Sibylline Books. A female in strange attire is said to have appeared before Tarquin of Rome, offering to sell nine manuscripts which she had in her possession; but the king, discouraged by the price, declined the application. The woman withdrew, destroyed the one-third of her literary treasures, and, returning again into the royal presence, demanded the same price for what were left. The monarch once more refused her terms; and the mysterious visitor retired again, and burnt up the one-half of her remaining store. Her extraordinary conduct excited much astonishment, and, on consulting with his augurs, Tarquin was informed that the documents which she had at her disposal were most valuable, and that he should by all means endeavor to secure such a price. The king now willingly paid for the three books not yet committed to the flames, the full price originally demanded for all the manuscript. The Ignatian epistles have experienced something like the fate of those Sibylline oracles. In the sixteenth century, fifteen letters were brought out from beneath the mantle of a hoary antiquity, and offered to the world as the productions of the pastor of Antioch. Scholars refused receive them on the terms required, and forthwith eight of them were admitted to be forgeries. In the seventeenth century, the seven remaining letters, in a somewhat altered report, again came forth from obscurity, and claimed to be the works of Ignatius. Again, discerning critics refused to acknowledge their pretensions; but curiosity was aroused by this second apparition, and many expressed an earnest desire to obtain a sight of the real epistles. Greece, Syria Palestine, and Egypt were ransacked in search of them, and at length three letters are found. The discovery creates general congratulation; it is confessed that four of the epistles, so lately asserted to be genuine, are apocryphal; and it is boldly said that the three now forthcoming are above challenge. But truth still refuses to be compromised, and still disowns these claimants for her approbation. The internal evidence of these three epistles abundantly attest that, like the last three books of the Sibl. they are only the last shifts of a grave imposture."

Comment on the testimony here quoted must be reserved for another article. These quotations should be borne in mind by the reader. They are valuable, and should be preserved by all who are interested in the Sabbath controversy, and who have not access to the original sources of information. E. J. W.

"The Mission of Christ" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. In previous numbers of the SIGNS, we considered briefly the subject of eternal life-that which those have who believe in Christ. We learn that eternal life is the gift of God through Jesus Christ (Rom. 6:23), and that therefore none can ever possess it unless they have the Son. John 3:36. The question now arises,

"What shall those have who do not believe in Christ?" In this article, and succeeding ones, we shall seek a Bible answer to this question. An understanding of this subject is necessary, not merely that we made be driven to Christ through fear of the consequences of unbelief, but that we may have a proper appreciation of the love of God. We cannot praise God, and his love to us as manifested in Christ, as we ought, unless we understand, as far as our finite minds are capable of understanding, that from which his love rescues us.

In the first place, we notice that their condition is different from that of believers in Christ. This has already been shown. Christ said to the unbelieving Jews, "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." John 5:40. The obvious meaning is that they had not life, and could not have it without coming to him, and accepting him as their Saviour. From John 3:17 some would argue that all mankind will be saved, because Christ said "For God sent not this Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might have life." Such a conclusion shows the folly of basing a theory on a single text, regardless of other texts or the context. The eighteenth verse explains the seventeenth. "He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is *condemned already*, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." Now we know why God did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world. That would have been an unnecessary proceeding. The world was condemned already. His mission was to save as many as possible from a lost world. "God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Rom. 5:8. The tenth verse of this chapter shows that being sinners is equivalent to being enemies; and that is why the world was condemned, because all have sinned.

God sent his Son "that the world through him might be saved;" there was opportunity for all the world to be saved if they would, but they must comply with the condition,-believe on Christ. And

650

now what is to become of those who do not accept this condition? The verse quoted at the beginning of this article tells us: "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." From this we learn that if God had not sent his Son, the whole world would have perished; and since the condition of salvation is belief in Christ, it necessarily follows that those who do not believe in him will perish; they will accept nothing from Christ, and therefore they receive the same doom that they would if he had not come.

In the passage under consideration (John 3:16-18), there are two classes brought to view, believers and unbelievers. The first class receive the reward of eternal life, the second class are left to perish. Now since these two classes are directly opposite in character, it must follow that to perish is the exact opposite of eternal life. The opposite of life is death, and the opposite of eternal life is eternal death. That death is what unbelievers receive, we learn from Rom. 6:23: "The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

In Rom. 5:12 we learn how the whole world came to be in this state of condemnation, on account of which they would all perish if it were not for Christ. Paul says: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned;" etc. Adam was the one man by whom sin entered into the world. The stream, unassisted, cannot rise higher than the fountain, and therefore Adam's posterity are necessarily born into a state of sin. When Adam sinned, God looked down the ages and saw a whole human race in a state of rebellion, and, consequently, of condemnation; and then it was that his great love was manifested, in giving his only begotten Son to die for a rebellious world. Since the sentence pronounced upon Adam extended to the whole human race, we will turn and examine it.

In Gen. 2:15-17 we learn that God placed Adam in Eden to dress it and to keep it, giving him permission to eat freely of the fruit of every tree, with one exception. Concerning that the Lord said: "But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." There has been much bewildering comment on this verse, the conclusion usually being that the death here threatened was threefold, viz., "death spiritual, death temporal, and death eternal." But as in the giving of the law, so also in pronouncing the penalty for its violation, the words must be understood in "their usual and most known signification." When the words of a law or of a penalty are such as are in common use, no one is justified in placing any construction upon them. Now the term "die" in the text is unqualified, and it must therefore mean simple death. It cannot mean *spiritual* death for the following reasons: 1. Nothing is said about any such kind of death. 2. According to the commonly accepted meaning of spiritual death—a state of sin—the act of eating the forbidden fruit would have been spiritual death; and consequently the penalty pronounced upon Adam for a certain act would have been the condition of the act prohibited! But the penalty was not the act itself, but something that should follow that act. Either could mean *temporal* death, *i.e.*, death for a time; for that would be equivalent to a pardon before the sin was committed, which would be absurd. As before stated, the penalty was simply *death*.

Right here we are met with an objection. Says the objector: "You cannot take the words of the penalty in their exact literal signification, because they read thus: '*In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,*' and the record says that Adam lived nine hundred years." Still we say that the penalty means just what it says. If it does not, then Adam had no means of knowing what would be the penalty if he should sin. The objection arises from the erroneous supposition that the sentence has been carried into effect. Those who make it seem to forget the words of Christ, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." If God had not so loved the world, the sentence would have been executed, Adam would have died that very day, and we, his posterity, would never have existed. It was not Adam all alone whom God loved, but the whole race whom he had created in him. On account of this great love, the execution of the sentence was stayed, and man was granted another trial. The plan of salvation was devised, and Christ agreed to take the sins of the world upon himself, and rescue man

from his lost condition. Bear in mind the fact that God did not revoke the penalty; he merely stayed its execution, in order to give men a chance to accept the conditions of pardon. If none of Adam's race should accept these conditions then they would all suffer the penalty threatened to him; if a few accept the conditions, then they alone escape the threat of doom. And so when we read that Christ was given that whosoever believeth in him should *not perish*, we understand that the original penalty announced to Adam was that he should perish. "To perish" signifies, "to be destroyed; to go to destruction; to come to nothing; to be blotted from existence." That this will be the doom of all who disregard the love and mercy of God in Christ Jesus, is fully borne out by the Scriptures, as we shall see.

It may not be out of place to briefly consider the marginal reading of Gen. 2:17: "Dying thou shalt die." By some this is supposed to afford an answer to the objection that Adam did not immediately die and that therefore the words of the penalty cannot be taken literally. From this marginal reading they gather that the penalty threatened was that the seeds of death, as it is expressed, would be sown in Adam as soon as he sinned, or, in other words, that he would become mortal, and would eventually die. But this does not help the matter at all; for if we substitute "thou shall die," for, "thou shalt surely die," we are still shut up to the fact that this was to occur "*in the day* that thou eatest thereof." The truth is that the marginal reading does not express to us the meaning of the original so correctly as to the words of the text, "Thou shalt *surely* die." It is a construction that often occurs in the original, when emphasis is required. It is used in Gen. 2:16: "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest free eat." The marginal reading is, "eating thou shalt eat." This does not mean that he should begin to eat and continue to eat until the act of eating should be consummated, but was an emphatic permission to Adam to eat.

The same construction is used in Ex. 3:7, where the Lord says, "I have surely seen the affliction of my people." Had our translators done as they did in Gen. 2:16, 17, they would have placed in the margin, "Seeing I have seen." Then, according to the interpretation given to the marginal reading of Gen. 2:17, it would mean that God began to see, and continue to see, until finally he saw. This would make nonsense of the text, yet it would be as legitimate an interpretation as the other. The expression is simply an emphatic statement that God had seen the affliction of his people; and Stephen, in his discourse (Acts 7:34), marks this emphasis by the repetition of the statement: "I have seen, I have seen." So the statement in Gen. 2:17 did not mean that man should begin to die and continue to die until he should finally be dead, but it was an explicit and emphatic declaration that death should immediately follow his sin. If we should translate this passages as Stephen did the similar construction in Ex. 3:7, it would read: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt die thou shalt die." This would well express the meaning. A parallel to this emphatic declaration of the death penalty is sometimes heard in human courts.

"Thou shalt *surely die*." This penalty was unequivocal and unconditional. But for the merciful forbearance of God, and his love as manifested in the promised

sacrifice of Christ, the human race would have been blotted from existence, in Adam.

With have now found how man incurred the wrath of God; and in succeeding articles we shall learn more fully how that wrath will be manifested to all who do not flee to the refuge offered. The consideration of the words spoken to Adam after he had sinned: "Dust thou art, and not the dust shalt thou return," must be deferred until we have finished this subject now before us. E. J. W.

November 6, 1884

"The Sabbath-School" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST NOV. 29

1. What do the afflictions of this life work for us? 2 Cor. 4:17.
2. Under what means do we behold unseen things? Heb. 11:1.
3. By what means do we behold unseen things? Heb. 11:1.
4. While looking (by faith) at unseen things, of what are we assured? 2 Cor. 5:1.
5. What is meant by "our earthly house of this tabernacle" being dissolved? Compare 2 Pet. 1:13, 14 with John 21:18, 19.
6. What does Paul say that we earnestly desire while in this earthly tabernacle? 2 Cor. 5:2.
7. Why do we desire to be "clothed upon"? 2 Cor. 5:4.
8. Then to what is being "clothed upon with our house which is from heaven" equivalent?
9. What do these two "houses" represent? 1 Cor. 15:44.
10. Which of these is first? 1 Cor. 15:46.
11. When is the spiritual body bestowed? 1 Cor. 15:42-44.
12. Whence does this spiritual body come? 1 Cor. 15:49.
13. When is it that corruption puts on incorruption, and mortality puts on immortality? 1 Cor. 15:42, 51-53.
14. Then when is it that mortality shall be "swallowed up of life"?
15. And to what is this equivalent? 2 Cor. 5:4.
16. Who hath wrought us for this thing? Verse 15.
17. What is it for which God hath wrought us?
18. As a pledge of immortality, what does he now give to us? Verse 5.
19. If when this earthly house is dissolved, and we are "clothed up" with our heavenly house, mortality is swallowed up of life, what opposite conditions do the two houses represent?
20. Then in what condition are we while in this earthly body?
21. And while "at home in the body," from whom are we absent? Verse 6.
22. When is it that we shall be with the Lord? 1 Thess. 4:16, 17.
23. And what do we "put on" at that time? 1 Cor. 15:21-54; 2 Cor. 5:2-4.

24. Since that is the dissolving of this present body, and we are not "clothed upon" with our spiritual body till the resurrection, in what condition are we between death and the resurrection? 2 Cor. 5:4.

25. But is that a desirable state?

26. What do we desire rather than this? 2 Cor. 5:8.

27. Quote the three texts to prove that we can be "present with the Lord" only at his second coming.

In the portion of Scripture covered by this lesson the apostle sets before us the grounds for hope. The matter what we may be called upon to suffer, we are to be of good courage, and trust in the Lord; for this is what is meant by 2 Cor. 4:16: "But though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day-by-day." In the next verse he tells us why he is thus hopeful: "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." Surely if we believe this, we could, with the apostle, "glory in tribulation."

It is not, however, for every one, nor under all circumstances, that afflictions accomplish this result. It is not to all that afflictions seem light. Each person is inclined to feel that his own trials are the most severe of any; but certainly there are none that have to endure more than Paul did. Now what was the means by which he lightened them? "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." And thus it is that everybody can make their own trials light or heavy, just as they please. If they choose to look only at the present time, and think of their trials, they will appear enormous; but if they looked at eternal things—the world to come, and its joys—earthly sorrows will be entirely lost sight of. Who would not endure a moment of pain to secure a year's pleasure? If during an entire year we should suffer pain but a single second, would that instant of pain be remembered? Certainly not; it would not attract our attention. Well, a second of time is infinitely greater in comparison with a year, than a life-time is in comparison with the eternity. So, then, if our entire life were filled with pain, it would not be remembered in eternity. Now in order to get the benefit of this comparison *now*, and make our present afflictions seem light, we have only to transport ourselves, by faith, to the eternal world, looking so steadfastly at it that what it has to offer appears real to us. Christians are to live not alone in the present, but in the future—"for we walk by faith, not by sight."

But what is that unseen thing at which we look, that affords this hope? The first verse of chapter 5 gives the answer: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." This verse gives the answer in full; the remaining verses are devoted to enlarging upon and explaining this point. The question to be solved, then, is, What are these two houses? and when are they occupied?

There can be no question but that by the dissolution, of this tabernacle the apostle refers to death. Peter uses the same expression in referring to his decease. 2 Pet. 1:13-15. The fourth verse, being partially a repetition of verse 2,

affords data for determining when the second house is bestowed. "For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." Thus we see that when we are clothed upon with our heavenly house, immortality is bestowed, or, still better, that the being "clothed upon with our house which is from heaven" is the same as the putting on of immortality. We have already learned (1 Cor. 15:51-54) that immortality is given only when the Lord comes; so we conclude that this heavenly house is not received at death. This will appear still more plainly hereafter.

By referring to the 15th of 1 Corinthians, we find still more about these two "houses." In the forty-fourth verse we learn that there are two bodies, a natural body and the spiritual body. These bodies do not exist at the same time, but the first is the natural body, "and afterward that which is spiritual." Verse 46. Verse 49 tells us that this spiritual body is heavenly, thus more fully identifying it with "our house which is from heaven." And now from verses 42-44 we learn that this spiritual, heavenly body is given at the resurrection: "So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonour; 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." Thus we find that the two houses are the natural and the spiritual body; that the spiritual body is given at the resurrection, which is at the coming of the Lord; and that this receiving of the spiritual body, or "putting on immortality," is the same as mortality being 'swallowed up of life.'

But what about the state of death? What house do we occupy then? None at all. Our condition at that time is represented by the term "unclothed." While we are in this house-this mortal body-we groan, "earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven." In Rom. 8:23 Paul says that that for which we groan is "The redemption of our body," thus proving what we have already learned, that the heavenly house is the putting on of immortality. "If so be dead been clothed we shall not be found naked." 2 Cor. 5:3. Now if this earthly house is dissolved at death-which none will deny-and the heavenly house is given only at the resurrection, it must be that there is a time of being unclothed. But this was not what Paul desired; it is not for which we groan. Death is not given as the object of desire. We groan with the burden of mortality, not that we desire death to rid us of the cares of this life, but desiring that mortality shall be swallowed up of life. Because we do not desire to be thus unclothed, however, is no sign that that may not be our lot. But "we shall not all sleep;" some will be living when the Lord comes, and they will change mortality for immortality "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye.'

Mortality and immortality are then the two houses-the one earthly, and temporal; the other heavenly, and eternal. Now while we are in the first state we are absent from the Lord; for it is only when Christ comes, and immortality is bestowed, that we shall be "forever with the Lord." And since this is the case, we are not only willing to be absent from this mortal state, and be present with the Lord, but that is the thing for which we groan. Our confidence rests in the fact that God has created us for this self same thing; he designs that we shall have

immortality, and to assure us that it will be given, he has given unto us the earnest of his Spirit. So long as we have that, we are sure of our future, immortal inheritance. And our faith in God's promise brings that inheritance so near, and makes it so real, that, in spite of present tribulation, we may be always "rejoicing in hope." E. J. W.

"Everlasting Fire" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we considered the condition of the world without Christ, the state from which Christ saves those who believe in him, and which unbelievers are to receive. It was bound to be *perdition*-the exact opposite of life eternal. In our further investigation of this subject, in order that doubts may not embarrass the mind of any, we will first consider those texts that are supposed to teach just the opposite of what we have found to be the case. And first, we will say that it is not a subject on which philosophy or mere human reason can throw light. We can know nothing about it, except what we learn from the Bible. It is not for man to say what God will or will not do. Believing that the Judge of all the earth will do right, we must prepare our minds to accept what his word says concerning the fate of those who rebel against his Government. If we should find that they are to be kept alive through eternity, suffering infinite torture, we are bound to accept that view, even though it is repugnant to our ideas of justice. And so, also, if we find, as we have already, that they are to perish, *i.e.*, be blotted from existence, then we must accept that view, however contrary it may be to our previous instruction.

We have said that there are, and will be at the end of the world, but two classes-believers and nonbelievers, or righteous and wicked. In the twenty-fifth of Matthew these two classes are brought to view. The King is represented as separating the two classes, setting the righteous on his right hand and the wicked on his left. "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Verse 34. This disposes of the righteous; they then receive the reward of eternal life. The time will then have come for the saints to "take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever." Dan. 7:18. But what of the wicked? "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Matt. 25:41.

Does the fact that the wicked are to go into "everlasting" fire, prove that they will live and be tormented to all eternity? We will not presume to decide without an examination of the Scriptures. Let the Bible be its own interpreter. In the seventh of Jude we read that "Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of *eternal* fire." The reference will be understood by all. On account of the wickedness of the cities of the plain, God rained down fire from heaven upon them, and their fate,-"suffering

the vengeance of the eternal fire,"-is given as an example and warning to other evil-doers.

Now must we understand, because those cities suffered the vengeance of "eternal fire," that they are therefore now in existence, and will be eternal? Turn to 2 Pet. 2:6, and read: "And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha into ashes condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly." What was the result of that eternal fire? The cities upon which it fell were turned to ashes. And Jeremiah shows that, instead of its requiring an eternity for eternal fire to accomplish its work, it takes but a short time. He says: "For the punishment of the iniquity of the daughter of my people is greater than the punishment of the sin of Sodom, that was overthrown as in a moment, and no hands stayed on her." Lam. 4:6. Now if the cities were "overthrown," and turned to ashes, then the fire must have long ago ceased to burn. And this is the case, for the waters of the Dead Sea now roll where those cities once stood. The "eternal fire" in that case did not burn to all eternity. If that was so in one instance, it may be in another.

We have seen (Matt. 25:41) that fire is to be the means by which the wicked are punished. What will be the result of this fire? Read Mal. 4:1, 3, and we shall see: "For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." "And ye shall tread down the wicked; for *they shall be ashes* under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts." So we see that this "eternal fire," into which the wicked are to go, like that which fell upon the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, will turn into ashes. That seems reasonable enough. Fire always turns to ashes that which is thrown into it, if that thing be combustible; and in this case we are told that the wicked "shall be stubble." Why should they not be ashes when the fire has done its work?

On Jude 7, Dr. Barnes has the following comment:-

"The phrase 'eternal fire' is one that is often used to denote future punishment-as expressing the severity of the intensity of the suffering. As here used, it cannot mean that the fires which consumed Sodom and Gomorrah were literally eternal, or were kept always burning, for that was not true. The expression seems to denote, in this connection, two things: (1) That the destruction of the cities of the plain, with their inhabitants, was as entire and perpetual as *if* the fires had been always burning-the consumption was absolute and enduring-the sinners were wholly cut off, and the cities forever rendered desolate; and (2) That in its nature and duration this was a striking emblem of the destruction which will come upon the ungodly."

But does the Bible also say that the fire into which the wicked are to be cast shall not be quenched? It certainly does; let us read: "And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched. Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Mark 9:43, 44; also verses 45-48. We would not in the least evade the full force of this text; we believe in it, and yet we still hold that the wicked are to become ashes, and cease to be. Let us see if we

cannot also find an instance of unquenchable fire that has already existed and ceased to be. In the seventeenth chapter of Jeremiah, the Lord, by his prophets, warned his people against the sin of Sabbath-breaking. He told them that if they would keep the Sabbath according to his commandment, their city, Jerusalem, should stand for ever. "But," said he, "if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath day, and not to bear a burden, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and *it shall not be quenched*." Jer. 17:27. But the Jews did not heed this warning; they continued to violate the Sabbath, and the Lord brought upon them that which he had threatened. Read what is said of it:-

"And the Lord God of their fathers sent to them by his messengers, rising up betimes, and sending; because he had compassion on his people, and on his dwelling-place; but they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, and misused his prophets, until the wrath of the Lord arose against his people, till there was no remedy. Therefore he brought upon them the king of the Chaldees, who slew their young men with the sword in the house of their sanctuary; . . . and they burnt the house of God, and brake down the wall of Jerusalem, and burnt all the palaces thereof with fire, and destroyed all the goodly vessels thereof. . . . To fulfil the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah." 2 Chron. 36:15-21.

Here we see that as the result of that fire that was not to be quenched, the palaces were *burned*, and the vessels were *destroyed*. Is the fire burning in yet? Certainly not. Are the palaces and walls still in existence? No; the fire made an end of them. But suppose the fire that was kindled in the gates of Jerusalem had been quenched; what would have been the result? Why, the walls and palaces would not have been *devoured*, as Jeremiah had said they should.

Take a common occurrence. A fire breaks out in a city. The wind fans the flames so that every effort to extinguish them is in vain. The next day the papers say that certain blocks of buildings were burned to ashes. Why was it? Because the fire *could not be quenched*. If it could have been, the buildings would have been preserved. But does the fire still continue to burn? No; it went out as soon as the buildings were consumed. There was nothing then for it to feed upon, and it died.

Now what did we read in Malachi that the fate of the wicked shall be? "They shall *be ashes* under the soles of your feet." But this result would not be accomplished if the fire into which they are to be cast should be quenched. The fact that the fire shall not be quenched is the fullest proof necessary that they will be utterly consumed. Mark the strong language used by John the Baptist: "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." Matt. 3:12. Here, as in many other places, the wicked are likened to chaff; now if they are to assist in the flames of punishment to all eternity, this would be an inappropriate figure, for chaff does not long withstand the fire. And the fact that they who are represented by the chaff will not be proof against the destructive action of the fire, is indicated by the statement that he will "burn up" the chaff.

Right here we may notice a passage in Isaiah. "The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites. Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" Isa. 33:14. This is a very pertinent question. Shall we conclude from that that the prophet teaches that the wicked will dwell in the fire to all eternity? That would be a hasty, shortsighted conclusion. The very next verse answers the question: "He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly; he that despiseth the gain of oppressions, that shaketh his hands from holding of bribes, that stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood, and shutteth his eyes from seeing evil." Such, and such alone, can dwell with the devouring fire, and with everlasting burnings. While the "devouring fire" seizes upon the chaff, and *burns it up*, the righteous ones, gathered into the garner of the Lord, shall dwell in safety. Well may the sinners in Zion be afraid, for the day is coming that "shall *burn them up*, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." E. J. W.

"The 'Teaching of the Apostles'" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

The reader must bear in mind the reason why these articles are written. It is not because we attach any importance whatever to the document called the "Teaching of the Apostles," but because some people are lauding it to the skies, and claiming that it would completely overturn all seventh-day observance. Our object was to show just how much weight it does have, so that none can have the "Teaching" as an excuse for Sunday keeping. In our investigation we have found, (1) That when correctly translated, the document does not mention the "Lord's day;" (2) That it is not claimed by its most zealous defender that the "Teaching" was written by any of the apostles; (3) That no one knows when it was written, but they *suppose* that it was in the first, the second, or the third century; (4) That no one pretends to know who wrote it; (5) That the fact that it was written early in the Christian era adds nothing to its value, because writers on church history agree that it was a common thing to forge the names of imminent men, and that to deceive and lie in a good cause was thought to be commendable, even by those calling themselves Christians; and that even when we concede honesty of purpose to them, we cannot depend on what they say, because they were in every way unfitted to be expositors of Bible doctrine.

Still further, we found that the immediate company in which it was found does not recommend it, because the so-called "Epistle Barnabas" is universally conceded to be a forged document, besides being full of blunders, and puerile and absurd to the last degree. Concerning the *two* "Epistles of Clement," we found that one is not an epistle at all, and is not claimed by scholars to be the production of Clement, and that the other *bears no author's name*, so that nobody knows who wrote it, and, more than all, is admitted by all to have been the object of as much interpolation. And as for the "Epistles of Ignatius," they are declared by higher authority to be base forgeries, "the last shifts of a grave imposture," "utterly spurious," and said only to be "swept away from among the genuine remains of early church literature with the bosom of scorn." Such is the

company in which this document that is to upset all the calculations of Sabbath-keepers was found.

And now comes the venerable Bishop Bryennios himself, the one to whom the world is indebted (?) for the discovery of this wonderful production, and says that of the sixteen chapters that compose the "Teaching," the "last ten chapters are entirely distinct, and have no authority whatever, except so far as the writer happens to be correct in his injunction." And the *Independent* of October 16th, the one from which the last quotation is taken, commenting upon it, says: "European and American scholars have not claimed that *any* part of the 'Teaching' is authoritative; the first six chapters no more so than the last ten. They only insist that a whole document has value and significance as a reflection of the teachings and usages of the sub-apostolic age."

Surely we need quote no more testimony, the learned Bishop grants that the last portion of the "Teaching" has no authority, "except so far as the writer happens to be correct in his injunction." That is a great concession. Now we can answer for seventh-day keepers that they are not disposed to regard any writings whatever as having authority, except so far as the writer is correct; the standard of correctness must invariably be the Bible; and when any writer makes a statement that agrees with that standard, we accept it, not because certain writers said so, but because it does agree with the standard.

The *Independent's* statement that the whole of the "Teaching" has value only "as a reflection of the teachings and usages of the *sub*-apostolic age," is a confession that the document is simply one of the forgeries so common in the early centuries. It purports to be the "teaching of the apostles," when it is nothing of the kind. This proves the truth of what we said in the second article, that nobody really believes that the "Teaching" carries with it in the weight of authority. Then why did the *Advance* say that it would tend strongly "to make keepers of the seventh day change their observance to the first day, and keepers of the first day are confident of their position than heretofore"? There can be but one answer: Advocates of first-day observance have no Scripture authority for their claims, have fallen into the habit of accepting anything which seems to support them, even though they know their witnesses to be false.

That this conclusion is not ill advised, appears from an examination of the quotations in our last article, concerning the so-called epistles of Clement, Barnabas, and Ignatius. Those quotations were made for a twofold purpose. First, to show the writings from whose company the "Teaching" derived so much of its honor, and second, that our readers might know the foundation upon which the Sunday institution is built. For, be it known, the same writings—those attributed to Clement, Barnabas, and Ignatius,—are constantly quoted in behalf of Sunday observance. The statements found in them, together with a few from other "Fathers," equally untrustworthy, are the strongest proofs brought to bear in favor of Sunday-keeping. Men who write "D. D." after their names, who have graduated at theological seminaries, where church history is a most prominent branch of study, and used textbooks in that study were those from which we have made our quotations, will quote the words of these "Fathers," with as much

assurance as though they were inspired. We will not question the honesty of such men, but we think that the following words are fulfilled in them:-

"Wherefore the Lord said, Forasmuch as this people draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men; therefore, behold, I will proceed to do a marvellous work among this people, even a marvellous work and a wonder: for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid." Isa. 29:13, 14.

The reader will have little difficulty in estimating at its true value of the evidence that has formed the basis for Sunday observance, when he reads the statement of the *Advance*, that the "Teaching" will tend to "make first-day keepers more confident of their position than heretofore." Vain confidence! As though any number of untruths could be made to equal one truth. Truly, when men turn away from the commandments of God, and are determined to abide by the "precept of men" their perceptions become blunted, and they become unable to distinguish truth from error. In closing, we would say to all who desire to *establish* Sunday observance, that it cannot be done unless they can bring a "Thus saith the Lord" in support of it, because the storm that is coming will "sweep away the refuge of lies," but "the word of the Lord abideth forever." Nothing will stand that is not built upon this foundation. E. J. W.

"A Mixed Case" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

At the last Methodist conference in California a "Sabbath Committee" was appointed, whose report appeared in full in the *Advocate*. It is but just to state that the report as given was not adopted, but what the objections were is not stated. If they were against the first paragraph, which we quote below, we shall be happy to make them known if we are informed of them. Here it is:-

"Sabbath is made binding upon the human conscience by the law of God. Some statutory provisions, intended to impress the world with its holiness, passed away with the exigencies to which they were made specially to apply; but the fourth commandment is yet as binding as the first for the sixth. The decalogue is fundamental law. It is the constitution of the moral world, and the full force of its fourth section passed over to the first day of the Jewish week by the change which the Holy Spirit distinctly announced and the apostolic church adopted immediately after the resurrection."

It is doubtful if so great a medley of truth and error could be found in one paragraph of any subject except the Sabbath. The first half is straight enough. The law of God contains our rule for Sabbath observance. The statutory provisions, that were local and temporary, form no part of the fourth commandment, as is admitted above. Consequently their existence or non-existence in no wise affected the force or meaning of the fourth commandment. That, as the committee truthfully said, "is yet as binding as the first were the sixth." This being the case, it necessarily follows that all our knowledge concerning the Sabbath must be derived from the fourth commandment.

Thus far we agree. But now, after stating that the decalogue is the constitution of the moral world, they add, "and the full force of its fourth section passed over to the first day of the Jewish week." If that be so, then we must find some statement to that effect in the fourth commandment, or else must find it in an amendment to the constitution. Read the commandment: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work, but *the seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in *it* thou shalt not do any work; thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." This commandment, the committee say, is as binding as the first or the sixth. By what legerdemain do they make it uphold first-day observance when it mentions only the seventh day, and that explicitly? We would like to have that committee explain their words.

We will ask another question: What did the commandment mean when it was given? What day did it specify as the day of rest? All will admit that it was not the first but the seventh day of the week. The committee admitted this, when they said that the force of the fourth commandment "passed over" to the first day of the week. If any are in doubt as to just what day the Lord did point out by the commandment, let them read the sixteenth chapter of Exodus, and remember that the order of things therein stated continued forty years. For forty years the seventh day was marked by the regular occurrence of miracles. Now, then, another query: Since the wording of the commandment has not been changed, and it clearly designated the seventh day when it was given, how is it possible for it to mean the first day now? Can the same commandment teach one thing at one time, and another thing at another time? If it can, why could it not teach both things at the same time? And if it did that, would it really teach anything?

Let us try this mode of reasoning on the first commandment. That says, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." There is no mistaking who is meant by this commandment, for it is prefaced with, "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage."

666

The living God is the one who thus claims supreme honor, and so it was and is understood. But we find that in after years the Jews, as an entire nation, forsook the Lord, and served Baal. For this cause God visited them with punishments. What a pity they did not have the wisdom of modern theologians, for then they could have said: "The decalogue is the constitution of the moral world, and the full force of its fourth section has passed over to Baal." We are not sure that this argument would have been of any advantage to them, for they doubtless had an abundance of the excuses with which to quiet their consciences, and we very much doubt if they could have brought the Lord over to their way of thinking by any such reasoning. But why should not the Lord be satisfied with that kind of obedience to the first commandment as well as to the fourth? We are certain that neither the *Advocate* nor the "Sabbath Committee," would be willing to allow that the first commandment justifies the Chinaman in his worship of Joss. And why not? Because it particularly specifies the God who is to receive our adoration. Very good. But the committee admit that the fourth commandment is as binding

as the first; why then do they keep the first day when it enjoins the seventh? Can they give a satisfactory answer?

"But we have already given our authority," perhaps they will say. Let us look at it. They say concerning the decalogue that "the full force of its fourth section passed over to the first day of the Jewish week by the change which the Holy Spirit distinctly announced, and the apostolic church adopted immediately after the resurrection." We can only say that we have read The New Testament through more than once, and we never came across any such distinct announcement; and we have never seen any one that did. If that committee have some revelation from the Holy Spirit that other men have not, we think it is their duty to make it known. One thing is certain: neither Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, nor James, ever made that "distinct announcement" known.

We think all candid persons will agree that the committee have not established their case. It must stand with the Scotch verdict of "not proven." To all who are inclined to accept their conclusions without proof, we would say, Be cautious how you proceed. God himself declares that he is a jealous God, and we are very sure that in the Judgment they will not be able to convince him that when he said one thing he meant something directly opposite. E. J. W.

November 13, 1884

"The Sabbath-School" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST. 6 DEC. 6

1. When Christ was crucified, who were put to death with him? Luke 23:32, 33.
2. While they were hanging on the cross, what did one of the thieves do? Verse 39.
3. What did the other one do? Verse 40.
4. With what words did he rebuke his companion? Verses 40, 41.
5. To whom did the penitent thief address himself? Verse 42.
6. What request did he make? Verse 42.
7. What reply did Jesus make? Verse 43.
8. What is the midst of paradise? Rev. 2: 7.
9. By the side of what river is the tree of life? Rev. 22: 1, 2.
10. From what does the river of life proceed?
11. Then since both the tree and the river of life are in Paradise, where is God's throne?
12. When people go to paradise, in whose presence do they go?
13. How long after Christ's crucifixion was the resurrection? 1 Cor. 15:3, 4.
14. On the morning of the resurrection what did he say to one of his disciples? John 20:17.

15. If he had not yet ascended to the father could he have been in Paradise on the day of this crucifixion?

16. Since Christ cannot deceive, can it be that he intended to meet the in Paradise three days before?

17. If not, why did he use the word "to-day"?

18. At what time did the thief want to be remembered? Luke 23:42.

19. When does Christ have his kingdom? Matt. 25:31.

20. And when will all who believe on him be with him? John 14:3.

21. Then to what time did the penitent thief look forward?

22. Will his request then be granted notwithstanding he is now dead? 1 Thess. 4:15-17.

The lesson this week covers that much discussed passage. Christ's answer to the thief on the cross. Comments on this subject need not be extended to any great length, for if the texts referred to are each read carefully, and a comprehensive view of them all is then taken, there can be no difficulty in arriving at the true interpretation.

In the first place we must consider the present and previous circumstances of the malefactor, and what it was for which he asked. One source of the popular error on this subject is the supposition that the thief had never before heard of Christ. Such a supposition is not probable. The wonderful thing about his action was which he manifested. But faith comes by hearing (Rom. 10:17), and in no other way. So the thief must have heard of Christ and his mission. While others, even his chosen disciples, thought that Christ's career was ended, and that there was no hope of his saving any one, the thief grasped the great truths which Jesus had been trying to impress upon his followers, of a resurrection and a future coming in glory, when he would reward every man according to his deeds. In harmony with this new born hope, the penitent thief exclaimed, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom."

It is evident that whatever might have happen to the thief that day would not be in answer to his request; for Christ did not have his kingdom that day. He himself had likened the kingdom of heaven to a nobleman that "went into a far country to receive for himself the kingdom, and to return." In the seventh of Daniel we learn that the kingdom is not given to the Son of man until all earthly kingdoms have run their course. When he receives the kingdom he will return. So he says, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, *then* shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." Matt. 25:31. And therefore Christians are instructed still to pray, "Thy kingdom come;" as yet they are only "*heirs* of the kingdom which God hath promised to them that love him." It is worthy of note in this connection that, according to Griesbach, Luke 23:42 should read, "Lord, remember me in the day of the coming."

The next point to be noted is what the Lord promised. It was, "Thou shall be with me in Paradise? Where and what is paradise? A few words in answer must suffice. Paul plainly intimates (2 Cor. 12:2-4), that it is in, or corresponds to, the third heaven. We can identify it still more closely. In Rev. 2:7 we learn that the tree of life is "in the midst of the paradise of God." In Rev. 22:1, 2, we learn further that the tree of life is on either side of their river of life. Then the river of

life must also be in Paradise. From this same passage we also learn that the river of life proceeds from the throne of God, thus showing that the throne of God is in the midst of the Paradise of God. Whoever goes to Paradise must necessarily be in the presence of God. Christ's promise to the thief, then, was virtually this: "Thou shalt be with me in the presence of God."

Now what about the fulfillment of that promise? Was it fulfilled that day? or is its fulfillment still future? We can determine this in two ways: (1) By considering, as we have done, what an answer to the thief's request would imply, and (2) By examining the actual facts in the case. By the first we learned that if Christ intended his promise as a direct answer to the thief's request, then its fulfillment must still be future, because Christ's coming is still future. Now as to the recorded facts. On "the third day" after the crucifixion, as Mary, suddenly recognizing her risen Lord, was about to embrace him, Jesus said: "Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father." John 20:17. This at once settles the matter, for if he had not ascended to the Father, of course he did not go to Paradise-into his presence-three days before. But it is not possible that Jesus should have prevaricated in the least, for "he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth" (1 Pet. 2:22); and therefore he did not go to Paradise on the day of his crucifixion, it must be that he did not promise the thief that he should be with him there that day. In the light of the facts of the case we are forced to conclude that they who think that Jesus and the thief met in Paradise on the day of the crucifixion, do not understand the Saviour's words to the thief.

Consider the circumstances under which Jesus uttered those words. He had told his disciples that he was the one spoken of by the prophets, who was to occupy the throne of David. He had told the twelve that when he should sit on the throne of his glory they also should sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Their hopes had been raised to the highest pitch when, but a few days before, he had entered Jerusalem in a triumphant manner, while the multitude waved palm branches before him. They had thought that their hour of triumph had come, and that he was then to assume his kingdom. Instead of that, however, they had seen him taken by a cruel mob, hurried unresistingly from judgment-seat to judgment-seat, subjected to the most brutal insults, beaten, spit upon, and scourged, and finally fainting and under the load of a heavy cross, to which he was now fastened with huge nails, dying the death of the malefactor. The hopes of the disciples were blasted, and while they had all confidence in the integrity of their Master, they thought he had been deceived. To them the future looked dark and gloomy. Not so with Jesus. From the beginning of his earthly ministry he had foreseen this event; and his confidence in God's power to raise him from the dead, and in the final success of his mission,-that true suffering he should bring many sons into glory,-remained unshaken. And so when the penitent thief, with a faith that has seldom, if ever, been equaled, preferred his request, the mind of Jesus reached forward to the consummation of his work, and like a king he replied in words calculated to strengthen the faith of the petitioner, "I say unto thee *to-day*, thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Truly so royal a gift was never before promised under such untoward circumstances.

"But," some one will say, "the punctuation will not allow of such interpretation." Well, we have found that the words of Jesus himself will not allow any other interpretation, so what shall be done? Shall we preserve the present punctuation, and thus make Jesus contradict himself? or shall we alter the punctuation so that the passage will be in harmony with the after statement of Jesus, and with the rest of the inspired record? Reason and reverence would say the latter, because the punctuation is only the work of man, while the words of Jesus cannot disagree. If we just imagine ourselves back in the time when Luke wrote these words, or else that the art of punctuation has not yet been invented, our difficulty will vanish. Remembering that there were no marks of punctuation when the Bible was written, we can read the words of Jesus so that they will harmonize with other statements of Scripture. We will not say to change the position of the comma, but just drop it out, leaving the texts as it was originally written. Then read it, making the emphasis where a due regard for the harmony of the sacred word would suggest that it be made. Surely there is no more of presumption in dropping out a comma than there is in placing it there in the first place. In fact, there is no presumption in either case. Those who placed it there doubtless thought that it was necessary to the sense. We, with clearer light on God's word, see that it destroys the sense, and read it in harmony with that clearer light. E. J. W.

"Everlasting Punishment" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

In our last article, based upon Matt. 25:41, we found that the "everlasting fire" into which the wicked are to be cast at the last day, will have the defect to "burn them up," so that they will "be ashes;" that the fire is "unquenchable," thus showing that there will be no hope of escape for those who are cast into it, but that it will continue to burn as long as there is anything left for it to feed upon.

We now come to the forty-sixth verse, and here we are obliged to make another stand, for so firmly is the doctrine of eternal torment fastened on the minds of men, that simple proof to the contrary is not sufficient, unless every text bearing upon the subject is examined, and shown to be in harmony with that proof. In summing up his discourse, the Saviour marks the final disposition of both the righteous and the wicked in these words: "And these [the wicked] shall go way into everlasting punishment; the righteous into life eternal."

In order to a perfect agreement on this text, we will state that the two words "everlasting" and "eternal" mean in this place exactly the same thing. They are both translated from the same

681

Greek word. If, instead of two different words the translators had rendered both by the same word, making it either "eternal punishment" and "eternal life," or "everlasting punishment" and "everlasting life," it would have saved much unnecessary controversy. We are taught, then, from this text, that the punishment of the wicked is to last as long as does the reward of the righteous. This we most firmly believe. But it must be borne in mind that this verse conveys no intimation of what that punishment shall be. To say that one who violates a certain statute

shall receive the penalty of the law, does not determine how, nor to what extent, he is to be punished. It may be by fine, imprisonment, confiscation of goods, or death. In the text before us, however, we are told that the length of the punishment; it is to be as long as the reward of the righteous.

Now what is that punishment? Return to Rom. 6:23 and read: "The wages of sin is *death*; but the gift of God is eternal life to Jesus Christ our Lord." The punishment, then, is to be death; and since that punishment is to be everlasting, we conclude that eternal death will be the portion of the wicked. This agrees exactly with our previous investigation. As corroborating this conclusion, we cite 2 Thess. 1:7-9: "And to you who are troubled [God will recompense] 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; who shall be punished with *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." This destruction comes "from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power," and this agrees with the eighth verse of the next chapter, which says: "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." And this again is in harmony with the statement in Revelation, concerning the wicked: "And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them." Rev. 20:9.

That which has caused the misunderstanding in regard to Matt. 25:46, is the mistaken idea of the punishment. Because "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish," are threatened to "every soul of man that doeth evil" (Rom. 2:8, 9), men seem to think that tribulation and anguish constitute the sum of the punishment. All these things are threatened, they are nowhere declared to be eternal, as in the death which is "the wages of sin." Everywhere in the Bible, death and life are the alternatives set before the individual. He may believe and live, or he may do evil and die. "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; in that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, and to keep his commandments and his statutes and his judgments, that thou mayest live But if thine heart turn away, so that thou wilt not hear, but shalt be drawn away, and worship other gods, and serve them; I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish. . . . I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live." Deut. 30:15-19.

Whatever of anguish may be accessory, the above language shows that so surely as life shall be given to the obedient, death shall be the portion of the sinner. If not, what force is there in the words of the prophet: "Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit: for why will ye die, O house of Israel?" Eze. 18:31. Here the prophet, like Paul, "knowing the terror of the Lord," persuades men to turn from sin. But his persuasion from that standpoint loses all its power if he has made a mistake as to what that "terror" is. Let it be borne in mind that the

punishment-"the wages of sin"-is death. Until death has been inflicted upon the sinner, he has not *been punished*, however much he may suffer. Now the Saviour does not say that the wicked shall go into an everlasting condition of *being punished*, which would be everlasting dying, but into *everlasting punishment*, which is *everlasting death*.

The wise man has said, "There is a way which seemeth right unto a man; but the end thereof are the ways of death." Prov. 14:12. And the apostle James only repeats the statement in another form when he says: "Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bring a forth death." James 1:15. In short, throughout the inspired record, we find only a repetition of our Saviour's words: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not *perish*, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. The death that was threatened to Adam, the execution of which was stayed that he might, by the aid of Christ, have another chance for life, still hangs over his posterity. They may escape from the "wrath to come" by believing in Christ, and thus becoming new creatures. If they do not accept this offer, the penalty will be allowed to fall upon their guilty heads. And to these are the words of Christ: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." John 3:36.

"But the wrath of God *abideth* on him." Let us see how much force there may be in this statement. The second psalm is devoted to a brief history of those presumptuous mortals who "take counsel together against the Lord and against his Anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us." Unto these the Lord shall speak in his wrath, and he will vex them in his sore displeasure, even giving them to the Son to be broken with a rod of iron, and dashed in pieces like a potter's vessel. In view of this threatened punishment, they are exhorted to be instructed, and to repent, and believe on Christ; or, in the words of inspiration, to "kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and he perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little." Ps. 2:12. The wrath of God and of the Son is the same, for the Father hath "committed all judgment under the Son," and has given him authority to execute it. John 5:22, 27. Now what is the result of the manifestation of this wrath? Even when it is "kindled but a little," its effect is to cause those against whom it is directed to "*perish* from the way." Then if a slight manifestation of God's wrath will cause the sinner to "perish," *i.e.*, "to die; to be blotted from existence," what will be the effect if the wrath of God *abideth* on him? It can be nothing less than to keep him in everlasting death. And thus we find, from whatever portion of the Scripture we approach the subject, that the verdict is the same. The Lord "reserveth wrath for his enemies" (Nahum 1:2); the effect of that wrath, when let fall upon them, is to blot them from existence (Ps. 2:12); they will never afterward, to all eternity, have any existence. E. J. W.

"The Lord's Day" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

CONSIDERATION OF THE ARGUMENT FROM THE PRACTICE OF THE EARLY CHURCH

It will be remembered that our articles on the "Teaching of the Apostles" were called out by an article that appeared in the *Advance*, making extravagant claims for that document, as for ever settling the Sunday question. Its argument was as follows: The "Teaching" exhorts all to come together on the Lord's day to break bread and give thanks; the disciples at Troas, with Paul, did on one occasion assemble on the first day of the week to break bread; and Justin Martyr said, in his first apology to the Roman Senate, and that "on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gathered together to one place," etc. From these they arrived at the conclusion that when the apostle John said, "I was in the Spirit on a Lord's day," he intended by the term "the Lord's day" to designate the first day of the week. This is a fair statement of the Sunday Lord's-day position, which we designed to candidly examine. In this examination we have nothing to do with the so-called "Teaching of the Apostles," because (1) we have already shown that it has not the slightest degree of authority, being the uninspired production of some unknown person, and (2) the expression "Lord's day" nowhere occurs in that document, whether it be good or bad. The term "Lord's day" is used, however, by the apostle, and people have a right to demand that teachers of the Bible tell whether he referred to the seventh or the first day.

The statement of Justin Martyr will be considered first. The reader will notice that even he does not say that the first day of the week was termed the Lord's day, but uses the expression, "on the day called Sunday." If that day had been regarded as sacred, some other title would have been bestowed. This, however, is of little consequence. The argument is that John speaks of the Lord's day, and the fact that Christians of Justin Martyr's time assemble on Sunday, proves that Sunday is the day which John had in mind. The reason why he spoke of it as "the day called Sunday" was, as is stated by the *Advance*, because it was called by the Romans "the day of the sun."

This argument for Sunday as the Lord's day would be a good one, and indeed conclusive, if it could be shown that the practices of Christians in the early centuries were always in harmony with the Scriptures. In order to make the argument of any account whatever, it must be shown that their customs were necessarily correct. But how shall we know whether or not their practices were correct? Only by comparing them with the Bible, for that alone contains the rule of righteousness. Our Sunday friends, in their appeals to the practice of the early church, make the mistake of determining by the actions of men what the Bible teaches, when, instead of that, they ought to appeal to the Bible, to determine the correctness of those actions.

We will give a few quotations to show how little we can depend on the practices of Christians, even in the first centuries as exponents of a true Christian doctrine. First we quote the words of Paul. To the elders of the church at Ephesus, he said:-

"Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath

purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Acts 20:28-30.

Not only did he predict that there would be heresies taught in the church after his departing, but writing to the Thessalonians, he said, "For the mystery of the iniquity doth already work." Church history, written by first-day authors, bears witness

682

to the truth of Paul's words. Mosheim, writing concerning the second century, says,-

"A large part, therefore, of the Christian but observances and institutions, even in this century, had the aspect of pagan mysteries."-*Book I, Part II, chap. IV, sec. 5.*

Again he says:-

"There is good reason to suppose that the Christian bishops purposely multiplied sacred rites for the sake of rendering the Jews and pagans more friendly to them."-*Book I, Cent. II, Part II, chap. IV, sec. 2.*

In a footnote to the above passage, Mosheim says further:-

"It will not be unsuitable to transcribe here a very apposite passage which I met with in Gregory Nyssa's life of Gregory Thaumaturgus: 'When Gregory perceived that the ignorant and simple multitude persisted in their idolatry, on account of the sensitive pleasures and delights it afforded, he allowed them, in celebrating the memory of the martyrs, to indulge themselves, and give a loose to pleasure (*i.e.*, as the thing itself and both what precedes and follows a place beyond all controversy, he allowed them in the sepulchres of the martyrs, on their feast days, to dance, to use sports, to indulge conviviality, and to do all things that the worshipers of idols were accustomed to do in their temples on their festival days), hoping that in process of time they would spontaneously come over to a more becoming and more correct manner of life."

Such was the policy of the leaders of the church in the second century, this century in which Justin Martyr lived. Let anyone read the last quotation, and then read a description of the abominations practiced at even festivals, and he will hardly be willing to adopt any custom whatever on the example of such Christians. Sunday was so called by the Romans, because it was dedicated to the worship of the sun. Its Latin name was *Dies Solis*, day of the sun. Now if the bishops of the church, in their desire for "converts" from among the heathen, allowed them to observe their festivals with the most abominable orgies, is it to be considered a strange thing if they allowed them to retain the very day of one of their festivals? If they did not scruple to multiply rites and ceremonies to suit the superstitions of the ignorant crowd, certainly they would not hesitate to accept one that was already in use.

Thus far we have simply shown that we are not to be influenced in favor of any custom because it was practiced by the early Christians. Their course determines nothing for us. We will therefore leave them, and in our next article will allow the Bible to determine which day of the week is the Lord's day. E. J. W.

November 20, 1884

"The Sabbath-School" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST. 6 DEC. 13

1. Upon whom did Christ pronounce a special blessing? Matt. 5:10.
2. For what did Peter say it was better to suffer? 1 Pet. 3:17.
3. For what did Christ once suffer? Verse 18.
4. For whose sins did he suffer? Isa. 53:5.
5. Why did he thus suffer? 1 Pet. 3:18.
6. How did he suffer for our sins? *Ib.*
7. By what was he made alive? *Ib.*
8. To whom is it said that Christ preached? Verse 19.
9. By what agency did he preach to the spirits in prison? Verses 18, 19.
10. But who are they who walk at liberty? Ps. 119:45.
11. Who may be said to be in prison?
12. When was it that Christ by the Spirit preached to those disobedient ones?
1 Pet. 3:20.
13. Did the Spirit of God indeed strive with the antediluvians? Gen. 6:3.
14. When did the Spirit cease to strive with them?
15. To what place do the dead go? Ps. 8:48.
16. Where did Christ go before he ascended to Heaven? Eph. 4:9.
17. Did the same Jesus that ascended to Heaven also descend into the
grave? Eph. 4:10.
18. Did the soul of Christ go into the grave (*hades*)? Acts 2:29-32.
19. What Scripture proof can you give that Christ did not preach while in the
grave?
20. When we read that Christ suffered for sin, "being put to death," does it
mean that the soul of Christ suffered even to death? Matt. 26:38; Isa. 53:10, 12.
21. What had the Lord promised concerning death? Isa. 25:8.
22. How only could he destroy death? Heb. 2:14.
23. If Christ himself had not died, what would be the condition of the human
race?

The Scripture which calls out the texts that compose this lesson, is 1 Peter 3:18-20. The text itself teaches a lesson far different from that which is commonly supposed to teach, and the design of the lesson is to correct this mistaken idea. The apostle exhorts Christians to be patient under reproach, even though it be unjust, citing the example of Christ, who, though sinless, suffered for sins, "the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went in preached and to the spirits in prison." It is concerning this last expression that the misapprehension exists, people supposing that because preaching to the spirits in prison is introduced

almost immediately after the death of Christ is spoken of, therefore Christ must have preached to those spirits after his crucifixion and before his resurrection. If this supposition be true, then our previous teaching concerning the state of man has been at fault; therefore we will study the text carefully.

It would be well for those who hold to the theory that Christ immediately after his crucifixion went and preached to the spirits in *hades*, to compare this text with Luke 23:43, which was studied last week. It is claimed from that text that Christ went at once to Paradise; yet the same persons claim from 1 Pet. 3:18-20 that Christ went to some place where the dead were congregated, and preached to them. If one theory be true, the other cannot be. A little examination of this passage will show us that no statement whatever is made in it concerning the condition of Christ between his death and resurrection.

Notice that the statement concerning his preaching to the spirits in prison does not immediately follow the statement that he was put to death. Between these two is the statement that he was "quickened"-made alive. So if we follow the order of the apostle's statements, we find that the preaching was done while Christ was alive. But on reading the verses still more closely, we find that Jesus did not preach in person at all. It was by the Spirit that he preached. The apostle, having introduced the sufferings of Christ, mentions the fact that he was put to death. But the Bible writers always connect the death and the resurrection of Christ. They do not have Christ put to death, and then leave him. So he says, "put to death in the flesh, but quickened,"-made alive. This is not all, he was "quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison." The verse teaches simply that the Spirit which raised Christ from the dead, is the very same spirit by which Christ preached to the imprisoned spirits.

Now when did this preaching take place? The twentieth verse contains the answer. "When the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." Turning to Gen. 6:3, we read: "And the Lord said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years." Thus we find a harmony between the two passages; the Spirit of the Lord was striving with the antediluvians. Christ was preaching to them, through Noah, but all true preaching is accompanied by the Spirit of God. It is the Spirit that impresses the truth of God upon the heart, and convinces of sin.

"But," says one, "you forget that those to whom Christ preached by the Spirit, were in prison." No, we do not. For what purpose was the Spirit upon Christ when he was here on earth? In Luke 4:16-21 we read that Christ read Isa. 61:1, 2, and said, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." That scripture reads: "The spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to [them that are] bound." Who are these captives? David says, "I will walk at liberty; for I seek thy precepts." Ps. 119:45. And from that we would conclude that all others are not at liberty. So Peter says of false teachers, and those who are inspired by them: "While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption; for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage." 2 Pet. 2:19. Paul also teaches that if a man yields himself to sin, he is the servant of sin.

Rom. 6:16, 17; and in Rom. 7:15-24 he gives a graphic description of the struggles of one who is seeking to escape from the cruel bondage of sin. At last he finds liberty in Christ; his servants alone are free men. So then all sinners are in prison; they have transgressed the law of God, and where the laws are not a nullity, transgressors are always consigned to prison. Through faith in Christ, they may get liberty. But this liberty is contingent on their obedience to the law. The Spirit presses the claims of the law home to the heart, and when the sinner repents and accepts the way of truth, the Spirit abides with him. See Rom. 8:7-14. In Noah's time "the wickedness of man was great" (Gen. 6:5); and therefore the Spirit, through the preaching of Noah, was striving to have them repent and find true liberty.

It is not alone for the bearing that the popular theory of this text has on the Bible doctrine of immortality, that it deserves notice. There is a deeper reason. The popular interpretation of both 1 Pet. 3:18-20, and Luke 23:43, but only makes these texts contradictory, but overthrows the foundation principles of the gospel. In what way? By virtually denying the death of Christ. When man had sinned, he could not save himself. He could not by any obedience atone for his own sin. Neither would the life of one man answer for the life of another, for all have forfeited their lives by sin. Human sacrifices, then, would avail no more than with the blood of bulls and goats. Nothing but the life of a divine being, one who was sinless, and the giving of the law, could answer for man. Such an one was which Christ. He offered himself freely, not because law had any claim on his life, but that his righteousness might be counted instead of the past transgressions of those who should believe in him, and obey him. But now they tell us that Christ, the divine Son of God, did not die; that only his earthly, human body died, if that be so, then indeed is our faith vain, and we are yet in our sins. With the sorrowing Mary we may say, "They hath taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him." An interpretation that makes such a conclusion necessary should not be held for a moment by those who profess to love the Lord.

That Christ himself did die, there is abundant proof. Aside from the texts which say that the dead know not anything, we have special statements concerning Christ. The Jesus that "ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things," who now sits at the right hand of God, there making intercession for us, is the same Jesus who "descended first into the lower parts of the earth." Eph. 4:9, 10. Not merely his human body, but his soul, which certainly must include his divinity, went into the grave. As we read in Acts 2:29-31, David did not, in the sixteenth psalm, speak of himself, but, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath that he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne, "He seeing this before spake of *the resurrection of Christ that his soul was not left in hell [hades, the grave], neither did his soul see corruption.*" If, by the resurrection, the soul of Christ was not left in the grave, then it must previously have gone into the grave. Christ himself declared in the garden that his soul was "exceeding sorrowful; even unto death," and this is just in harmony with the prophet's statement that he "poured out his soul unto death." Isa. 53:12. By death alone could he "destroy him which had the power of death,

that is, the devil." Heb. 2:14. So then, notwithstanding the theories of man, "the foundation of God standeth sure," viz., that "Christ died for the ungodly." E. J. W.

"Punishment of the Wicked" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

"FOREVER AND EVER"

There is one text that should have received attention in connection with the article concerning the "everlasting fire" into which the wicked are to be cast. Before introducing it, however, and we will briefly review the points already made.

1. Those only who accept Christ receive eternal life; all others perish. John 3:16. That is, they will be blotted from existence. This is the penalty which was threatened in the beginning, before sin entered, and which is now simply delayed a little in order to allow mankind an opportunity to repent. Thus it is that "the long suffering of our Lord is salvation." 2 Peter 3:15.

2. The agent by which the death penalty is to be executed, is fire-"everlasting fire." We saw that it was "eternal fire" that destroyed the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah (Jude 7), and that by means of "unquenchable fire" the walls and palaces of Jerusalem were *devoured*. Jer. 17:27; 2 Chron. 36:18-21. We learned also that the "eternal fire" that fell upon the cities of the plain turned them to ashes (2 Peter 2:6), and that this is what is always accomplished when fire is unquenchable. The wicked being likened to chaff, and stubble, it does not tax our imagination in the least to understand how, when cast into unquenchable fire, they will be burned up, and be ashes. Matt. 3:12; Mal. 4:1, 3.

3. We have also seen that the wicked go into "everlasting punishment." But this punishment is death (Rom. 6:23), so that Matt. 25:46 simply teaches that from the death which the finally impenitent suffer, there will be no resurrection. This point was still further shown by the statement in Ps. 2:12, that even a slight manifestation of God's wrath causes the one against whom it is directed to perish, and that since that wrath *abides* on the sinner (John 3:36) there will be no recovery from that perdition.

The texts already cited are amply sufficient to prove the final utter destruction of the wicked; but we have no desire to evade the point, or to pass by any text which would seem to militate against the positions taken. We therefore turn our attention to Rev. 14:9-11: "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."

The question is, Does the expression, "the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever," necessarily imply that the torments of the wicked will never

cease? If it does, then there is an unexplainable contradiction between it and those texts which speak plainly of the final extinction of the wicked. But this cannot possibly be; it cannot for a moment be admitted that there are contradictions in the sacred record. This text,

697

then must harmonize with the great mass of testimony already quoted. We might quote authorities on the meaning of the Greek word rendered "forever," but we shall let the Bible explain this text, just as we have all the others, for it is only when men take it by itself, without regard to other Scriptures, that it presents any objection to the position we have taken in regard to the destruction of the wicked. In the twenty-first chapter of Exodus, the first four verses, we find the law in regard to the length of the time a Hebrew might be kept as a servant. Six years was the limit; after he had served six years, his master was bound to let him go free, for nothing, and allow him to take away as much as he brought with him. If during his term of service he had married one of his master's servants, she and her children were to remain with the master. In such a case, however, it would often happen that the servant would rather stay with his wife and children than have his liberty; if so, the law made the following provision:-

"And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free; then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and *he shall serve him for ever.*" Ex. 21:5, 6.

Now will anyone claim that the life of that servant, as well as that of his master, was to be prolonged to all eternity? Certainly not; no one can be found who would gather from the above text that either the servant or his master would live any longer than a natural life-time. The text simply teaches that under the special circumstances mentioned, the servant should remain with his master and serve him continuously, as long as he should live. So we find that "forever" does not necessarily mean "to all in eternity."

Take another instance: In Isa. 34:9, 10, we read, concerning the land, here called "Idumea," as follows: "And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up for ever; from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it for ever and ever." In a similar strain the prophet continues to the close of the chapter; and then we have read: "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them; and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing: the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon, they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God." Isa. 35:1, 2. These words are spoken of the same land from which, in the preceding chapter, it is that the smoke should ascend for ever. So we see that there does come a time when the smoke does not arise from it; and that is when "the indignation of the Lord upon all nations" shall have been accomplished. Thus again we find that "forever," even "forever and ever," does not necessarily imply that there shall be no end.

This text is the more important to note, as it has a direct bearing on Rev. 14:11. The time when the smoke shall thus ascend for ever, is "the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion" (Isa. 34:8), and the time when "the indignation of the Lord is upon all nations" (verse 2). This being so, and the fact having been proved that the land does afterward cease burning, and become renewed, we find that we are positively bound to admit that there will come a time when the smoke of the torment of the rebellious ones will cease; and that the statement that it shall ascend for ever and ever, means, as in the other two cases cited, but that it will ascend *continuously*, as long as there is any wicked in existence. There will be no reprieve in their case, or relaxing of the punishment. The fire which causes the smoke is unquenchable; it utterly devours the sinners; but when they have been *devoured*, and have become ashes, then the fire will of necessity cease to burn, and likewise the smoke will cease to ascend.

Read the verses (Rev. 14:9-11) once more. They (the rebellious ones) "shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture." In our last article we learned (Ps. 2:12) the effect of the wrath of God when it is kindled even a little against the people of the earth; is to cause them to "perish,"-"to come to nothing." Now if the wicked are made to drink of the "wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture," certainly the result can be nothing less than their utter destruction.

We are not attempting to fix the duration of the "tribulation and anguish" which the wicked shall suffer previous to their death, nor to limit it in any way. The statement that "they have no rest day nor night," implies that it will not be of short duration. That they will suffer anguish for a long time, there can be no doubt; neither can there be any more doubt that this anguish which will eventually be terminated by death; "for the wages of sin is death;" "sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." If we insist that the torments of the wicked never cease, then these texts have no meaning. Yet it must be borne in mind that there is no restoration to the favor of God. No; the wicked shall "go away into everlasting punishment," even "everlasting *destruction*."

Rev. 14:10 is not the only place where the "wine of the wrath of God" is mentioned. In Jeremiah 25:15 we read: "For thus saith the Lord God of Israel unto me; Take the wine cup of this fury at my hand, and cause all the nations, to whom I send thee, to drink it." The different nations that shall drink of it are then specified, and the list closes with these words: "And all the kings of the north, far and near, one with another, and *all the kingdoms of the world*, which are upon the face of the earth." Verse 26. This corresponds with Ps. 75: 8: "For in the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and the wine is red; it is full of mixture; and he poureth out of the same: but the dregs thereof, *all the wicked* of the earth shall wring them out, and drink them." Now what will be the result of their drinking of this cup? We turn again to the prophecy in Jeremiah:-

"Therefore thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Drink ye, and be drunken, and spue, *and fall, and rise no more*, because of the sword which I will send among you. 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. For, lo, I begin to bring evil on the city which is called by my name, and should ye be utterly unpunished? Ye shall not be unpunished: for I will call for a sword upon all the inhabitants of the earth, saith the Lord of hosts." "A noise shall come even to the ends of the earth; for the Lord hath a controversy with the nations, he will plead with all flesh; he will give them that are wicked to the sword, saith the Lord." "And the slain of the Lord shall be at that day from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth; they shall not be lamented, neither gathered, nor buried; they shall be dung upon the ground." Jer. 25: 27-29, 31, 33.

Thus we see that the drinking of the wine of the wrath of God produces death. They who drink it "fall, and rise no more." This is perfectly in harmony with what we have previously learned of the effect of God's wrath, when it abideth on the sinner. But there is one more text to be noticed in this connection, which settles the case absolutely. It is Obadiah 15, 16, which reads thus:-

"For the day of the Lord is near upon all the heathen; as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee; thy reward shall return upon thine own head. For as ye have drunk upon my holy mountain, so shall all the heathen drink continually, yea, *they shall drink*, and they shall swallow down, and *they shall be as though they had not been.*"

What stronger language could be used to show the final *utter extinction* of the wicked? And let it be remembered that this language is used concerning those who drink of "the wine up the wrath of God," threatened in Rev. 14: 9-11. Certainly all must agree, then, that this latter text, instead of teaching the endless torture of the wicked, plainly shows that day, after suffering for an unknown length of time the "tribulation and anguish" which is their just due, and finally receive the full wages of sin, which is death. E. J. W.

"The Lord's Day" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

"I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet." Rev. 1:10. Strange as the statement dwell may appear, an examination of this text involves an answer to the question, "Who is the Lord?" Indeed, it may be said that this question covers a large portion of the ground at issue. The fact is not going to any difficulty in the text itself, but solely to the position taken by those who have appropriated the term "Lord's day" to the first day of the week. They have made the settlement of the question as to what day is meant by the expression "Lord's day" depend on something which is not, or ought not to be in dispute at all. This fact will be more clearly seen by the following, from an article entitled "The Lord's Day," which was sent to us sometime ago for review:-

"To learn what day is the Lord's day, it is necessary to know who is the Lord. Adventists deny that Jesus is Lord, therefore they are prepared to deny that that day which gives Jesus must honor is the Lord's day."

If the writer of the above knew anything at all about Seventh-day Adventist (for of course they are the Adventists to whom he refers), he well knew that he

was penning a falsehood when he wrote it. It is a good sample, however, of the method of argument (?) by which Sunday has been exalted to, and maintained in, its present position in the professed Christian world. Instead of going directly to the point, and bringing proved-Bible proof-that Sunday is the Lord's day, its adherents attempt to turn the mind away from a consideration of the real question at issue. They erroneously assume that if Christ is Lord, then Sunday must be the Lord's day; then they assert that Adventists deny the divinity of Christ. The result is that, in the minds of those whom they can induce to believe their statements, a very natural prejudice is aroused against the Adventist; and in proportion as they become prejudiced against Seventh-day Adventists, they increase in devotion to any institution or practice to which Seventh-day Adventists are opposed. But there is no more reason in the assumption that, because Christ is Lord, therefore Sunday is the Lord's day, than there would be in the assumption that, because Noah built the ark, therefore he must have been the discoverer of America. And the statement that Seventh-day Adventists deny that Christ is Lord, is nothing less than willful of falsehood. Such methods are adopted only by a man who are conscious that they have no proof for their theory, yet are determined to sustain it at all hazards. Macaulay says that whenever people have made up their minds without knowing why, "discussion ends in scurrility, the last resource of the disputant who cannot answer, and who will not submit."

The inspired prophet exclaimed: "O Israel, thy prophets [teachers] are like the foxes in the deserts." Eze. 13:4. The marked characteristic of the fox is craftiness. He will cover up his trail,

698

and resort to various devices to throw the hunters off his track. His characteristic cunning is manifested in deceiving his pursuers as to his relocation, causing them to think that he is in a certain hole when he is far distant. That the prophet, by this figure, aptly describes the supporters of the Sunday-Sabbath, is evident to one who has studied their tactics. Take the case before us, for instance. They accuse us of denying the divinity of Christ in order to divert attention to the real question at issue, and also to conceal the fact that they themselves in reality deny his divinity. For proof of this last statement we offer the following:-

It is readily conceded that the seventh-day Sabbath was appointed by God himself at Sinai; this is not denied by those who will not allow that it was given at creation. Further, they do not claim that God ever appointed any other day. But they do claim that Sunday should be observed in honor of Christ, and that he sanctioned, if he did not institute, such observance. Thus they make the Father and the Son antagonistic to each other, or, to say the least, they have each one working on a plan of his own, and for his own pleasure. But this is utterly at variance with the truth uttered by Christ, "I and my Father are one." John 10:30. Unity with the Father is an essential part of the divinity of Christ; and therefore to claim that Christ engaged in a thing that the Father did not, or that he has any interest separate from the Father, is to deny that perfect unity, and, consequently, to deny the divinity of Christ. Since the question of the divinity of Christ is made a

prime factor in determining this matter of the Lord's day, the remainder of this article will be devoted to that point.

Christ says, "I and my Father are one." This we must accept as an absolute fact in the sense in which he designed it. He prayed to the Father for his disciples, "that they may be one, even as we are one." John 17:22. The union between the Father and the Son is the same as should exist between brethren in the faith. It is a union of thought and purpose. See 1 Cor. 1:10. The will of one is the will of the other. The language of Christ was, "I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart." Ps. 40:8. Again, "Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works." John 14:10. A closer union than this cannot be imagined. So close is the union that Christ is called God, as in Isa. 9:6, and Titus 2:13. In talking with the young man (Matt. 19:16, 17) he himself plainly showed his right to be called God. The apostle Paul, speaking of Christ, says that "in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." Col. 2:9.

This fact of the unity of the Father and the Son, must of necessity be true at all times, and under all circumstances. Let us see. Jesus is known as the Saviour, the Redeemer of the world. It is through his blood that we have redemption (Col. 1:14), and besides his name there is no salvation in any other. Acts 4:12. But if he and the Father are one, the Father must have had an equal share in the work of redemption. And so it is. The plan of salvation was not devised and executed by Christ apart from the Father. It is God's love that is commended to us in the death of Christ. Rom. 5:8. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. When Christ was on earth he was doing the Father's work, for he said, "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish *his* work." John 4:34. And in harmony with this idea were his words to Mary, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" Luke 2:49. The message that he bore was from the Father. He himself said, "My doctrine is not mine, but His that sent me" (John 7:16): "For 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." John 12:49. And so Paul says that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world under himself." 2 Cor. 5:19. Therefore whatever memorials of redemption are observed, must be in honor of God as well as of Christ.

Again, God is best known as the Creator of the world. This, indeed, is that for which he would be remembered, for his creative power is that which distinguishes him from false gods. See Jer. 10:10-12; Ps. 96:5; 2 Cor. 8:5, 6; Acts 14:15. But if Christ and the Father are one, then Christ must have shared equally with the Father in his work of creation. And so he did. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . . All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made." John 1:1-3. Of the One through whose blood we have redemption, Paul says that "by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: *all*

things were created by him, and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Col. 1:16, 17. And finally, Paul exhibits the unity of Father and Son in both creation and redemption, in these words: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days *spoken unto us by his Son*, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, *by whom also he made the worlds.*" Heb. 1: 1, 2. Thus we learn that it was through Christ that God made the world, and through Christ that God conveyed to lost man his message of mercy. In Christ God's will is made known and executed, and thus it is that he is called "the Word of God."

When we say that all Seventh-day Adventists hold to the truths taught by these scriptures as cardinal points of faith, it will be readily perceived that a denial of the divinity of Christ is not one of their peculiarities. With Peter they believe that God hath made this same Jesus who was crucified "both Lord and Christ;" and they also gladly acknowledge that fact "that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father." John 5:23. In what way they should honor him, will be shown next week. E. J. W.

November 27, 1884

"Helps in Studying the Lesson" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

The question has been asked, "At what time in the study of the Sabbath-school lessons should *helps* be brought in, and how should they be used?" To this question it is difficult to get an answer in a few words. In order to have a thorough knowledge of the subject, it would be necessary to have a clear understanding of what is meant by "helps;" but that must be waived for the present. We will suppose it to include the concordance, dictionaries, atlas, commentaries, histories, etc. Some will derive help from that which would be of no service to others. Taking it for granted that the things at hand are such as may be a help indeed, we would mark out, in brief, the following as a good plan for starting the lesson:-

Having learned from the lesson paper what the lesson is about, and what portion of Scripture it covers, take the Bible at once, there is where you will find the lesson to be studied. Read carefully, several times, all the texts that are quoted, so as to get them well in mind. The next step will be to commit to memory the portion that is to be memorized. This, of course, will not be accomplished at one effort; to commit the text thoroughly will be a work covering the whole week. If the student wishes, and is able, he may commit the whole of the lesson to memory; this is done by some, with profit. But it is not best to attempt too much at once. It is not the desire to tax the memory to such an extent that earnest thought cannot be put upon the matter thus committed.

While thus learning the texts referred to, the student should bear in mind the object for which they are quoted. Very often many things may be learned from a single verse; the question will indicate for what particular thing the verses is quoted. Then after learning the answers to each individual question, the lesson

should be considered as a whole, to see the relation of the questions to one another, and what general point is made by the whole lesson. When this has been done, the student is ready to consult outside helps.

In the matter of consulting commentaries, great care and judgment must be exercised, as on doctrinal points they are often misleading. It is not safe for any one to consult commentaries indiscriminately, unless he is previously pretty well grounded in the truth. Commentaries are more for the learned than the unlearned. If one has a good general idea of the subject which he is studying, and is anchored to certain fixed principles, so that he can sift the chaff from the wheat, he will learn much from commentaries. It often happens that a positively erroneous exposition will awaken a train of thought in the mind of the careful student, that will be very profitable. Those, however, who are most familiar with commentaries, know that quite often the text upon which the student most needs light, is the one upon which the least is said. The reasons for this is obvious. It is perhaps needless to suggest that if there is any work bearing on the lesson, of whose orthodoxy you are fully assured, that is the one to be consulted first. It will aid your judgment in your further search.

One "help" should never be neglected. It is that of the Holy Spirit. It is the author of the Bible (2 Pet. 1:20, 21; Eph. 6:17), and can best give light upon it. One of its offices is to guide into all truth (John 16:13), and it may be had by any one for the asking. Luke 11:13; Mark 11:24. The promise, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men literally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him," is given to all. This help should be sought before beginning the lesson, and during all the time of studying it. One thing more: The Saviour has said, "If any man will do his will he shall know of the doctrine." He who earnestly and prayerfully studies the word, with a sincere desire to profit by it, cannot fail to be enlightened. Jesus also said: "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 14:23. Now we read that "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." When John 1:5. If then he dwells in us, what an all-powerful, ever-present help we have. Without this help, all others are worthless. E. J. W.

"Good Advice for Sabbath-Schools" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

The advice which we have to give is not our own, but is a bit that we found in a book written more than eighteen hundred years ago. It is contained in the following words of Paul to Timothy: "But foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes." 2 Tim. 2:23. If every school would have this verse engrossed in large letters, suitably framed, and hung in a conspicuous place in the classroom, we believe that it would be to its benefit. There is no school in which is not needed as a warning, if not as a reproof.

We would by no means be understood as deprecating a spirit of investigation, or as advocating the shutting off of questions, except such as are indicated in the verse quoted. They are certain death to spirituality either in the school, the teachers' meeting, or anywhere else. It is a lamentable fact that among any body

of persons there will be some whose minds always grasp the fact that is not under consideration. A text of Scripture always conveys to them a hidden meaning, and they feel called upon to make known their doubts, or their new ideas. Others are always reaching out after the unattainable. They want to know more than is revealed. The question as to where Cain got his wife is still current. "Who was Melchizedek?" is asked with as much anxiety as though eternal happiness depended on the correct answer. The question, "How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?" is still put in spite of the fact that the inspired apostle has marked the mental ability of the questioner down to zero.

There is no end to these foolish and unlearned questions. We mention (though not without a blush) a case that occurred in a Sabbath-school which we recently visited. In the course of the lesson, Gen. 7:14, 15 was quoted as a proof text. At the close of the hour, when the leader inquired if any one had a question to ask concerning the lesson, one pupil rose and with much seriousness asked to know the difference between a bird and a fowl (!), since both words occur in Gen. 7:14. It will be said that this is an extreme case, and that so foolish a question is seldom asked. No doubt it is an extreme case, and if the question had been only *asked* we would not mention it; but there were no less than half a dozen persons who were unguarded enough to offer *answers*. It was this fact that convinced us that the bit of advice which we have quoted is greatly needed.

In the current lessons in the SIGNS, on immortality, there is room for an abundance of unlearned questions. Some will want to know *how* the Spirit can return to God. Others will demand, or offer to give, an exact definition of the terms "soul" and "spirit." "How is it that the dead can hear the voice of God?" is a question that worries not a few. "What is life?" will probably be asked until mortals reach the state where they will not dissipate their intellectual powers by employing them on unprofitable questions.

"They do gender strifes." The strifes do not always appear; in fact, we seldom hear of them in Sabbath-school, nevertheless strifes is the legitimate result of such questions. The reason is that there is nothing to decide the question at issue. There is nothing to which either party to the discussion can appeal as a final authority. The opinion of one is of as much value as that of another, and none are worth anything. If the discussion of such questions does not lead to strife, it is solely because the parties have enough grace in their hearts to yield a point, or let the matter drop.

As a general thing, the subject matter of the lesson will suffice to fill all the time allowed. If something in the lesson brings to one's mind a text outside of the lesson, which throws additional light upon it, by all means let him speak of it for the benefit of others. The object of every lesson is to stimulate, not to repress, thought. If the leader sees that the text has no bearing, he can state that fact in a few words, and in a manner not to wound feelings of many. It may chance that the leader's judgment is at fault, and that the text is to the point, but so long as he is leader he must be allowed to direct the course of the lesson. In a company of earnest students there will be no dearth of good thoughts, and it would be better to let one or two be lost, than to have a discussion to no profit. If a theory can be

supported by Scripture, it must be good, but *guesses* concerning the Bible do not amount to much.

As we before said, these questions are usually dropped before they develop into strife; but of what profit are they? Are there not enough *revealed truths* in God's word to occupy all our powers of mind, without frittering them away on foolish questions, or those to which no answer can be given, and which, even if answered, are of no practical importance? Time is too precious to spend on trifles, and therefore let us always and everywhere heed the apostle's admonition: "Foolish and unlearned questions avoid." E. J. W.

"The Lord's Day.' (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

(Continued.)

In our further investigation of this subject, we shall understand that the word "Lord" is applied both to the Father and the Son, and that even though we find it in various places applied specifically to one of them, the act predicated of that one is the act of the other also. We have seen that there is no working at cross purposes between the two, but that they are "one" in every thought and act. It is sometimes claimed, in connection with Rev. 1:10, that in the New Testament Jesus only is called "Lord," some other title being invariably applied to the Father. One text (Rev. 11:15) is sufficient to disprove that claim: "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." Here there can be no question but that "Lord" refers to the Father especially. In one verse in the Old Testament (Ps. 110:1), the word is applied to both Father and Son: "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit down at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." But in this case, the Hebrew has a different word for each; but in Rev. 11:15 the word for Lord is *Kurios*, the same that is used throughout the New Testament.

From John 5:23 we learn "that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father." Wherever, then, we find an act enjoined by the Father, we know that the performance of that act honors the Son also, and that the neglecting of it is as much an insult to the Son as to the Father. Disobedience to the Father dishonors Christ. Now turn to Isa. 58:13, 14 and we shall find one way in which we are to honor God: "If

714

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, honourable; and shalt honour 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."

In this text the Lord, through his prophet, speaks of "my holy day." So it is the "Lord's day" that is under consideration. The text shows that the Lord claims but one day as his own, because it does not say "my holy days," nor "one of my holy days," but "*my holy day.*" From this we also learn that the "Lord's day" is *holy*.

And still further, we learn that this holy, Lord's day is the Sabbath: "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*, honourable," etc. Now turn to Ex. 20:8-11, and you will find all these things combined, and in addition will be told exactly what day of the week this holy Sabbath-the Lord's day-is:-

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

Right here we stop to notice an objection. A Presbyterian Catechism, which is before us, claims that the Sabbath is not the seventh day in order from the creation, but may be "any other seventh part of our weekly time." The reason it gives for this claim is this: "In the beginning of the commandment it is not said, 'Remember the seventh day,' but, 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.' Just so in the end of this command, the words are not, 'The Lord blessed the seventh day,' but, 'The Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.'" The fallacy of this reasoning is very evident, when we remember that "*the seventh day is the Sabbath*." Since the seventh day is the Sabbath, that is, the seventh day and the Sabbath exactly coincide, and are one and the same thing, a blessing pronounced on the Sabbath day was, of necessity, a blessing on the seventh day. But that there may be no chance for any to imagine that our reasoning is not sound, we quote the direct statement of the sacred record: "And *God blessed the seventh day*, and sanctified [hallowed, see Webster] it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Gen. 2:3. In the face of this scripture, men may speculate as much as they please, but it will be in vain. It will still remain a fact that "the seventh day is the Sabbath."

"But," it is still objected, "the commandment does not say that the seventh day *of the week* is the Sabbath, and therefore we are left to decide for ourselves which seventh day we shall keep." The inspired record decides this point, too. But first we would ask, If the commandment does not enjoin the observance of the seventh day *of the week*, what seventh day does it enjoin; it must be the seventh or last day of a period which consists of just seven days, the first six of which are devoted to labor. But the only period of that kind known is the week. Now turn to an incident recorded in the New Testament.

Immediately after the death of Jesus on the cross, Joseph of Arimathaea, begged his body, and took it down and laid it in a sepulcher. The inspired historian tells us "that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on." Luke 23:54. He says further that "the women also, which came with him to Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day." Verses 55, 56. Here we have the record of two successive days,-the preparation day, and the Sabbath of rest, which immediately followed. What next? "Now upon *the first day of the week*, very early in the morning, they came onto the

sepulcher." Luke 24:1. This was "when the Sabbath was past." Mark 16:1. Now if the first day of the week immediately follows the Sabbath day, on what day of the week does the Sabbath come? The seventh, of course, for there are only seven days in a week. The disciples, then, rested on the seventh day of the week. But what does that signify? If you read the fifty-sixth verse entire, you will see. "And they returned, and prepared spices and appointments; and rested the Sabbath day *according to the commandment.*" We have already seen that they rested on the seventh day of the week; now if this was "according to the commandment," what is plainer than that the fourth commandment enjoins the observance of the seventh day of *the week*?

We have learned, then, that the seventh day of the week was the Lord's day from the beginning, that the Lord sanctified it, or made it holy, and that the followers of the Lord, those who loved to honor him, observed it as such even after the crucifixion. And here we will leave the subject for this week. E. J. W.

December 4, 1884

"The Sabbath-School" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 46.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST DEC. 20

1. Where do you find the story of the rich man and Lazarus? Luke 16:19-31.
2. What description is given of the rich man? Verse 19.
3. What is said of Lazarus the beggar? Verses 20, 21.
4. What happened to them both? Verse 22.
5. Throughout the narrative, in what condition are they both represented as being? Verses 30, 31.
6. What further shows that they are not considered as being alive? Verse 25.
7. What is cited in the narrative as sufficient authority concerning the future? Verses 29, 31.
8. In the Old Testament, what do we learn as to the condition of the dead? Eccl. 9:5, 6.
9. What becomes of their thoughts? Ps. 146:3, 4.
10. How much interest are they able to manifest in the affairs of their friends who still live? Job 14:21.
11. Where is the rich man represented as being after his death and burial? But 16:22, 23. (See Revised Version.)
12. What does the word "hell" (*hades*) signify? 1 Cor. 15:55. (See marginal reading of the word "grave.")
13. What have we learned as to the dominion of death and the grave over mankind? Ps. 89:48.
14. To what place did Christ go when he died? Acts 2:29-32.
15. What kind of a place is the grave? Job 10:20-22.

16. What can you say concerning the activity of the wicked in the grave? Ps. 31:17.

17. Why should people not put off that which they find to do in their life-time? Eccl. 9:10.

18. In view of this state of things, what kind of a land is the grave called? Ps. 88:10-12.

19. In the narrative before us, where is the beggar represented as having been taken? Luke 16:22.

20. What does the inspired record say of Abraham and his death? Gen. 25:8.

21. Can this mean that he went to Heaven? Josh. 24:2.

22. What is meant by "being gathered to his people"? Gen. 15:15.

23. Was any different disposition made of Abraham than of the rich man in our lesson? Compare Gen. 15:15; 25:9, with Luke 16:22.

24. Then must not all of these persons, if all of them ever really existed, have gone to the same place?

25. What is the place to which all the dead go?

LESSON FOR DECEMBER 27

1. Relate what is stated in the 16th of Luke concerning the rich man and the beggar.

2. What happened to them both?

3. To what place have we learned that they both went?

4. Do you know of any people who are exempt from going into the grave?

5. What does the psalmist say about all men going into the grave? Ps. 89:48.

6. Of what was "man" formed? Gen. 2:7.

7. What did he afterward become? *Ib.*

8. What was imparted to him to bring about this change? *Ib.*

9. Does the breath have life and consciousness in itself?

10. How does the wise man describe the death of man? Eccl. 12:7.

11. Since there is nothing to man but that which is formed of the dust, and the breath, can there be any conscious entity when the dust returns to the earth?

12. Give a brief summary of the Scripture statements concerning the dead—their place and condition.

13. Since both Lazarus and the rich man are represented in Luke 16 as dead, could the conversation ascribed to them have been real?

14. What other instances can you cite of inanimate objects represented as talking? Gen. 4:10; Hab. 2:10; James 5:4.

15. What are such representations called? See Webster's definition of "apologue."

16. What important lesson is taught by this apologue?

17. With what precious statement of Christ is it in harmony? Luke 16:11-13.

18. What action of the Pharisees made its recital necessary? Ps. 16:14.

19. Why is human judgment as to the comparative worth of man liable to be at fault? 1 Sam. 16:7.

20. When will every man be judged according to his real merit? 1 Cor. 4:5.

21. What will the righteous Judge give to those who love his appearing? 2 Tim. 4:8.

22. How will the despised, humble poor man stand then? James 2:5.

23. When will the angels actually take the righteous to the mansions of rest? Matt. 24:30, 31.

24. When will the wicked be tormented? Matt. 13:40-42.

25. When the separation is thus made, what fixes the gulf between the righteous and the wicked? Rev. 22: 11.

That which forms the basis of these two lessons, is the story of the rich man and Lazarus, as found in Luke 16: 19-31. It is given in the lesson under the general heading, "Immortality," although the Scripture has really nothing to do with that subject. The condition of the dead, or the final reward of the righteous and the wicked, was not the subject under consideration, and Christ did not design by this passage to teach anything concerning either of those things. The only object, then, in considering it as bearing on the subject of immortality, is to show what it does *not* teach, rather than what it does, and to make it the means of refreshing our minds on certain plain declarations of Scripture already learned.

The idea that has become popular in regard to this passage of Scripture, is that a real occurrence is described—that the soul, or spirit, of Lazarus, and his death, was borne a way to a place called Abraham's bosom, in the full enjoyment of unutterable bliss, and that the disembodied soul, or spirit, of the rich man, as conscious as when it inhabited the body, was cast down to hell, there to suffer the torments of the damned. So firmly fixed is this idea in the minds of the majority of people, that it will be necessary to show its inconsistency before stating what the text is really designed to teach.

Let us, then, for a moment suppose the passage to be a plain narration of fact. "And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom." Verse 22. The other is the law of language by which it can be made to appear that that which "was carried" is not the same thing that "died." Popular theory would have it that the *body* of Lazarus died, and that his *soul*, or *spirit*, was carried to Abraham's bosom. But the language forbids any such construction. "The beggar died and [the beggar] was carried." If only the body died, then only the body was carried; if it was the soul or spirit that was carried, then it was only the soul or spirit that died. Let us suppose, by way of illustration, that a man is describing a hurricane and its effects. Of a certain building, he says: "The house trembled to its foundation, and was blown down." Now if, when you inquire the amount of the loss, he should say, "Oh, the house was not blown down, it was the people who were in it," would you not think that he needed to learn how to use the English language? So we think concerning those who would argue from this passage that one part of Lazarus died and another part was carried to Abraham's bosom.

Again, we meet with the same difficulty in the case of the rich man. "The rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lift up his eyes." In this case the language plainly says that that which died was the same that was buried, and this again was the same that is next said to be in hell. If it was only the body that died and was buried, then it was only the body that was in torment. If it was the

soul that was in torment, then was the soul that died. It will be noticed that throughout the narrative, all parties are represented as possessed of all the organs and faculties of ordinary living beings. These things are sufficient to show that the popular idea is inconsistent with itself, and that we cannot look upon this scripture as containing the relation of an natural occurrence.

This conclusion is still further sustained by a consideration of the fact that both parties in this narrative are represented as dead. It is said of both that they died; Abraham says to the rich man, "Son, remember that thou in thy *life-time* receivedst thy goods things, and likewise Lazarus evil things, but *now* he is comforted, and thou art tormented." Here is a direct contrast between their present condition and their life-time. Now when we remember that "the dead know not anything;" that when man's "breath goeth forth and he returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish;" that they perceive not when their friends are exalted or abased (Job 14:21), we conclude that this passage must partake of the nature of a fable.

We find, moreover, that the word here translated "hell," is *hades*, and this, we are told, is the Greek word signifying the place of all the dead. If we turn to 1 Cor. 15:55, we find that "hell" (*hades*) is placed in the margin as the equivalent of "grave" in the verse. Now in Ps. 89:48 we learn that there are none who can deliver their souls from the power of the grave; and in harmony with this, we find that both righteous and wicked go there. Gen. 37:35; Job 14:13; Ps. 31:17. Still further, we find that this place where all go is a "land of forgetfulness" (Ps. 88:10-12); a "land of darkness, as darkness itself," "where the light is as darkness" (Job 10:22); and that in it "there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom" (Eccl. 9:10). Since all the dead go there, this narrative concerning those who are expressly declared to be dead, could not have been an actual occurrence.

This narrative may then properly be called a fable or an apologue. But the latter, Webster defines as "a story or relation of fictitious events, intended to convey useful truths; a moral fable." It differs from a parable, in this respect: a parable relates things which do take place among mankind, and which therefore *might* occur in the case supposed; but an apologue relates the supposed actions and words of brutes and inanimate things. Of this figure of speech there are many instances in the Bible, as in Gen. 4:10, where Abel's blood is said to cry; in Hab. 2:11, where the stone and the beam are said to speak together; in James 5:4, where the hire of the laborers is said to cry; and an extended instance occurs in Judges 9:8-15, where the trees are represented as talking among themselves, and choosing a king. In all of these cases, some truth is designed to be conveyed in a striking manner.

In order to understand what this fable is designed to teach, we must observe the connection. The chapter opens with the parable of the steward. He was commended because he prudently provided for the future. From this, the Saviour showed the necessity of using the wealth with which God may intrust us, in his service, so that he may commit to our trust true riches. Said he, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." "And the Pharisees also, who were covetous, heard all these things; and they derided him." They regarded riches as a mark of God's

especial favor, and poverty as indicating his displeasure. He therefore, by a fable drawn from their own tradition, showed that if a man has all his good things in this life, he can expect nothing more. He may *seem* to be far above his poverty-stricken but pious neighbor,

727

but when things are seen as they really are, as God sees them, it will appear that there is indeed a great gulf between them, but that the advantage is all in favor of the poor man. Death ends the probation of every man, and thus *fixes* this gulf, so that there can be no changing of positions. E. J. W.

"The Salvation Army" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 46.

E. J. Waggoner

Several weeks ago we copied from an editorial in the *Holiness Evangelist* a few sentences descriptive of an all-night meeting of the Salvation Army. The editor, although expressing a mild doubt as to the strict necessity for all their antics, was very enthusiastic in his praise of the meeting, telling how much good he had received, and advising everybody to attend the next one. One has just been held in San Jose, and a delegation of about seventy-five went down from Oakland. From the report of it in a paper published in Oakland, by members of the Salvation Army, we make the following extracts:-

"On the way down the drums and brass instruments, the tambourines, and the human lungs and voices were strained to their utmost. The psalmist, if he had been there, would have been reminded of his old days when men rejoiced before the Lord with all their might."

If incoherent screeches, and a jargon of confused sounds constitute praise to God, then a minstrel show must be a very pious place, and a gang of hoodlums must be devout beyond all computation. Lest any should think that our comparisons are unjust, we quote from their own description of what took place after they reached the place of meeting in San Jose:-

"The Salvationists filled the platform full. Then commenced a meeting that is perfectly inconceivable to those who haven't seen it,-a meeting into which is brought into combination all the amusing features of a minstrel show, and the earnestness and solemnity of the day of Judgment. There was levity without license; unbounded fun, without a thought of sin in it; faces laughing in every feature with unmeasured glee, yet all radiant with the glory of God. Here was war in Heaven sure enough. Any one who has the idea that fighting sin is going to be a long-faced business had better go to an all-night meeting of the Salvation Army."

That one of the participators could be serious and write stuff like the above, is sufficient evidence of the terrible delusion into which these people have fallen. To imagine that the solemnity of the Judgment can be associated with fun, levity, and the amusing features of a minstrel show, argues an amount of moral blindness that would be incomprehensible in professed Christians, were it not for certain texts of Scripture to be noticed hereafter. If any think that we publish such things for the

729

purpose of holding them up to ridicule, they greatly mistake our purpose. It is too serious a matter for ridicule. We do it simply to call attention to the nature and tendency of the Salvation Army, and kindred organizations. We have held that the Salvation Army, and the so-called "Holiness Bands," which are the same thing only less boisterous, are but feeders for Spiritualism; that they are, in fact, forms of Spiritualism; and that the leaders are simply in training, unconsciously, for Spiritualist mediums. Before we give a Scriptural reason for this judgment, we will present two or three paragraphs more, which may, perhaps, cause some to read with more interest and attention than which follows. In defending the statement that there is a Spiritualist gate to the heavenly city, the paper says:-

"Every Christian must see that Spiritualism has in it a great truth mixed with much error. This truth is the resurrection of the dead, but the Spiritualists are not out half far enough yet. This work cannot be complete till they can materialize the dead, and keep them materialized, so that they shall put on incorruption."

Again, in another article we find this:-

"When God shall have prepared us, and when we 'know Christ, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of the sufferings, being made conformable unto his death' (Phil. 3:10), then shall we attain the resurrection of the dead, that is, we shall have power to call forth the dead, and, by virtue of the God power in us, assist them to put on incorruption."

One specimen paragraph from an article, "The Vail Taken Away," will suffice to show to what extent some who profess Christ, or even now given over to a "mind void of judgment":-

"Through the past dispensation men have preached 'Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness' (1 Cor. 1:23), but this stumbling block, this vail, is to be taken away."

These extracts indicate the tendency of this movement. If it should be urged that no respectable number of people will ever accept such foolishness and error, we reply that there are tens of thousands of Spiritualists who seriously hold to error even worse than that which we have quoted. What is to hinder *all* members of the "Salvation Army" and the "Holiness Bands" from accepting the same and worse, even if they do not at present go to such great lengths? In their present attitude there is nothing to hinder it, but everything to favorite. Let us examine the guide book and see. In Rom. 1:28, the apostle speaks of the heathen, whom God gave over to a "reprobate mind," or, as the margin has it, to "a mind void of judgment." The reason for this was "when they knew God they glorified him not as God," and "did not like to retain God in their knowledge." Again, in the 2 Tim. 3:8, the same apostle speaks of others who are "of *no judgment* [margin] concerning the faith." These are not heathen, but professing Christians, men who have "a form of godliness." In their case, also, their lack of judgment concerning spiritual things, is due to the fact that, though they are "ever learning," they are "never able to come to the knowledge of the truth," and the reason for this is that they "*resist* the truth."

Such a condition of mind as this,-the individual being unable to judge correctly concerning the truth,-is the legitimate result of resisting it. The Saviour said: "Yet a little while is the light with you. Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come

upon you; for he that walketh in darkness *knoweth not whither he goeth.*" John 12:35. From this we can learn nothing else than that light will not remain with the person forever, unless used. "The path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day;" but if one rejects light, darkness comes, and then he will not know whither he goeth. "If the light that is in thee be darkness," said Jesus, "how great is that darkness." Matt. 6:23. The greater the light of man has, the greater will be the errors into which he will fall if he turns away from it. The case of Saul is an illustration of this. Called of God to rule over his people, and enjoying the favor of God, he rejected the word of the Lord, and was left to himself. The consequence was that he deliberately went for counsel to a woman who was in league with the devil, although he had previously strongly condemned all such practices. Numerous other instances might be cited to show how enlightened Christians may, by rejecting certain truth, fall to a condition where an outrageous sin will appear to them to be an act of righteousness.

Now how is it with these people? Do they exalt the law of God, and require their "converts" obedience to it? By no means. The law of God is the last thing thought of. The quotations made above show the looseness of their teaching. The "holiness" people, who are more conservative than their brethren of the "Salvation Army," also repudiate the law. Nearly three years ago a "holiness" paper published in this city, stated that one of the most effectual methods of checking the spread of holiness among the people was to "imbue them with the idea that they are to be holy by striving to do right, to keep the law of God." We have never seen this statement repudiated by any so-called "holiness" paper, and we have kept close watch of those published on this coast. It was only recently that the editor of the principal Pacific Coast "holiness" paper, and the leader of the movement in this city, when asked concerning the duty of man to obey the law of God, and keep his Sabbath said that he had no patience with anybody that would ask such a question. Of course not. His mission is to spread "holiness," and obedience to the law would checking it entirely. For our part we profess no sympathy with "holiness" that is opposed to God's law, and we shall do all in our part to check it.

We have said that this movement leads directly into the follies and wickedness of Spiritualism. We repeat the statement. Give this thought careful attention: There is no intermediate ground between truth and error. Said Christ: "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad." Matt. 12:30. If a man does not believe the truth, he must believe its opposite-error. But ever, owing to the natural deceitfulness of the human heart, rapidly propagates itself. As one falsehood leads to another, so one error accepted leads to the acceptance of another, and this, too many more. This is in harmony with the words of Christ, that if light be not accepted, darkness will come in its stead, and the unfortunate one will not know where he is going. By his own acts he places himself where he cannot control himself, and is led captive by Satan at his will.

The Bible, however, speaks plainly on this point. We read (2 Thess. 2:9-12) that just before the coming of the Lord, the devil will work among certain people with "all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of

unrighteousness." This indicates nothing less than complete satanic possession. How is it that Satan acquires such complete control them? "Because they received not the love of the truth." "Strong delusion, that they should believe a lie," is allowed to come upon all "who believe not the truth, but have pleasure in unrighteousness." Now when we remember that the law of God alone is truth and righteousness (Ps. 119:142, 151, 172, etc.), and that these "holiness" people do not *profess* to believe it nor have pleasure therein, how can we doubt that they are opening the door for Satan to take possession, or, in other words, running into Spiritualism? As a matter of course, they all hold to that foundation doctrine of Spiritualism, natural immortality, or, the conscious existence of the dead.

We would not be understood as saying that all members of these "bands" and "armies" have so fully rejected truth that they cannot be reclaimed. We only show a tendency of the movement. Many of them have never seen the light in its clearness; all such will have ample opportunity to accept it if they will. There is great danger, however, that these will become too infatuated to even see the light when it comes. They are educated to believe that feeling is faith, and that self-satisfaction is the evidence of the approbation of God.

We write in no spirit of harsh criticism. We pity the poor souls who are ensnared by this terrible delusion. But we feel that we would be recreant to duty if we did not sound a note of warning to those who may be looking upon the movement with favor. We make no apology for plain words concerning Spiritualism itself, and we know not why we should not be equally zealous in warning people against its advance guard. To all those not yet deluded, we would say, Give no countenance, either by word or by presence, to this counterfeit religion. You cannot afford, for the sake of gratifying your curiosity, to run the risk of falling under its power. Do not be misled by loud professions, and fervent prayers and exhortations, while the power of the "truth," and even the profession of it, are wanting. Remember that the Lord has said: "To this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and *trembleth at my word.*" E. J. W.

"The Lord's Day. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 46.

E. J. Waggoner

(Continued.)

From the Bible we have fully identified the Lord's day. Following is a brief summary of the means by which it is done: The title Lord is applied to both Christ and the Father. Since these two are one, that which belongs to one must be the property of the other also; there can be no division between them. In Isa. 58:13 we learn that the Lord's day is holy, and that it is the Sabbath; and this at once caused us to turn to the fourth commandment, where we found that the seventh day is declared to be the Sabbath. Since the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord (Ex. 20:10), and the Sabbath is the Lord's holy day (Ex. 20:10, 11; Isa. 58:13), it necessarily follows that the seventh day is the Lord's day. Lest any one should think that this is not definite enough, we have it stated that the women who rested on the "Sabbath day, according to the commandment" (Luke 24:56), did so upon the day before the first day of the week, or in other words, upon the

seventh day of the week. In the naming of the days of the week, the name "Saturday" was given to the seventh day (see Webster's Dictionary, Cyclopedias, etc.), and since the names are now used more frequently than the numerals, it may be more clear if we say that from the Bible we find that the day now called Saturday is the Lord's day. So confident are we of the correctness of our deductions that we defy anybody to show from the Bible that any other day than Saturday is entitled to the designation "Lord's day."

Although the fact that the seventh day-Saturday-is the true Lord's day has been established, we will carry our investigation further, and show that there is no chance for even the supposition that any other day was elevated to the position of Lord's day. In the second chapter of Mark, we find that on a certain occasion the Pharisees reprov'd Christ for allowing his disciples to satisfy their hunger on the Sabbath day, by eating the wheat which they plucked as they walked through the field. It will not be disputed that the day here called "the Sabbath day" was the seventh day of the week,-Saturday,-because it was the day which the Pharisees recognized as the Sabbath. Let this be borne in mind while you read the words of Christ, "Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Mark 2:28. In the face of this, can anyone deny

730

that the seventh-day Sabbath is the Lord's day? The fourth commandment plainly declares that it is so, and Christ has added his testimony to the same effect.

It is sometimes claimed that the text last quoted, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath," shows that, as Lord of the Sabbath, Christ had the authority to do with it as he pleased, even to changing it, or dispensing with it entirely. We will not discuss the question of his right or power; the only question that can affect the case is, Did he, as Lord of the Sabbath, violate it, or give any individuals license to do so? He did not, as we shall see; then, of course, his being Lord of the Sabbath day, does not alter our relation to it. He was its Lord from the beginning, and we cannot show our allegiance to him as our Lord, without honoring the day which he especially claims as his own. We will now examine some texts to show how Jesus regarded the Sabbath day.

In Luke 4:16 we read as follows concerning an act of Christ very soon, after his baptism: "And he came to Nazareth, where he was brought up; and as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read." Webster's definition of the word "custom" is this: "Frequent repetition of the same act; way of acting; ordinary manner; habitual practice; usage." So we learn that it was his habitual practice to observe the seventh-day Sabbath as a day of public worship. This is in perfect harmony with his declaration in John 15:10: "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love." If he kept his Father's commandments, He must have kept the fourth commandment, which enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week; and so we learn from Christ's own statement, made the very night of his betrayal, that he had always kept the Sabbath.

John 5:18 is sometimes quoted as proof that Christ did not regard the Sabbath as sacred. His own testimony should certainly be taken in preference to

that of the Pharisees. They said that he had broken the Sabbath; he said, some time after the events recorded in John 5, "I have kept my Father's commandments." We must believe, then, that he did not break the Sabbath. It is true he went directly contrary to some of the Rabbinical traditions, but that amounts to nothing. Had he followed their traditions, he could not have kept the law, for by their traditions they transgressed the law. Matt. 5:3.

What had Jesus done that the Pharisees accused him of Sabbath-breaking? He had on the Sabbath day healed a man of an infirmity of thirty-eight years' standing, and had told him to take up to little mat upon which he was lying, and walk. John 5:1-9. Now was this a good act? Most certainly it was. Well, Jesus himself declared, on another and similar occasion, that "it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days." Matt. 12:12. He is the Lord of the Sabbath, and, as such, was competent to declare the law of the Sabbath. The charge that Jesus broke the Sabbath comes now, as it did then, from a narrow and mistaken idea of the Sabbath commandment. He said that his act was lawful, and so it was, but the fourth commandment forbids only *our own*, or secular work. Work that is done in the service of God, as was that performed by the priests in the sanctuary, work that does not in any way benefit the worker, but is solely for the glory of God, is not forbidden by the commandment. Thus the Saviour is vindicated from the charge of Sabbath-breaking. How serious a charge this is, and how blindly wicked are those who make it, will be shown next week. E. J. W.

December 11, 1884

"Ancient Spiritualism. Saul and the Witch" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 47.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST-JAN. 3.
Ancient Spiritualism.

SAUL AND THE WITCH

1. When on a certain occasion the Philistine host came against Israel, how was King Saul affected? 1 Sam. 28:4, 5.
2. To whom did he seek for guidance? Verses 7, 8.
3. How had Saul previously treated such people? Verses 3, 9.
4. By what authority had he done so? Ex. 22:18; Lev. 20:27.
5. Why had the Lord given such instruction concerning the diviners, consulters of familiar spirits, etc.? Deut. 18:10-12.
6. With what people were such abominations common? Verses 9, 12.
7. What had the Lord said it would be the result to those who should seek after such persons? Lev. 19:31.
8. Since Saul had obeyed the Lord in putting away those who had familiar spirits, why did he now consult one? 1 Sam. 28:6.

9. When he went, for whom did he ask? Verse 11.
10. Why did he not go directly to Samuel? Verse 3.
11. What can you say concerning the part which the dead are able to act in earthly affairs? Eccl. 9:5, 6.
12. Give other Scripture testimony concerning the state of the dead.
13. Then could it indeed have been Samuel himself who carried on the subsequent conversation with Saul?
14. Was Saul at this time in favor with the Lord? 1 Sam. 28:6.
15. Why had the Lord rejected Saul? 1 Sam. 15:22, 23.
16. When people reject the word of the Lord, what are they left to believe? 2 Thess. 2:11, 12.
17. Then since Saul had rejected the word of the Lord, what must his supposed interview with Samuel have been?
18. Who is the author of the illusions and lies? John 8:44.
19. Whom did he then worship? 1 Cor. 10:20.
20. When the Israelites turned from the Lord, whom did they worship? Deut. 32:16, 17.
21. Then what sort of a spirit was it which Saul consulted?
22. How is the devil able to make himself appear? 2 Cor. 11:14.
23. If he can appear as an angel light, would it not be easy for him to assume the appearance of persons who have died?
24. How could Saul have been kept from being deceived?

The lesson this week is based on the account of Saul's visit to the witch of Endor, recorded in the 1 Sam. 28. In order to keep the connection, the entire chapter should be carefully read. It may not be amiss to say that many good people suppose that Samuel did really come and talk with Saul, and thus they are strengthened in their belief of the conscious existence of the dead. We shall follow the subject in the order of the questions in the lesson, and see what we find.

The scene opens with the Philistine host prepared to fight against the Israelites. So great was the number of the Philistines, as compared with that of the Israelites, that Saul was very much alarmed. As it is forcibly expressed in the text, "his heart greatly trembled." When David was surrounded by enemies, he said to the Lord, in his prayer, "What time I am afraid, I will trust in thee;" but Saul was in a pitiable condition, for when he would seek the Lord, he received no answer. In his extremity he had his servants find a woman that had a familiar spirit, and, disguising himself, he went to her for information.

It was necessary for him to disguise himself, else he could not have gained admittance to the witch's abode; for in time past, "Saul had put away those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land." This was in accordance with the command of God, and does not mean simply banishment, but death. Thus: "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." Ex. 22:18. "A man also or woman that hath a familiar spirit, or that is a wizard shall surely be put to death." Lev. 20:27. In Deut. 18:9-12 we learn that witchcraft, and consulting with familiar spirits, was very common among the heathen that inhabited Canaan and before it was conquered by the Israelites. Under direction from the Lord, Moses said to Israel:

"When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations. There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord; and because of these abominations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee." The woman at Endor was one who had, by some means, escaped the proscription.

In order to a perfect understanding of this incident, it is very necessary to know the relation that existed between Saul and the Lord. Why would not the Lord listen to Saul? The answer is founded 1 Sam. 15. The Lord had given Saul a commission, and he had not fulfilled it. He deliberately disobeyed the Lord. And this was only one of a long series of disobedient acts. So the prophet Samuel announced the will of the Lord, in these words: "For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king." 1 Sam. 15:23. From that time, we learn that Samuel came no more to see Saul. So we see that Saul's rejection by the Lord was due to the fact that he himself had first rejected the Lord.

When Saul came to the witch, he said, "Bring me up Samuel." Why did he not seek directly to the prophet himself? Because "Samuel was dead, and all Israel had lamented him, and buried him in Ramah, even in his own city." 1 Sam. 28:3. In response to this request the woman told him that she saw an old man, covered with a mantle, coming up out of the earth. Verses 13, 14. The reader will notice that in this case Saul did not seek the apparition at all, but "perceived that it was Samuel," from the woman's description. Notice, also, that the pious Samuel was called "up," and came up "out of the earth," instead of down from heaven. Saul knew nothing about the doctrine of the good going to Heaven at death, and the heathen, one of whom he was consulting, it had all souls, good and bad alike, in the lower world-in *hades*.

Now what reasons have we for saying that Samuel did not converse with Saul on that occasion, and was not there at all? 1. It is not reasonable to suppose that, if Samuel would not during his life-time listen to Saul, whom he loved, when personally urged do so, he would come to him after death, at the solicitation of a despised heathen. 2. It is the height of absurdity to suppose that God, who had rejected Saul, and had refused to answer him in his own appointed way,-by dreams, by Urim, or by prophets,-would communicate with him through one whom he had said should be put to death as an abominable thing. 3. That which settles the matter beyond all controversy, is the word of inspiration: "The living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything." "Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished." "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." Eccl. 9:5, 6, 10. Man's "breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Ps. 146:4. Satan has the power of *death*; but the Lord alone has *life*. Satan can seize men, and shut them up in his prison house, the grave; but Satan cannot liberate them;

Christ alone has the keys of the grave; he alone can set Satan's captives free. For these reasons, we say we *know* that Samuel had no more to do with the occurrence narrated in 1 Sam. 28, than the stones under their feet.

"If Samuel was not there, who personated him so successfully as to deceive Saul?" Satan, or one of his evil angels. And this also is susceptible of Bible proof. First, we learn that "Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light." 2 Cor. 11:14. It was as an angel light, his true form and character concealed, that he came with his temptations to Christ in the wilderness. Had he come as the chief of the powers of darkness, he could not have hoped to make any impression on the Saviour. He hoped to deceive Jesus into thinking that he was an angel sent with a message from heaven. The Lord, however, saw through the disguise at once. But the point is, if Satan may appear as an angel light, how much more may he not personate a human being. To successfully personate another is nothing more than many *man* are able to do.

Second, Saul had put himself on the devil's ground. Long before he had first cast off, and then been cast off by the Lord. Now there is no neutral ground between the Lord and Satan. As soon as Saul was entirely out from under the influence of God, he passed under the influence of Satan. His frenzied attacks on the innocent David showed the influence under which he had fallen. Then what more natural than that he, being under the influence of the devil, should go to the devil for help? A "familiar spirit" is "a demon or evil spirit supposed to attend the call."-*Webster*. "Witchcraft" is "intercourse with evil spirits." See also the definition of "sorcery," and "enchantment." This was what the heathen practiced. Their worship was devil worship. "But I say, that the things which the Gentile sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils." 2 Cor. 10:20. Whenever the Israelites forsook the Lord, they engaged in devil worship. See Deut. 32:16, 17; Ps. 106:34-37. No wonder that they were an abomination to the Lord. Therefore, since Saul had voluntarily put himself under the devil's power, we are forced to conclude that the devil deceived him in this instance. Deceived him, indeed he did; for if space permitted, we could show that Saul did not die on the morrow, as was intimated to him.

"How could Saul have kept from being deceived?" By heeding the word of the Lord. "Strong delusion, that they should believe a lie" (2 Thess. 2:9-12), is not sent to men until they reject the truth. And in that case, how could it be otherwise? If a man does not believe the truth, what is there but lies for him to believe? Remember, also, that it is an "evil heart of unbelief" that first leads men away from God, and under the devil's power. And now we will give a sure rule for detecting all evil spirits. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8:20. Christ at once detected Satan's attempted imposture because he acted contrary to the written word. So when we hear of men who pretend

to communicate with the dead, we may know that there is no light in them, because the Bible says "the dead know not anything." If we strictly adhere to God's word, we cannot be deceived; if we cast any portion of it aside, we need not hope to stand. E. J. W.

"The Lord's Day. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 47.

E. J. Waggoner

(Continued.)

At the close of our article last week, we were considering the charge made against Christ, that he violated the Sabbath. Those who make this charge are doubtless not aware of its real import, and we will therefore show them. The Sabbath commandment is one of the ten precepts of the law of God. It enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week. Whoever breaks that commandment is guilty of sin, "or sin is the transgression of law." 1 John 3:4. To say, therefore, that Jesus broke the fourth, or any other of the ten commandments, is equivalent to saying that he was a sinner. It is hardly necessary to quote Peter's assertion that he "did no sin," for we do not know of any one that would claim in a direct manner that he did; but it is no worse to say openly that Jesus was a sinner, than it is to charge him with the violation of one of the commandments.

Read once more Christ's words in John 15:10: "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love." From this we understand that those who do not keep his commandments cannot abide in his love; and the idea which he conveys is that his abiding in his Father's love was due to the observance of his commandments. It will be said that it is impossible to conceive of such a thing as that Christ should not abide in the Father's love; this is love, and the reason is that it is impossible to conceive that Christ should in any degree deviate from the will of a Father. See John 6:38.

The words of Christ, in Matt. 5:17, 18, while they vindicate him from the charge of commandment-breaking, establish most firmly our conclusion that the seventh day-Saturday-is still the Lord's day. Remembering that the fourth commandment of the law enjoins the observance of the seventh day, declaring that it is the Lord's holy day, we read: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." As Christ said on another occasion, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17. There is no possibility of mistaking these words. While heaven and earth endure, the law of God cannot be changed to the extent of the mutilation of a single letter. Then the seventh day must be the Lord's day as long as heaven and earth remain.

Lest some one should cavil at John 15:10, and say that we are now to keep the commandments of Christ, and not those of the Father, we repeat that since Christ and the Father are one, their commandments must be the same. Jesus himself answered this objection in advance, not only in Matt. 5:17-19, but in John 6:38: "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me;" and also in John 7:16: "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me."

Thus we have again proved that the seventh day is now the Lord's day, and must remain so until the end of the time.

We now turn once more to trace its course through the New Testament. In the 24th of Matthew we have an instance of Christ's tender regard for his own sacred day. In telling his disciples of the future destruction of Jerusalem, he warned them that when they should see Jerusalem compassed with armies they should flee from the city, and from all Judea. "But pray ye," said he, "that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day." Verse 20. On this verse Olshausen says: "In interpreting this it must be observed that Jesus regards the law of the Sabbath as divine, and part of the moral law, yet without sanctioning the

745

rigid notions which prevailed among the Jews concerning the Sabbath law as correct." Here, again, there can be no doubt that the day to which Christ referred was the seventh day of the week—the day which the Jews kept as the Sabbath. So, then, he recognized the fact that the seventh day would be the Sabbath forty years after his ascension.

After the ascension of Christ, when the disciples when about their work of preaching the gospel, we find frequent mention of the Sabbath. Thus Paul and his companions went out of Philippi on the Sabbath to a place of prayer by the river-side, and he spoke to those who assembled there. Acts 16:13. At Antioch, in Pisidia, they "went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and sat down." Acts 13:14. After Paul had concluded his discourse, and the Jews had gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles "besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath." "And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." Acts 13:42, 44. Again, at Thessalonica, where there was a synagogue of the Jews, "Paul, *as his manner was*, went in unto them, and *three Sabbath days* reasoned with them out of the Scriptures." Acts 17:2. When Paul arrived in Corinth, he made his home with a Jewish family, "And he reasoned in the synagogue *every Sabbath*, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." Acts 18:4. This practice was kept up as long as he remained there, a year and six months, at least. Verse 11.

These texts show the custom of Paul and his companions, but it is not for that purpose that we quote them. We do not plead "apostolic example" in behalf of Sabbath observance or any other good act. That is to say, we do not keep the Sabbath *because* the apostles did. We know that they did keep the Sabbath, for the same reason that they refrained from worshipping idols, and from theft, because they had regard to regard to the law of God, which enjoins the first act, and prohibits the others, and we do the same for the same reason. Our object in quoting these references to "the Sabbath day," is to call attention to the use of that term in the New Testament. There can be no question but that in every one of these instances the seventh day is referred to. Now the New Testament, as well as the old, was written by inspiration of God. That is, the Holy Ghost was really the author of the instruction there given. We find, then, that the Holy Ghost calls the seventh day of the week "the Sabbath day," just the same as when the Old Testament was written. The New Testament was written by Christians and for Christians; and whatever name it uses to designate anything, must be the proper

term for Christians to use, and the *only* proper term. Therefore the proper appellation for the seventh day of the week is "Sabbath," or "Lord's day," for both refer to the same thing.

One point more. The New Testament does not recognize any day as the Sabbath, except the seventh day. This may easily be shown. James, in addressing the council at Jerusalem, said: "For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues *every Sabbath day.*" Acts 15:21. And Paul, in his discourse at Antioch said: "For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets *which are read every Sabbath day.*" Acts 13:27. Paul and James are both speaking of Jewish worshipers. No one questions the fact that it was conducted on the seventh day of the week, and no one would make the claim that it was ever conducted, excepting occasionally an annual festival, on the first day of the week. Therefore when those inspired apostles said that Moses and the prophets were read in the Jewish synagogue "every Sabbath day," they most effectively restricted the use of the term "Sabbath" to the seventh day of the week. If something that is read on every successive seventh day, is read on "every Sabbath," there is certainly no possibility that any other day of the week can be the Sabbath. But the Lord says that the Sabbath is his holy day; therefore every seventh day of the week,-every Saturday, if you please,-is a "Lord's day." This statement is made without the slightest fear of successful contradiction. E. J. W.

"Who Is Responsible?" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 47.

E. J. Waggoner

The first number of the *Western Churchman*, a neat, well-printed eight-page paper, published in Denver, Col., has just come to our table. As its name indicates, it is devoted to the interests of the Episcopal Church in the West. We wish it well, and have no doubt that it will succeed. That which the most attracted our attention, however, was something not peculiar to the journal, but an extract from the catechism. In the Sunday-school lesson occurs the following:-

"Q.-What did your Sponsors then for you?

"A.-They did promise and vow three things in my name:

"First-That I should renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh. Secondly-That I should believe all the articles of the Christian faith. And thirdly-That I should keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of my life."

This, our readers will understand, is the promise that is made at the baptism (sprinkling) of an infant. As we read it, the thought occurred to us that those who make it take a grave responsibility upon themselves. We do not believe that any realize how great it is. Let us see. The baptism of an individual indicates his death to sin, and his determination to walk, as the apostle says, "in newness of life;" or, as the catechism has it, to "renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh," and "keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same," all the days of

his life. Now it is evident that an infant a few days or weeks, or even months old, is not competent to make any such promise. It knows nothing of the sinful works of the flesh, nor of God's holy will and commandments. This is well understood and therefore his parents, or some other persons of mature age, make a promise for him. These persons are then called that child's sponsors.

The question now arises, Suppose that the child, as he approaches manhood, does not manifest any disposition to fulfill the vow made for him by his sponsors, who is responsible? Such a case frequently happens. We have personally known many who have been baptized (?) in infancy, who courted "the pomps and vanities of this wicked world," and revealed in "all the sinful lusts of the flesh." It is barely possible that they nominally believed the "articles of the Christian faith;" but their faith was not indicated by works, for they lived and died in open violation of "God's holy will and commandments." Now in such cases are not those who made the vow responsible for its non-fulfillment? The very name that is applied to them-"sponsors"-indicates that they are.

A sponsor, according to Webster, is "one who binds himself to answer for another, and is responsible for his default." Then those who make the vow above recorded virtually say, "I bind myself as surety that this vow shall be fulfilled in the future life of this infant; if he shall fail to fulfill it, I will do it myself, or will suffer the consequences of such failure." But this, as all can see, involves difficulties that cannot be overcome.

1. It becomes necessary, in case the child approves faithless, for the sponsor to do his duty for him, as well as his own. This, however, is an impossibility, for no man can do more than his own duty. It is upon the supposition that a man may do more than his own duty that the Catholics base the monstrous doctrine of indulgences. Christ says: "When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do." Luke 17:10.

2. "The wages of sin is death;" and since the child lives and dies in sin, the one who has pledged himself to become responsible for his failure to live a Christian life, must die in his stead. But here more difficulties present themselves. (a) What is to become of the one in whose stead the sponsor dies? He cannot be saved, for he has never accepted Christ, and "there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. Then to men must die for the offense of only one. This would be injustice, and therefore cannot be, for God is just. (b) The sponsor has, no doubt, lived a life of humble obedience, and faith in Christ; then according to the promise (Rom. 10:9; Rev. 22:14), he must be saved. And thus it happens that he must both live and die! His own reward is eternal life, but on account of the sins of the one for whom he became surety, he must suffer eternal death. Impossible.

3. While there can be no doubt that the sponsor really pledges himself to one or the other of the above-mentioned impossible things, the Bible settles the matter thus: "Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the soul that sinneth, it shall die." "The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father

bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." Eze. 18:4, 20.

Thus we see that in no way is it possible for sponsors to fulfill the vow that they make at the so-called baptism of an infant. Their action is nothing else than a solemn farce. But does this relieve them entirely from responsibility? By no means. It is not a light thing for one to promise that which he can by no possibility fulfill. If for "every idle word that man shall speak they shall give account thereof in the day of Judgment," how much more shall they be held to answer if those idle words are in the form of solemn vows.

The conclusion which any one can see should be drawn is that such promises are sinful. God never requires men to make promises that involves such contradictions, and that cannot be fulfilled. "But the child cannot promise for himself to forsake the ways of sin, and what shall be done?" Wait until he is able to make his own choice. If the child is not old enough to make an intelligent choice for himself, he cannot know what sin is, and therefore needs no baptism. "But the Saviour says, 'Suffer little children to come unto me,' and how dare we disobey that command?" You need not. "*Suffer*," that is, allow them to come. Do not throw any obstacle in their way, and you will be obeying it. You may invite them to come, you may urge them to come; but do not think that you can come in their stead. The most that you can do in that line is to set a godly example for them; if this is done, they will undoubtedly come.

These remarks apply to all who practice what is called infant baptism. The inconsistencies herein shown up, should convince them of the folly of such a practice. We have not begun to enumerate the evils that grow out of it; their name is legion. For all of these, we ask, Who is responsible? With what words will those who practice infant baptism answer, when the Judge shall ask, "Who hath required this at your hands?" E. J. W.

December 18, 1884

"The Sabbath-School. Spiritualism" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST-JAN. 10.

Spiritualism.

1. What did Paul say should come in the last days? 2 Tim. 3:1.
2. What causes these perilous times? Verses 2-5.
3. What sort of persons are they who do these things? Verse 6.
4. What all-important requirement do they lack? Verse 7.
5. How do they resist the truth? Verse 8.
6. How was it that the magicians of Egypt withstood Moses? Ex. 7:10-12.
7. For what purpose will miracles be performed just before the Lord's coming? Matt. 24:23, 24.
8. By what power did the heathen magicians perform their miracles? 1 Cor. 10:20.

9. Then must we not expect, from the words of Paul and Christ, that by the aid of devils, miracles will be performed in the last days? Rev. 16:13, 14.

10. For what purpose do these spirits of devils work miracles? *Ib.*

11. What immediately follows their deceitful miracles? Verse 15.

12. What did Paul say the coming of Christ would immediately follow? 2 Thess. 2:8, 9.

13. Among other things what do these wonder-working spirits profess to be? Matt. 24:23, 24.

14. What is the specific work of Christ? John 5:40; 10:10.

15. What has Christ brought to light? 2 Tim. 1:10.

16. Then if the spirits claim to be Christ, what will they claim to have demonstrated?

17. By what is this now fulfilled?

18. Who originated the doctrine of the natural immortality of man? Gen. 3:4.

19. Who is this serpent? Rev. 20:2.

20. What effect does this doctrine have upon the wicked? Eze. 13:22.

21. How is it that people are deceived by these lies? 2 Thess. 2:9-12.

22. When we are urged to seek unto them that have familiar spirits, to what should we turn? Isa. 8:19, 20.

23. How is it that we can resist the adversary? 1 Pet. 5:8, 9.

24. In order to successfully resist the devil, where must we have the word of God? Ps. 119:11.

"This know also, that in the last days perilous time shall come." Reference is here made to the time immediately preceding the coming of the Lord. The reason why the times are then so perilous, is contained in the first clause of the second verse: "For men shall be lovers of their own selves." The sins that are afterward enumerated are simply different forms of the one great sin-supreme love for self; men will love themselves, and pleasures, more than they love God. There is no form of idolatry that is any more debasing than this.

"Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." Those who commit these crimes are professed followers of God. Here, then, we find that there are heathen who have a knowledge of the true God, and who profess to worship him. The sins that are imputed to them are of the same class exactly as those which are common among the ancient heathen. See Rom. 1:28-32. How is it that they deny the power of godliness? By their evil practices. Paul elsewhere speaks of certain unbelieving ones, who "profess that they know God, but in works they deny him." Titus 1:16. The apostle does not say that these persons have no power; but it is the power of *godliness* that they lack. They are of the class that the prophet speaks of, who take delight in approaching to God, who fast, and afflict themselves, and are very fervent in their devotions, yet the Lord sees them not. These are they of whom the Lord speaks in Matt. 7:22: "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?" Surely, such zeal and power must indicate true Christianity; but the Saviour says he will say to them, "I never knew you." They will be told to depart from him.

Why? Because, with all their profession, they "work iniquity," or do unlawful deeds.

One sin seems to especially characterize this class. Not content with saying that they are "without natural affection" and "incontinent," the apostle continues. "For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women, laden with sins, led away with divers lusts." From the fact that they are "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth," we conclude that these people do not regard their wicked practices as sinful. They have not that "knowledge of the truth" which would enlighten them, and so they "call evil good, and good evil." They are "despisers of those that are good," and in their blindness they "resist the truth."

How do they resist the truth? "As Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these resist the truth." 2 Tim. 3:8. This sheds a flood of light on the subject, for in Ex. 7:11, and onward, we learn that Pharaoh's magicians withstood Moses "with their enchantments." They withstood him by performing, up to a certain point, miracles, the object of which was to make the king believe that his gods were as powerful as the God of Israel. Enchantment is the same as sorcery, and witchcraft; it is "intercourse with evil spirits." Then the magicians, Paul tells us were Jannes and Jambres, resisted Moses by means of their intercourse with evil spirits. What evil spirits? The spirits of devils, for heathen worship was nothing but devil worship; when the heathen offered sacrifices, they offered them to devils. 1 Cor. 10:20. Now since people in the last days will resist the truth just as the magicians did, we know that they will oppose the spread of the truth by means of miracles which, through the power of Satan, they are unable to perform.

This conclusion is verified still further by the prophet, who saw, just before the coming of the Lord, the "spirits of devils working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world." Rev. 16:14, 15. Paul also tells us that the coming of Christ follows "the working of Satan with all power and signs and wonders." 2 Thess. 2:9. Christ spoke of these wonders as being signs of his coming, and said that they would be so great that, if it were possible, they would deceive the very elect. Matt. 24:23, 24. These verses also give us a clue to the nature of these deceptions. "For there shall arise false christs, and false prophets." Now if certain people profess to be Christ, they must necessarily profess to do the work which the Bible says Christ alone has power to do. Christ says, "I am come that they might have life." Paul says that Christ has "brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." Modern Spiritualists claim that Spiritualism alone demonstrates the immortality of the soul. They say that while Christians *believe* that man is immortal, they *prove* it. By their so-called materialization of dead persons, they *seem* to prove it, but this is the delusion against which we are warned.

Satan's first recorded lie, the one which has formed the basis of all his deceptions, was the statement to Eve, "Ye shall not surely die." There in the garden of Eden he proclaimed the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. By this same doctrine he deceives the people in the last days. The great truth of the Bible is salvation in Christ alone; salvation from sin and its penalty, death; "He

that believeth on the Son have everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." John 3:36. Those who do not receive this true, who teach that there will be endless life for the wicked, and that the dead are not really dead, are open to this deception of Satan. The devils, personating individuals who have died, can appear to their friends who believe in the immortality of the soul, and thus "demonstrate" it to them. When people accept this as truth, the miracles which they perform will also be attributed to the Spirit of God. Then those who say anything against the doctrines taught by these wonder-working spirits, will be accused of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and will be persecuted. Thus these last-day apostates become "despisers of those that are good."

The only safety is in having the word of God *hidden* in the heart. If the word has been "engrafted" into life of the individual, he will always have wherewith to resist the devil. "And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead? To the law and to the [the Spirit of prophecy; see Rev. 19:10] if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8:19, 20. E. J. W.

"The Lord's Day. (Concluded.)" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

(*Concluded.*)

It would seem that the many Bible proofs that the seventh day of the week is "*the* Lord's day" should be sufficient to silence all cavil among those who claim to regard the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice. But some will say, "You have entirely ignored the claims of the first day of the week; if you examine the record concerning that day, you might find cause to change your mind." We do not believe that we should; for when a thing is positively proved to be right, its opposite is, by the same argument, just as surely shown to be wrong. If the seventh day is "*the* Lord's day," then the first day cannot be. But in order that there may be no dissatisfaction, we will see what the Bible has to say about the first day. With the aid of a concordance we can easily find every text in the New Testament, which contains reference to the first day of the week.

The first text is Matt. 28:1: "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulcher." Simply an incidental mention of the day, so we will go on.

Mark 16:1, 2: "And when the Sabbath was passed Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him [Jesus]. And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came under the sepulcher at the rising of the sun." This is but a repetition of what we found in the other texts. One point, however, we would call attention to. The Sabbath is the Lord's day, as we have proved at length. See Isa. 58:13. Now the first day of the week did not come until after the Sabbath was passed; therefore these texts, instead of showing the first day to be the Lord's day, prove positively that it is not. But we will look further.

Luke 24:1: "Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they [the women, see chap. 23:55] came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them." Here again the evidence is damaging to the claims of Sunday to be the Lord's day. First, we notice that the disciples took the first day of the week to do a work of love for Jesus, which they would not do on the day of his crucifixion, because "the Sabbath drew on." Second, we find (chap. 23:54-56) that that Sabbath day immediately preceded the first day, and that they rested upon it "according to the commandment." That says "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord" (Ex. 20:10); showing that the first day is not the Lord's day. We will try again.

John 20:1: "The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulcher, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulcher." Simply a reiteration of the statement that on the first day of the week certain Christian women set out to perform a piece of work. We must evidently look elsewhere for our Sunday Lord's day.

Mark 16:9: "Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils." It would have been strange indeed, if Christ had not shown himself to his disciples as soon as he was risen, in order to comfort them, and to confirm their faith in him. It would be equally strange if the evangelists, whose great aim was to establish the fact of Christ's resurrection, should not mention the particulars connected with it. In this text, again, we have only a simple statement of an incident that might occur on any day.

John 20:19: "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." The remarks on the preceding text will also apply to this. To the plea that the disciples were at this time celebrating the resurrection of Christ on the day which they had resolved to devote to his honor, we reply (1) That this was not a religious meeting, but that the disciples were in their own place of abode (see Acts 1:13, 14); (2) They were partaking of their evening meal (see Luke 24:33; Mark 16:14); (3) They did not yet believe that Jesus was risen from the dead. After Mary Magdalene had seen him, "she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not." Mark 16:10, 11. They continued in sorrow and unbelief throughout all that day (Luke 24:13-17; Mark 16:13), and did not believe until they saw him for themselves in their room, in the evening of the day of his resurrection. "Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord."

The six instances of the use of the term the first day of the week are all concerning the particular day on which Christ rose from the dead. If that day that were designed to have any effect upon the practice of the disciples, in regard to the day of rest, these texts must certainly have contained a statement of that fact; but they do not. The evangelists mention the first day of the week in their narrative as a matter of course, and state in the most matter-of-fact manner possible, that the day preceding it is the Sabbath, the Lord's day. We will continue our search.

Acts 20:7: "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight." Here is a religious meeting on the first day of the week. Can it be that we have found what we are after? If you say "Aye," and that the disciples evidently regarded this day as the Lord's day, then we will venture to inquire, By what authority did they so regard it? We have no record of its being exalted to the honor of Lord's day, and we dare not accept any custom without authority. As we have read the text again, however, our enthusiasm ebbs, as we find that it gives no intimation that the day on which they came together had any sacredness whatever. It is simply "the first day of the week." It is true that they came together to perform a religious act-the breaking the bread-but this act was not confined to any particular day, but was done "every day." Acts 2:46. Our Sunday friends are wont to comfort themselves not a little with the thought that the disciples did hold a meeting on the first day of the week; but they seem to forget that they also held meetings, and that, too, among the heathen,

761

on the seventh day of the week. See Acts 17:42, 44; 17:2; 18:4, 11. Thus we have one instance, and *only one*, of a religious meeting on the first day of the week, and no less than eighty-four meetings on the seventh day of the week. "But," says a friend, "the fact that the disciples worshipped on Saturday proves nothing for Saturday observance, because they held meetings on every day of the week." Exactly so; but if the mere example of the disciples in regularly worshipping on the seventh day, does not prove that day to be the Sabbath, how in the name of reason can a single instance of Sunday worship prove the first day to be the Sabbath?

In considering this text we have not thought it necessary to show that the meeting was on what is known as Saturday night, and that Paul and his companions traveled all the next day, he on foot, and they by sea, although that is the case, and is admitted by many first-day authors. The obvious fact that the day is given no sacred title, and just mentioned, and nothing more, is sufficient to show that we have not yet found what we seek. We will try once more.

1 Cor. 16:1, 2: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as that given order to the churches in Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings but I come." Well, what have we here? No Lord's day, at any rate. The phrase, "lay by him in store," indicates that the appropriation for the poor was to be done at home. The phrase, "as God hath prospered him," shows that the individual was to look over his accounts to see what his gains had been during the previous week, a work suitable only for a secular day. The fact that it was to be done on a specified time-the first day of the week-shows the duty of system in our offerings to be poor. Dr. Barnes, who most sincerely believed in the sacredness of Sunday, said on this text: "Let him designate a certain portion; let him do this *by himself*, when he is at home, when he can calmly look at the evidence of his prosperity. Let him do it not under the influence of pathetic

appeals, or, for the sake of display when he is with others, but let him do it as a matter of principle, and when he is by himself."

"Nor ought we to leave unnoticed the method which he recommends of laying aside week by week what is devoted to God (1 Cor. 16:2)-a practice equally remote from the excitement of popular appeals and the mere impulse of instinctive benevolence."-*Conyebear and Howson*.

And now, what next? There is nothing more. We have examined every text in the New Testament (eight in all), which mentions the first day of the week, and with what success the reader has seen. Not the shadow of a hint have we found that would show that Sunday has any sacredness.

We have heard it stated from the pulpit, that Rev. 1:10 must refer to the first day of the week, because the term "Lord's day" is not elsewhere in the Bible applied to the seventh day. As much as to say, "Rev. 1:10 cannot refer to Saturday, because that day is nowhere else in the Bible called *Lord's day*; but it must refer to Sunday, because that day is uniformly called 'the first day of the week.'" That is a fair specimen of Sunday logic. It is a simple fact, however, as we have already seen (Ex. 20:8-11; Isa. 58:13; Mark 2:28, etc.) that the seventh day of the week is called the Lord's day.

And here we leave the matter. We have carefully and candidly considered the subject of the Lord's day, in the light of the Scriptures. As a very brief summary of the whole matter, and to remind the reader of the necessity of making a correct decision, we beg him to read these three texts:

"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy works; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Ex. 20:8-10.

"If thou want to turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on *my holy day*; and call the Sabbath a delight, all wholly of the Lord honorable; and shalt *honor him* [by keeping the Sabbath as he directs], 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, 14.

"For them that honor me I will honor; and they that despise me [by disobedience] shall be lightly esteemed." 1 Sam. 2:30. E. J. W.

"Punishment of the Wicked" *The Signs of the Times* 10, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

DIRECT TESTIMONY

In the preceding articles on the punishment of the wicked, we have confined ourselves principally to a consideration of those texts which are popularly supposed to teach the endless existence of the wicked in torment. We have found that, on the contrary, they teach most emphatically their final utter extinction. Indeed, the strongest proofs in favor of the position which we have taken concerning the future destiny of the impenitent, is to be found in those texts which are generally used by the opponents of that doctrine. We will now proceed

to the consideration of a few texts that are so plain that they of themselves should be allowed to settle the question. Some of these we shall quote without comment.

"Fret not thyself because of the evil-doers, neither be thou envious against the workers of iniquity. For they shall soon be *cut down like the grass and wither as the green herb.*" Ps. 37:1, 2.

"For evil-doers shall be *cut off*; but those that wait upon the Lord, they shall inherit the earth. For yet a little while and *the wicked shall not be*; yea, thou shalt diligently considered his place, and it shall not be." Ps. 37:9, 10. Compare this with Obadiah 16: "For as ye have drunk upon my holy mountain, so shall all the heathen drink continually, yea, they shall drink, and they shall swallow down, and *they shall be as though they had not been.*" We should like to know how these texts can be harmonized with the doctrine of the endless existence of the wicked. That theory cannot be held except by denying these texts, or, what is the same thing, ignoring them.

"For such as be blessed of him shall inherit the earth; and they that be cursed of him shall be *cut off.*" Ps. 37:22.

"Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! . . . which justify the wicked for reward, and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him! Therefore as *the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust: because they have cast away the law of the Lord of hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel.*" Isa. 5:20-24.

"And now they sin more and more, and have made them molten images of their silver, and idols according to their own understanding, all of it the work of the craftsmen: they say of them, Let the men that sacrifice kiss the calves. Therefore *they shall be as the morning cloud, and as the early dew that passeth away, as the chaff that is driven with the whirlwind out of the floor, and as the smoke out of the chimney.*" Hos. 13:2, 3. Dr. Scott, after quoting this text, says, "i.e., violently and speedily made to banish and disappear." The "Speaker's Commentary" says of this passage: "The tone of indignant derision passes into that of stern wrath the inflexibility of the purpose to punish is expressed by the accumulation of four several images, all describing utter extermination." That is just what the language signifies,—"utter extermination." If it does not mean that, we do not see how it can be anything.

The preceding texts have compared the wicked to the most combustible material—stubble and chaff. In the following, the prophet makes the case stronger yet; the wicked are declared to be stubble:-

"For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." "And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts." Mal. 4:1, 3. With this agree the words of John the Baptist: "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will

thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." Matt. 3:12.

We turn once more to the 37th psalm. In verse 20 we read: "But the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lamb; they shall consume; *into smoke* shall they consume away." The psalmist could have given no illustration of the final destiny of the wicked that would have been more forcible to the minds of the Jews. Every morning and every evening, according to the law, a lamp was placed on the altar and consumed. Beside this, the fact every sin-offering, whether it was a bullock, a goat, or a lamb (Lev. 4), was burned upon the altar. They sought the fat of lambs continually vanishing into smoke, and in that column of the ascending smoke they had an ever-present reminder of the fate of the incorrigibly wicked. They knew that when the fat was placed in that sacrificial fire, it was not preserved, but was speedily destroyed; and so when the psalmist said, "The enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume; and the smoke shall they consume away," they knew that the fate of the unrepentant sinners would be utter extinction. The last part of the verse only confirms the first clause: "The wicked shall perish;" for as we have already seen, the word "perish" means, "To be destroyed; to go to destruction; to pass away; to come to nothing; to be blotted from existence."

"Why," says one, "you are an annihilationist." Our reply is, We believe what we have just been reading from the Bible; if that is what you call and annihilationism, all right; we shall not be frightened from our position, whatever name may be applied to us. This word "annihilation" is a great bug-bear to many. Say they, "It is impossible for a matter to be annihilated." Now while we should not dare place any limit to God's power, we do not believe that he will blot out of existence any of the matter which he has created; but that he will and does change the form or combination of parts of many things, we have the most abundant evidence. Webster defines "annihilate" thus: "1. To reduce to nothing; to destroy the existence of; to cause to cease to be. 2. To destroy the form or peculiar distinctive properties of, so that the specific thing no longer exists, as, to annihilate a forest by cutting and carrying away the trees, though the timber may still exist." The Bible says that the wicked "shall not be;" that "they shall be as though they had not been." There was a time once when they were not; they had no existence; but the matter of which they are composed was even then in existence. So likewise the matter of which they are composed will remain after they cease to be. When the fat was placed on the altar it was destroyed; no one removed it, yet in a little while there was no fat there. What had become of it? It had become smoke. The *fat* was annihilated, if you please; but the matter which had composed it was not. Thus, we are told, will it be with the wicked. If any one disagrees with the statements concerning the wicked, his quarrel is with the Bible, not with us. E. J. W.

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

January 1, 1885

"Punishment of the Wicked" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST JAN. 17

1. How many classes of people does the Bible recognize as existing in the world? Matt. 13:24, 25.
2. What are these classes? Verse 38.
3. How long do they remain mingled together? Verses 28-30.
4. When is the harvest? Verse 39.
5. Is there any class between these two? Matt. 12:30.
6. Can one be in both these classes at the same time? Matt. 6:24.
7. When will the separation between these two classes be made? Matt. 25:31-33.
8. Briefly describe the character of these two classes? Verses 34-45.
9. What will finally become of them both? Verse 46.
10. When it is said that the righteous shall go into "life eternal," what is meant? Luke 20:35, 36.
11. Define the words "everlasting" and "eternal."
12. How much difference in duration will there be between the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked? Matt. 25:46.
13. What is to be punished with the wicked? Rom. 6:23.
14. Since their punishment is to be everlasting, or eternal, what can you say of the death which is the wages of sin?
15. What is said of the punishment of those who do not obey the gospel? 2 Thess. 1:7-9.
16. From whom does the apostle say the everlasting destruction comes?
17. What is it that comes from God and destroys the wicked? Rev. 22:9.
18. Will any wicked person escape the wrath of God? Nahum 1:3.
19. How many of earth's inhabitants have never sinned? Rom. 10:23.
20. Then how will it be possible for anybody to escape eternal death? 1 John 1:7.

There are innumerable classes of people in the world, according to a human reckoning, but according to God's standard-the Bible-there are only two. These are the righteous and the wicked. God made man upright, and designed that he should remain so; but the enemy came in and marred the handywork of the Creator. Since the fall of Adam there has not been a time when there have not been wicked persons on the earth. Indeed, so great has been the contamination that there has been no man since that time who was not to a greater or lesser extent a sinner. It is evident, then, that if at that time the tares-the wicked of earth-had it been plucked up, there would have been no wheat left. Both are to

grow together until the harvest-the end of the world. Then a separation will be made by the only one who is able to distinguish between the good grain and the worthless matter.

From these facts two things are evident. 1. There are only two classes. Christ said: "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad." Matt.12:30. There is no provision made for people who are "as good as the average." To be only as good as the average of mankind, is to be very bad. The standard is-*good*. Anything different from that is bad. 2. None receive the reward until the Lord comes. In the end of the world-the harvest-the master sends for his angels, and they "sever the wicked *from among* the just." The farmer does not reap one portion of his wheat-field in the spring, another in midsummer. And still another in the fall. There is a special harvest-time, and then all his grain is reaped. So the Lord has not been all the time gathering from this field that he has sown, but has "appointed a day in the which he will judge the world." "The harvest is the *end* of the world," not the beginning, middle, and end.

From Matt. 25:35-45 we learn that the Lord weighs not only *actions* but intentions. Those to whom the king says, "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom," etc., have not an opinion of their merit. They have had such exalted ideas of right that their humble deeds seem as nothing in comparison. But love to Christ is the mainspring of all their action, and that glorifies every deed however small. Christ identifies himself with his people so closely that whatever is done to them is accounted as done directly to him. On the other hand, we learn that no act, however worthy in itself, is of any value in the sight of God unless done for love to Christ. The heathen did many good things. Their philosophers taught what they called "virtue," some things in which were really good. But all their boasted virtue was only for the exaltation of self. Selfishness was the motive that prompted all their deeds; and since a fountain cannot send the forth at the same time both sweet water and bitter, neither can a good accompany evil, it follows that even their seeming good deeds were really evil. On this same basis, whatever is done "*In order* that we may have eternal life," with the idea that good deeds are going to make one worthy of reward, is all in vain. Love must be the ruling motive. If we serve God because of gratitude to him for his love that has already been manifested to us, his love will be still further manifested in *giving* us eternal life. His love will always be as much greater than ours as he is greater than we; consequently the utmost efforts that our love can prompt will fall infinitely short of compensating for his benefits to us.

"And these [the wicked] shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life the eternal." Matt. 25:46. The words of "eternal" and "everlasting" are from the same word in the original, and mean the same. We know that in this case they mean "without end," for Christ tells us that those who obtain that world, cannot die anymore (Luke 28:35, 36); hence eternal life means life without end. Then eternal or everlasting punishment means punishment without end. This will be the fate of the wicked. But mark; this verse; does not tell the *nature* of the punishment; only tells us that the punishment will be inflicted, and that it will last eternally. Rom. 6:23 tells us what the punishment is to be: "The wages of sin is death." Then Matt. 25:46 might very properly be

paraphrased thus: "And these-wicked-shall go away into eternal death; but the righteous into eternal life." This is exactly what the text teaches. In harmony with this Paul says of those who know not God, and do not obey the gospel, that they "shall be punished with *everlasting destruction*." This cannot be the case if they are never *destroyed*. The agent of this destruction is to be fire, which is to come "from the presence of the Lord." See 2 Thess. 2:8; Rev. 20:9.

"The Lord is slow to anger, and great in power, and will not at all acquit the wicked." Nahum 1:3. No guilty person can escape the wrath of God. How then can anybody escape eternal death, since "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God"? Only by having their guilt taken away by the blood of the Lamb of God. If we do not come to Christ, we can never have life; but if he is "made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification," he will also be unto us "redemption." E. J. W.

"Fate of the Wicked" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FROM THE JEWISH SACRIFICES

The prophet David had in his lifetime an experience similar to that of many others. That to which we refer is recorded in the seventy-third psalm. He thought things were very unequally and unjustly divided. He saw that the wicked were as a rule in better circumstances than the righteous; and in contemplating this, he came very near making shipwreck of this faith. Said he: "But as for me, my feet were almost gone; my steps had well nigh slipped. For I was envious at the foolish, when I saw the prosperity of the wicked. For there are no bands in their death; but their strength is firm. They [are] not in trouble as other men; neither are they plagued like other men. . . . Their eyes stand out with fatness: they have more than heart could wish. They are corrupt, and speak wickedly concerning oppression; they speak loftily. They set their mouth against the heavens, and their tongue walketh through the earth. . . . And they say, How doth God know? and is there knowledge in the most High? Behold, these are the ungodly, who prosper in the world; they increase in riches." Verses 2-12.

As he contrasted his condition with theirs, he concluded that the service of the Lord didn't pay. His words were: "Verily I have cleansed my heart in vain, and washed my hands in innocency. For all the day long have I been plagued, and chastened every morning." Verses 13, 14. How many people we have heard reason in the same way. "If God is just," they say, "why does he allow Mr. A, who is a humble, devoted Christian, to suffer so much of poverty and sickness, while Mr. B, his blasphemous neighbor, has an abundance of everything, with nothing to trouble him?" It is short-sighted reasoning, as David himself found out, although not from his own reasoning as to what God ought to do. He continues: "When I thought to know this, it was too painful for me; until I went into the sanctuary of God; then understood I their end. Surely thou didst set them in slippery places: thou castedst them down into destruction. How are they brought

into desolation, as in a moment! they are utterly consumed with terrors. As a dream when one awaketh; so, O Lord, when thou awakest, thou shalt despise their image." Verses 16-20.

In these verses we find a striking confirmation of the texts which have before been quoted as proving the final utter extinction of the wicked. Their present security is only apparent, not real; they are in slippery places, and are to be cast down to destruction. As in a moment they are to be brought into desolation. More than this, when the Lord arises to take vengeance on his adversaries, they are to be as a dream when one awakes from sleep-vanished into nothingness. As elsewhere expressed, they are to be "as the early dew that passeth away."

All this the psalmist found out when he went into the sanctuary of the Lord. Let us then, go in with him, and see for ourselves what is there taught concerning the fate of the wicked. It is evident that we must consider that part of the sanctuary service which has to do with sin, if we are to learn anything concerning the end of the wicked. This service is given somewhat at length in the fourth chapter of Leviticus. We will quote enough of the chapter to bring the matter directly before us:-

"And if any one of the common people sin through ignorance, while he doeth somewhat against any of the commandments of the Lord concerning things which ought not to be done, and be guilty; or if his sin, which he hath sinned, come to his knowledge: then he shall bring his offering, a kid of the goats, a female without blemish, for his sin which he hath sinned. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin offering, and slay the sin offering in the

9

place of the burnt offering. And the priest shall take of the blood thereof with his finger, and put it upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering, and shall pour out all the blood thereof at the bottom of the altar. And he shall take away all the fat thereof, as the fat is taken away from off the sacrifice of peace offerings; and the priest shall burn it upon the altar for a sweet savour unto the Lord; and the priest shall make an atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him." Lev. 4:27-31.

With some modifications, of a minor character, this was the ceremony to be performed when sin had been committed. The victim to be offered might be a bullock, a goat, a lamb, or a pidgeon, according to the rank or wealth of the sinner, the poor not being required to bring so costly an offering as the wealthy. But in all the principle was the same, and that principle is so simple that a child can easily grasp it. The sinner, by laying his hands upon the head of the offering, transferred, in figure, his sins to the victim, which represented Christ, "who his own self bear our sins in his own body on the tree." 1 Peter 2:24. The offering having thus, in figure, received the sins of the transgressors, was slain, thus prefiguring Christ, who was "delivered for our offenses," and who "died for the ungodly." When this was done and the blood or flesh of the victim had been carried into the sanctuary, the man's sins were forgiven him. If he remained penitent until the day of atonement, his sins were blotted out entirely when the sanctuary was cleansed. Lev. 17. In all this reference was had to Christ, who "appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."

As a victim, when it had in figure received the sins of the transgressor, was slain, so Christ, when the Lord had laid on him the iniquity of the all, "poured out his soul unto death." He died for us, "the just for the unjust;" thus showing what would be man's fate had the offering not been made, or should he not accept it. And so, in the figure, the penitent Jew, as the victim bearing his sin was slain before his eyes, was reminded that "the wages of sin is *death*." The victim was then burned to ashes, thus showing both the instrument and the completeness of the sinner's destruction; and so the penitent was taught in a manner that he could not misunderstand nor forget, "the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away."

Now no one can deny that these sacrifices typified Christ's sacrifice, nor that Christ himself did really die for sinners, unless he denies the truth of the Bible. Then the conclusion is unavoidable that if Christ had not died all men must have died, for all men are sinners; and further, since "he was manifested to take away our sin," thus saving us from death because he saves us from sin, it is just as evident that those who do not wash their robes of character and make them white in the blood of the Lamb, will in the end perish. Their fate will be the same as though no sacrifice had been made. This is what David learned when he went into the sanctuary of the Lord, and this made him content with his hard lot.

One text more must suffice for the direct testimony concerning the destruction of the wicked. We give it because the contrast between the righteous and the wicked is so marked. It is Ps. 37:37, 37: "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright; for the end of that man is peace. But the *transgressors shall be destroyed* together; the end of the wicked shall be cut off." Note the contrast: The end of the upright is peace, but the end of the wicked shall be cut off. Dr. Barnes says that the word rendered "end" means properly "the last or extreme part; then, the end or issue of any thing, that which comes *after* it; then, the after time, the future, the hereafter. Isa. 2:2; Micah 4:1; Gen. 49:1. Dan. 10:14. It may, therefore, refer to *anything* future; and would be well expressed by the word *hereafter*." The Septuagint has *engkatateimma*, the meaning of which is, according to Liddell and Scott, "a reminder." Substituting this meaning in the place of the word as translated, we get the full force of the text. Thus: "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright; for the *remainder* of that man is peace. But the transgressors shall be destroyed together; the *remainder* of the wicked shall be cut off." And this agrees with what the psalmist says in the earlier part of this, and in the seventy-third psalm. The righteous, although they may be plagued and afflicted in this earth, will, in the new earth, "delight themselves in the abundance of peace" all the remainder of their lives, which will last to all eternity. But the remainder of the wicked, who now have all that they desire, shall be cut off. Nothing could more clearly express their other extinction. "The end [remainder or hereafter] of the wicked shall be cut off;" *i.e.*, there shall be no remainder to their lives. E. J. W.

"The Lord's Supper and the Laying On of Hands" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

The following earnest letter of inquiry to the editor was recently received from a reader of the SIGNS, in Iowa:-

"To-night I have finished the second reading of your work, 'Thoughts on Baptism,' particularly that part relating to trine immersion. I bitterly opposed the Adventists here in Iowa, for nearly two years, but now I inquire of them. Baptism has been the hardest point to yield, so far. (I was a trine immersionist.) I have been looking up your references as far as I am able, and so far I have found them correct. I have compared yours and J. H. Moore's tract, and as the light comes in, I believe more and more in single immersion. I believe your tract [pamphlet] will settle the difficulty with me. But there are other things that I do not yet understand.

"Why do not the Adventists observe the Lord's Supper? as it is evident the Lord with his apostles partook of a full meal. John 13:4. And in 1 Cor. 11:20, Paul speaks of the Lord's Supper, and if a hint that it, as Paul gives, shows that such a thing did exist, why are not the Dunkards right; partaking of a full meal? They (the Dunkards) also lay hands on the baptized, that they may receive the Holy Ghost. Acts 8:17. Why do not the Adventist do so?

"I write this verily for information and explanations of the Scriptures referred to. Please don't delay. I desire to be in harmony with Christ and his people before probation closes. Yours fraternally, in hope. J. J. E."

THE LORD'S SUPPER

Our brother is mistaken in supposing that Adventists do not celebrate the Lord's Supper. We judge, however, that he does not regard the ceremony which will serve as being really the Lord's Supper, because it is not an ordinary, regular meal. That the Lord's Supper as celebrated by Adventists, and Christian churches generally, is identical in the form with that instituted by our Lord, and that to making it an ordinary meal is a perversion of the ordinances, can be easily demonstrated by the Bible, to the satisfaction, we think, of our inquiring brother.

1. It is true that Paul, in his letter to the Corinthians, does speak of a full meal in connection with the Lord's Supper, but only to condemn the practice. In this first epistle the apostle corrects many errors of the Corinthian church. After rebuking certain other unseemly practices, he takes up their manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper, and says (1 Cor. 11:20, 21): "When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper. For in eating everyone taketh the before other his own supper; and one is hungry and another is drunken." That is to say, "Although you profess to celebrate the Lord's Supper, you do not take it in fact, because you eat and drink to satisfy the demands of appetite." No stronger evidence than these two verses is needed to show that those who partake of a full meal under the impression that they are celebrating the Lord's Supper, are grievously mistaken. In astonishment at their

obtuseness, the apostle continues: "What? have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? Or despise ye the house of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not."

2. Although the ordinance of the Lord's Supper was instituted on the night of the last Passover, it was entirely distinct from that meal. This is apparent from an examination of the records of the evangelist. Matthews says: "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; *this* is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for *this* is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Chap. 26:26-28. Mark's words are almost the same. Luke says (chap. 22:19, 20): "And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you; *this do* in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup *after supper*, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you."

From these texts we learn (1) That it is only the bread and the wine that commemorate our Lord's death; and (2) That these emblems were partaken of "after supper," *i. e.*, after the Passover meal. Both these points are very clearly made by Paul and 1 Cor. 11: 23-26, after he had shown the Corinthians what the Lord's Supper is not. We quote: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: *this do in remembrance of me*. After the same manner also he took the cup, when *he had supped* ["after the eating of the evening meal"], saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood; *this do ye*, as oft as ye drink it, *in remembrance of me*. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come."

This is too plain to be misunderstood. Paul did not depend upon hearsay for his evidence, but received it directly from the Lord himself. All that they were to do in remembrance of Christ, as showing forth his death till he should come, was to break and eat bread, and drink of the cup; and this memorial was instituted after the supper was over, and was entirely distinct from it. The Lord's Supper consists simply in partaking of the bread and wine, emblems of the broken body and spilled blood of Christ; whatever more is added is a perversion of the ordinance. Since the institution of the memorial was entirely distinct from the Passover Supper, and had no reference to it, there is no more reason for having the celebration of the Lord's Supper preceded by a full, ordinary meal, than there would be for introducing it by the performance of some other act of Christ on that day.

More proof might be given on this subject, but it would seem that these Bible statements of what the Lord's Supper is, and the declaration by Paul that the eating of a meal is not the Lord's Supper, should be sufficient to settle the matter.

LAYING ON OF HANDS

To the question why the Adventists do not lay hands on baptized persons, that they may receive the Holy Ghost, it would be sufficient reply to say that no such act is commanded. The gospel commission (Matt. 28:19, 20) says nothing of the laying on of hands, in addition to baptism; consequently we have no authority for such a custom.

More than this, we find that the Holy Ghost was not given in a fixed, arbitrary manner, even in the apostles' time. In the case cited, and in Acts 19:6,

10

we learn that the apostles laid hands on baptized persons, who then received the Holy Ghost; but in Acts 10:44, 45 we have an instance where the Holy Ghost fell on a room full of people who had not been baptized, and without the imposition of a human hand; and in the case of the conversion and baptism of the eunuch (Acts 8:26-40), which is related with great minuteness, we have no intimation concerning any act of laying on of hands. When the apostles laid hands on those whom they baptized, it seems to have been in view of an especial work which they were to perform.

With these facts before us, and others that might be cited, we think that might be cited, we think that Adventists would be acting in a very presumptuous and unwarranted manner, if, in partial imitation of the apostles, they should lay hands on people in order that they might receive the Holy Ghost. E. J. W.

January 8, 1885

"The Sabbath-School" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST JAN. 24

1. When will all the nations of earth be gathered before the Lord?
2. How many classes of people will there be?
3. Name and describe them?
4. What will be said to those on the right hand-the righteous? Matt. 25:34.
5. What will the Lord say to those on the left? Verse 41.
6. Have any people ever yet been punished with everlasting or eternal fire? Jude 7.
7. Describe the fate of Sodom and Gomorrha. Gen. 19:24, 25.
8. How long a time, in comparison with eternity, did it take to accomplish this overthrow? Lam. 4:6.
9. As the result of being overthrown by "everlasting fire," what did those cities become? 2 Pet. 2:6.
10. After the cities became ashes what must have become of the fire?
11. Then does "everlasting fire" necessarily burn to all eternity?
12. What did the prophet Malachi say of the fierceness of the fires of the last day? Mal. 4:1.
13. As the result of this fire, what will the wicked be? Verse 3.

14. When this takes place, what will have become of the fire which devoured them?

15. What wonderful promise was made concerning Jerusalem, on condition that the people should obey the Lord? Jer. 17:24, 25.

16. What did the Lord say that he would do if they did not obey him? Verse 27.

17. What did he say that this fire should do? *Ib.*

18. What did he say should not be done to the fire? *Ib.*

19. What is the meaning of the word "devour"?

20. If the fire, when kindled, had been quenched, would the gates and palaces have been devoured?

21. When that upon which the flames were feeding was "devoured," what must have become of the fire?

22. What did Christ say of the fire into which the wicked are to be cast? Mark 9:45.

23. Since the fire is not to be quenched, what will it do? Rev. 20:9.

24. Then how much of the wicked will there be left? Mal. 4:1.

It has been said that the Bible is like a fiddle, because it will play any tune that is desired. To this it has justly been replied that you can get only one tune from a fiddle if you keep your fingers off from the strings. So the Bible of itself does not teach many and contradictory doctrines, but only one, harmonious in all its parts. In no case is this better illustrated than in the doctrine of the punishment of the wicked, which we are now considering. If we only let the Bible explain itself, nothing more harmonious was ever seen. Our lesson covers one or two texts which suffer much from being tampered with by human hands; let us see how they appear when the Bible is used as a commentary.

"Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." The "angels that kept not their first estate" sinned against such great light that there was for them no forgiveness. If man had not yielded to temptation, they would alone have suffered the torments of the everlasting fire; but now they are to be accompanied by wicked men who will not be forgiven. "And this torment is never to end," says one, and then, of perchance, he asks, "Is it just for God to cause a man to suffer the eternal torment for the sins committed in one short life?" We answer, It must be, if that is what he has threatened to do. We are not to decide by our ideas of justice what God ought to or will do, but must derive our ideas of justice from what God says he will do; for he is the embodiment of justice, as well as of every other desirable thing. Perhaps if we study carefully, we shall find that God has not threatened anybody with eternal torment. Eternal *punishment*, as we learned last week, is threatened; but we must remember that this punishment is *death*, and that no one has received his punishment until death takes place, and then *torment* must necessarily cease.

As we read along the New Testament, with this text in mind, our attention is caught by a similar expression in Jude, the seventh verse: "Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering

the vengeance of eternal fire." Everybody is familiar with the story of the destruction of Sodom. It is found in Gen. 19. There we learn (verses 24, 25) that God rained upon Sodom and Gomorrha fire and brimstone, and *overthrew* them and all their inhabitants. Peter tells us how complete was this overthrow: "And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha *into ashes* condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly." 2 Pet. 2:6. When a thing is reduced to ashes, we know that every particle of it that is combustible has been burned, and that fire can no longer be kept burning upon it. In fact, there is no surer way of putting out a fire than of covering it with ashes, for they are incombustible. So then the cities of Sodom and Gomorrha having been long since turned to ashes, must have, for an equally long time, ceased to burn; nobody will question this, for all believe that a portion of the Dead Sea covers a place where they once stood.

And still those cities suffered the vengeance of "eternal fire." This being true, we reasonably conclude that although the wicked are to go into everlasting or eternal fire, they need not necessarily continue to burn to all eternity. At least Matt. 25:41 does not teach that they will. Now if we carry our investigation a little further, we shall see that, as in the case of the cities of the plain when they were turned to ashes, the fire which prey upon the wicked must cease to burn. "For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." Mal. 4:1. Stubble cannot long withstand the action of fire, and we are not surprised to learn that if the wicked are stubble nothing will be left of them when once they are subjected to the flames. But read verse 3: "And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts." That settles the matter beyond controversy. We know not how long a time it may take to reduce the wicked to ashes; to our comprehension it will doubtless be a very long time; but we are certain that they eventually will be ashes, and are just as certain that when that time comes, the "everlasting fire" which consumed them will have ceased to burn.

The learned commentator, Dr. Barnes, although he believed in the eternal torment of the wicked, has given the following just criticism on Jude seven:-

"The phrase 'eternal fire' is one that is often used to denote future punishment-as expressing the severity and intensity of suffering. See Notes on Matt. 25:41. As here used, it cannot mean that the fires which consumed Sodom and Gomorrha were literally eternal, or were kept always burning, for that was not true. The expression seems to denote, in this connection, two things: (1) that the destruction of the cities of the plain, with their inhabitants, was as entire and perpetual as *if* the fires had been always burning-the consumption was absolute and enduring-the sinners were wholly cut off, and the cities forever rendered desolate; and (2) that in its nature and duration this was a striking emblem of the destruction which will come upon the ungodly."

Mark 9:45 is another text that is sadly misunderstood. People think, or, rather, conclude without thinking, that "fire that never shall be quenched" must of course always continue to burn. But what is the natural consequence to perishable

substances when the fire into which they are cast is not quenched? Why, they are burned up, of course. They are speedily reduced to ashes, and then the fire, which was not quenched, dies a natural death. Throw stubble into the fire; if you speedily quench the flame, the stubble may be saved; but if the fire is unquenchable, nothing can keep the stubble from becoming utterly consumed. So of the wicked; if the Bible said that the fire shall be quenched, we should know that they would escape punishment; but no human power can quench the fire of the last day, and God said that he will not. So we must conclude, even if the Bible did not tell us, that the wicked are to be *devoured*, not preserve alive. When the fire has done its work, they will be left "neither root to nor branch." E. J. W.

"False Witness" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

Some time ago we received a circular from a crank who pretended to know exactly when the Lord would come. We say "a crank," because his professed "calculations" showed that in his mental make-up he was decidedly crooked. He represented nobody, and made no pretensions to, and we thought we treated his guess-work with great respect when we promptly granted it a place in the waste basket. The time that he had set was Jan. 5, 1885, and as this date is in the past, he is doubtless now at work on a new and improved computation.

But news was scarce after election, and the most of the papers to which this circular was sent, gave it a prominent place in their columns. More than this, both secular and religious papers have given the gratuitous information that "the Adventists have fixed it that the end of the world is to be January 5, 1885." When this statement was first noticed, a denial of it, and a true statement of the case was sent to the San Francisco *Bulletin*, which showed its fairness by giving it as prominent a place as it did the other. But not one of the papers that copied the original charge have copied the refutation. After that refutation appeared in the *Bulletin*, a religious journal in San Francisco repeated the statement that the Adventists have fixed the time for the end of the world. We can only conclude that, not having been able to make any headway against the doctrines of the seventh day at best, it is willing, in order to create prejudice against them, to place itself among those who love and make a lie.

Wherever Seventh-day Adventists are known, it is well understood that they set no time for the Lord to come, and have no sympathy with those who do so. It is true that some who profess to be Adventists do presume to fix the time when the Lord will come; but the unwarranted act of a few irresponsible persons should not be set down against an entire denomination, which repudiates both the persons and their methods.

The Lord himself, speaking of his coming, said, "But of that day and hour knoweth no man." This is in the same chapter in which he says that after certain signs have taken place, we must "*know* that he is near, even at the doors." The same word that obliges us to be Adventists, also obliges us to confess our ignorance as to the day, or month, or year when the Master will return.

We have no expectation of causing false reports to cease. We do not suppose that, because of our protests, people will cease to show their contempt for the Bible doctrine of the coming of the Lord, by maligning and ridiculing those who profess it. On the contrary, we expect that such things will increase. Personally they did not trouble us, and our only object in noticing them is to disabuse the minds of some who have innocently believed these false reports, and who, but for them, would look with favor on the doctrines which we are sure are of vital importance. E. J. W.

January 15, 1885

"Punishment of the Wicked-Continued" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST JAN. 31

1. With what does Paul say that the wicked shall be punished? 2 Thess. 1:7-9.
2. When will this punishment take place?
3. From whom does this destruction come?
4. What does the prophet Joel say of the day of the Lord? Joel 1:15.
5. What is the agent of this destruction that comes from the Lord? 2 Thess. 2:8; Rev. 20:9.
6. What does the inspired writer say of the suffering of those who are thus *devoured*? Rev. 20:10.
7. Repeat another testimony on this point. Rev. 14:9-11.
8. What, in ancient times, was the law concerning Hebrew servants? Ex. 21:2.
9. If in the seventh year the servant refused to leave his master, what was done? Verses 5, 6.
10. After the ceremony of boring the servant's ear had been performed, how long was he to serve his master? *Ib.*
11. Can this by any possibility mean that in such a case the servant was never to die?
12. What must we understand by the expression, "he shall serve him forever"? (See note.)
13. Then what may we understand by similar expressions concerning the torment of the wicked?
14. What positive proof can you give that those sufferings will eventually be terminated by cessation of existence? Mal. 4:1, 3.
15. How many other texts do you remember that prove the same thing?
"Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; 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; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." 2 Thess. 1:6-9. The time when this vengeance will be taken on the disobedient is stated in verses 7 and 10. It is when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, and when he shall be glorified in his saints. Compare Matt. 25:31-36.

There is a quite general misunderstanding of this text in Thessalonians. We frequently hear it quoted as though it read that the wicked shall be banished from the presence of the Lord. But the text says no such thing. Further, to be banished from the presence of the Lord is an impossibility, for God is omnipresent; he fills the universe; and still further, if such a thing were possible, it would be no punishment for the wicked, but would be what they would desire. No position could be more unsatisfactory to a wicked man than to be continually in the presence of God. What the text does say of the wicked is that they "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." The destruction comes from the Lord. So we read in Joel 1:15 that the day of the Lord comes "as a destruction from the Almighty." And Paul in another place says that the wicked shall be consumed by the spirit of his mouth, and destroyed by the brightness of his coming, thus showing how they are destroyed from, or by, the glory of his power.

From Rev. 21:9, as well as elsewhere, we learn that fire is to be the agent in the destruction of the wicked. As they compass the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city, fire comes down from God out of heaven, and *devours* them. This indicates complete extermination. Then what are we to understand when, in the next verse, we read that they "shall be tormented day and night forever and ever"? Some may answer that this applies only to the devil, who deceived them. This will not meet the difficulty, since the Scriptures do not teach that Satan is to be punished differently from the wicked, except in degree; and in Rev. 14:11 we have a statement concerning the wicked, that is similar to that in Rev. 22:10. Now since John, looking at things that are to be, as though they had been, saw that the fire *devoured* the wicked, and Paul says that they shall be punished with everlasting *destruction*, we must conclude that "forever and ever" must be limited in duration. For if the wicked are always to exist in torment, then it would necessarily follow that they will never be destroyed nor devoured.

The Bible must be its own interpreter, and we will let this text, which seems obscure, be explained by another one, which has no obscurity. Turn to Ex. 21, and read verses 2-6: "If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve: and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing. If he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself; if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him. If his master have given him a wife, and she have born him sons or daughters; the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself. And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free; then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall serve him for ever." We say that there is no obscurity in this passage. The different parts of the transaction are clearly indicated, and the

result is plainly stated: after having his ear bored through which an awl, the servant was to continue a bondman forever. And no one would mistake the statement, and suppose that the servant was to endure the rigors of servitude throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity. Certainly not. All would agree that this means simply that the servant could, under those circumstances, derive no benefit from the Sabbath year, but that he must serve without intermission just as long as his life should last. This is all there is to it.

"But why," says one, "do you introduce such an instance as that?" In order to show that the term "forever" does not necessarily indicate that the thing to which it is applied has no end. It may be applied to an object that is in its nature perishable, as in the case of the servant. In general this rule may be laid down: Whenever there is anything in the nature of the object spoken of that forbids the idea of its eternal existence, the term "forever" merely implies continuity of existence. God's word forbids us to imagine that the wicked shall exist throughout eternity; so when we read that they shall be "tormented day and night forever and ever," we are to understand that their torments will be long, and will be unintermitting until they are utterly consumed. That such a time will come is taught by the word of the Lord: "For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and *all that do wickedly*, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh *shall burn them up*, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall *leave them neither root nor branch.*" Mal.4:1. "And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts." Verse 3; Matt. 3:11, 12; 2 Thess. 1:7-9; 2:8; Rev. 22:9; Rom. 6:23; John 3:16, 36; and many other texts may be cited to prove the same thing, namely, that the wicked will eventually be utterly exterminated. E. J. W.

"A Puzzled Correspondent" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

From a gentlemen in Medina, Ohio, who has read a few copies of the SIGNS, we have received a letter which contains objections that are common to so many, and which seems to indicate a spirit of kindness and candor on the part of the writer, so that we are constrained to print it entire. It reads as follows:-

"DEAR BRETHREN: I have just received a copy of the SIGNS, and have read it with great pleasure and profit, though the journal is not new to me. Your views of the second advent, immortality through Christ, etc., all meet my views exactly. I do not understand the Sunday question, however, as you do. You seem to imply that if we begin on Sabbath, Dec. 5, 1884, and go back by sevens, we should arrive at the Sabbath which God gave to Moses; but as no sane man pretends to tell the year the law was given, of course we cannot tell where to stop, and hence all is guess-work. I am just as sure that to-day [Dec. 7] is the truth Sabbath, as you can be that Dec. 5 was.

"But even if we did know this, what then? I profess to be a Christian, and hence I care no more for what Moses commanded, than I do for what Mohammed commanded. Christ is the *end* of the law to everyone that believeth. He who follows Christ does more honor to Moses and the law than he does who

worships law only. Christ elaborated every one of the commandments in the decalogue except regarding Sunday, or the 'Sabbath,' and of that he speaks as though it were more for us than we for that.

"If infidels cared nothing for Sunday, how can you make them respect Saturday? Why not change their hearts instead of their calendar?

"Yours in Christ, W. P. R."

Our brother has got things sorely confused in his mind, but we will endeavor to set him straight in regard to them. In the first place, we shall inform him that since December 5 fell on Friday, we do not count that day either backward or forward, to find the Sabbath. We are Christians, not Mohammedans. He says, "I am just as sure that today [Dec. 7, the date of the letter] is the true Sabbath, as you can be that Dec. 5 was." Granted; but unless his confidence exceeds that, he will not be likely to do much homage to the Sunday. We can say ourselves that we also are "just as sure" that Sunday, December 7, was the Sabbath as we are that Friday, December 5, was, and not one particle more so. There is just the same Bible authority for keeping Sunday that there is for keeping Friday, and that is-just none at all.

Of one thing we are just as certain as it is possible to be of any thing, and that is that if, beginning with any Sabbath (Saturday), we should count back by sevens, we should find that we have the same seventh-day Sabbath which God commanded the Jews to keep, and upon which he rested in the beginning. It is not at all necessary that we should know the exact age of the world, nor the exact year in which the law was given. The following points establish the matter beyond all controversy: 1. The Sabbath of the fourth commandment is the one upon which God rested at creation. See Ex. 20:8-11; Gen. 2:2, 3. 2. It was the same day that was kept in the time of Christ, and of which he declared himself Lord (Mark 2:28), for the women who followed Jesus to the sepulcher returned and rested the Sabbath day "according to the commandment." Luke 23:56. 3. It is not possible that the reckoning of days since that time could have been lost, for the Jews, who as a nation have kept the Sabbath quite strictly ever since the Babylonian captivity, were dispersed to every nation under the heavens, and there is not the slightest disagreement among them as to which day is the true Sabbath, no matter how widely separated they may be. Moreover, within a comparatively short time after the days of Christ, his professed followers adopted the day of the heathen festival of the sun,-the first day of the week,-professing to do it in honor of Christ's resurrection on the first day of

41

the week; not in whatever part of the world you go, you invariably find that the so-called "Christian Sabbath" is the day following the Sabbath which to Jews observe. Thus we know that the day of the Sabbath has never been lost since the creation. On this point, Bishop E. O. Haven, of the M. E. Church, said:-

"There is no good reason for denying that the Jewish Sabbath is the true seventh day, reckoning from the creation of man, and that the Christian Sunday is the first day of the Hebrew week, or of the genuine week."-*Pillars of Truth*, p. 89.

And now that we *know* that we have the original seventh-day Sabbath, "what then?" Says our brother: "I profess to be a Christian, and hence I care no more for what Moses commanded than I do for what Mohammed commanded." Well, we profess to be Christians too, yet we care, far more for Moses than we do for Mohammed, because "we know that God spake unto Moses" (see Num. 12:6-8; Deut. 34:10), and there is no evidence that God ever manifested himself in any way to Mohammed. Christ was the prophet the Lord was to raise up, like unto Moses (Deut.18:18, 19; Acts 3:22-26); and he reproved the Jews because they did not really believe the words of Moses. Indeed Christ plainly says that they could not believe on him unless they first believed the words of Moses (John 5:46, 47); and therefore if our brother really cares no more for Moses than he does for Mohammed, he has the word of Christ before for it that his profession of Christianity amounts to nothing; that without believing Moses he cannot be a Christian. We do not believe that he carefully considered what he was writing.

But the Sabbath commandment does not rest on the authority of Moses. "And God spake all these words, saying, . . . Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work," etc. Ex. 20:1-11. "These words *the Lord spake* unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice: and he added no more. And he wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me." Deut. 5:22. Certainly our brother cares something for what the Lord commanded, even if he has no regard for Moses.

"Christ is the *end* of the law to everyone that believeth." True; but must we therefore conclude that with every believer in Christ there must be an end of keeping the law? Let us try a case, and see if our brother will agree with us. I believe in Christ, therefore I will curse and swear, because Christ is the end of the law which says, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." Again, because I believe in Christ, who is the end of the law, I will shoot the next man I meet, and take his watch and purse. "No, no," our friend will surely say, "that would not do; if you believe in Christ you must forsake sin." Exactly; so say the Scriptures: "He that saith he abideth in him [Christ] ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked." 1 John 2:6. And he "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." 1 Peter 2:22. Sin is the transgression of the law (1 John 3:4); so then if we profess to abide in Christ we must cease transgressing the law, or, in other words, we must keep the law. Now by what rule does our brother decide that, because Christ is the end of law, we are at liberty to violate the fourth commandment, and are not at liberty to violate the third, sixth, or eighth? "Are not your ways unequal?"

Is the follower of Christ at liberty to break the law in any particular? Listen to the words of Jesus himself: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he 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." Matt. 5:17-19. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." Matt. 7:21.

The follower of Christ it is not free to break the law, although Christ is the end of the law. Then in what sense is he the end of the it? In this sense that in the present state of the world Christ is the object of the law; *i.e.*, the law, having no power of itself to make sinful man perfect, drives them to Christ, in whom they may attain all the perfection which the law requires. Paul clearly expresses the case in a few words: "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.

"He who follows Christ does more honor to Moses and the law than he does who worships the law only." Very true; for if any one "worships the law only," he will make a miserable failure; "without me," says Christ, "ye can do nothing." Christ's office is to enable us to *do*, as well as to cleanse us from past transgressions. One cannot be a follower of Christ without keeping the law.

"Christ elaborated every one of the commandments of the decalogue, except regarding Sunday." Very much mixed. Christ said nothing about the second commandment, and did not elaborate the eighth, ninth, nor tenth; yet we do not feel of liberty to slight them on that account. And he certainly did not elaborate the commandment regarding Sunday, because no such commandment was in existence until the rise of the "man of sin," many years after the time of Christ's earthly ministry.

"The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." Mark 2:27. These are the expressed, not implied, words of Christ. It was made for man's use. Now if our brother wishes to know just how God designs that man shall use the Sabbath, let him read the fourth commandment, and he will find out. God made the Sabbath for man to keep holy. Will our brother keep it so, and thus use the Sabbath as God intended it should be used?

The paragraph concerning infidels and the Sabbath will be noticed in another article. E. J. W.

"Easy Conversion" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

Much ado has been made over the announcement that Mr. M. K. Schermerhorn, one of the most prominent of Unitarian preachers, has been admitted into the Episcopal Church, and this taken orders therein, and "the church" has been congratulated upon so valuable and accession. According to Mr. Schermerhorn's own statement, however, his "conversion" does not seem to have been prompted wholly by unselfish motives. He says:-

"As to Unitarianism, I will say that it has been a constant disappointment to me, though I always tried to make the best of it. I have seen the Unitarian cause steadily declining. Out of fifteen societies in the New York and Hudson River Conferences, for instance, six have died outright during the past twelve years. No

new ones have been started, and those remaining are, with three or four exceptions, just alive, and that is all. This same is more or less true all over America and England, too. In short, I lost all hope for any permanent growth of Unitarianism long before I left Newport, and this, in part, was what (providentially, as I now feel) caused me to turn my studies and thought in the direction of the older churches and faith."

Even in politics such an avowal as that would not be considered a credit to any man. Much has been said, especially during the last campaign, about standing up for a principle, even though the party be in the minority; but here we find a clergyman openly announcing that he has left the church of which he was long champion, solely because he had no hope that it would ever rival other denominations, and people do not think that there is anything out of the way in his course. Well, why should they? Isn't popularity getting to be the standard of orthodoxy? Of late the discussion between Catholics and Protestants has waxed hot, as to whether Catholicism has really made the progress that is claimed for it, as though its character were to be judged by its ability to gain converts. One of the most common objections as we hear against the Sabbath of the Lord is, "Oh, there is only a mere handful of people that keep it, anyway." And the argument upon which Sunday advocates are willing to rest their cause is that "everybody keeps Sunday."

When people can pass from one church to another, or from the world to the church, so easily, what is to hinder the whole world from being "converted"? and then the millennium will be ushered in. It is natural for man to love to be on the winning side; and as soon as the church can demonstrate that she is the strongest power in the world, people without number will feel "providentially" directed to join her communion. E. J. W.

"'Christian Consciousness' vs. the Bible" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

In a recent number of the *Independent*, Prof. Francis L. Patton sharply criticizes a statement by Dr. Harris, in the *Andover Review*, that "Christian consciousness" must be recognized as the final authority in matters of faith and practice. In the course of his article he says:-

"Common consciousness cannot be appealed to as the criterion of religious progress without danger of jeopardizing the Protestant principle that the Bible is the rule of faith. Dr. Harris admits that what he calls the 'obsolescent theology' agrees as well with a word of God as it ever did, but affirms that it does not agree with the Christian consciousness. Suppose, however, that the Bible should say one thing, and Christian consciousness should say something else; or suppose that Christian consciousness should undertake to supplement the Bible. What then? It is an old charge against those who have had an objective rule of faith, that they made the word of God of none effect through their traditions, and that they taught for doctrines the commandments of men. We know how the Roman Catholic churches followed the example of the scribes and Pharisees in this

respect. Is there no danger that a party will rise in the Protestant churches, committing the same error? We think that there is great danger. And when, under the influence of a zeal that lacks both knowledge and discretion, the attempt is made to force upon the conscience of men the yoke of party fanaticism and popular clamor, there is little doubt but that an earnest, but at the same time ignorant, quietism will find great use for the phrase that is under discussion, and as a *phrase*, catchword, appealing to the sympathies of the unthinking, that Christian consciousness may become the 'organ' of what some will call religious progress."

There is as little doubt that the state of things outlined by the professor is imminent, as there is that "Christian consciousness" is superseding the Bible, as a test in matters of religion. We see this "Christian consciousness" manifested in that form of worship which mistakes feeling for faith, whose adherents *know* that they are right, because their hearts tell them so!

And especially is it manifested in those who would be enforce the observance of the Sunday because a majority of Christians had declared, by precept and example, that Sunday is the Lord's day. The plain language of the fourth commandment is ignored by the Protestants and Catholics alike, for the custom and sentiment of "the church." E. J. W.

"The Work in Healdsburg" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

The winter term of the College opened on Monday, January 5, with 120 students in attendance. Of this number fifty-six are now enrolled in the special Bible course. Besides these, we know of several who expect to join us in a few days. All seem to be in earnest, and disposed to make the most of their present opportunities.

The family at the Students' Home now numbers fifty-six. This number will soon be increased. The new students readily fall in with the ways of the place, and cheerfully perform their allotted tasks of labor and study. We are certain that the benefit derived from the discipline at the "Home" is fully equal to that gained at the college proper. No parent should think of sending his child to the Healdsburg College, and not have him live at the Students' Home. We hope that God will bless the labors of this term, and make them fruitful for good in his cause.

E. J. W.

Healdsburg, January 8.

January 22, 1885

"Punishment of the Wicked-Continued" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST.6FEB. 21

1. Give a scriptural explanation of Rev. 14:9-11; 20:10.
 2. When the wicked have been simply *tormented* with fire and brimstone, have they received their reward? Rom. 6:23.
 3. Then what must that fire do in order that the wicked may receive their deserts? Mal. 4:1.
 4. What is appointed unto all men? Heb. 9:27.
 5. Can this death, to which all men are appointed, be the death which is the wages of sin?
 6. What is promised to all men, regardless of their character? 1 Cor. 15:22; Acts 24:15.
 7. Are the wicked now suffering their punishment? 2 Peter 2:9.
 8. When will ever man be rewarded according to his works? Matt. 2:9.
 9. Then for what purpose will they come forth from their graves? Job. 21:29, 30.
 10. Give further proof that the death which is common to all men is not the wages of sin. Eze. 18:26.
 11. What is it that causes the death which is the wages of sin? Rev. 20:9.
 12. What is this death by fire called? Rev. 21:8.
 13. How long is it after the resurrection of the righteous before the wicked are "brought forth" to destruction? Rev. 20:4, 5.
 14. Who will escape the second death? Rev. 2:11; 20:6.
- "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." Rev. 14:9-11.

It is not the province of this lesson to explain the meaning of the beast, his image, or his mark. It is sufficient to say that to worship the first two, or receive the last, must be the most heinous crime that man can commit, since it brings down upon the offender the unmingled wine of the wrath of God. The point to be explained is the expression, "and the smoke of their torment ascendeth but forever and ever." As this has been explained in past lessons, a brief mention here will be sufficient. If the student will read Ex.21:2-6, he will find that the term "forever" does not necessarily denote that the thing to which it is applied shall never cause to exist; for under certain conditions a servant was to serve his master *forever*, which could not possibly mean "without end." Now if that term does not *necessarily* mean "without end," Rev. 14:9-11 affords no proof that the wicked will be tormented to all eternity. That doctrine, if true, must be approved by other texts. But we have already learned that the wicked are to be stubble in a fire that shall "burn them up," and will leave them "neither root nor branch." Then, as in Ex. 21:2-6 we understand that "forever" means as long as the servant might

live, so we must understand that Rev. 14:9-11 teaches that the smoke from the torment of the wicked will ascend without any cessation, until there are no wicked left in existence.

This explanation will also suffice for Rev. 20:10: "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever." The preceding verse shows that the fire has already "devoured" the wicked; this shows that the devil, the author of sin, survives to see the destruction of all his works. That he himself will, after a long torment, cease to exist, we are well assured, because Christ did not die in vain, and he died that he might "*destroy* him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." Heb.2:14. Satan is the "root" from which all wickedness springs; the day that cometh shall leave neither root nor branch.

It is true that "indignation and wrath, tribulation, and the anguish" are threatened to "every soul of man that doeth evil" (Rom. 2:8, 9), yet we are by no means to suppose that those things comprise the sum of the punishment which the wicked are to receive. "The wages of sin is *death*," and then until death takes place, the sinners will not have received their punishment. They are to be "punished with *everlasting destruction*;" and this will not be until their torment has been ended by the eternal death.

Certainly no one can gather from the Scriptures that the death with which we are so familiar is the wages of sin. "It is appointed unto man *wants to die*;" all men, both good and bad, die because they have inherited a mortal nature, and not because they have sinned. To all men, whether good or bad, there is promised a resurrection (Acts 24:15; 1 Cor. 15:22) from the death which they die as a consequence of being the descendants of mortal Adam; now if this death were the penalty for sin, then the resurrection would be the revoking of the penalty; but this can never be, because, when once inflicted, it is to be everlasting. That none of the wicked are now receiving the penalty for their sins is evident from 2 Pet. 2:9: "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." Those who are dead are preserved in their graves, from which, at the voice of Christ, they shall come forth. John 5:28, 29. Job also says that "the wicked is reserved to the day of destruction," and that "they shall be brought forth to the day of wrath." Job 21:30.

In Eze. 18:26 we have most conclusive evidence that the death which Adam died, and which all his posterity have likewise suffered, was not as a penalty for sin. It reads thus: "When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and *commiteth iniquity*, and *dieth in them*; for his iniquity that he hath done *shall he die*." The prophet here mentions two deaths. If a man dies in his sins, *i.e.*, if he does not repent before death overtakes him, then he shall die. But if he is dead, how can he die? Evidently he must have a resurrection, and this, as we of seen, is promised to all men, irrespective of character. Those that have done evil come forth from their graves to the resurrection of damnation. John 5:28, 29. And in harmony with this idea are the words of Rev. 21:8: "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and

sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: *which is the second death.*"

Rev. 20:6 shows when the wicked are "brought forth" to suffer the second death. The apostle in verse 4 mentions the righteous who have been martyred, who, he says, lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. They had been dead, but now lived. This, he says, is the "first resurrection." It is the first because "the rest of the dead lived not *again* until the thousand years were finished." The word *again* implies another living, or a resurrection. So a thousand years intervene between the resurrection of the righteous and that of the wicked. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; upon such the second death hath no power." This statement has no force unless those who do not have part in the first resurrection do suffer the second death. This is the death which is the wages of sin, and is brought about by fire. It is yet future, and will not take place until the harvest,—"the end of the world"—when the tares will be gathered out and bound in bundles to be burned. Matt. 13:24-30, 36-43. E. J. W.

"Will Worship, and No Worship" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

The last paragraph of the letter upon which we commented last week reads as follows:-

"If infidels care nothing for Sunday, how can you make them respect Saturday? Why not change their hearts instead of their calendar?"

We will notice the last question first. That such a question could be asked, is evidence of the almost entire absence of *thought* concerning the subject of the Sabbath. How the questioner could have obtained the idea that anybody wants to change the calendar, is beyond all comprehension. It is certain that we do not desire any such thing. We are satisfied with the calendar that we have. With Bishop Haven, we believe that our week corresponds to the Hebrew week,—the genuine week,—and that "the Jewish Sabbath," as he termed Saturday, is the true seventh day, the one which God blessed and sanctified. All the change we desire, is a change in men's hearts, a change which will be indicated by their changed practices. Keeping the calendar that they have, we want them to rest upon the day which God appointed, instead of on one of which he spoke nothing; to obey the word of the Lord, instead of their own inclinations. If we were in the habit of going to San Francisco every Wednesday, and should change our custom and afterward go on Tuesday, would we thereby change the calendar, or the reckoning of days? Of course not. Why cannot people of reason as intelligently in regard to moral duties as they do concerning ordinary, temporal affairs?

The first question in the paragraph above quoted indicates another erroneous idea that has obtained considerable currency. It is imagined that if people lose their confidence in the Sunday institution they will pay no regard to any day; and from this point people jump to the conclusion that we do wrong in exposing the fraud by which Sunday is made to appear to be the Sabbath. We shall see how much truth there is in these conclusions.

"If infidels care nothing for Sunday, how can you make them respect Saturday?" In turn, we would ask, If people *do not* lose their respect for Sunday as a sacred institution, how can they be made to respect the Sabbath of the Lord? Said the Saviour, "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon;" "no can serve two masters." So no man can regard the Sabbath as holy to the Lord, and at the same time give equal homage to Sunday. To answer more directly, we say that we would get them to respect the Sabbath, by inducing them to respect its Author. Let their hearts be changed, so that they will reverence God and his word, and the work is already done. If people really have reverence for God's word (not merely such portions as suit their fancy, but the whole of it), they will reverence the fourth commandment; and if they respect the fourth commandment, they must necessarily keep the seventh day,-Saturday,-as is therein enjoined.

As a matter of fact there are thousands who now respect God's holy Sabbath, who have not the slightest regard for Sunday; and the number of such persons is being increased every day. We readily grant that the great majority of people cannot be induced to respect the Sabbath; but shall we for this reason cease to work for those who will accept the truth? Because we cannot rescue *all* the inmates of a burning building, shall we make no effort to save any?

And now we would like to ask our friend a question. If a man is an infidel, what difference will it make whether he respect Sunday or not? Will the respect that he may have for Sunday atone for his unbelief? Perhaps there are not many who would answer this question in the affirmative, and yet it is the position that thousands of professed Christians really hold. There is a society called the "National Reform Association," which puts a premium on just such religion as that. To have Sunday kept strictly is really the one great point for which they labor. Says its organ, concerning some officials twh travel on Sunday, "Not one of those men is fit to hold office in the nation." It would introduce a new kind of civil service reform. And make one's zeal for the Sunday, and his strictness in observing it, the test of his fitness for office. Now when that party gets strong enough to dictate to the nation, how long will it be before every *politician*, whether infidel or Jew, will be a strict Sunday-keeper? Not long; and by the National Reform Association this will be counted to them for righteousness. Yet these same people charge Adventists with having no religion but the Sabbath.

A frequent charge against Seventh-day Adventists is that they destroyed people's confidence in the Sunday Sabbath, and do not succeed in persuading them to keep Saturday. It is claimed that these people are left in a worse condition than they were before, and that therefore the work of Seventh-day Adventists is wholly bad. The charge is not true. As we before stated, the number of Sabbath-keepers is being daily increased; and these accessions, from the ranks of infidelity as well as from those who have always revered the Bible, and who have walked in all the light that they had. But not all that hear the truth obey. Now are these in a worse condition than before? Undoubtedly; a man cannot reject light with impunity. The preaching of Christ, while it won some, hardened others. He himself said, "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin." John 15:22. Will our friends

charge Christ with doing a bad work because he left some people worse than they were before?

And yet, in the particular case under consideration, we doubt if persons are made any worse by

57

losing faith in the supposed sacredness of Sunday, even if they do not accept the true Sabbath. Is one error better than another? We know that it is a grievous sin for a man to refuse to regard any day as a holy, when the Lord has said, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy;" but is that man disobeying God any more than the one who not only deliberately refuses to obey the command of the Lord, but who shows his contempt for that command by doing something exactly the opposite? We would not wish to occupy the position of either one. Here is a father who has two sons. One of them hears his father's wishes and commands, and then invariably goes contrary to them, and the other refuses to do anything; would you say that the first is better than the second? Would you not rather say that both are bad and deserving of punishment?

Take the first commandment. Our friends can use their reason in regard to this commandment, because their own interests are not directly affected by it. But there are millions who now practice the grossest form of idolatry. Now it is a fact that thousands who hear the teaching of the missionaries, never accept it. Take the Japanese, for instance. As a nation they are idolaters. Much missionary work has been done among them, and now Christianity is tolerated in Japan. There are many Japanese Christians, many native Japanese who are preaching the gospel to their fellow-men. But we now find that of the educated Japanese the great majority are infidels. This is a noted fact. They look on the worship of God and the worship of idols with equal disdain. Why is this? They have been led to see something of the foolishness of worshiping gods of wood or bronze, and have gone to the other extreme, believing in nothing. Shall we call back the missionaries from Japan? Shall we conclude that they are doing a bad work? Will our opposers say that it would be better to let all the Japanese remain heathen than to convert a few at the expense of making the rest infidels? Is it better to worship a log of wood than to worship nothing? To all these questions we think we hear an emphatic, No. Better that a few be saved than that all perish.

We would that all could see this matter in its true light. We have known people who acknowledged that Saturday-the seventh day-is the only true Sabbath, but who thought that they would appease the wrath of God against their disobedience by keeping Sunday very strictly. How deceitful is sin! It blinds men so that they call evil good, and good evil. May the Lord enable our brother and many others who are in a like position, to realize that *obedience* is what is required, and that *all* stubbornness is iniquity and idolatry. E. J. W.

January 29, 1885

"Punishment of the WickedóContinued" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST FEB. 28

1. What is given to those who believe on Christ? John 3:36.
2. What is to be the fate of those who believe not the Son?
3. What does the Psalmist say will be the result to the wicked, if the Lord's wrath is kindled only a little? Ps. 2:12.
4. Then what will be their condition if his wrath *abides* on them?
5. What contrast did the wise man make between the continuance of the righteous and that of the wicked? Prov. 10:25.
6. With what words of the Psalmist does this agree? Ps. 1:1-4.
7. What is to be done with the chaff? Matt. 3:12.
8. To what other perishable substances are sinners compared? Hos. 13:3.
9. To what is their destruction compared? Isa. 5:24.
10. How has the beloved disciple described the fate of the wicked? Rev. 20:9.
11. In what manner will they be devoured? Nahum 1:10.
12. Into what shall the wicked consume? Ps. 37:20.
13. Of what was man formed? Gen. 2:7; 18:27.
14. After the fire of the last day, what will the wicked be? Mal. 4:3.
15. In view of this fact, what does one of the prophets say of the wicked?
Obadiah 16.
16. What corroborative testimony can you give on this point? Ps. 37:9, 10.
17. Quote another text which proves that a time will come when there will be no wicked in existence in the universe. Rev. 5:13.
18. Who is the author of the doctrine that the wicked shall not die? Gen. 3:4.
19. Who is the serpent? Rev. 20:2.
20. For what purpose did the devil invent that doctrine? Eze. 13:22.

If the reader will only take pains to look up the references given in this lesson, he certainly will not need comments to aid his understanding of the subject. Just note the strong expressions that are used concerning the wicked: They "shall not see life." John 3:36. They pass away as does the whirlwind. Prov. 10:25. They are "like the chaff which the wind driveth away." Ps. 1:4. This chaff is to be burned up with a fire so intense that it cannot be extinguished. Matt. 3:12. "They shall be as the morning cloud, and as the early dew that passeth away, as the chaff that is driven with the whirlwind out of the floor, and as the smoke out of the chimney." Hosea 13:3. "As the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust." Isa. 5:24. "They shall be devoured as stubble fully dry." Nahum 1:10. They shall consume "into smoke." Ps. 37:20. "The day that cometh shall burn them up," and "they shall be ashes" under the feet of the righteous. Mal. 4:1, 3. "They shall be as though they had not been." Obadiah 16. "For yet a little while, and *the wicked shall not be*; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be." Ps. 37:10.

One who reads these texts may well wonder how those who profess to believe the Bible implicitly can hold to the doctrine that the wicked shall exist in torment to all eternity. That doctrine squarely contradicts every one of the texts which we have quoted. Yet the contradiction is no more emphatic than was the serpent's contradiction of the words of the Lord, when he said to the woman, "Thou shalt not surely die." Gen. 3:4. This was the origin of the doctrine of eternal life for the wicked. It is the only doctrine held by religionists, that can be traced *directly* to the devil. His object in inventing this doctrine was to induce Eve to transgress the command of the Lord; and it has been for the purpose of holding men in the bondage of sin, that he has kept the doctrine prominently before all mankind ever since.

In Ezekiel 13:22 we have the testimony of the Lord on this subject. When threatening punishment upon certain evil ones, he says it is, "Because with lies ye have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life." Let us see how this result has been accomplished.

We do not know the exact motive of the one who introduced this doctrine of eternal life for the wicked, into the Christian church. It was no doubt mainly a result of his heathen training, and without any definite motive. But so far as he had any definite idea, it was designed to deter men from sin and to frighten them into repentance. This is why all denominations have advocated it in times past. We have often heard it said by ministers, that if the doctrine of eternal torment were not preached, sinners would have no fear of the consequences of sin. Just as if the Lord did not know what he was about when he made *death* the penalty for sin! The Lord has said, "The wages of sin is death," and, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die;" but these persons say, in effect: "No, no, Lord; you must not tell people that for if you do they will all keep sinning." And so, making light of the real penalty, and ignoring the love of God as the great factor in turning men to righteousness, they presume to improve upon his word.

And so the doctrine of eternal torment was for many years taught in all its horrible enormity. People accepted it as the word of God, because the priests and ministers said that it was such. Thousands were frightened into a nominal profession of Christianity, and to the infliction of severe punishments upon themselves, thinking by so doing to avert the wrath of God. It is safe to say that no *real* converts were made in consequence of the propagation of this doctrine; but "the church" gained immense sums of money by the sale of "indulgences," or releases from punishment, to poor, deluded sinners; this money was spent by the popes in self-aggrandizement and riotous living, and the devil was doubtless satisfied.

But there was always a class of people who, believing that the word of God taught this horrible doctrine, repudiated the Bible entirely. They would have nothing to do with a book which taught, as they supposed, such barbarous cruelty. And thus the doctrine has fostered infidelity. Others believed the doctrine, and settled down into stolid indifference, while others determined to have as good a time as possible while they were on earth. The terrible French Revolution, when all religion was proscribed, and God and the Bible were insulted and

ignored, was a recoil from this terrible doctrine of eternal torment. And now, in our day, we find that the church itself is passing from that extreme of error, to the other extreme. Instead of being the leading topic of sermons, as formerly, the doctrine of eternal torment is seldom mentioned. On the contrary hundreds, yes thousands, of ministers who are called "orthodox," openly hold that God will not punish anybody, or that if he does, it will only be for a time, and that then all men will be restored to his favor. Now anybody who stops to think can see that if men believe this, there is absolutely no incentive for them to change their course of life. The fear of punishment has been taken away, and if they are taught that all men will ultimately be saved, whether they now wish to be or not, they can see no necessity for believing on Christ. And so we see the object that Satan had in the beginning is attained, the wicked are strengthened in their wickedness and carnal security, by the promise of life. The safest and the best way is to hold and teach only the simple truth, and leave the results with the Author of truth. E. J. W.

"How It Was Done, and Why" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

The Sunday-schools of the country are now engaged in studying the book of Acts, having recently begun with the twentieth chapter, where they left off six months ago. That chapter notes a certain meeting that was held by the disciples, on the first day of the week, and it was to be expected that many lesson commentators would make as much out of it as possible, to bolster up Sunday observance. In looking over the list, we find that they are all about the same. The following from the N. Y *Independent*, as of Dec. 25, 1884, is a fair sample of the whole:-

"At Troas we find the brethren assembled on a Sunday. Indeed the early churches there was an observance of the seventh day and the first day both. The observance of the seventh day has never been formally abrogated; but it died out gradually, as the converted Jew of to-day does not circumcise his children, though the command to circumcise has never been formally repealed. Among the converted Gentiles the Lord's Day [by this term the *Independent* means *Sunday*, and not the *Sabbath*.] would naturally command a more general observance than the seventh day, and as Christianity ceased to make converts among the Jews, but increased among the Gentiles, the observance of the first day became general and that of the seventh was gradually discontinued."

In nothing else would scholars, such as the editors of the *Independent*, tolerate jumping at conclusions in this way. A single meeting on the first day of the week is accepted as proof that Sunday was the regular day of worship among the early Christians. If this be logic, what conclusion must we draw from the fact that, beginning with the day of Pentecost, they held meetings every day? The Sunday controversy affords proof that the keenest logicians may be led by self-interest to take leave of logic, and reason like infants. Let us notice in detail the *Independent's* position on the introduction of the Sunday into the Christian church.

1. "In the early churches there was an observance of the seventh day and the first day both." Well, then, if we are to be guided by the *practice* of the early church, why do not all the churches now observe both days? Why is it that the *Independent*, which believes in following the example of the early church, has omitted one important item? One thing is certain: The *Independent* has no ground on which to condemn Seventh-day Adventists. It acknowledges that Christians generally have departed from the custom of the early church, which it regards as authoritative. For our part we make no claim to follow a certain course simply because someone did so long ago. The Scriptures are the only guide, and we can read them and understand them as well as people ever could.

2. "The observance of the seventh day has never been formally abrogated." But it was formally enjoined, and is therefore still binding. "Yet [the observance of the seventh day] died out gradually." Will the *Independent* please tell us what constitutes sin? Is it violation of law, or violation of *custom*? Among certain nations the worship of the true God gradually died out, until it ceased altogether. Must we conclude that in those countries the old law which says, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," is not binding? that the worship of titles is alright? Why cannot people remember that the command, "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil," is for all time, and that wrong cannot be made right, no matter how many people practice it. The New Testament bears this testimony: "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also *the law*, for sin is the transgression of *the law*." 1 John 3:4. Modern and uninspired teachers would have us accept this version: "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also *custom*; for sin is the transgression of *custom*." We do not accept this new version. "The older is better." If the law enjoining the observance of the seventh day has not been abrogated, then everyone who does not observe the

73

seventh day is, to that extent, a sinner. With many, such action may be a sin of ignorance, but it is a sin nevertheless.

But the *Independent* claims to present a parallel to the neglect of Sabbath observance. It says: "It died out gradually, as the converted Jew of to-day does not circumcise his children, though the commandment to circumcise has never been formally repealed." If a text could be found which should say, "Sabbath-keeping is nothing," as 1 Cor. 7:19 says of circumcision, how readily it would be quoted. Of circumcision Paul says: "For he is a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is all word and deed flesh; but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the Spirit, and not in the letter." Rom. 2:28, 29. If now the *Independent* could find a text, saying, "For he is a Sabbath-keeper, who observes the seventh day; . . . but he is a Sabbath-keeper, who observes the first day," then it would have as good ground for Sabbath desecration as it has for not practicing circumcision. The *Independent* well knows that there is no point of comparison between circumcision and the Sabbath. By the style of argument which it uses, every one of the precepts of the moral law may be trampled upon without sin. The Spiritualist says, "Whatever *is*, is right;" that is, custom and the inclination must be allowed to settle questions of right and wrong. "Oh, no, says the *Independent*, "You must not say so of

everything; that is true only when applied to the fourth commandment." But it will not be long before Christian people who give a custom an inclination as reasons for disregarding the Sabbath of the Lord, will find the same argument thrown back on them concerning the sixth, seventh, and eighth commandments. Those who thus set at naught a portion of the law of God, are opening the flood-gates of the iniquity, and will certainly be responsible for the wickedness that follows.

3. "Among the converted Gentiles the Lord's Day [Sunday] would naturally command a more general observance than the seventh day." Of course it would; and so, likewise, falsehood, and demon-worship accompanied by licentious rites would *naturally* command more general observance than would the pure worship of Jehovah; but that would not make such practices right. In the last part of the paragraph quoted, the *Independent* has let us into the true secret of the change from the seventh to the first day of the week. The first day was the heathen festival day. Around that day clustered memories of wild revels in honor of their god; in fact, all their old religious prejudices were *naturally* in favor of that day, and as they increased in numbers until the true disciples became only a small minority, the old customs were indeed gradually brought in. And because a horde of them chose to call themselves Christians while retaining their heathen customs, Christians of to-day think that they must follow their example. Dr. Killen, in "The Ancient Church," p. 440, gives us another custom for which these nominally converted heathen manifested a natural fondness. He says:-

"The code of heathen morality supplied a ready apology for falsehood, and its accommodating principles soon found too much encouragement within the pale of the church. Hence the pious frauds which were now perpetrated. Various works made their appearance with the name of some apostolic man appended to them, their fabricators thus hoping to give currency to opinions or practices which might otherwise have encountered much opposition. At the same time many evinced a disposition to supplement the silence of the written word by the aid of tradition."

And the successors of those persons are now numbered by the million. Tradition is now exalted far above the law of God. Why do not the churches adopt lying as a Christian ordinance? It was practiced in the early church. To be sure there is a law against lying, and it was never formally abrogated, but the converts from among the Gentiles had a natural tendency to lie, and so a strict regard for truth began gradually to die out. If it is right to keep Sunday, then it is right to lie and deceive, for both practices stand on the same foundation, namely, the custom of the majority. Verily, "The customs of the people are vain." E. J. W.

February 5, 1885

"Punishment of the Wicked" Review *The Signs of the Times* 11, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST MARCH 7

Review.

1. How many classes of people does the Bible recognize?
2. When will the final separation between them take place?
3. With what will the righteous be rewarded?
4. What will be done with the wicked?
5. What can you say of the comparative duration of the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked?
6. What is to be the punishment of the wicked?
7. What is the agent in the destruction of the wicked?
8. How complete will be this destruction?
9. To what perishable material are the wicked likened? Quote texts.
10. What will be the effect of the wrath of God abiding on the wicked?
11. How can you harmonize the theory that you have advanced with Mark 9:43?
12. What is always accomplished by an unquenchable fire? Matt. 3:12.
13. Prove that Rev. 20:10 does not contradict the doctrine that the wicked are to become utterly extinct.
14. Of how many deaths does the Bible speak?
15. Explain the distinction between the first and the second death.
16. State the origin and effect of the doctrine that the wicked are not to *die* for their iniquity.
17. What do you learn from Rev. 5:13?

Although the lesson this week is a review, which give a few notes for the aid of those who have not had the previous lessons. However much people may imagine that there is provision made in the gospel for people who are "as good as the average," the fact remains that the Bible recognizes only two of classes,- the good and the bad. "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil." Deut. 30:15. To be counted *good*, a person must keep all of God's commandments; to be among the bad requires the breaking of no more than one. "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not together with me scattereth abroad." Matt. 12:30. In the battle of life there is no intermediate or neutral ground.

This is also evident from the account of the final separation. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats; and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left." Matt. 25:31-33. The succeeding verses plainly tell the character of these two classes. The first class are they who have served the Lord; love for him has sanctified every effort of their lives, and they have obeyed this exhortation of the apostle: "Whatsoever he do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and to the Father by him." Col. 3:17. The other class are they who have lived for self; even their deeds of kindness have been prompted by love of applause, and so have been nothing but manifestations of the evil in their hearts. To the first class it is said: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

Matt. 25:34. To the other class it is said: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Matt. 25:41.

The comparative duration of the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked is stated in Matt. 25:46. The Saviour closes his discourse with these words: "And these [the wicked] shall go away into everlasting on [eternal] punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." If there were no other text relating to this question, we should note that death is to be the final portion of the wicked. If it were not so, then the promise of eternal life to the righteous would not indicate any difference in the state of the two classes. But there is a contrast. The wicked shall go into *punishment*, but the righteous into *life*. No one who regards the Bible will say that both classes see this same award; but it is certain that the righteous are to have *life*. Now anything that is different from life must be death, therefore the wicked receive the sentence of death, which is executed. To show that this conclusion is sound, we have only to quote Paul's words: "The wages of sin is *death*; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom.6:23. The Saviour said that the punishment of the wicked and the life of the righteous are both to be eternal; therefore we know that eternal life,-death from which there is no resurrection,-is the wages of sin. Paul says (2 Thess.1:7-9) that the wicked shall be punished with "everlasting destruction," when the Lord Jesus is revealed from Heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire; and both John (Rev. 20:9) and Malachi (Mal. 4:1-3), and many others state this destruction is to be by fire.

For the completeness of the destruction of the wicked, we can only refer the reader to a few texts, which required no interpretation. See Ps. 1:1-4; 2:8, 9; 37:9, 10, 20, 38; Isa. 5:24; Obadiah 16; Mal. 4:1-3; 2 Thess. 1:7-9; Rev. 20:9, etc. David says that if the wrath of God be kindled but a little, its effect will be to cause the wicked to "perish from the way" (Ps. 2:12); when therefore it *abides* on the wicked (John 3:36), they will be, as Obadiah has said, "as though they had not been." See Webster's definition of "perish."

In Mark 9:43 the Saviour says that the wicked shall be cast into a fire that "never shall be quenched." This, instead of contradicting the above statements, is the strongest confirmation of them. The effect of an "unquenchable fire" is to "burn up" that which is cast into it (Matt. 3:12); if the wicked were cast into any other kind of fire, their destruction would not be complete. "Everlasting fire" is fire whose effects are everlasting; it is like that which destroyed the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah. Jude 7. This was unquenchable fire, and resulted in the overthrow of those cities; it turned them to ashes.

We can only refer to the texts that answer question 13. See Ex. 21:1-6, where it is stated that under certain circumstances the Hebrew servant should serve his master "forever." Of course this meant during his natural life. So, likewise, "forever," in Rev. 20:10 and similar passages, covers only the space of time that it is possible for persons to exist in "unquenchable fire." See also Isaiah 34 and 35, where, after the land is described as burning and lying waste, so that none can pass through it "forever and ever," it is described as blossoming and as the rose, and being inhabited by "the ransomed of the Lord."

This death of which we have been speaking is "the second death." Rev. 21:8. "In Adam all die," both righteous and wicked, men and little children; and "so Christ shall all be made alive." 1 Cor.15:22. Christ does this for all, because no one is to blame for being the descendant of Adam, and thus mortal. When all have been made alive, it will be seen who are worthy to have life continued to them, and those who have died in their iniquity shall die the second time. Eze. 18:26. This is the death to which God had reference when he said to Adam, "In the day that thou eat this thereof, thou shalt surely die." That penalty has never been executed; through the kindness of God in Christ the execution of the penalty was stayed, in order to give fallen man another chance for his life. Christ tasted death for every man, and those who accept his sacrifice will escape the penalty for sin, but upon those who do not, it will fall grievously.

The originator of the doctrine of life for the wicked, as we learn from Gen. 3:1-4, was the serpent, "which is the devil and Satan." Rev. 20:2. His object in teaching it to Eve was to lead her to sin. He made her believe that if she disobeyed God she would not suffer for it, but would be the gainer by it. It was a direct lie, and it had its designed effect. Ever since that time it has been repeated, and with the same result. Thus the Lord through his prophet rebukes those who "with lies" have made the heart of his people sad, and have "strengthened the hands of the wicked, that he should not return from his wicked way, by promising him life." Eze. 13:22. Reader, do you wish to be found on the devil's side, perpetuating his falsehood? E. J. W.

"Vice As an Aid to Virtue" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

A short time ago it was stated in the daily papers that Dunton C. Ross, a noted athlete and saloon-keeper, have announced his intention of leaving his present business and entering the ministry. To that, of course, no one offers an objection. We shall be pleased to see every saloon-keeper quit the business; even if he did not feel the necessity of disgorging his ill-gotten gains, society would be the better for a diminution in the number of plague spots. And the desire to enter the ministry is certainly a laudable one, provided the aspirant does not seek simply to make gain by his "godliness," or to gratify unholy ambition. Mr. Ross may be perfectly sincere; doubtless he is as honest in his purpose as he knows how to be, but we have our doubts as to his fitness for the position which he seeks. For a man to decide to enter the ministry, before his heart has been touched sufficiently to make him quit selling beer, looks to us as though he was troubled with moral blindness. It is better for a man to become converted before he decides to enter the ministry, than to make such a decision and then be "converted." In the former case there would be more hope of the conversion being genuine.

But that to which we wish to call special attention is the statement made by Mr. Ross, that he has learned many things in his career as a saloon-keeper and "sporting man," which will be of material value to him in his work as a preacher. He thinks that, with his past experience, all he needs is a short course in

theology, to prepare him for successful work. It is a deplorable fact that this idea obtains quite generally in the world. If a man has been a "rough," people will flock to hear him were people by his "sad experience" as he tells how degraded he used to be; while the man who has from his earliest childhood endeavored to walk in the path of virtue, is thought to be deficient. It is no exaggeration to say that a large majority of people think that a career of vice is almost absolutely essential to fix one to be a teacher of morals. They did not formulate their ideas in words, but the thought is there. When they compare a teacher who has been brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, with one who has assiduously served the devil nearly all his life, there is a decision in favor of the latter. They almost wish that the first one could have had the advantage of at least a short course in crime, "would it have been such a benefit to him."

Now the secret of this is found in the love which the natural human heart has for sin. Each heart has a natural tendency toward that which is evil. "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." Matt. 15:19. There is a charm about the man who has distinguished himself among his vicious associates, which leads some to almost deify him; and this fascination is felt to a greater or lesser extent by every unrenewed individual. Let us examine this matter, and see if a man is really benefited as a teacher by having been familiar with all the details of vice.

Take, for instance, the teacher of youth in the high school or the college. Of two candidates for such a position, one of whom never learned to read until he was forty years of age, while the other has been a close student from his early years, and has always associated with the educated and refined, which would be chosen? Every committee would choose the latter, without hesitation. In so doing they would show wisdom. It is not denied that the first man might take a good teacher, but the question is, Can he teach as well as he could if in his youth he had trained his mind to think? Is his previous ignorance a recommendation? There can be no difference of opinion as to the answer.

Suppose I am to make a trip into the mountains, and was to secure a competent guide. Shall I accept a man whose principal recommendation is that he is thoroughly familiar with all the streets and alleys of the city, and who has never been in the country? Not by any means. The hardy mountaineer is the one whom I will choose. I care not if he knows nothing about the city where I live. What I want is that he shall be familiar with the place to which I am going. He cannot guide me if he has not been there himself.

The same rule will apply to religious teachers. A man may know all about the paths of vice, and the steps that takes hold on hell, but that is not the kind of instruction that people need. They know enough in that direction; and many will go that way fast enough without any instruction. What they do need is to be led into wisdom's way, to learn the ways of peace, and to know the love of that passeth knowledge. Who shall lead them there? Shall it not be the man who has walked in those ways himself, and who has been with Jesus? Reason would answer, Yes. No amount of argument can convince us that Ahab could ever have developed into a teacher that would compare with Enoch, who walked with God all his life. The best man that ever lived has enough of human nature to contend

with to enable him to sympathize with the struggles of poor, frail sinners. We do not say that a good man is *best* fitted for a religious teacher, but that he is the *only* one for such a position. If he has at some time in his life followed vicious practices, the grace of God through Christ must remove the stains

89

before he can render acceptable service to God. But he can never be the man that he would have been had he always lived an upright life.

This is a matter that should receive serious thought by our young men who are designing to work in the cause of God. You want to lead men to God; but you can never lead others there till you have been there yourself. You must *know Christ* before you can reveal him to others. This is *the essential* qualification. While you are striving for intellectual culture, do not neglect culture of the heart. It is right and necessary to improve the talent of intellect that God has given you; but at the same time let it be your chief aim to reach "the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." Remember that men who were ignorant of books have done noble service in the cause of God, but never one who was ignorant of Christ. Let these words of one who had fallen low in sin, be pondered by all:-

"Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy holy Spirit from me. Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free Spirit. *Then* shall I teach transgressors thy ways; and sinners shall be converted unto thee." E. J. W.

February 12, 1885

"The Inheritance of the Saints" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST MARCH 14

1. What is the meaning of the word "meek"?
2. Mention two individuals who possessed this grace in a remarkable degree. Num. 12:3; 1 Pet. 2:21-23.
3. How was the meekness of Christ manifested? 1 Pet. 2:23.
4. In thus meekly suffering injury, what did he leave us? Verse 21.
5. What should we do? *Ib.*
6. What will be done by all who abide in Christ, or, in other words, by all Christians? 1 John 2:6.
7. Then what grace must characterize all Christians?
8. What is promised to the meek? Matt. 5:5.
9. By what other term are the meek referred to in this chapter? Verse 3.
10. What is promised to the "poor in spirit"?
11. What testimony does the apostle James bear on this point? Jas. 2:5.
12. What is an heir?

13. Then if the meek are "heirs," what can you say as to the time of their receiving their inheritance?

14. What must the heirs pass through before they can receive the promised inheritance? Acts 14:22.

15. What class of people in this world are in the best condition? Ps. 73:3-7.

16. On further consideration, what did David see would be their end? Ps. 73:17-19.

17. How complete will be their destruction? Ps. 37:10.

18. What will then take place? Verse 11.

19. Then what must take place before the fulfillment of the promise in Matt. 5:5?

A meek man, according to Webster, is one who is "mild of temper; not easily provoked or irritated; given to forbearance under injuries; soft; a gentle; yielding." The term is especially used of one who is submissive to the divine will; patient and gentle for religious motives. In Num. 12:3 it is plainly stated that "the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth." It is the prevailing impression that meekness is akin to effeminacy, and is worthy only of scorn; but if we recall the history of Moses, we shall see that such an idea is entirely erroneous. He was a great general, and the leader of mighty armies composed of fierce warriors. An effeminate man could have done nothing in the position of Moses, yet while Moses was leading the host of Israel, he was very meek. By reference to Ex. 2:11-17, it will be seen that Moses was naturally of a quick, impetuousness disposition, and given to the resenting of injuries. His gentleness and forbearance were the result of communion with God.

No one could think of charging Christ with weakness in any particular, yet he was the embodiment of meekness. Peter describes the meekness that is acceptable to God: "For this is thankworthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully. For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? but if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God." 1 Pet. 2:19, 20. This grace is one of the most difficult to acquire, for it is most foreign to our nature. But Christ has set us an example, that we should follow in his steps, and he, the sinless one, "when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not." 1 Pet. 2:23. As the prophet said, "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." Isa. 53:7. We cannot be Christians unless we are Christ-like; and if we are like Christ, we shall be meek. Therefore meekness is the characteristic of the Christian.

"Blessed are the meek, they shall inherit the earth." Matt. 5:5. Since all Christians, and none but Christians, are truly meek, this promise must apply to all Christians. In Matt. 5:3 we read, "Blessed are the poor in Spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." To be poor in Spirit is to be just the opposite of haughty, or, in other words, it is to be meek. So this promise is also to the meek. Now by comparing these two verses with James 2:5, we shall see that the same thing is promised both in the third and fifth verses of Matt. 5. The text referred to says:

"Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath prepared to them that love him."

In this last text we find that those who are lovers of God, humble disciples of Christ, are *heirs* of a kingdom. Matt 5:5 shows that such shall inherit the earth, or, in other words, they are heirs the earth. The inevitable conclusion, then, is that the earth is "the kingdom which God hath promised to them that love him."

An "heir" is one who is entitled, either by birth, adoption, or special promise, to succeed to the possession of some property. But the heir is not in possession; when he comes into possession of his property, he ceases to be an heir. So if we speak of any one as being heir to a certain estate, it is understood that the time of his inheritance is still in the future. So the kingdom spoken of in Jas. 2:5 cannot be the gospel and its privileges, or the church, because those to whom the apostle speaks our brethren in the church, and already enjoying the blessings of the gospel. The kingdom which they are to receive is not yet in their possession, because, by virtue of their Christianity, they are *heirs* of it. Before they can inherit it, they must pass through great tribulation. Acts 14:22.

It scarcely needs any argument to show that the followers of God are by no means the possessors of this world. Christ says, "In the world ye shall have tribulation." John 16:33. By the "world" is meant here, this present world; not the world in its redeemed state. And it often means wicked people. For proof of this, see John 15:18, 19; 1 John 3:1. Then Christ's statement in John 16:33 would imply that the wicked now have the ascendancy. It was the contemplation of this fact that caused David to almost lose faith in God. Said he, "I was envious at the foolish, when I saw the prosperity of the wicked. For there are no bands in their death; but their strength is firm. They are not in trouble as other men; neither are they plagued like other men. Therefore pride compasseth them about as a chain; violence covereth them as a garment. Their eyes stand out with fatness; they have more than heart could wish." Ps. 73:3-7. In the twelfth verse he says, "Behold, these are the ungodly, who prosper in the world; they increase in riches." These things well-nigh caused David's steps to slip.

But when he went into the sanctuary of the Lord, then he understood the end of these prosperous ones. He saw that although they seemed so secure, their feet were set in slippery places. "Thou castedst them down into destruction. How are they brought into desolation, with terrors. As a dream when one awaketh; so, O Lord, when thou awakest, thou shalt despise their image." Ps. 73:18-20. Here is brought to view the utter destruction of the wicked, concerning which we have learned in past lessons. The completeness of their destruction is thus stated by the psalmist: "For yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be." Ps. 37:10. And when this destruction shall have been accomplished what will take place? "But the meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace." Verse 11. So we learn that this earth, the kingdom which is promised to them that love God, is not to be inherited until the wicked are consumed from off the face of it. Until that time, the meek are only heirs. E. J. W.

February 26, 1885

"Inheritance of the Saints.óContinued" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COASTóMARCH 28

THE FIRST DOMINION FORFEITED

1. When the earth was created, to whom was given the dominion over it?

"And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Gen. 1:26-28.

2. What was its condition at that time?

"And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day." Gen. 1:31.

3. Did man also share in this perfection?

"So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." Gen. 1:27.

"Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions." Eccl. 7:29.

2. What further shows that the dominion which God instructs to man must be preserved spotless?

"Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven." Matt. 6:10.

"And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." Dan. 7:27.

5. Then until what time only, could Adam hope to retain the dominion given to him?

6. When the dominion was given to Adam, what prohibition was put upon him?

"But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Gen. 2:17.

7. Did he heed this prohibition?

"And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the

fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat." Gen. 3:6.

8. Since the dominion given to Adam was a perfect one, what was the necessary result of his sin?

9. By what agency was Adam's fall accomplished?

"And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat. And the Lord God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat." Gen. 3:12, 13.

10. Who is the serpent?

"And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years." Rev. 20:2.

11. Is a man overcome by another, what is the result?

"While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption; for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage." 2 Peter 2:19.

12. By whom was Adam overcome?

13. Then to whom did he become subject?

14. What becomes of a man's possessions, if he himself is overcome by another?

"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.

15. Then when Adam was overcome by Satan, what must have become of the dominion which he held?

16. What *title* does Paul apply to the one who blinds men concerning the gospel?

"But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost; in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." 2 Cor. 4:3, 4.

17. What is the *name* of the one who performs this work of deception?

"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." 2 Thess. 2:9, 10.

18. Then who is "god of the world"?

19. What other title does Paul apply to the one who works in the children of disobedience."

"Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." Eph. 2:2.

20. Although Satan usurped the dominion from Adam, did he become absolute ruler?

"That they shall drive thee from men, and thy dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field, and they shall make thee to eat grass as oxen, and they shall wet thee with the dew of heaven, and seven times shall pass over thee, till thou know

that the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will." Dan. 4:25. E. J. W.

"Mercy and Justice" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

It is quite generally held that and what is termed the old, or what is termed the Jewish, dispensation, God ruled according to a stern and justice, holding men to a strict account for everything; but that in the "Christian dispensation" mercy has predominated in his dealings with men; that justice has now stepped down from the throne, and that mercy has taken its place. This idea has taken almost universal hold on the minds of people. Let each reader examine his own mind, and he will find that some time in this life he has entertained this idea. We have before us a statement to this effect, made by a Doctor of Divinity, in the Sunday-school lesson notes of a prominent religious journal. The statement is as follows:-

"Since the days of Christ's assumption of the mediatorial power, 'old things are passed away, and all things are become new;' and souls are now saved only through the grace of Him to be in whom is to be a new creature."

This statement may be taken as a fair representation of the prevailing opinion. Let us examine the theory, and see how well it represents the God of the universe. On general grounds we should condemn it, because it is derogatory to the character of God. It represents him as a changeable being, one who is swayed at different times by different impulses; but we know that with him there is "no variableness, neither shadow of turning." The Lord says (Eze. 18:25) that his ways are equal; but this theory makes them decidedly unequal. As it is commonly held, it actually charges God with injustice; for the opposite of justice is *injustice*, and if at any time God should relax his justice, to that extent he would be unjust. No Christian would think of openly charging God with being unjust, yet this is exactly what is done by everyone who says that at the present time God dispenses mercy at the expense of justice.

This evidently erroneous position is taken as a consequence of the mistaken notion that strict justice and tender mercy are incompatible. It is because men have so perverted truth that justice is hated. In short, men regard justice as injustice. This idea carried out to its extreme, makes anarchists and nihilists,-men who regard justice as tyranny. We shall endeavor to show not only that justice and mercy are compatible, but that they must exist together if they exist at all. That which would be mercy in a just man, is simply weakness and imbecility in an unjust man. God has always possessed both these attributes to exactly the same extent that he does now, and will possess them the same to all eternity.

When God had created the earth, beautiful and in every way perfect, he gave it to man. "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto

them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." Gen. 1:26-28. Adam was given dominion over the earth and all that it contained. That is, he was made its lord or ruler. The earth was to be his kingdom, he, of course, to be subject to the great Creator.

Since Adam was to be subject to God, there must of necessity be something to test his loyalty, and his fitness to be confirmed in the dominion that had been given to him in trust for the Lord. God created him for immortality (2 Cor. 5:4, 5), but before he could be made immortal his worthiness for that inestimable boon must be proved. It never would have done to make man immortal, incapable of death, before his character was tested. That would have been taking the risk of perpetuating sin, the very existence of which God abhors. Should man prove unworthy, he would necessarily lose the dominion which had been intrusted to him; and since this great gift,-an eternal inheritance,-was to be the reward of his faithfulness, it was but fitting that a corresponding penalty should be administered if he should prove disloyal. Accordingly we find that God laid on him the following injunction, with the penalty attached:-

"And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

How long the man remained obedient, we have no means of knowing; but in the next chapter we find the record of his disobedience. And now, according to the previous declaration of God, in spite of Satan's lie (Gen. 3:4), Adam must die. He must "pass from an animate to a lifeless state;" he must "cease to live;" he must "suffer a total and irreparable loss of action of the vital functions;" for that is what is signified by the word "die." But "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not *perish*, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. Here the infinite mercy of God was displayed in the very beginning. Men had basically and ungratefully betrayed the trust given him; he had rebelled against God. He had surrendered to God's enemy, and had thus become the enemy of God.

But God had no enmity in his heart toward man. He has no pleasure in the death of him that dieth (Eze.18:32), and so he provided a way for man's escape. In the statement that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head (Gen.3:15), there was the promise of the Messiah, by whose death men might become reconciled to God. Rom. 5:8-10. The penalty was not revoked, but the execution of it was stayed, in order to allow all to lay hold on the means to become reconciled to God, if they chose to do so. That penalty still hangs over the human race; and since the Son of God was given so that those and only those who believe in him should not perish, it follows that the penalty will be allowed to fall upon those who do not believe in him. In proof of this Paul states that those who know not God, and obey not the gospel

of our Lord Jesus Christ, "shall be punished with *everlasting destruction*." 2 Thess. 1:7-9.

The Bible reveals to us the sad fact that the number of the saved will be small in comparison with the number of those who will be lost. Matt. 7:13, 14. The vast majority of mankind have chosen to remain in rebellion against God, yet there will be among the saved some of from "every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." There will not be one, however in all that vast throng, who has been saved in any other way than by belief in the only begotten Son of God, for he is the only way. "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. From the depths of his anguish Job exclaimed, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth." Job 19:25. And Isaiah proclaims the glad truth that "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." Isa. 53:5. Although Isaiah wrote more than seven hundred years before the sacrifice was actually made, he could justly use the past tense, since the lamb was "slain from the foundation of the world." Rev. 13:8. A promise from God, who cannot lie, is the same as though the thing were already performed.

Thus far God's mercy. From the fall to the day of redemption it is the same. It was no less six thousand years ago than it is now, for it was then that Christ was given for man's redemption. It was no light thing for God, who loves with an infinite love, to consent to deliver up his only Son to be insulted and murdered. But he made the sacrifice, and did it at a time when it was needed, when destruction to man was imminent. Now since there is in the universe no greater gift than the Son of a God, it follows that God gave at the first all that he had to give, and consequently it was simply impossible for any greater manifestation of his mercy ever to be made. And so the present dispensation contains no more mercy than there was in the patriarchal age.

No one can dispute these propositions. But some may say that God's mercy will be suspended when, according to his word, he destroys the wicked. Few can see any mercy in the punishment of sinners, and many deny that there is in it any justice. We believe that there is both; that God's justice, as well as his mercy, "endureth for ever."

1. "Can God justly punish the wicked?" Certainly; because he has said that he will, and said it before any sin had been committed. Then the question is really this: "Has God the right to attach a penalty to his laws?" The answer must be, He has such a right, if he has a right to make laws, for a law without a penalty attached is a nullity. A law, for the violation of which no penalty is provided, has no force, and is worth no more than the material on which it is written. Blackstone, the eminent jurist, whose "Commentaries" are standard authority in both hemispheres, says:-

"Of all the parts of the law, the most effectual is the *vindictory*. For it is but lost labor to say, 'Do this for that,' unless we also declare, 'This shall be the consequence of your non-compliance.' We must therefore observe that the main strength and force of a law consists in the penalty attached to it."-*Cooley's Blackstone, Vol. p. 55.*

That God has a right to make laws for his creatures, follows from the very fact that he is the Creator of all things. Any individual has a right to make laws for another just to the extent that that other is dependent on him. Now since in God "we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts 17:28), and are entirely dependent on him, it follows that he has, by right, the supreme control of us. Not only has he the right to make laws for his creatures, but he is bound to do so; for no intelligent creature can exist unless they have respect to some common standard. There must be something to regulate their actions, otherwise they would encroach upon each other's rights, even if they had no malice in their hearts, and confusion if not extermination would be the result. This standard is called law. God is indeed the only one who can really make laws. Human laws derive their force from the fact that they are in harmony with the law of God. Blackstone says that we are in duty bound to violate any human law that runs counter to the law of God. The Bible teaches the same thing.

2. Since God has the right to make laws and to affix penalties, mercy as well as justice demands that those penalties be executed if the laws are violated. If God has brought subjects into existence, and has given laws for their mutual good, and for the maintenance of the rights of each, he is bound to support and protect those subjects in the enjoyment of their rights. But if any one breaks the law, he destroys this evenly-balanced condition of things, and infringes directly on the rights of others. And now some of God's subject are being oppressed by the rebels. Shall he let them suffer? If he does, he will justly incur the charge of being unmerciful. He must punish the guilty, in order to assure the loyal ones of his power and his willingness to protect them. Should he allow the laws to be transgressed with impunity in one part of his Government, his subjects in another part would be in constant fear lest rebellion should spring up in the midst of them, and their lives thereby be endangered.

Take human laws for an example. Every civilized country has a law prohibiting murder. Now suppose there is a country which never punishes the murderer, what will be the result? The people will either take the laws into their own hands, or else they will flock to a country where their lives will be protected. People instinctively recognize the fact that there is no safety except in the enforcement of the laws, and the punishment of evil-doer; and a Government which does not do this, receives nothing but contempt, and soon ceases to exist.

This enables us to understand psalm 136. The psalmist says: "O give thanks unto the Lord; for he is good: for his mercy endureth for ever. . . . To him that smote Egypt in their firstborn; for his mercy endureth for ever; and brought out Israel from among them; for his mercy endureth for ever," etc. The Egyptians were fearfully wicked. They were in rebellion against God, and were wickedly oppressing his people. They had received warning after warning, but to no purpose. For God to leave Israel in that hard bondage, would have been cruel. But the Egyptians would not let them go until they were forced to do so by the severe judgments of God. The Egyptians had, by their obstinate and insolent rebellion, forfeited all claim upon God, and his mercy was displayed in a remarkable manner in the deliverance of his people. And so God's mercy will be shown even in the final destruction of sin and sinners. By that act he will show his

loyal subjects in all of his dominion that he has a care for their welfare, and will protect them. His mercy endures just the same, even while he is punishing the guilty; they, however, have voluntarily rejected it.

One more question will arise in the minds of some. It is this: "Why did not God destroy the wicked ones in the beginning, when the first sin was committed, and then create a new race?" That would have been allowing Satan to triumph, and besides, the new race would also have been obliged to stand a probation, and would have been as liable to fall as was the first. But the great reason is found in God's love to the creatures of his hand. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. They who ask why God did not at once destroy the sinner, have a very limited idea of the love which God has for his creatures. That millions will finally be destroyed, is not the fault of God, but of man. God has done all that infinite love could do. There was no necessity for any to perish, for such was not God's will. 2 Pet. 3:9.

It must also be remembered that this earth is not the whole of God's dominion. We must not be so thoughtless as to suppose that this little world takes up all of God's attention. More than one world (Heb 1:2) owes its allegiance to the Maker of all. "The Lord hath prepared his throne in the Heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all." Ps. 103:19. The telescope reveals worlds many thousand times as large as ours. And here, in this little speck of the universe, puny man has dared to lift up the standard of rebellion against God's Government! A wonderful and a horrible thing! Think of it; rebellion against God! Shall he put it down? Most certainly; the integrity of his Government demands it. In mercy and justice to his loyal subjects in other portions of the universe, he must show that he can and will maintain order.

But first he must let all see the terrible consequence of rebelling against his just decrees. Says Paul (1 Cor. 4:9): "We are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men." This is as true of all the world as it is of the apostles. While all the creatures in the universe behold the wonderful spectacle of one province (so to speak) in rebellion, they learn "that it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God;" and that God will "by no means clear the guilty;" and thus, while they learn to trust more fully in his protecting arm, and praise him for his mercy, they are effectually deterred from ever presuming to rise up against him. As God permits the rebellion to fully develop itself, they see the terrible hideousness of sin, and the justice of God in finally blotting it from his universe. And when this shall have been accomplished, "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," will with glad accord join in ascribing "blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever." E. J. W.

March 19, 1885

"Inheritance of the Saints" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST APRIL 21

1. What did Adam lose by his transgression?

2. By whom is the dominion to be restored?

3. State another result of Adam's transgression?

"Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Rom. 5:12.

4. Who has the power of death?

"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.

5. Then what did Adam receive from Satan as the price of his dominion?

6. What, then, was the curse which Adam's sin brought on the human race?

"Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Rom. 5:12.

7. Besides recovering the lost dominion, what else does Christ do for man?

"But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." 2 Tim. 1:10.

8. By what means does Christ destroy death?

"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.

9. Who alone are freed from the curse?

"He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." John 3:36.

10. In consequence of Adam's sin, what was pronounced upon the earth?

"And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life." Gen. 3:17.

11. What was this curse?

"Thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field." Gen. 3:18.

12. In order to redeem man from *his* curse, what was it necessary for Christ to undergo?

13. 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.

13. Then if Christ redeems the earth from *its* curse, what must he bear?

14. How and when did Christ bear the curse of the earth?

"And when they had platted a crown of thorns, they put it upon his head, and a reed in his right hand: and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews! And they spit upon him, and took the reed, and smote him on the head." Matt. 27:29, 30.

In the beginning, as we have seen, the dominion over the whole earth was given to Adam. The earth was then "very good." It was as good as it could be. There was upon it no taint of sin. So the dominion which God gave to Adam was not over the earth merely, but over the *sinless earth*, i.e., the earth unstained by sin. Then as soon as sin was introduced, that dominion was necessarily lost. Satan was the one who induced man to sin, and therefore he usurped the dominion, and obtained the title of "god of this world." The "first dominion," however, is to be restored. Micah 4:8. Evidently the one who overthrows the usurper, will be the one to restore the dominion. Now Christ was manifested that he might destroy the devil and his works. Gen. 3:15; Heb. 2:14. Therefore Christ is the one who is to restore the lost dominion over the earth. That Christ is to possess the earth is plainly stated in Ps. 2:7, 8.

By his sin, Adam not only lost the dominion for himself, but he made it impossible for any of his posterity to possess it. For since it was forfeited through sin, his descendants could not possess it, because they were born sinful. Moreover his whole posterity were, with himself, doomed to death. Satan has the power of death (Heb. 2:14), and since he induced our first parents to sin, that he might get the dominion, it follows that they gave it up in exchange for death. Death was the price that they received for the earth. This was the curse which came upon man, and from which Christ came to redeem us. Through death he abolishes death, and brings life and immortality to light. Heb. 2:14; 2 Tim. 1:10. All who have Christ (John 3:36) have life, and thus become free from the curse. Christ is our life. Col. 3:4.

But it was not man alone that Christ came to redeem. He came "to seek and to save that which was lost." Luke 19:10. But the earth, as well as man, was lost. Because of Adam's sin, the curse passed upon the earth. This curse was that it should bring forth thorns and thistles. Gen. 3:17, 18. In order to redeem man from the curse, Christ was made a curse. He suffered death, that he might redeem us from the power of death. In like manner, that he might redeem the earth, he must bear the curse under which it groaned, and which was taking its life. So when he was about to die, his tormentors placed upon his brow a crown of thorns (Matt. 27:29, 30), and he thus bore at the same time the curse of the earth and the curse of men. By this he gained the right to redeem both. E. J. W.

March 26, 1885

"Inheritance of the Saints. Promises to Abraham" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 13.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST APRIL 15

PROMISES TO ABRAHAM

1. When did the Lord first appear to Abraham?

"And he said, Men, brethren, and fathers, hearken: The God of glory appeared unto our father Abraham, when he was in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Charran." Acts 7:2.

2. What did he then say to him?

"And said unto him, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and come into the land which I shall show thee." Acts 7:3.

3. To what place did Abraham go from Mesopotamia?

"Then came he out of the land of the Chaldaeans, and dwelt in Charran; and from thence, when his father was dead, he removed him into this land, wherein ye now dwell." Acts 7:4.

4. How long did Abraham stay in Charran (Haran)? *Ib.*

5. After the death of his father, where did he go? *Ib.*

6. Locate, as nearly as possible, all these places on the map.

7. Where do you find the record of these events of which Stephen speaks? Gen. 12:1-5.

8. How old was Abram when he went into the land of Canaan?

"So Abram departed, as the Lord had spoken unto him; and Lot went with him: and Abram was seventy and five years old when he departed out of Haran." Gen. 12:4.

9. How old was he when his father died?

10. When the Lord told Abram to leave his native country, what promise did he make?

"And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." Gen. 12:2, 3.

11. What expression shows that this promise was not merely a local affair?

12. How extensive was it?

13. What will be the condition of the world when this promise meets its fulfillment?

14. Who are they who are blessed?

"Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night." Ps. 1:1, 2.

15. Then what will all the world do when this promise is fulfilled?

16. And when God's will is thus perfectly performed, what will be on this earth?

"Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven." Matt. 6:10.

The answer to question 9 will be readily seen by those who connect Gen. 12:4 with Acts 7:4. He went out of Charran [or Haran] into Canaan when his father was dead, says Stephen. Moses says that he was seventy-five years old when he went into Canaan. So he was seventy-five years old, and his father died.

From a single expression in the promise contained in Gen. 12:2, 3, we know that it was not a local affair. That expression is this; "In thee shall *all the families of the earth* be blessed." It embraces all the inhabitants of the earth. But it is not fulfilled until all the inhabitants of the earth are *blessed*. That condition does not now exist, and has never yet existed. Now we learn in Ps. 1:1, 2 who are blessed,-those who love and obey the law of God. Of course; if the curse came because of *sin*, the blessing will come only when there is obedience. Therefore, when this promise is fulfilled, and every inhabitant of the earth will be delighting in the law of the Lord. In harmony with this are the words of Christ in his prayer (Matt. 6:10), showing that such a state exists only when the kingdom of God exists on earth. E. J. W.

April 2, 1885

"Inheritance of the Saints. Promises to Abraham.óContinued" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 14.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COASTóMAY 2

PROMISES TO ABRAHAM.óCONTINUED

1. Under what circumstances was the promise first made to Abraham?
2. Repeat this promise?

"And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." Gen. 12:2, 3.

3. What condition of things will exist when this is fulfilled?
4. What scripture contains additional features of the promise?

"And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered. Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee." Gen. 13:14-17.

5. When was this promise made?

"And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward." Gen. 13:14.

6. What did the Lord promise at this time?

"And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever." Gen. 13:14, 15.

7. To whom besides Abraham was the land promised? *lb.*

8. How long was it said that they should have it? *lb.*

9. How numerous did the Lord say his seed should be?

"And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth; so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered." Gen. 13:16.

10. If his seed was to be "as the dust of the earth," how much of the earth would it occupy?

11. Then to what was the promise equivalent?

12. How much territory does Paul say that the promise included?

"For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." Rom. 4:13.

13. Why did the Lord make such great promises to Abraham?

"Seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him? For I know him, that he will command 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. 18:18, 19.

In our last week's lesson we learned that the first promise was made to Abraham while he was in his native country, when God told him to go out into a land which he should show him. Gen. 12:1-3. We found that the promise affected not only Abraham, but all the people who should live at a certain time upon the earth; that at that time all would be blessed, and would, consequently, be keeping God's commandments.

After Lot had separated from Abraham, we find the promise renewed, with some additional particular. This will be found in Gen. 13:14-17. There we find that land was promised to Abraham, and to his seed, and that it was to be theirs forever. In the sixteenth verse we learn that his seed was to be "as the dust of the earth." This is but another way of saying that his descendants should fill the whole earth. That being so, it follows that the promise given at that time was that he and his descendants should possess the whole earth. In Rom. 4:13 we learn that this conclusion is correct. We must not fail to note, however, as recorded in Gen. 18:18, 19, that the Lord's promise to make of Abraham a great nation, and the fact that Abraham would command his children and his household after him, that they should keep the way of the Lord. E. J. W.

April 9, 1885

"Inheritance of the Saints. Promises to Abraham.óContinued" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 15.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COASTóMAY 9

PROMISES TO ABRAHAM.óCONTINUED

1. Repeat the promise made to Abraham after Lot had separated from him.

2. Where is this promise found?

3. What did this promise embrace?

"For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." Rom. 4:13.

4. How great a posterity did the Lord say Abraham should have?

"And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth; so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered." Gen. 13:16.

5. On another occasion, what did the Lord say of his posterity?

"And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be." Gen. 15:5.

6. Had Abraham at this time any children?

"And Abram said, Lord God, what wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless, and the steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus?" Gen. 15:2.

7. How did he regard this promise from the Lord?

"And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness." Gen. 15:6.

8. How did the Lord regard Abram's belief? *Ib.*

9. How old was Abram when the Lord next appeared to him?

"And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect." Gen. 17:1.

10. What part of the promise did the Lord at this time renew?

"And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly." "And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee." Gen. 17:2, 6.

11. What name did the Lord at this time give him as a continual reminder of this promise?

"Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee." Gen. 17:5.

12. What is the meaning of "Abraham"?

"Father of a great multitude." Gen. 17:5, margin.

13. What did the Lord at this time say he would give to Abraham and his seed?

"And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God." Gen. 17:8.

14. How long did the Lord say they should possess this land? *lb.*

15. And how much land have we learned that they were to have?

16. On what condition was this promise given?

"And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect." Gen. 17:1.

17. Then to what other promise is this equivalent?

"But the meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace." Ps. 37:11.

The promise made to Abraham after Lot separated from him, will be found in Gen. 13:14-17. It will be remembered that the promise embraced a grant of land, and this land, we learned (Rom.4:13), was the whole earth. In Gen. 17:1-8, we have the same thing repeated. At that time the Lord gave him his name, "Abraham," meaning, "a multitude of nations," or a "father of many nations." This would serve to continually keep in mind the promise that his seed should be as the dust of the earth, and as the stars of heaven. God also at this time repeated the statement that he would give the land (the earth) to Abraham and his seed for an "everlasting possession." As noted in our last lesson, this promise was on condition that Abraham should walk perfectly before the Lord. Since a meek person is a follower of Christ, and therefore perfect, it follows that this promise is equivalent to that already learned in Ps. 37:11. E. J. W.

April 16, 1885

"Inheritance of the Saints. Promises to Abraham.óContinued" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 16.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COASTóMAY 16

PROMISES TO ABRAHAM.óCONTINUED

1. After Abraham had obeyed the command to offer up Isaac, what did the Lord swear to do?

"And said, By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son; That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven,

and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice." Gen. 22:16-18.

2. How numerous did he say Abraham's seed should be? *Ib.*

3. Where have we found similar expressions?

"And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth; so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered." Gen. 13:16.

"And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be." Gen. 15:5.

4. What did the Lord say that Abraham's seed should possess?

"That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies." Gen. 22:17.

5. What is indicated by the statement that his seed shall possess the gate of his enemies"?

6. Then with what other scriptures already learned, is this parallel?

"And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." Gen. 12:3.

"For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever." Gen. 13:15.

"For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." Rom. 4:13.

7. What further shows that the promise in Gen. 22:16-18 is the same as those already learned? Compare Gen. 22:18 with Gen. 12:3; 18:18.

8. Why did the Lord now say that he would do this thing?

"And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice." Gen. 22:18.

9. And what have we before found was the condition on which the promise was based?

"For I know him, that he will command 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.

10. What did Stephen say as to the fulfillment of the promise recorded in Gen. 13:15; 17:18?

"And he gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on; yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child." Acts 7:5.

11. What do we know concerning all of God's promises?

"The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." 2 Pet. 3:9.

"For all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us." 2 Cor. 1:20.

12. Then what must we conclude concerning these promises to Abraham?

"Thy seed shall possess of the gate of his enemies." Gen. 22:17. Ancient cities, as is well known, were surrounded by walls, and the only means of entrance was by means of gates, which were well guarded. Whoever controlled those gates, controlled the city. If an enemy could gain possession of the gates of a city, they could keep the inhabitants closely confined within, or could admit whomsoever they chose. So to possess the gate of one's enemies would signify supreme rule. When it was promised that Abraham's seed should "possess the gate of his enemies," we understand that his seed was eventually to occupy all the territory then occupied by those who were antagonistic to him. But this was equivalent to the inheritance of the earth, thus showing that this text is parallel with Gen. 12:13; 13:15; Rom. 4:13, which have already been considered.

Notwithstanding these promises, which were made to Abraham as well as to his seed, Abraham died without seeing their fulfillment. Stephen says that God did not give him enough of the land to set his foot on, although he promised that he would give him the whole of it. But we know that the Lord is not slack concerning his promises, and that all his promises are yea and amen; they cannot be broken. Every one will be fulfilled to the letter. This being the case, we must conclude that the Lord did not intend that Abraham should receive the inheritance immediately, but that the promise should be fulfilled to him at some future time. When we read that Abraham died "*in faith*," although he had not received the inheritance, we know that this was the way he understood the Lord. Had Abraham not thus understood the Lord, he would have died discouraged, instead of "*in faith*." E. J. W.

May 7, 1885

"College Notes" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

On Monday, April, 20 a most interesting meeting in the interest of the school was held in the College chapel. Since it was not the regular stockholders' meeting, the financial report was only approximate, but all were surprised at the good showing. Of this, however, we shall speak more particularly next week, when we shall have the report of the stockholders' meeting. That which contributed most to the interest of the meeting, and of which we wish to speak, is the experiences that were given by some of the students. Remarks being in order, after the teachers had spoken concerning the work of the last term, and the prospects for the future, one young man arose and said that he owed a debt of gratitude to the College, which she could never repay. He knew that the College did not advertise to be a sanitarium, yet it had been such to him, during his two years' attendance. He said that his health was so poor when he entered that he should have been obliged to leave in a short time, if it had not been for the regular hours, and the physical exercise in the industrial department.

One who has attended during the last school year, spoke very feelingly of the pleasant associations formed, and the previous religious privileges he had enjoyed while trying to gain knowledge.

Another said that he had gained both spiritually and intellectually. The North College Hall had been to him a *home*, and he felt that it would be a pleasure for him to work for the school.

One young man said that he was in very poor when he left home last fall, and that his friends had tried to discourage him. Now his health is good, his mind stronger, and his open bright.

Still another, who has spent two winters at the College, and has already done some good work in the missionary field, said that if he has any success in life, the founders of the College will receive a large portion of the reward.

One young lady said that before she came to the College she had never done any work, did not know how, and did not want to. Now, besides what she had gained mentally, she had learned much about work, and what is more, had learned to like it.

Others spoke to the same effect. These utterances were spontaneous, and none who heard them could doubt their sincerity. If all the patrons of the College, and all who should be patrons, could have heard them, we are confident that the present accommodations would not be sufficient for half of those who would attend next term.

The industrial system of education is no longer an experiment so far as Healdsburg College is concerned. It is a decided success. There are many who think it would be a good thing if it could be carried out; but in this case the students take hold heartily to carry out. It would do one good to see the pride which, with very rare exceptions, the students taking in the College, and in preserving a neat and orderly condition about the premises. The visitors present at the meeting were pleased at the general appearance of things; but no one who has not been present, can have any idea of the amount of work that has been done by the students.

It was noticeable that nearly all of the students who spoke at the meeting, mentioned the fact that their health had improved. One of the brethren who has been a devoted friend of the school, and who was instrumental in securing the attendance of several students last fall, said that at first sight it was difficult for him to recognize some of them, because of their improved physical condition. This is an item upon which too much stress cannot be laid. There are many schools where students may rapidly gain knowledge from books, but there are few schools where they can at the same time steadily improve in health, and also learn how to preserve the health which they have gained. Healdsburg College is one of these, and the only one with which we are acquainted.

We would not forget to mention the good feeling that has uniformly prevailed among the students. We believe that it would be a rare thing to find so many young people of different tastes and habits, brought together in one family without more or less discord. The fact that there was a perfect harmony was not because those present were naturally better than others, but because, with few exceptions, all were striving to live up to a high Christian principle. Much may also be credited to admirable tact and good management of those having charge of the "Students' Home." No family of six was ever better regulated than this one of sixty.

No one can fail to see the hand of God in the prosperity that has attended the Healdsburg College, and know that if with humble hearts we suitably acknowledge his blessings, it will be manifested in a more marked degree in the future. E. J. W.

June 4, 1885

"Inheritance of the Saints. (Continued .)" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 22.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST 6 JULY 4

SOJOURNING IN A STRANGE LAND

1. What question did Abraham ask on one occasion when the Lord repeated the promise to him?

"And he said, Lord God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?" Gen. 15:8.

2. What did the Lord say in reply?

"And he said unto him, Take me an heifer of three years old, and a she goat of three years old, and a ram of three years old, and a turtledove, and a young pigeon." Gen. 15:9.

3. What did Abraham do?

"And he took unto him all these, and divided them in the midst, and laid each piece one against another; but the birds divided he not. And when the fowls came down upon the carcasses, Abram drove them away." Gen. 15:10, 11.

4. What happened when the sun was going down?

"And when the sun was going down, a deep sleep fell upon Abram; and, lo, an horror of great darkness fell upon him." Gen. 15:12.

5. In this vision, what did the Lord say to Abraham?

"And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years." Gen. 15:13.

6. How long were his seed to be strangers in a strange land?

7. When the time was expired, what was to be done?

"And also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance." Gen. 15:14.

8. What was the name of the land which they were to have as their own?

"And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God." Gen. 17:8.

9. Why could Abraham not at once take possession of it?

"But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again; for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full." Gen. 15:16.

10. When the Lord did at last deliver the Israelites from bondage, what did he say to them?

"And Moses went up unto God, and the Lord called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel; Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel." Ex. 19:3-6.

11. What did he say they should be?

"And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel." Ex. 19:6.

12. In making this promise, what was the Lord doing?

"For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth. The Lord did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people; but because the Lord loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt." Deut. 7:6-8.

13. Then with what is Ex. 19:3-6 parallel?

14. What was the condition of the promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob?

15. And what was the condition of this promise to the Jews?

"Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine." Ex. 19:5.

"And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years." Gen. 15:13. The student must not forget the idea that this refers solely to the bondage in Egypt, for Paul tells us (Gal. 3:17) that from the announcement of the promise to Abraham until the giving of the law, at Sinai, was but four hundred and thirty years. This four hundred and thirty years is thus computed: From the giving of the promise until the birth of Isaac, twenty-five years (compared Gen. 12:1-4 with Gen. 25:5); from the birth of Isaac until the birth of Jacob, sixty years (Gen. 25:26); from the birth of Jacob and till the going down into Egypt, one hundred and thirty years (Gen. 47:8, 9), making 215 years from the giving of the promise until the beginning of the sojourn in Egypt; and Josephus says ("Antiquities," chap. 15, 2) that 215 years was the length of that sojourn. Thus the 430 years of Gal. 3:17 and Ex. 12:40, 41 are accounted for.

The text under consideration (Gen. 15:13), however, is more difficult. It is evident from the text, and also its parallel in Acts 7:6, that the four hundred years' sojourn ends at the same time as the four hundred and thirty years' sojourn, viz.,

at the deliverance from Egypt. Then the four hundred years' of affliction (Gen. 15:13) must have begun thirty years after the giving of the promise. Dr. Clarke and others say that the mocking Ishmael when Isaac was weaned (Gen. 21:1-10), called persecution by Paul in Gal. 4:29, marks the beginning of the four hundred years. Isaac was born twenty-five years after the promise, and the age of weaning is placed at about five years (see Clark on Gen. 21:8), thus making the thirty years from the promise.

This is certainly not inconsistent with Gen. 15:13; for if Abraham's *seed* was to be afflicted four hundred years, we would expect that persecution to begin with Isaac. The only difficulty remaining is to show the harmony of these texts with Ex. 12:40, 41, which speak of the *children of Israel* as sojourning four hundred and thirty years. But Dr. Horne ("Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures," Vol. 1, part 1, chap. iii., see vi.) says that the text, according to the ancient Samaritan Pentateuch, should read thus: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, *and their fathers*, which they sojourned *in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt*, was four hundred and thirty years." This rendering, which is confirmed by the Alexandrian manuscript of the Septuagint, makes perfect harmony.

From Deut. 7:6-8 we learn that when the Lord brought the Israelites out of Egypt, and made the promise recorded in Ex. 19:3-6, it was simply in keeping with the promise made to their fathers. The fact that the conditions of the two promises were the same (compared Gen. 26:5 and Ex. 19:5) harmonizes with this statement. E. J. W.

June 11, 1885

"Inheritance of the Saints. (Continued .) The Promised Land" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST 6 JULY 11

THE PROMISED LAND

1. When the Lord brought the children of Israel out of Egypt, what promise did he make them?

"And Moses went up unto God, and the Lord called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel; ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel." Ex. 19:3-6.

2. Of what promise was this a continuation?

"For thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God; the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth. The Lord did not set his love upon you, nor choose you, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people; but because the Lord loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt." Deut. 7:6-8.

3. Into what land were they to be brought?

"And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God." Gen. 17:8.

4. Who led them into this land? Read Josh. 1:1-6, 11.

5. To whom did the Lord say he had sworn to give the land which Joshua was to divide among the people?

"Be strong and of a good courage: for unto this people shalt thou divide for an inheritance the land, which I sware unto their fathers to give them." Josh. 1:6.

6. Cite the passages in which the promise was made to the fathers. Gen. 12:1-3; 13:14-17; 15:1-16; 17:1-8; 22:15-18; 26:1-5; 28:10-15.

7. Since the promise was made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in person, could the possession of the land by their descendants be a fulfillment of that promise? It evidently could not.

8. In making the promise to Abraham, what had the Lord said his seed should possess?

"That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies." Gen. 22:17.

9. Was this fulfilled when Joshua led the Israelites into Canaan?

"Yet the children of Manasseh could not drive out the inhabitants of those cities; but the Canaanites would dwell in that land. Yet it came to pass, when the children of Israel were waxen strong, that they put the Canaanites to tribute; but did not utterly drive them out." Josh. 17:12, 13.

10. What is Paul's testimony on this point?

"For if Jesus [margin, that is, Joshua] had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day." Heb. 4:8.

11. Where do we find that "other day" mentioned?

"The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvellous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." Ps. 118:22-24.

12. What day was it of which David spoke?

"(For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the day of salvation have I succoured thee: behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation.)" 2 Cor. 6:2.

13. Since another day was spoken of, what does Paul concede?

"There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God." Heb. 4:9.

14. Who is it that leads the people into the true rest?

"Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls." Matt. 11:28, 29.

15. And who are they who are Christ's?

"And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Gal. 3:29.

16. Then through whom is the promise to Abraham and his seed fulfilled? E. J. W.

"How Readest Thou?" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

There has been of late quite an interest raised over the question in a recent Sabbath-school lesson, as to how old Abram was when his father died. We will therefore quote a portion of one letter from a brother who requests an answer through the SIGNS, and the answer to it will serve for all. He says:-

"The idea was conveyed in the Sabbath-school lesson in the SIGNS, a few weeks ago, that Abram was seventy-five years old when his father died, and the subject was brought up in the school at---, which caused some comment.

"As well as I remember, the SIGNS stated plainly that he was at that age at the death of his father, and suppose the conclusion was gotten at in this way. In the last verse of Gen. 11 we have an account of the death of Terah, Abram's father, and the 12th chapter begins with what the Lord had told Abram in regard to leaving his father's house, etc., and says: 'So Abram departed, as the Lord had spoken unto him; and Lot went with him; and Abram was seventy and five years old when he departed out of Haran,' and as his father had died before he departed, he must have been seventy-five when his father died."

The brother has the idea exactly, and when we have read his words we wondered that there could be any question in his mind. But the next few words of his letter show the cause of his difficulty. He continues-

"But right here is where I think the mistake is. The Bible does does say that Terah died before Abram left Haran, but, on the other hand, conveys the idea very strongly that he did not. It is true that the last verse of chapter 11 gives an account of the death of Terah, and the first verse of chapter 12 gives an account of what the Lord told Abram about leaving his country, but it does not say that it was after his father's death that he told him this, or that he did not leave before his father's death."

And right here is where we would place several exclamation marks. It is strange that the brother should have forgotten or overlooked Acts 7:2-4, which was referred to in the same lesson, and which reads thus:-

"Men, brethren, and fathers, hearken: The God of glory appeared unto our father Abraham, when he was in Mesopotamia, before he *dwelt in Charran* [Haran], and said unto him, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and come into the land which I shall show thee. Then came he out of the land of the

Chaldaeans, and dwelt in Charran; and *from thence, when his father was dead, he removed him* into this land, wherein ye now dwell."

The question, then, is reduced to this simple proposition: Since Abram left Haran when his father died (Acts 7:2-4) and he was seventy-five years old when he left Haran (Gen. 12:4), how old was he with his father die? No great mathematical skill is required to solve this problem. This was about the order in which it was stated in the Sabbath-school lesson, if we remember correctly. We apprehend that the question concerning Abram's age at the death of his father, was raised in order to see if those studying the lessons were in the habit of comparing scripture with scripture, and noting the bearing of one upon the other. It seems that in this case many did not do so.

What has thrown so many off the track is this: They read in Gen. 11:26, "And Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran." And in Gen. 11:32 they read: "And the days of Terah were two hundred and five years: and Terah died in Haran." putting these two together, they say, "Why, of course Abram was 135 years old when his father died." Thus they ignored the plain and positive statements of Gen. 12:4 and Acts 7:4, by which we must be guided. The record does not say that Abram was born when his father was seventy-five years old. There are two statements in Gen. 11:26; one is that Terah lived seventy years without children, and the other is that he begat at Abram, Nahor, and Haran. We are not to suppose that these three sons were all born at the same time, anymore than we are to suppose when we read (Gen. 5:7), "And Seth lived after he begat Enos eight hundred and seven years, and begat sons and daughters," that all his sons and daughters were born at one time. Neither is it necessary to suppose that Abram was the first-born. The youngest son, if he was the most noted, is very often named first. Thus, "Ephraim and Manasseh" is the order in which Joseph's sons are usually named, although Ephraim was the younger. See Gen. 41:51, 52; 48:17-20.

For another illustration, see Gen. 5:32: "And Noah was five hundred years old; and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth." The casual reader might suppose that these sons were all born to Noah at one time, and he would certainly suppose that Shem was the eldest, and Japheth the youngest. But by comparing Gen. 9:22-24 with Gen. 10:21, we learn that Japheth was the eldest son, and Ham was Noah's second son. He is mentioned first, because he is most worthy of note, as being the ancestors of Abraham. So it is in Gen. 11:26. Terah was seventy years old when the first of his sons was born; but this was not Abram, since he was not born until his father was 135 years old. (Compare the age of Abram at his father's death, with Gen. 11:32.) He is, however, named first, because he was the only one of note among the sons of Terah.

We have not devoted so much space to this question because we thought it a matter of great importance that all should know just how old Abraham was at his father's death, but to show the necessity of careful thought in studying the Scriptures. All the facts of any case do not always appear in a single passage, and different ones must be compared. One thing must always be borne in mind: Whenever a thing is plainly stated in the text or must *necessarily* be concluded from a comparison of two or more positive statements, no *seeming* contradiction

based on an inference, can be entertained. Incomplete statements, or inferences, must always be interpreted in harmony with positive declarations. By so doing we shall find perfect harmony in the Bible. E. J. W.

June 18, 1885

"Inheritance of the Saints. Continued. An Earthly King Chosen" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 24.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JULY 18

AN EARTHLY KING CHOSEN

1. Give two proofs that the partial possession of Canaan by the Israelites was not the fulfillment of the promise.

2. If the possession of the land had been complete, would that have been a complete fulfillment of the promise?

"And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also." Rom. 4:11.

3. When the Lord brought them from Egypt, what did he promise to make of them?

"Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel." Ex. 19:5, 6.

4. How were they governed for many years after that time?

"After that he gave unto them judges about the space of four hundred and fifty years, until Samuel the prophet." Acts 13:20.

5. Who was the last of the judges?

"And Samuel judged Israel all the days of his life. And he went from year to year in circuit to Bethel, and Gilgal, and Mizpeh, and judged Israel in all those places. And his return was to Ramah; for there was his house; and there he judged Israel; and there he built an altar unto the Lord." 1 Sam. 7:15-17.

6. In his days what did the Israelites demand?

"Then all the elders of Israel gathered themselves together, and came to Samuel unto Ramah, and said unto him, Behold, thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways: now make us a king to judge us like all the nations." 1 Sam. 8:4, 5.

7. What did the Lord say they had done in making this demand?

"And the Lord said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee; for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them." 1 Sam. 8:7.

8. Then under whose immediate authority must they have been up to this time?

9. What did the Lord say that Samuel should do?

"And the Lord said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them." "Now therefore hearken unto their voice: howbeit yet protest solemnly unto them, and show them the manner of the king that shall reign over them." "And the Lord said to Samuel, Hearken unto their voice, and make them a king. And Samuel said unto the men of Israel, Go ye every man unto his city." 1 Sam. 8:7, 9, 22.

10. Who was chosen as their first king?

"And afterward they desired a king; and God gave unto them Saul the son of Cis, a man of the tribe of Benjamin, by the space of forty years." Acts 13:21.

"And when Samuel saw Saul, the Lord said unto him, Behold the man whom I spake to thee of! this same shall reign over my people." 1 Sam. 9:17.

11. By whom was Saul chosen as king over Israel?

"Now the Lord had told Samuel in his ear a day before Saul came, saying, Tomorrow about this time I will send thee a man out of the land of Benjamin, and thou shalt anoint him to be captain over my people Israel, that he may save my people out of the hand of the Philistines; for I have looked upon my people, because their cry is come unto me." 1 Sam. 9:15, 16.

12. Had the Lord, then, but utterly rejected his people because of their rejection of him?

No; this is shown by the fact that he chose their king for them.

There is a seeming discrepancy between Acts 13:20 and 1 Kings 6:1. The latter text says that Solomon began to build the temple in the four hundred and eightieth year after the exode, which would not allow all four hundred fifty years of government by judges. The explanation which seems the simplest is that which connects Acts 13:20 with the first part of the 17th verse of the same chapter, and regard the expression, "about the space of four hundred and fifty years," as explanatory of the words "and after that." Thus: The God of this people of Israel chose our fathers. . . . and about the space of four hundred and fifty years after that he gave unto them judges, until Samuel the prophet. E. J. W.

"Thoughts on the Third Psalm" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 24.

E. J. Waggoner

This psalm is said to be "a psalm of David, when he fled from Absalom his son." There is no reason to suppose that this inscription is not correct. Whether it was written during the flight, or was written afterwards, as expressing the feelings which he had on that occasion, is immaterial. Knowing the circumstances which called for this psalm we can enter more fully into the feelings of the psalmist. Those circumstances we find recorded in detail in 2 Sam. 15, 16, 17. With the

incidents therein related fresh in our minds, let us examine the psalm, and see what there is in it which is profitable for us. See 2 Tim. 3:16, 17.

Verse 1. "Lord, how are they increased that trouble me! many are they that rise up against me." The same language may be used by every one who professes to follow Christ. To every one the warning is given, "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he made devour." 1 Pet. 5:8. He is at the head of a host, so that we have, as the apostle says, to contend "against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against wicked spirits in high places." Eph. 6:12. Moreover, Christians are informed that in the world they shall have tribulation; Satan is the "god of this world," and since he is the enemy of all righteousness we would naturally expect that the world would not be friendly to the Christian. So we read, "If ye were of the world, the world would love its his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world, hateth you." John 15:19. It is often said that the world is now becoming friendly to Christians and Christianity. To this we would simply repeat the text above quoted, and others of a similar nature. The world persecuted Christ, and he says: "The servant is not a greater than his lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you. . . . But all these things will they do unto you for my

375

name's sake, because they know not him that sent me." John 15:20, 21. James wrote, as a truth for all times, that "the friendship of the world is enmity with God, whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God. James 4:4. When, therefore, we hear men speak of Christians whom the world loves, we must conclude that their Christianity is worldliness; that instead of being followers of God, they are enemies.

Besides the devil and the world, each one has his own self, the worst enemy of all, to contend against. "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." "For the flesh lusteth again this Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." Surely we may well say, as did David, "Lord, how are they increased that trouble me! many are they that rise up against me."

Verse 2. "Many there be which say of my soul, There is no help for him in God." David's enemies thought that his overthrow was complete. One of them said, tauntingly, "The Lord hath returned upon thee all the blood of the house of Saul, in whose stead thou hast reigned; and the Lord hath delivered the kingdom into the hand of Absalom thy son; and, behold, thou art taken in mischief because thou art a bloody man." 2 Sam. 16:8. Even so the world, looking at the faults of Christians, will say, "They are no better than others; they do things that are just as bad as the things that we do; there is no more hope for them than for us." And the Christian himself, who, more than anyone else, has a vivid sense of his own shortcomings, too often gives way to the same desponding thoughts. How often people say: "I have so many sins to overcome, and am so weak, that it

doesn't seem of much use for me to try." What is this but saying of one's own soul, "There is no help for him in God"?

Notice the use of the word "soul," in this verse. Some imagine that the terms soul invariably refers to an "immaterial substance," to something which has unending existence, yet which is not an entity. But David, speaking of those who were seeking his life, said, "Many there be which say of my soul, There is help for *him* in God."

Verses 3, 4. "But thou, O Lord, art a shield for me; my glory, and the lifter up of a mine head. I cried unto the Lord with my voice, and he heard me out of his holy hill." No portion of the Scriptures was written without a purpose. "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have a hope." Rom. 15:4. When we read in the Old Testament, how wonderfully God delivered his people in time of battle, it is that we may take courage. Not that we are to engage in physical warfare, in which God will fight for us, but that we may know God's power to help all who are in trouble. In the 20th chapter of 2 Chronicles we find an interesting account of the deliverance of the Jews, from their enemies, who greatly outnumbered them. This was done because the people believed and trusted in the Lord. The case of Gideon and his army (Judges 6 and 7) is a similar one. These were visible proofs of God's power to deliver, and serve to give us confidence in such promises as the following:-

"The Lord is good, a stronghold in the day of trouble; and he knoweth them that trust in him." Nahum 3:7.

"But God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." 1 Cor.10:13.

The fifth verses shows God's continual care for his people: "I laid me down and slept; I awaked; for the Lord sustained me." How many of us are there who remember as they arise in the morning that "it is of Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not." (Lam. 3:22), and that "they our new every morning"? The adversary of souls would destroy us. As a roaring lion he walks about, seeking whom he may devour, and this he would do with us physically as well as spiritually; for if he could cut short our lives, while we are unprepared for the Judgment, he would thereby most effectually devour us, and bring us to eternal ruin. That he does not do this, is because of the continual watchfulness of God. "Behold, he that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep." Ps. 121:4.

It is remarkable that when driven from his throne by traitors, who cared for nothing but to take his life, David could peacefully lie down and sleep. The source of this peace is found in Isa. 26:3, 4: "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on thee; because he trusteth in thee. Trust ye in the Lord for ever; for in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength." Having one's mind stayed on God is equivalent to delighting in and obeying his law (Ps.1:1-3), as we read, "O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of sea." Isa. 48:18. The

Bible abounds in statements concerning the peace and blessedness of those who obey God.

But it will be objected that David had not kept the law, and that his present distress was the direct consequence of his sins. That is true, and this is why many said of his soul that there was no help for him in God. We are often tempted, as before stated, to say the same thing of ourselves, when for some cause we are brought to a vivid sense of our sinfulness. In such times we forget, what David remembered, that although no man could stand before God if he were unable to answer for his conduct, there is forgiveness effectual, that he may be feared. Ps. 130:3, 4. David had sinned, but he had repented, and believing God's promise (see Isa. 55:7), he could rest as peacefully as though he had never committed a sin.

Why should we not thus rise above the temptations of the enemy? Paul says: "What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? 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? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth." Rom. 8:31, 33.

With these texts before us, but we need not wonder at David's boldness, as indicated in verse 6: "I will not be afraid of ten thousands of people, that have set themselves against me roundabout." There are two reasons why people may not fear an invading army: 1. Because they are in league with the enemy, or intend to yield without resistance. 2. Because they are strongly fortified and protected, and are confident that with the help which they have they can make a successful resistance. David's boldness was of the second class. Many persons think it an indication of virtue to invite temptation, that they may show how they can resist it. In the case before us we see that boldness is not always inconsistent with flight. David was fleeing from his pursuers, yet he felt fearless in the Lord. So we, while we are to resist the devil, that he may flee from us, are not to seek opportunities to resist him. Our prayer is to be, "Lead us not into temptation;" we are to shun the place of evil, but when the enemy comes to us, we are to vigorously resist him. We may be sure that he will not allow us to lack of opportunities to put forth all the strength he can muster.

In the 7th verse David states as already accomplished, what the Lord will do for all his people. He will save them, and discomfit their enemies. Comparing the enemies to ravenous beasts, who would be disabled by having their teeth broken, he says: "Thou hast smitten all mine enemies on the cheek ; thou hast broken the teeth of the ungodly." The psalm then appropriately closes with an acknowledgement of God as the author of both present and future, complete salvation. "Salvation belongeth unto [or, it is of] the Lord; thy blessing is upon thy people." E. J. W.

June 25, 1885

"Inheritance of the Saints. Continued. Rejection of Saul as King of Israel" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST 6 JULY 25

REJECTION OF SAUL AS KING OF ISRAEL

1. Who was the first king of Israel?

"And afterward they desired a king; and God gave unto them Saul the son of Cis, a man of the tribe of Benjamin, by the space of forty years." Acts 13:21.

2. By whom was he chosen? *Ib.*

3. How long did he reign? *Ib.*

4. On one occasion what message came from the Lord to Saul from Samuel?

"Samuel also said unto Saul, The Lord sent me to anoint thee to be king over his people, over Israel; now therefore hearken thou unto the voice of the words of the Lord. Thus saith the Lord of hosts, I remember that which Amalek did to Israel, how he laid wait for him in the way, when he came up from Egypt. Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass." 1 Sam. 15:7-9.

5. How did Saul carry out his instructions?

"And Saul smote the Amalekites from Havilah until thou comest to Shur, that is over against Egypt. And he took Agag the king of the Amalekites alive, and utterly destroyed all the people with the edge of the sword. But Saul and the people spared Agag, and the best of the sheep, and of the oxen, and of the fatlings, and the lambs, and all that was good, and would not utterly destroy them: but every thing that was vile and refuse, that they destroyed utterly." 1 Sam. 15:7-9.

6. What excuse did Saul make for thus disobeying the command the Lord?

"And Saul said unto Samuel, Yea, I have obeyed the voice of the Lord, and have gone the way which the Lord sent me, and have brought Agag the king of Amalek, and have utterly destroyed the Amalekites. But the people took of the spoil, sheep and oxen, the chief of the things which should have been utterly destroyed, to sacrifice unto the Lord thy God in Gilgal." 1 Sam. 15:20, 21.

7. What did Samuel say the Lord values more than sacrifices?

"And Samuel said, 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.

8. To what was Saul's stubbornness equivalent?

"For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king." 1 Sam. 15:23.

9. What had he rejected?

He had rejected the word of the Lord.

10. Since rebellion is equal to idolatry, had not Saul, in rejecting the word of the Lord, rejected the Lord himself?

Certainly the record shows that Saul was virtually an idolater, and thus as wicked as the Amalekites, whom he had been sent to destroy.

11. Because Saul had thus rejected the Lord, what had the Lord done?

"For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king." "And Samuel said unto Saul, I will not return with thee: for thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, and the Lord hath rejected thee from being king over Israel." 1 Sam. 15:23, 26.

12. What had he rent from Saul?

"And Samuel said unto him, The Lord hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbour of thine, that is better than thou." 1 Sam. 15:28.

13. To whom did Samuel say the kingdom was given? *ib.*

14. What important lesson may we learn from the narrative in this chapter?

From the narrative recorded in 1 Samuel 15, we may learn how particular God is in his requirements, and how dangerous it is for us to presume to deviate from the plain letter of his commandments. Saul flattered himself that God would overlook his disobedience in preserving the best of the flocks of the Amalekites because, they were preserved for sacrifice. But God would not accept such a service. Had he accepted Saul's excuse, it would have been the equivalent to admitting that Saul knew what would honor the Lord better than the Lord himself knew, and that was not true. When God tells us to do a thing in a certain way, we are to understand that to do just as he says, will honor him more than anything else. We are not at liberty to presume that we can honor him by different course; that would be setting ourselves above God, and consequently we would be idolaters. From this narrative we can see an illustration of Prov. 28:9: "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." E. J. W.

"Upper Columbia Camp-Meeting" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

This meeting was held on the old camp-ground at Milton, Or., and was preceded by a ten days' session of Bible study. The attendance at the meeting was much smaller than last year; the excessively cold weather and dry spring had put crops back so much that many felt unable to come. Much-needed rains fell a few weeks before the meeting, which caused some to take courage and reverse their decision to stay away. If our brethren allow the fear of hard times to hinder them from obtaining the spiritual blessings God places within their reach, they will lose much. If the Lord is indeed soon coming, we cannot look for long-continued seasons of temporal prosperity, yet our spiritual needs are greater than

ever. We need the blessings to be received at our annual gatherings more than ever before, and sacrifices must be made to obtain them.

Sometimes the Lord tries us, and we find that the sacrifice does not prove so great as we thought it would be. One brother who hesitated long about attending, finally left his work and attended a portion of the Institute and the camp-meeting. On his return home, he found that his business had prospered in his absence more than when he was present.

Two class exercises of the Institute were held each day before the meeting, and one every day after the meeting began. The intervals between classes during the Institute were devoted to study and to work on the ground. Morning and evening prayer-meetings were held each day, and these, together with the influence of the Bible study, gave those present a good preparation for the meeting. As people came onto the ground just before or at the beginning of the regular camp-meeting, they found the Spirit of the Lord already present, and a deep interest manifested. Indeed, it was not possible, as one brother said, to tell when the camp-meeting really began.

The business sessions were marked by a spirit of union, and a desire to see the cause advance. The ten days' session of Bible study allowed the workers present to mature plans and to arrange business so that it could be attended to with dispatch. The Lord helped in the preaching of the word, to a marked degree, and the social meetings were seasons of blessing. Many said that it was the best camp-meeting that they had ever attended; this was not because of the smoothness of the preaching, but because there was a willingness on their part to carry out the instructions given.

In closing, we wish to mention two benefits resulting from the holding of a Biblical Institute before and during a camp-meeting: 1. The people have something to think and talk about. We never attended a camp-meeting where there was so little visiting and idle talk. Wherever a little group was gathered, they were engaged in her study, preparing for the next recitation. 2. As a natural consequence, the spiritual interests of the meeting was quickened. The Holy Spirit came into hearts as they meditated on the word. If no permanent increase of knowledge had been gained by those present, these results alone would amply repay for the effort. We trust, however, that lasting impressions have been made, and that all have received a new impetus in Bible study.

We are now on the pleasant camp-ground in Portland, ready to begin the work to-morrow morning. E. J. W. *Portland, Or., June 13, 1885.*

July 2, 1885

"Inheritance of the Saints. Continued. The Promise to David" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 26.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST 6 AUG 1

THE PROMISE TO DAVID

1. Relate the circumstances which led to the rejection of Saul as king of Israel. See 1 Sam. 15.

2. Where is this narrative recorded? *ib.*

3. When Samuel said that the Lord had taken the kingdom from Saul, to whom did he say it had been given?

"And Samuel said unto him, The Lord hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbour of thine, that is better than thou." 1 Sam. 15:28.

4. Who was the one whom the Lord chosen the place of Saul?

"And Nathan said to David, Thou art the man. Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, I anointed thee king over Israel, and I delivered thee out of the hand of Saul." 2 Sam. 12:7.

5. From what occupation was David taken to be made king?

"Now therefore so shalt thou say unto my servant David, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, I took thee from the sheeppcote, from following the sheep, to be ruler over my people, over Israel." 2 Sam. 7:8.

6. Where do we have an account of the choosing and the anointing of David?

"And the Lord said unto Samuel. . . . Fill thine horn with oil, and go, I will send thee to Jesse the Beth-lehemite; for I have provided me a king among his sons. . . . And Samuel did that which the Lord spake. . . . And he sanctified Jesse and his sons, and called them to the sacrifice. And it came to pass, when they were come, that he looked on Eliab, and said, Surely the Lord's anointed is before him. But the Lord said unto Samuel, Look not on his countenance, or on the height of his stature; because I have refused him; for the Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart. Then Jesse called Abinadab, and made him pass before Samuel. And he said, Neither hath the Lord chosen this. Then Jesse made Shammah to pass by. And he said, Neither hath the Lord chosen this. Again, Jesse made seven of his sons to pass before Samuel. And Samuel said unto Jesse, The Lord hath not chosen these. And Samuel said unto Jesse, Are here all thy children? And he said, There remaineth yet the youngest, and, behold, he keepeth the sheep. And Samuel said unto Jesse, Send and fetch him: for we will not sit down till he come hither. And he sent, and brought him in. Now he was ruddy, and withal of a beautiful countenance, and goodly to look to. And the Lord said, Arise, anoint him: for this is he. Then Samuel took the horn of oil, and anointed him in the midst of his brethren; and the spirit of the Lord came upon David from that day forward. So Samuel rose up, and went to Ramah." 1 Sam 16:1-13.

7. When the Lord placed David over his people, what did he do for him?

"Now therefore so shalt thou say unto my servant David, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, I took thee from the sheeppcote, from following the sheep, to be ruler over my people, over Israel; and I was with thee whithersoever thou wentest, and

have cut off all thine enemies out of thy sight, and have made thee a great name, like unto the name of the great men that are in the earth." 2 Sam. 7:8, 9.

8. What did he make him?

"And I was with thee whithersoever thou wentest, and have cut off all thine enemies out of thy sight, and have made thee a great name, like unto the name of the great men that are in the earth." 2 Sam. 7:9.

9. What did the Lord say he would yet do for David?

"Also the Lord telleth thee that he will make thee a house." 2 Sam. 7:11, last clause.

10. To whom did the Lord say he would establish the kingdom?

"And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom." 2 Sam. 7:12.

11. For how long a time did the Lord say that David's house and kingdom should be established?

"And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever." 2 Sam. 7:17. E. J. W.

July 16, 1885

"Inheritance of the Saints. Continued. Promise Concerning the Kingdom of Israel" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST AUG. 8

PROMISE CONCERNING THE KINGDOM OF ISRAEL

1. Why was Saul rejected from being king of Israel?

"For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king." 1 Sam 15:23.

2. Who was chosen in his stead?

"Now therefore so shalt thou say unto my servant David, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, I took thee from the shepcote, from following the sheep, to be ruler over my people, over Israel." 2 Sam. 7:8.

3. By whom was David chosen to be ruler?

4. Where do you find the record of his anointing? 1 Sam.16:1-13.

5. Repeat the promise which the Lord made to David concerning his house and kingdom.

"And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee; thy throne shall be established forever." 2 Sam 7:16.

6. What promise did the Lord make yet the same time concerning his Israel?

"Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime." 2 Sam. 7:10.

7. What did he say he would appoint for them? *lb.*

8. Where should they dwell? *lb.*

9. From what should they be free? *lb.*

10. From 2 Sam. 7:10, quoted above, what conclusion must be drawn concerning the promises made to Abraham, and to the Israelites at Sinai?

We must conclude that those promises were not fulfilled in the possession of the land of Canaan by the Israelites. If they had been, we would not at this time find the Lord renewing the same promise, when they were already in the land that the Lord had given to them.

11. In what condition was the kingdom of Israel when the Lord made the promise recorded in 2 Sam. 7:10?

"And it came to pass, when the king sat in his house, and the Lord had given him rest round about from all his enemies." 2 Sam. 7:1.

12. Then what must we conclude concerning that promise of rest and peace?

Since the Israelites were already dwelling in the land that the Lord had given them by Joshua, and were at peace with all around them, it follows that the promise of a land of their own, and of rest and peace, must refer to something in the future, something far greater than anything yet known. This can only be found in that perfect inheritance when the "kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom." Dan. 7:27. This will be the perfect rest that remains for the people of God, for when the meek inherit the earth they shall "delight themselves in the abundance of peace." Ps. 37:11.

13. Who was David's immediate successor? 1 Kings 1:32-39.

14. What had the Lord said concerning him?

"And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build an house for my name, and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever." 2 Sam. 7:12, 13. E. J. W.

"Camp-Meeting in Portland, Oregon" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

The details of this meeting have been sufficiently reported by Elder Loughborough, but we would add a few thoughts. First, we were made to realize more than ever before the necessity of progress in meetings of that kind. If the work of the Biblical Institute was in its general features the same as the one in Milton, but it did not have the lifting influence on the meeting that it would have had if those attending had had time to devote to study. The truths of the word cannot be absorbed by the simple contact; if we would make them our own we must search for them as for hidden treasure. All the powers of the mind, aided by the Spirit of God, must be brought to bear, and by this means they will be strengthened. There is no discipline of mind equal to the study of the Bible.

Although our circumstances were somewhat unfavorable, the institute was by no means a failure. Those present received new ideas as to how to study the Bible; the familiar truths were seen in a new light, and above all, the great central, elevating a truth-God's love for mankind-was realized by many as never before. He returned to their homes rejoicing in a hope and confidence to which they had hitherto been strangers.

One interesting feature was the children's meetings. These were held every day, beginning when the Institute was about half over. The aim in these meetings was to tell the gospel story in language suited to the comprehension of the youngest, and to lead them to the study of the word for themselves. It is a mistake to suppose that to reach the minds of children one must talk in a childish manner, or in any degree to lower the dignity of the subject. Familiar illustrations, both to the eye and the ear, should be freely used, but no word should be uttered that would lead any to think that the way of salvation for a child is different from that for the adult. The "deep things of God," if properly presented, are more readily grasped by young minds, than by those of mature years. The plan of salvation is so simple in its greatness that the average man overlooks it. Like Naaman, we find the thing required of us very difficult because it is so simple. But in childhood everything is real; the simplicity of childhood was given by Christ as the pattern for Christians. There is, therefore, every encouragement in teaching the children the way of life. There were no meetings held on the ground that were more full of interest than those held with the children.

In these meetings, as well as in all others, much prominence was given to the subject of reverence for God's word, and for the places where he is worshiped. As the result of this teaching, we had as quiet and orderly a camp-ground as I ever saw. The children were made to feel that the entire camp was a sacred place, and there was scarcely any running and playing or loud talking even during intermissions. Care was taken to have all enter the tent where meetings were held, in a reverent matter, with head uncovered. Surely we should not come into God's house with less indication of respect than we would into a neighbor's parlor.

We believe that as outward marks of respect were shown, reverence was increased in the heart, and God added his blessing. If the parents will now carry out the lessons which they learned, and will also seek to deepen the impressions made upon the children, and endeavor to instruct and interest them in sacred things, they will find their own souls watered, and will see their children growing up to strengthen the church, and may God help them, and abundantly bless the North Pacific Conference. E. J. W.

"The Sabbath in Eden" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

It has been our constant aim to avoid controversy as far as was possible. Believing that the coming of the Lord is here, and that the strict observance of the ten commandments (with divine assistance) is necessary to a complete preparations for that event, we design to get these truths before the people in the

most direct manner possible. While, therefore, we deprecate debate, we dare not lower the standard of truth because it is opposed. Whenever we make strictures upon those who teach differently, we do so, not because they have assailed "our position," but because they oppose what we firmly believe to be Bible truth. We do not consider ourselves as standing in opposition to anybody, but as simply lifting up the truth, which is being trodden down.

Quite frequently newspaper articles and reports of sermons in opposition to the Sabbath, are sent to us, with the request that we reply to them. Of course these articles contain no argument for objection that has not been met and answered hundreds of times, and our first impulse is usually to throw them aside as unworthy of further notice. But we recollect that the old objection which to us seems so flimsy, is to many a new one, and a real stumbling-block. Therefore we feel constrained to give them notice. If that notice be often extended, it is not because we fear that truth itself will suffer by the opposition, but that honest minds that have not been accustomed to think upon Bible themes, may not be entangled in error. It is for this reason that we begin to briefly notice a series of articles on the Sabbath question, by C. E. W. Dobbs, D. D., recently published in the *Indiana Baptist*.

The writer takes the position throughout, that Sunday (invariably called by him the "Lord's day") is not the Sabbath, and that its observance, although the obligatory upon Christians, derives no force from the fourth commandment; that it is purely a "gospel institution, and that the fourth commandment, enjoining the observance of Saturday, has, with the rest of the Decalogue, entirely passed away."

One word concerning the idea that the Sunday-sabbath is a gospel institution. If this were so, then it must stand upon the same plane as other gospel ordinances, - baptism and the Lord's Supper. No Christian, whatever denomination, thinks of allowing unbelievers to participate in these ordinances. If the Sunday-sabbath be a gospel institution, then no unbeliever must be allowed, much less compelled, to observe it. But Dr. Dobbs does not believe this theory any more than do his Baptist brethren. This is proved by their own actions. A Baptist father would not invite his unconverted children to partake of the Lord's Supper, nor would he allow them, while still unconverted, to be baptized, yet he would require them, while they were subject to his authority, to observe Sunday. Notwithstanding what men may say, their actions show that they do not really believe that Sunday is a Christian ordinance.

We most heartily agree with the Doctor in his claims that Sunday observance finds no authority in the fourth commandment. But, knowing that there is no Bible authority outside of the fourth commandment for the observance of any day as sacred, we conclude that the Doctor's admission rules Sunday out of the question. By the side of that admission, we wish to place a few others. In its issue of March 1, 1882, the *California Christian Advocate* said:-

"When we plead for a law for it [Sunday] as a day of rest, we can justify that only on the ground that it is according to the law of nature, and necessary to man. . . . We cannot sustain it before the people, if we claim its sanctity as a religious institution."

Very true, only it would be difficult for the *Advocate* to show how to rest on Sunday meets the wants of man's nature, anymore than rest on Saturday. The *Christian at Work*, in its issue of April 19, 1883, said:-

"Some plant the observance of the Sabbath [Sunday] squarely on the fourth commandment, which was an exquisite injunction to observe Saturday, and no other day, as a holy day unto the Lord. . . . The truth is, so soon as we appeal to the *litera scripta* [*i.e.*, the plain reading] of the Bible, the Sabbatarians have the best of the argument."

Again, its issue of January 8, 1885, the *Christian at Work* says:-

"We rest of the designation of Sunday on the church having 'set it apart of its own authority.' The seventh-day rest was commanded in the fourth commandment, as it is written in every tissue and trembling fiber of the human frame. The selection of Sunday, thus changing the particular day designated in the fourth commandment, was brought about by the gradual concurrence of the early Christian church, and on this basis and *none other* does the Christian Sabbath, the first day of the week, rightly rest."

All true; but if the observance of Sunday was brought about by the "gradual concurrence" of the church, then of course it was not instituted by Christ; and if it was not instituted by Christ, then it is obviously not a Christian institution; and therefore, although "the church" did gradually effect this change, it was to that extent at least unchristian. But now for the argument against the Sabbath. We quote:-

"Some find evidence of the Edenic institution of the Sabbath in Gen. 2:3: 'God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work.' This is supposed to be the enactment of the Sabbath law for the race. But it is an exceedingly frail support for such an institution. The language is only the historian's statement that the Sabbath, instituted two thousand years afterwards, had a commemorative relation to creation. It is barely mentioned by him proleptically, as giving the divine determination to sanctify the seventh day, and to constitute it a religious rest day in the future ceremonial law."

How does the Doctor or anyone else find so much in Gen. 2:3? Those who say that Gen.2:3 records what the Lord designed to do two thousand years in the future, seem to be wise above that which is written, for there is not the slightest intimation of such a thing in the text. Just as reasonably might we affirm that "there was no marriage institution until two thousand years after the creation, the statement in Gen. 2:24, that a man 'shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh,' being only the historian's statement that the marriage relation, instituted two thousand years afterward, had a commemorative relation to the union of the first pair. It is merely mentioned by him proleptically, as giving the divine determination to sanctify the marriage relation, and to constitute it the sacred ordinance in the decalogue," which, by the way, is in no sense a ceremonial law. But no sane man would accept such an interpretation, or rather *perversion*, of the Scriptures in regard to marriage; and no unprejudiced person can for a moment regard such reasoning as just when applied to the Sabbath.

What, then, may we will learn from Gen. 2:3? The text is plain: "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from

all his work which God created and made." This immediately follows the statement that God "rested on the seventh day from all his work which

426

he had made." Now we submit it to any candid person, that in Gen. 2:1-3 events are mentioned in historical order. From the reading of the text, no one would imagine that the third verse refers to something two thousand years after the event mentioned in the second; and there is nowhere in the Bible any intimation that such is the case. It is a fact, then, that the blessing and sanctifying of the seventh day immediately followed God's resting upon it, after the six days of creation were ended. To deny this is simply to make an *assertion* contrary to a plain declaration. Now we will find out what was comprehended in that act of sanctifying, and then we shall see upon what foundation the Edenic Sabbath rests.

To sanctify means "to set apart for a sacred or religious use; to make holy."-*Webster*. Its use, as applied to inanimate objects, may be learned from the following instances: When the Lord was about to come down on Mount Sinai, he said to Moses, "And thou shalt set bounds unto the people round about, saying, Take heed to yourselves, that ye go not up into the mount, or touch the border of it: whosoever toucheth the mount shall be surely put to death." Ex. 19:12. In verse 23 we read, "And Moses said unto the Lord, The people cannot come up to mount Sinai; for thou chargedst us, saying, Set bounds about the mount, and sanctify it." The mountain was sanctified, or set apart for a sacred use, and a barrier was built around it, so that none need be in doubt as to how far they might go.

Again, in Joshua 20 we find that the Lord told Joshua to appoint six cities to which men who had accidentally slain a man might flee for refuge. "And they appointed [margin, *sanctified*] Kedesh in Galilee in mount Naphtali," etc. Josh. 20:7. Here the same word is used as in Gen. 2:3. In what did the sanctification of these cities consist? In setting them apart for the use for which they were designed, by letting everybody know which cities were the cities of refuge. Without thus informing the people, the sanctification would have been a farce. Indeed, that is just what the sanctification was,-a public setting apart.

So with the Sabbath. First, God rested on the seventh day; then he blessed it, or spoke well of it; and lastly, he sanctified it, that is, he appointed that it should be preserved sacred. Just as Moses set bounds around the mount, so the Lord placed around the Sabbath the sanctions of his law. Now as we have seen that the sanctification immediately followed the resting and the blessing, we know to whom the Lord made the statement that the day was to be kept holy;-it was to all who were then living-Adam and Eve. But this pair represented all the inhabitants of the earth, for they had been commanded to "be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth." We find, then, that Gen. 2:3 teaches, in the most unmistakable language, that the seventh-day Sabbath was instituted at creation, and that it was designed for and given to all mankind. We may add, however, that in Gen. 2:3 we do not find the enactment of the Sabbatic law before the race, but the statement, as a fact of history, that such a law was made in creation. This

point, borne in mind, removes the next objection, which shall be noticed next week. E. J. W.

July 23, 1885

"Human Ignorance vs. Divine Knowledge" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 28.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week, in the article entitled "The Sabbath in Eden," we showed that Gen. 2:3 is an explicit declaration that the seventh day was sanctified immediately following God's rest upon it at the close of creation, and that to sanctify means to set apart, to appoint; so that we have the inspired record that, in Eden, God decreed that men should observe the seventh day as the Sabbath. We cannot be so sure that George Washington commanded the American army during the war of the Revolution, as we are that in Eden God appointed the seventh day to be kept by all mankind. For the knowledge of that we are dependent on human evidence, while this fact is made known to us "by inspiration of God."

But Dr. Dobbs says of Gen. 2:3:-

"To make the passage of any value as proof in this matter, it must be assumed that Genesis was an historic book, coming down from patriarchal times."

It makes no difference when the book of Genesis was written, so far as this case is concerned. The Doctor might as well have said that we cannot know that God created the heavens and the earth in six days, because Moses was not there to see it done, and to make the record on the spot. The reader must remember that Gen. 2:3 is not the commandment for Sabbath observance, but is simply the inspired record that such a command had been made. The patriarchs were not dependent on the record in Genesis, for their knowledge of the Sabbath, any more than the early colonists were dependent on "Ridpath's History of the United States," for their knowledge of the wars with the Indians or with Great Britain. We do need a history to inform us of that in which we are actors.

The lives of three men-Adam, Methuselah, and Shem-reach from the creation to Isaac. Methuselah was two hundred and forty-three years old when Adam died, Shem was ninety-seven years old when Methuselah died, and Isaac was fifty years old when Shem died. There certainly was opportunity enough for the patriarchs to know of the appointment of the Sabbath in Eden, even though no records were kept. Dr. Cunningham Geikie, in his "Hours with the Bible," vol. 1, chap. 20, paragraph 9, speaking of the call of Abraham, says:-

"No details are given of the creed of Abraham, but, in addition to his confession of the one only living God, it must have included all that was true in the popular beliefs of Chaldea. This would imply his knowledge of the Sabbath; for the seventh day, by a tradition handed down from Eden, was 'holy,' in his Eastern native land, and was honored by the cessation of all work on it."

Dr. Geikie says that even the heathen had at that time preserved the tradition of the Sabbath from Eden; but whether they did or not, it is beyond controversy that the patriarchs knew all about the sanctification of the Sabbath in Eden. But even if it were possible that they did not, their ignorance would not in the least affect the fact, for we have the word of the Lord for it, that the seventh-day Sabbath was set apart in Eden. Our relation to the Sabbath of the Lord must be regulated by his commandment concerning it, and not by somebody else's knowledge or lack of knowledge, nor by the time its institution was recorded.

Again we quote from Dr. Dobbs:-

"Just here it may be well to state that the Jewish Talmud, so scholars tell us, knows nothing of any ante-Mosaic Sabbath. Their doctors universally date the Sabbath from the Mosaic institution, generally referring its commencement to Ex. 15:25: 'There he made a statute,' etc."

We have never read the Talmud, so we, with Dr. Dobbs, must depend for a knowledge of its content, on what "scholars tell us." Grant that the Talmud knows nothing of an Ante-Mosaic Sabbath, and what does it prove? Nothing. Whether the Talmud knows anything about the Sabbath either before or after Moses, or whether it does not, matters not one whit. The Bible knows all about it, and it tells us in unmistakable language. We desire our knowledge of our duty to God, not from the Talmud, but from the Bible. If one honest man bears witness on a given point, the fact that a dozen other men know nothing about it does not overthrow his evidence. In other words, one man's knowledge of the fact, cannot be made of no effect by another one's ignorance. If all the man-made books in the world ignored the Sabbath, or knew nothing about its institution, it would make no difference; God's book remains unchanged.

But what of the statement that "their doctors universally date the Sabbath from the Mosaic legislation, generally referring its commencement to Ex. 15:25: 'There he made a statute,' etc." The preceding paragraph answers this statement also. If it were true that "their doctors" referred the institution of the Sabbath to the time when the Israelites were at Marah, that would not make it true, when the inspired record plainly tells us that it was instituted at creation. It is not an unheard-of thing for "doctors" to be mistaken. We have known doctors to say, in the face of the statement in Gen. 2:3, that God never blessed the seventh day; and we were presumptuous enough to believe the Bible in preference to the doctors. Whatever the Talmud may or may not say concern an ante-Mosaic Sabbath, Josephus says:-

"Accordingly Moses says that in just six days the world and all that is therein was made; and that the seventh day was a rest, and a release from the labor of such operations;-whence it is that we celebrate a rest from our labors on that day, and call it the Sabbath."-*"Antiquities," Book 1, chap. 1, section 1.*

It is a matter for curiosity, however a man who can see no proof whatever for Sabbath observance, in Gen.2:3, which speaks directly on a point, can find in Ex. 15:25 evidence of its institution, when the latter text makes no hint of the Sabbath. But the human mind, when controlled by prejudice, is not subject to laws.

We have space in this article for just one more quotation:-

"It is worthy of remark also that no Christian 'Fathers,' among the writings which have come down to us from the first three centuries, ever based the observance of the Lord's day [by this term the Doctor means Sunday] upon either the fourth commandment or a primeval and patriarchal Sabbath law."

And it is worthy of remark that that indicates the good sense of the "Fathers," more than anything which they did write. They did well not to base Sabbath observance upon the fourth commandment, nor upon any other commandment found in the Bible. It would be well if some of their successors in the Christian church would be as discreet. It is true that the "Fathers" did not base the observance of Sunday on the fourth commandment, but that need not hinder us from facing the observance of the seventh day, Saturday-the true Lord's day-upon the commandment. The reader will notice that thus far all of Dr. Dobb's argument against the Sabbath has been negative-consisting of what certain ones do not know about the Sabbath. In our next we shall examine what he claims to know about it. E. J. W.

July 30, 1885

"The Sabbath at the Exode" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

It will be remembered that in last week's review of Dr. Dobbs, we noticed his position that the Sabbath was first instituted at the waters of Marah (Ex.15:25). Whether he had some doubts of that, or whether it was simply because he is determined to prove that it is not commanded at creation, we do not know, but in his second article he takes the position that it was instituted in the Wilderness of Sin (Ex. 16). On this point he says:-

"The first mention of the Sabbath is in Ex. 16:23, 'To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath'-where, by the way, the Hebrew has no definite article, reading 'a rest of a holy Sabbath.' The first intimation of this rest is verses four and five, where Jehovah tells Moses of the double rate of manna to be gathered on the sixth day. In verse 22 we find the people doing this, and the rulers of the congregation, apparently not having heard, or at least not remembering the injunction given in verse five, came to tell Moses. He explains to them: 'It is that rest which Jehovah hath spoken of, a rest-a holy Sabbath-is to-morrow.' It is only in verse 29 that we have the definite article '*the* Sabbath.' . . . Everything in the whole narrative seems to point to this as the first knowledge of the Sabbath. Careful study has convinced me that the weight of critical exegesis and scholarly interpretation places the beginning of the institution just here."

The last statement, that "the weight of a critical exegesis and scholarly interpretation" places the institution of the Sabbath in the wilderness, gives us opportunity to quote from some critical scholars. The "Bible Commentary," by a company of "Bishops of the Anglican Church," has the following on Gen. 2:3:-

"The natural interpretation of these words is that the blessing of the Sabbath was immediately consequent on the first creation man, for whom the Sabbath was first made (Mark 2:27). . . . Moreover, it appears that, before the giving of the

commandments from Mount Sinai, the Israelites were acquainted with the law of the Sabbath. In Ex. 16:5 a double portion of manna is promised on the sixth day, that none need be gathered on the Sabbath. This has all the appearance of belonging to an acknowledged, though perhaps neglected, ordinance of divine service; not as if then for the first time the Sabbath were ordained and consecrated."

The same authority says that Ex. 16:23 "is at once a statement and an injunction. The people knew it as the Sabbath, they were to observe it as a great festival."

Dr. Scott, in his comment on Gen. 2:3, says:-

"The sacred writer here both records the appointment of the Sabbath, and assigns the reason for it: 'Because that in it the Lord rested from all his work.' This is evidently *historical*, and not by *anticipation*; for the reason subsisted from the beginning, and was more cogent immediately than it could be at a distance of more than two thousand years, when the command was solemnly renewed from Mount Sinai, long after sin had marred the beauty of the great Creator's work; and it concerns the whole human race, as much as the nation of Israel."

Other testimony to the same intent is given by Dr. Scott. Dr. Adam Clarke as an observer of the first day of the week, and a most critical scholar, yet he was not able to find, either in the Hebrew or in any translation of Ex. 16, any authority for supposing that the Sabbath was first given in the wilderness. On Ex. 16:23, he says:-

"There is nothing either in the text or context, that seems to intimate that the Sabbath was now *first* given to the Israelites, as some have supposed; on the contrary, it is here spoken of as being perfectly well known, from its having been generally observed. The commandment, it is true, may be considered as being now *renewed*; because they might have supposed that in their unsettled state in the wilderness, they might have been exempted from the observance of it. Thus we find, (1) That when God finished his creation, he instituted the Sabbath; (2) When he brought the people of Egypt, he insisted on the strict observance of it; (3) When he gave the law, he made it a *tenth* part of the whole; such importance has this institution in the eyes of the Supreme Being."

It may be well to state that "the weight of critical exegesis and scholarly criticism," which places the institution of the Sabbath at the exode, is found among those German theologians who throw overboard a large portion of the Pentateuch as of a doubtful nature, and attribute a large portion of the remainder to a later age than that of Moses.

Concerning the statement that there is no definite article in the Hebrew of Ex. 16:23, but little need be said. In fact the Doctor makes no argument from it, but simply makes the statement. He has doubtless heard the statement made, or has read it somewhere, and thinks it must surely be an argument against the Sabbath, although he doesn't know just how to make it, so he throws it in at random. As a matter of fact, although the definite article is not found in the Hebrew of Ex. 16:23, the word Sabbath is just as definite as it is in verse 29, where the definite article occurs. For instance, I may say "I went to church last Sabbath." Now although I use no definite article, the word "Sabbath" is just as

definite as it is possible to make it. Two paragraphs from a review of Armstrong's Sunday book will be sufficient to put the matter clearly:-

"There are two methods of determining whether or not a Hebrew substantive is definite. 1. By the presence of the article. 2. By 'construction.' A noun may be determined to be definite as certainly and as easily in the absence of the article as in its presence, if the construction demands it. The article is then understood."

"The word 'Sabbath' in Ex.16, and in the decalogue, Ex. 20, is definite *in every instance* of its occurrence. It is made definite in chap. 16:29 and 20:8, 11 by the use of the article; it is equally definite in chap. 16:23, 25 and 20:10 by construction, in the absence of the article."

The reader will doubtless wonder what bearing the absence of the article from verse 23 and its presence in verse 29 has on the Sabbath question. It has just this bearing: Many people who know nothing of the Hebrew will read such a statement from a man who writes "D. D." after his name, and although they cannot see any point to it, they think it certainly must mean something, and as that supposed something is in harmony with their prejudices, they rest content. The "reverend" men who make use of such "argument" know very well that a title, and a few phrases from, or allusions to, a foreign language, are wonderful conscience easers. E. J. W.

August 6, 1885

"No Probation after Death" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

A friend asks the SIGNS to give an exposition of 1 Pet. 3:18, 19; 4:6. He says that he has met a man who bases his believe in the immortality of the soul, on these two texts, the argument being that the dead spoken of are those that died previous to the promise to Abraham; that before Abraham's time there was no promise of the redeemer, and that to those who lived before that time, Christ went and announced the good news of salvation. The brother is not troubled on his own account, but wishes to know how to present the case to another.

In the first place, a man's opinion is no consequence whatever, unless he can offer some evidence in its support. When the objector says that there was no promise of the Messiah, until the time of Abraham, he must show proof, or else his theory is not worthy of consideration. That the Messiah was promised before our first parents were driven from the Garden of Eden, is susceptible of the clearest proof. Thus:-

1. It was the devil himself who attempted Eve. With Gen. 3:13 and 2 Cor. 11:3, compare Rev. 12:9, which says that the serpent is the devil and Satan, and that it is he that deceiveth the whole world. There can be no controversy over the statement that it was the devil under the guise of a serpent, who caused our first parents to fall.

2. In the garden God said to the serpent, the devil, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Gen. 3:15. Here is the statement that the

seed of the woman should destroy Satan; and when we read (Heb.2:9, 14) that Jesus died in order that "he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil," we know that Jesus Christ is the "seed" mentioned in Gen. 3:15. So then, notwithstanding what may be said to the contrary, we know that the Messiah was promised before the days of Abraham. More evidence could be given if it were needed.

But, it being true that the promised Messiah was known from the time of the fall, the supposition that Christ, between his crucifixion and his resurrection, went to preach the gospel to those who lived before the time of Abraham, or before the flood, amounts to nothing. There is absolutely no ground for the position that the people before Abraham were not on probation; therefore the only loophole for those who will have it that Christ, after his crucifixion, went and preached to some dead persons, is the more common position that certain ones, especially of the antediluvians, "did not have a fair chance," and that justice required that after death they should have the chance of which they were deprived during their lifetime. This is the position taken by Canon Farrar, and by all who, with him, adopt the theory of a probation after death. But this view is unscriptural and wicked, as we shall show.

It is wicked, because it presents God as a tyrant, changeable, and careless of the welfare of his subjects, instead of the God of infinite mercy, love and justice, and with whom is "no variableness, neither shadow of turning." Take notice. If it were true that immediately after his crucifixion Christ went and preached to some who had lived before the flood, there could be no other reason for it, than the one usually given, namely, that they had not had "a fair chance,"-opportunity to hear and repent. Then we have presented to us the spectacle of God visiting his terrible wrath, as in the flood, upon men whom he had not given a chance to repent! No earthly tyrant was ever accused of greater cruelty and injustice than this. And then they would have us believe that the unchangeable God, as if to atone for his error, sent his Son to announce a pardon to those who had once been the subjects of his ill-advised wrath! We marvel how any who profess to love and reverence God, can countenance a theory that so degrades his character. It cannot be denied that the picture here presented is the legitimate and only result of the objector's position on 1 Pet. 3:18-20. This alone is more than enough to stamp that position as erroneous.

That position is also wicked because it is unscriptural. The word of God says: "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." Ps. 115:17. Then even supposing that God had unjustly cut off some of the antediluvians, it would have been a hopeless mission for Christ to go to the grave to preach to them, for it would have been an impossibility for them to repent and give glory to God. More than this, allowing that Christ could and did go to the grave to preach to them, it would have been impossible for them to take any action whatever, for the inspired word says, "there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave." Eccl. 9:10. It would have been impossible for them to hear the message, for, while the living may know many things, "the dead know not anything." Eccl. 9:5. Of man it is said that "his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Ps. 146:4. And the grave is called,

a "land of forgetfulness" (Ps. 88:11, 12), "a land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness." Job 10:22.

Moreover, that position would have it that Christ did not really die, and that is not only unscriptural, but subversive of the whole plan of salvation. "Christ died for the godly." Rom. 5:6. He was "put to death" in order "He that might bring us to God." 1 Pet. 3:15. If, therefore, the divine Son of God did not die, then there is no salvation for sinners. But Christ did die; "poured out his soul unto death" (Isa. 53:12), and his soul, thus poured out unto death, was as "an offering for sin" (Isa. 53:10), and consequently there is hope for sinners.

Now let us read 1 Pet. 3:18-20, and see just what it does teach. The apostle after the exhortation to meekness under unjust accusation, says:-

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water."

Examine this text, and you will find the following simple statements:-

1. Christ, the just one, suffered for the sins of the unjust.
2. He did this that he might bring us to God.
3. He was put to death in the flesh.
4. He was made alive by the Spirit.
5. This Spirit was the same by which he went and preached to the spirits in prison.
6. This preaching was "when the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah."

It is the Spirit that convicts of sin (John 16:8), and the Spirit was striving with men in the days of Noah. Gen. 6:3. So they did have a "chance," but it was only while their days continued-in their case one hundred and twenty years. We see, then, that the preaching, spoken of in 1 Pet. 3:18, was done, not by Christ in person, but by the Holy Spirit; not in the Christian era, but before the flood; not to disembodied, conscious spirits confined in some part of *hades*, but to living men in the flesh, who were in the bondage of sin. See Rom. 7:14; Gal. 4:3.

But what shall we do with 1 Pet. 4:6? Just believe it. Let us read it, together with the two preceding verses: "Wherein they think it strange that ye run not with them to the same excess of riot, speaking evil of you; who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead. For this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit."

This has been done many times in our experience. We have often heard the gospel preached to men that are dead. But they were not dead at the time the gospel was preached to them, and the Bible nowhere says that the gospel was ever preached to men who *were* dead when the preaching was done. Peter, however, says that it was preached to them that *are* dead, and that statement effectually shuts off the infidel argument for a second probation, that some men

have "never had a chance." The reason why the gospel was preached to them, is that both living and dead must be judged, and God is just. "It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the Judgment" (Heb. 9:27), and not another probation. Before death comes, all have an opportunity to repent, so that if the Judgment finds them void of righteousness, they will be speechless.

This is the simple truth concerning the oft-perverted words of Peter. They are easily understood, and give no warrant whatever for the idea of a life in the grave. E. J. W.

August 13, 1885

"The Sabbath of the Decalogue" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 31.

E. J. Waggoner

In the third article by Dr. Dobbs, on the Sabbath question, we find the following:-

"The Sabbath of the Sinaitic decalogue was essentially and designedly a ceremonial institution of the Mosaic law, and as such was given and confined to that people whom the Lord their God had brought out of the land of Egypt. It was a sign between God and Israel only."

In the next paragraph, he says:-

"Some good brethren, while assenting in the main to my proposition, have thought the use of the word "ceremonial" unfortunate and misleading. I class the Sabbath institution with the other positive rites of Judaism. *To my mind*, the Sabbath is no more spiritual or moral than are the Passover and the new moon festival observances, commanded in the law of Moses. It, as well as they, was but a part of the 'shadows' which were to 'pass away' when the 'body' should come."

In answer to the Doctor's statement that to *his* mind there is nothing spiritual or moral about the Sabbath, we would quote the words of Paul, in 1 Cor. 2:14: "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." This Scripture has direct application in this case, for the apostle plainly declares that the one who refuses submission to the law of God, is not spiritual, but carnal. Rom 8:7. The same apostle plainly declares that "the law is spiritual;" that "the law is holy, and the commandment is holy, and just, and good." Rom. 7:12, 14. If the law is spiritual, then the fourth precept of the law is spiritual.

It is impossible to separate the fourth commandment from the rest of the decalogue. It is, as a whole, the moral law. The psalmist was speaking of the law as it was pronounced from Sinai, when he declared that it "is perfect" (Ps. 19:7), and he certainly referred to the words which were spoken amid the thunders of Sinai, when he said, "Thy word is true from the beginning; and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever." Ps 119:160.

Is the decalogue ceremonial and shadowy? If

the fourth commandment is, the whole must be. When God said, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," what did that typify? When God said, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain," what portion of the work of Christ was shadowed forth? Can any one tell? The truth is, there is not a single one of the ten commandments which has in it anything whatever of a ceremonial nature. Think a moment, reader. Did you ever hear anybody mention anything in the life, sufferings, or death of Christ, of which the Sabbath was typical? No one ever attempted to show in Christ's work the antitype of the Sabbath. The antitype of every portion of the ceremonial law may be traced in the work of Christ, but not so with the moral law. That is not a shadow, but the *substance* which, when trampled upon, made it necessary for Christ's work to be performed. The apostle says, "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God." 1 Cor. 7:19.

Some men *claim* that the Sabbath was given as a type of the saint's eternal rest. We have never seen any proof of such a thing, and we do not accept the statement as true; but if it were true, it would show that the Sabbath is still binding upon mankind, for the saints have not yet received their eternal rest, and the shadow can never stop until it reaches the substance.

The declaration of our Saviour, in Matt. 5:17, 18, is of itself sufficient to show that the law of God is not typical or shadowy: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Till all what be fulfilled? Till all the prophets be fulfilled. Christ's coming to earth was, as he said, in fulfillment of prophecy, for unto him all the prophets gave witness. Acts 10:43. But Christ did not at his first coming fulfill all that the prophets had spoken, for David, prophesying of him, said: "My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make [to endure] for ever, and his throne as the days of Heaven." Ps. 89:28, 29. Here is a prophecy that cannot be completely fulfilled as long as the days of Heaven exist—in other words, it reaches to eternity;—and therefore since not a jot nor a tittle can pass from the law until *all* be fulfilled, it is evident that the ten commandments will exist in full force, without the slightest change, as long as eternity endures.

Now what about the statement that the Sabbath was given because God brought the Jews out of Egypt? The falsity of that assertion has already been shown, by the fact that the Sabbath was given to man in Eden. If it was given in Eden, and was kept centuries before the Egyptian bondage, as we have already shown, then it was not given to commemorate the deliverance from that bondage.

There was something given which, while it served as a shadow of something good to be done for the race, commemorated the deliverance from bondage. This was the passover, described in Ex. 12. But the passover was eaten in the night, and therefore Moses said: "It is a night to be much observed unto the Lord for bringing them out from the land of Egypt; this is that night of the Lord to be observed of all the children of Israel in their generations." Ex. 12:42.

The objector, as he reads this, will think of Deut. 5:15, which reads thus: "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." That passage can afford no help to the opposers of Sabbath observance. Mark it well. It does not say that the Lord *gave* them the Sabbath day because he brought them out of Egypt, but that for that reason he commanded them to *keep*. There is quite a difference. The Sabbath was given to men at creation. When the children of Israel were in hard and cruel bondage in Egypt, they had grievous tasks placed upon them, and their taskmasters would not allow them any respite. They were not allowed to keep the Sabbath. Moses demanded of Pharaoh that he should let the people go, so that they might serve the Lord. Pharaoh refused, and the Lord compelled him to let them go. When God, with a wonderful exhibition of his power, have brought them out of bondage, that they might serve him, what could be expected but that he would command them to do so.

The fact that God at that time *commanded* them to keep the Sabbath is no evidence that a previous command had not been given to do the same thing. If it were, then it would appear that it was never wrong to steal, nor do any other thing forbidden in the ten commandments, until the deliverance from Egypt, for we read in Lev. 19:36, 37, as follows:-

"Just balances, just weights, a just ephah, and a just hin, shall ye have; I am the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt. Therefore shall ye observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them."

Even Dr. Dobbs would scarcely claim that there was anything shadowy or ceremonial in dealing justly, or that the obligation to do so has passed away. Then why should he make that assertion in the case of the Sabbath? The Sabbath was in no sense a memorial of the deliverance from Egypt; but the fact that God had miraculously delivered his people so that they might serve him, made it eminently proper that he should renew his command to them to keep an already existing institution. E. J. W.

"Who Was Melchizedek?" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 31.

E. J. Waggoner

How many times this question has been asked, and how many quires of paper have been used up in vain attempts to answer it! The number almost equals the number of those who have ever thought about the matter. Some, in answer to the question, will have that he was Shem, and others insist that he must have been our Lord in disguise. And, strange to say, when a person has one of these ideas in his mind, it is almost impossible for anyone to rid him of it.

Now to us the discussion over this question has always seemed something strange. We cannot yet conceive how it is possible for anybody with even a slight knowledge of the Scriptures, to be bothered over the matter, for the Bible tells us who Melchizedek was, in just as plain terms as could be desired. For the benefit of all who are troubled over the question, "Who was Melchizedek?" we will give a

direct answer from the Bible. Turn, if you please, to Gen. 14:18-20. There you will read:-

"And Melchizedek *king of Salem* brought forth bread and wine: and *he was the priest of the Most High God*. And he blessed him [Abram], and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth; and blessed be the most high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand. And he gave him tithes of all."

Here we are told, not only who he was but an incident in his life. He was both king of Salem and priest of the Most High God, and in that capacity he blessed the patriarch Abraham as he was returning from the slaughter of the five kings. He also received from Abraham a tenth part of all the spoil. See also Heb.7:1-4.

If this does not satisfactorily answer the question, we do not know what would. Take other instances! Who was David? Answer, He was king over Israel, and a prophet of God. Who was Moses? He was a prophet, and the leader and commander of the children of Israel. In the wilderness of Sinai, he went up into the mount; and God spoke to him face to face. Who was Paul? He was an apostle, called of God to carry the gospel to the heathen. All must admit that these answers tell plainly who David and Moses and Paul were. And in like manner, to say that now Melchizedek was king of Salem, and priest of God, fully answers the question, "Who was Melchizedek?"

Suppose that in answer to the question, "Who was Moses?" I should say, "He was John the Baptist;" or that if some one should ask, "Who was David?" the answer should be given, "He was Hezekiah;" or that if when speaking of my neighbor Mr. Jones, I should be asked who he is, and should answer, "He is Mr. Brown;" what would be thought? People would think that my mind was wandering. To us it seems just as absurd to say that Melchizedek was Shem, or that he was Christ, as it would be to say that David was Paul, or that Mr. Jones is Mr. Brown.

To be sure, we have a more full record of Moses and David and Paul, than we have of Melchizedek, but what of that? We have by no means a complete record even of their lives. It is not necessary that we should know all of a man's history, in order to know who he was. Of Enoch we only know that he walked with God and was translated; yet no Bible student ever raises the question, "Who was Enoch?"

"But," some one will say, "we the parents and descent of these men, and of Melchizedek's parentage we know nothing." How many are there who can tell who Elijah's parents were? or who were his descendants, and how old he was when he was translated? No one knows. We are told only his office and some of the incidents of his life, just as in the case of Melchizedek. The schoolboy, in his reading, chances to find references to a man by the name of Paulding. He will ask, "Who was Paulding?" His teacher, or the Biographical Dictionary, will answer, "He was one of the American soldiers who, in 1780, captured Major Andre." We know nothing of his parentage, and are told only one incident of his life, yet we do not straightway conclude that he must have been Anthony Wayne.

"Yes," says the objector, "but the Bible says that Melchizedek had no parents." If that were so, it ought to put a stop to the folly of calling him either

Shem or Christ, for we know who Shem's father was, and we know the age of Shem when he died. Likewise, of Christ, we know that as to his earthly life he was born of the Virgin Mary, and that before he came to earth he was known, as he still is, as the "only begotten of God." But the Bible does not say that Melchizedek had no parents. King James' version reads, "Without father, without mother," but this, in the Revised Version is correctly rendered, "without genealogy," thus agreeing with the margin of the old version, "without pedigree." His ancestry is not given, and in this he differs from the Levitical priests, in that their descent must be traced to Aaron. This was that which made his priesthood a type of Christ's. Christ has no predecessor nor successor in his priestly office, and therefore he is set forth as the antitype of Melchizedek, who stands as the sole representative of his order.

The type and the antitype, the shadow and the substance, cannot be identical. Christ is a priest "after the order of Melchizedek," and therefore it is impossible that they two should be one. Every attempt to go beyond the record and show the origin, descent, etc., of Melchizedek, is in reality an attempt to show that his priesthood was not a type of the priesthood of Christ. Let us give ourselves wholly to "those things which are revealed," and not waste time in vain attempts to be wise above that which is written. E. J. W.

August 20, 1885

"The Sabbath a Sign" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 32.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we quoted a paragraph which stated that the Sabbath was a ceremonial institution, given to commemorate the deliverance from Egypt, and that it was only a sign for the Jews, a distinguishing mark. The first statement we considered, showing its fallacy; this week we have briefly to consider the Sabbath as a sign. We shall quote the texts referred to by Dr. Dobbs.

Ex. 31:13: "Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you."

Eze. 20:12: "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them."

Eze. 20:20: "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."

These three verses tell us plainly what purpose the Sabbath served as a sign. Strange to say, it was not a sign between the Jews and the Gentiles, not a mark of national distinction, but that the people might know the God of Heaven. Each one of these verses tells the same thing. It was a sign by which they might know the Lord. But mark: It was the Sabbath when *hallowed* that enabled them to know the Lord. The Sabbath institution, a mere theory, could have no such effect; but when they *kept* the Sabbath, they could know the true God—the God that would sanctify them. Heathen gods could not sanctify; and since the people could not know the true God unless they kept the Sabbath, it follows that keeping the

Sabbath was necessary to sanctification. And this is just as true now as it was then.

Right here we have one strong evidence that the Sabbath was designed for all men. Thus: It is very certain that God wants all men to acknowledge him and to give him, the reverence and homage which is his due. It is hardly necessary to quote Scripture proof of this, since none will deny it. We will refer to one or two. "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." Rev. 4:11. Paul also said that God "commandeth all men everywhere to repent." Acts 17:30. This repentance is to be "toward God." Acts 29:21. Now if all men everywhere are called upon to show repentance toward God, it is evident that it is the duty of all men to know and serve him. Again, those who know not God are to be punished with everlasting destruction. 2 Thess.1:8, 9. It is evident, then, that is the duty of all men to know God.

But the text above quoted, says that it was only by keeping the Sabbath that the children of Israel could know who was God. If it was the keeping of the Sabbath that caused them to know the true God, it must be the keeping of the Sabbath that insures a knowledge of God to other people. Therefore since God wants to be known by all, he wants his Sabbath to be kept by all.

But how is it that the keeping of the Sabbath can perpetuate the knowledge of the true God? Read the words of the Lord concerning the Sabbath, in Ex. 31:17: "It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed." Now we have it. The keeping of the Sabbath causes our thoughts to turn to the creation, and thus we remember the true God, for it is his creative power that distinguishes him from false gods. "For all the gods of the nations are idols; but the Lord made the heavens." Ps. 96:5. "Thus shall ye say unto them, The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even they shall perish from the earth, and from under these heavens. He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion." Jer. 10:11, 12. Now the only thing whatever to keep this truth prominently before the minds of men is the Sabbath. That and that alone is the memorial of the creation.

Some may say that the works of creation are ever before us, and that we can ever keep the Creator in mind. But God foresaw that without the Sabbath man would not remember him, and the result has demonstrated his wisdom, for the people who disregard the Sabbath, very soon forget God. Without the weekly rest, in which they can meditate upon God's great power, they will soon cease to think of him at all; but the proper keeping of the Sabbath insures continual remembrance of God; for the Sabbath, to be kept properly, must be remembered throughout the week.

"But," says one, "the Sabbath, after all, was a sign only to Israel." This brings us to a brief consideration of why the Israelites are especially mentioned, and why it was that only the Israelites were gathered about the base of Sinai, to hear the law. Two reasons may be given:-

1. Of all the people on earth, the Jews alone retained the knowledge of the true God. Abraham had been called to separate from his heathen relatives, in order that he and his descendants might not, by heathen associations, be turned from their allegiance to him. God called Abraham for the same reason that four hundred years before he had chosen Noah,-because He alone was righteous. The people of the country in which he and his descendants were sojourners, were those who had sold themselves to the devil, and the Egyptians, to whom the Israelites were in bondage, were gross idolaters. In all the earth there was but one people, and that was Israel, that could have been induced to hearken to the voice of God. The law was therefore intrusted to them, with repeated injunctions not to forget it, in order that the knowledge of God might not become wholly extinct. Their duty was to hold up its light so that the nations might see it, and thus some be led to glorify God.

2. Because Israel alone had preserved the knowledge of the true God, he made a special promise to them, on condition that they should continue in his law. This was the first covenant, and when that was broken he made another, not with the Gentiles, but with the same people-the house of Israel and Judah. Jer. 31:31-34. The promises of God are to none but the Israelites (Rom. 9:4), and therefore all who are saved must be of Israel. Rom. 11:26. The heavenly city, into which the redeemed shall enter, has but twelve gates, and on these gates are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel. Rev. 21:12. We can readily see the reasonableness of this, when we remember that "Israel" signifies, "one who prevails," for none but the overcomers, those who prevail, can expect a place in the kingdom of God. And in this we find the strongest proof that God designed the seventh-day Sabbath to be kept by his people in all ages, because it is to be a sign between him and his people Israel *forever*.

"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." Ex. 20:8-10. E. J. W.

August 27, 1885

"Sabbath and Sunday" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

There are only a few more things in Dr. Dobbs' Sunday article which we wish to notice at present, and these are all of a favorable nature, that is, favorable to the Lord's Sabbath. In article five, we find the following statement, every clause of which he thinks is worthy of emphatic iteration:-

"The Holy Spirit never calls the first day of the week the Sabbath. Wherever that word is found in the New Testament, is the name of the Jewish institution, and refers to the seventh day-Saturday. We ought not to be wiser than the Scripture."

Amen. With the exception of the term "Jewish institution," as applied to the Sabbath, we could heartily say to the above, amen and amen. We need not stop to argue concerning the objectionable term, for all our readers know that the

Sabbath is the Lord's, that he claims it as his own (Ex. 20:10; 31:13; Isa. 58:13; Mark 2:29); and that it was observed in Eden, centuries before there was a Jew, and while "the whole earth was of one language and of one speech." With the exception of that single expression, the above quotation would seem to be the language of an earnest Sabbatarian. No one would suspect that is from one who hates the Sabbath of the Lord.

Our readers will of course understand that the Doctor's emphatic statement concerning the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Bible, is not because of any love for the Sabbath, nor disregard for Sunday, but simply because he would have Sunday called the "Lord's day," and would not have men observe any day as a *Sabbath*. Now let us see how his theory and practice agree. He is a Baptist preacher, and therefore whatever we find in the Baptist "Confession of Faith" may be quoted as his own words, since they have his endorsement. Following is the first article of that document:-

"The Scriptures.-We believe that the Holy Bible was written by men divinely inspired, and is a perfect treasure of heavenly construction; that it has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth, without any mixture of error, for its matter; that it reveals the principles by which God will judge us; and therefore is, and shall remain to the end of the world, the true center of Christian union, and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds, and opinions should be tried."

The twelfth article reads as follows:-

"The Law and the Gospel.-We believe the Scriptures teach that the law of God is the eternal and unchangeable rule of his moral government; that it is holy, just, and good; and that the inability which the Scriptures ascribe to fallen man to fulfill all its precepts, arises entirely from love of sin; to deliver them from which, and to restore them through a Mediator to unfeigned obedience to the holy law, is the one great end of the gospel, and of the means by grace connected with the establishment of the visible church."

Doctor Dobbs, having subscribed his name to these articles, says that according to the Scriptures, the seventh day,-Saturday,-and that alone is the Sabbath, yet refuses to obey the commandment which says, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy;" "in it thou shalt not do any work." Now if we accept him as our guide in matters of religion, how shall we know which of his utterances we are to be guided? Our Saviour said: "The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works; for they say, and do not." Matt. 23:2, 3. He could say this with safety, for whatever their practice, the scribes always taught that the strictest obedience was to be rendered to the law. But we cannot save this of our modern teachers, for they do not always "say;" they give an uncertain sound, sometimes teaching strict conformity to the Bible, and again teaching that it is not to be obeyed. In such a case, we prefer to listen to the Bible alone. "We ought not to be wiser than the Scriptures."

We cannot refrain from noting one other point, to show the inconsistency of calling the seventh day "the Jewish Sabbath." As correctly stated above, the Holy Spirit never called Sunday the Sabbath. Wherever that word is found in the New

Testament, it refers to the seventh day Saturday. Now it is not only admitted, but zealously claimed, that the New Testament was written for the purpose of teaching Christianity. Its language is the language for Christians to use, and those who accept it indeed, are Christians. (We also believe the same in regard to the Old Testament.) Then it necessarily follows that the Sabbath is just as much a Christian as it is a Jewish institution. As a matter of fact it is neither Jewish nor Christian; it belongs to no race nor age; it is the Sabbath of the Lord. But the law of God, which the Baptist "Confession of Faith" justly calls "the eternal and unchangeable rule" of God's moral Government, says, "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" (Ex. 20:8-10), and the Holy Spirit teaches emphatically in the New Testament that there is no Sabbath day but the seventh day.

In the same paragraph we find the following, from the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, quoted with approval; "The Lord's day [Sunday] then was *not a continuation* of the Jewish Sabbath, which was at first also observed, but a *substitute* for it." This is a fact, Sunday, improperly called Lord's day, was *substituted* for the Sabbath of the Lord, just as the bishop of Rome was substituted for the Lord, and sprinkling was substituted for immersion. We have the same authority for substituting sprinkling for baptism, or regarding the pope as the vicar of Christ, that we have for substituting Sunday for the Sabbath.

One more quotation, from Dr. Dobbs sixth article:-

"It cannot be repeated too often that there is no

522

Scripture authority for the transfer of the Sabbatic obligations and from the seventh day to the first day. Of such 'change of day,' not only the New Testament, but also the Christian literature of the early centuries, is absolutely silent. It was several hundred years after Christ before Christians began to identify the Lord's day [Sunday, not the Lord's day] with the Sabbath, and to adduce the authority of the fourth commandment in support of its sanctity. Surely it is suggestive that such is the case."

Very suggestive indeed. Let every Baptist read the above paragraph, and then ask himself if he can consistently continue to keep a day which has no warrant from Scripture. The Doctor says that the fact that several hundred years after Christ, Christians began to adduce the fourth commandment in support of Sunday sanctity, is suggestive. Suggestive of what? It shows that they knew that the fourth commandment is of eternal obligation, and that being determined not to give up their Sunday for the Lord's Sabbath, they found that the only way to satisfy people who wanted to be loyal to God, was to make them believe that the fourth commandment enjoined the observance of Sunday. This they largely succeeded in doing; but as the end approaches, the light cannot be hid; truth will be fully manifest to all the honest in heart; and soon every individual who holds the faith of Jesus will also keep the commandments of God. E. J. W.

"Handling the Word Deceitfully" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

A friend who is quite active as a canvasser for the SIGNS, tells us that in the place where he is now working there is among the people quite a deep interest on the Sabbath question. In consequence of this interest, the Presbyterian minister in that place, is troubled, feeling that some of his flock will keep "the Sabbath of the Lord" in stead of "the venerable day of the sun." To satisfy the people that their previous custom of keeping Sunday is correct, and to make them believe that the seventh day is no longer the Sabbath, he resorts to a trick that is worthy of a Jesuit. He tells them that, in the original, the word in the New Testament for Sabbath, is an entirely different word from that which in the Old Testament is translated Sabbath, and that they do not have the same meaning.

To some, the sophistry and the falsehood contained in such a statement would be apparent at once, but many honest persons would be thrown into confusion by a statement concerning languages with which they have no acquaintance. We think that we can easily relieve the minds of such, so that if the objection of that clergyman is all that troubles them, they need have no hesitancy in obeying the commandment.

It is true that the word for Sabbath in the original of the New Testament is different from that translated Sabbath, from the original of the Old. How is this? Simply because the New Testament was written in Greek, and the Old Testament in Hebrew. As a matter of course, the word for Sabbath would not be identical in both languages. Yet the thing mentioned is the same. A parallel to that minister's statement would be to claim that because the word for "horse" is not the same in France that it is in Germany, therefore the animal has an entirely different nature in the two countries. It is on a par with the statement of the late Spiritualist "Professor" Denton, that the word "resurrection" is not found in the Greek Testament. Of course not, for resurrection is an English word; but there is in the Greek Testament a word corresponding to it and having the very same meaning. Even so we would not expect to find the Greek word for Sabbath in the Hebrew Old Testament, nor the Hebrew word for Sabbath in the Greek New Testament. Yet both words have the same meaning that the English word Sabbath has.

When Martin Luther was before the Diet at Worms, he first made his defense in his native Germany, and afterward at the request of the emperor, who did not like the German, he repeated it in Latin. Does anybody suppose that his second speech had a different meaning from the first, because in the two languages things were called by different names? Of course not. These illustrations are sufficient to enable all to see through the trick to which the aforesaid clergyman resorted.

The lexicons will show that the Hebrew, Greek and English words for Sabbath have all one meaning. But one who knows nothing of either Hebrew or Greek may prove the fact for himself. The sacred historian, after describing the crucifixion of Christ, says "And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on. And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested *the Sabbath day according to the commandment.*" Luke 23:54-56.

The "commandment" is found in the Old Testament, in Ex. 20:8-11, and says the Sabbath on which the women rested was "according to the commandment," we have a positive evidence that the Sabbath of the New Testament is identical with that of the Old. And the fact that the Sabbath mentioned by Luke, immediately preceded the first day of the week, shows that the Sabbath of the Old and the New Testament is the seventh day of the week.

The requirements of courtesy make it impossible to characterize the course of that minister as it deserves. To say the least, it is dishonorable, and should at once deprive him of the respect and confidence of the people who know of it. And what should they think of a cause that requires its advocates to stoop to such mean evasions of truth? They must certainly conclude that the cause itself is the opposite of truth. For a man to adopt such methods of argument, is to confess in advance that the cause which he defends is a weak one, but that he is determined to win by deceit where he cannot by fair means. The course which he adopted to uphold Sunday is eminently worthy of an institution which owes its existence to fraud. Thank God, the truth does not require its advocates to resort to the tricks of the pettifogger. E. J. W.

September 3, 1885

"Bondage and Freedom" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

From a brother in Washington Territory we have received a request to explain Gal. 4:1-31, as there are some in the neighborhood who are trying to use that passage against the truth. It is impossible to give in one brief article an exhaustive explanation of the passage, since that would involve quite a lengthy dissertation on the law and the covenants. But we shall try to give a clear outline, so that the Bible student may readily grasp the apostle's meaning. Before long we hope to give a more full exposition of this and kindred passages.

To anyone who has carefully read the verses indicated, it is evident that three things are put in contrast with three other things. Hagar, ancient Jerusalem, and the old covenant, of which the first two stand as figures, are placed in opposition, to Sarah, the New Jerusalem, and the new covenant. Ishmael and Isaac stand respectively as representatives of those under the old covenant and the new.

Since Hagar was a bondswoman, the apostle, in using her as a symbol of the old covenant, means to indicate that the children of the old covenant are in bondage. They who are of the new covenant, are free, as Isaac was the son of a free woman. They that are of the old covenant, are after the flesh; while they of the new covenant are, as was Isaac, children of promise.

Before applying these points, let us briefly notice the difference between the two covenants. The first was made with the children of Israel when they left Egypt. Heb. 8:9. The terms of that covenant are found in Ex. 19:3-6; 24:3-7. They were simply these. God promised to make of the Jews a great nation, a kingdom of priests, and they, in turn, promised to keep his law. This was all. Now in this covenant there was no provision for the forgiveness of sin either past or future,-

no hint of Christ, through whom alone forgiveness or power to keep the law could come. Before they made this covenant, they had all broken the law, and since they were unable of themselves to keep the law, for without Christ nothing can be done (John 15:6), it is evident that that covenant or pledge to keep the law

538

simply brought them into bondage. When we say that it brought them into bondage, we do not mean that it brought them under obligation to keep the law, for that obligation existed before any covenant was made, and whenever they violated the law they were really in bondage; but that promise brought the matter right home to them, and served to cause them to realize that they were justly condemned.

Had there never been any other covenant than this, the whole world must have been lost, since without divine aid no one can keep the law, for the carnal mind is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. Rom. 8:7. Some will ask if God did not know that they could not fulfill the promise so readily made, and if it was not trifling with them to make such a covenant with them. God did indeed know that they had no power to do as they agreed, but he was not trifling with them. With this promise in mind, and a desire to keep it, they could not fail to learn their true condition-lost-and that would turn their attention to that other covenant, already in existence, which the Lord makes with his people. This is the second covenant:-

"After these days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." Jer. 31:33, 34.

The only difference between this and the first is that provision is made for sins to be pardoned, and the law is to be written in their hearts; that is, this covenant makes it possible to arrive at perfection, for that is what is meant by having the law in the heart. Forgiveness of sins is an instantaneous work, but the writing of the law in the heart is a progressive work, the work of a lifetime. When the law is fully written in the heart, then the individual is indeed sanctified; he is like Christ (Ps. 40:8), and is ready for translation.

We said that this second covenant was even then in existence. So it was, in effect. It is the same covenant which was made with Abraham since that covenant was confirmed in Christ (Gal. 3:17), and Abraham had the righteousness of faith. The same covenant had been made long before, as soon as the fall, as is indicated by the sacrifices by which the people showed their faith in a Saviour whose blood would secure their pardon. Had it not existed in substance from the beginning, there could have been no salvation for any; but men did receive pardon from the beginning, and the work of restoring the law in the hearts of believers has ever since been going on. This covenant, by procuring pardon for past sins and enabling the individual to keep the law, tends to liberty. It sets men free. The other covenant could not free a soul from the bondage in which he already languished. Those who cling to that are of the flesh

(Gal. 5:19, 21), since they cannot keep the law. And it may properly be said that all who are out of Christ are under the old covenant; they are in bondage.

Now note in the passage under consideration, that the Galatians, who seemed willing to forego the blessings of the new covenant, are said to wish to be "under the law." Then we may know that being children of the first covenant, being under the law, being after the flesh, and being in bondage, are all the same thing. But to be after the flesh is to be a violator the law of God (see Gal. 5:19-21), and therefore to be "under the law" is equivalent to being a violator of the law, and such are, of course, in bondage. See Rom. 7:14; 2 Pet. 2:19. Those who are children of the new covenant, have the law written in their hearts; they keep it, and therefore they walk at liberty. Ps. 119:45.

Now we learn from the first portion of the 4th of Galatians, that this was exactly the condition of the Galatians. Says Paul: "Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods. But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?" Verses 8, 9. They were leaving Christ and going back into slavery, and this, Paul assured them, would make them children of the bondwoman.

This probably explains all that causes any controversy. Remember why it is that those who are children of Sinai are in bondage. It is not because we have nothing to do with that law which was spoken from Sinai; just the contrary. That law stands fast as the throne of God, and abates not one jot of the righteous demands. And because it is so firm, those poor sinners who know nothing of Christ's salvation, or, knowing it, will not accept it, are in hopeless bondage—hopeless until they turn to Christ. If the law were abrogated, there could be no bondage for any. E. J. W.

September 10, 1885

"Nebuchadnezzar's Dream" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 35.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—OCT. 8

Last week our lesson left us with Daniel about to relate and interpret the dream which had made so wonderful an impression on the mind of Nebuchadnezzar, who could not recall any portion of it. This week we have the dream itself, and a portion of the interpretation. Without the least hesitation, Daniel repeated the dream, which we quote entire.

"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.

In this dream, by these symbols, the Lord had shown Nebuchadnezzar what should be "in the latter days." Verse 28. Beginning with his own time, the history covered by this dream reaches to the end of time. This is shown by the fact that the four divisions of the image, marked by the four different metals, represented four empires, the last of which was to be dashed in pieces by the setting up of the everlasting kingdom of God, represented by the stone which smote the image. Verses 44, 45. Immediately after relating the dream, the prophet addressed the king as follows: "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 37, 38.

These verses are as plain a statement of fact as any in the Bible. Two things are told. First, that Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom was represented by the head of gold, and second, that his empire was universal. The second item was of course well known to Nebuchadnezzar; the first must have riveted his attention. We say that the head of gold represented Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom, because the prophet immediately adds, "And after *thee* shall arise another *kingdom*;" and the Babylonian empire did not give place to another until twenty-three years after the death of Nebuchadnezzar.

The extent of the empire is indicated in verse 38: "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." This means universal dominion. A few years later, the prophet Jeremiah bore testimony to the same effect. The kings of Tyre, Edom, Moab, etc., with Zedekiah, king of Israel, were contemplating a revolt from Babylonian rule. To show them the folly of such an attempt, the prophet, by the command of the Lord, sent messengers to them, saying, "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. 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." Jer.4:4-7.

This language is not figurative nor hyperbolic. It is plain history, and is substantiated by the writings of profane historians. The "Encyclopedia Britannica," art. "Babylonia," after telling how Nabopolassar, ruler of the province of Babylonia, revolted from Assyrian rule, says:-

"The seat of empire was not transferred to the southern kingdom. 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 left without a rival."

The city of Babylon is described at great length by Rollin ("Ancient History," Vol. 1, book 3, chap. 1), and by Prideaux ("Connexion," Vol. 1, book 2). Our space, however will allow us to give only the brief yet very clear description given by Herodotus, as quoted by Lenormant ("Ancient History of the East," Vol. 1, book 4, chap. 5, section 3). It is as follows:-

"The city stands on a broad plain, and is an exact square, a hundred and twenty furlongs in length each way, so that the entire circuit is four hundred and eighty 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 of fifty royal cubits in width, and two hundred in height.

"And here I may not omit to tell the use to which the mould dug out of the great moat was turned, nor the manner wherein the wall was wrought. As fast as they dug the moat, the soil which they got from the cutting was made into bricks, and when a sufficient number were completed, they baked the bricks in kilns. Thus they set to building, and began to brick the borders of the moat; after which they proceeded to construct a wall itself, using throughout for their cement hot bitumen, and interposing a layer of wattled reeds at every thirtieth course of the bricks. On the top, along the edges of the wall, they constructed buildings of a single chamber, facing one another, leaving between them room for a four-horse chariot to turn. In the circuit of the walls are a hundred gates, all of brass, with brazen lintels and side posts. The bitumen used in the work was brought to Babylon from the Is, a small stream which flows into the Euphrates at the point where the city of the same name stands, eight days' journey from Babylon. Lumps of bitumen are found in great abundance in this river.

"The city is divided into two portions by the river, which runs through the midst of it. The river is the Euphrates, a broad, deep swift stream, which rises in Armenia and empties itself into the Erythrean [Arabian] Sea. [The river does not flow directly into the Arabian Sea, but into the Persian gulf.] The city wall is brought down on both sides to the edge of the stream; thence from the corners of the wall there is carried along each bank of the river, a fence of burnt bricks. The houses are mostly three and four stories high; the streets all run in straight lines, not only those parallel to the river, but also the cross streets which lead down to the water side. At the river end of these cross streets are low gates in defense that skirts the stream, which are, like the great gates in the outer wall, of brass, and open on the water.

"The outer wall is the main defense of the city. There is, however, a second, inner wall, of less thickness than the first, but very little inferior to it in strength. The center of each division of the town was occupied by a fortress. In the one stood the palace of the kings, surrounded by a wall of great strength and size; in the other was the sacred precinct of Jupiter Belus, a square inclosure, two

furlongs each way, with gates of solid brass, which was also remaining in my time."

The royal cubit was twenty-one inches. The reader will therefore see that the outer wall of the city was eighty-seven feet thick, and three hundred and fifty feet high. The city being divided into two parts by the Euphrates, the banks of which were protected by walls, the following means of passage was devised:-

"In each of these walls were twenty-five gates, corresponding to the number of the streets which gave upon the river; and outside each gate was a sloped landing-place, by which you could descend to the water's edge, if you had occasion to cross the river. Boats kept ready at these landing-places to convey passengers from side to side; while for those who disliked this method of conveyance, a bridge was provided of a somewhat peculiar construction. A number of stone piers were erected in the bed of the stream, firmly clamped together with fastenings of iron and lead; wooden draw-bridges connected pier with pier during the day, and on these, passengers passed over; but at night they were withdrawn, in order that the bridge might not be used in the dark. Diodorus declares that besides this bridge, to which he assigns a length of five stades (about 1,000 yards), and a breadth of thirty feet, the two sides of the river were joined together by a tunnel, which was fifteen feet wide and twelve high to the spring of its arched roof."-*Seven Great Monarchies (Rawlinson), Fourth Mon., chap. 4, par.6.*

The public buildings of the city were on the same magnificent scale. Of one of them we read:-

"The most remarkable edifice in Babylon was the temple of Bel, now marked by the *Babil* on the northeast, as Professor Rawlinson has shown. It was a pyramid of eight square stages, the basement stage being over 200 yards each way. A winding ascent led to the summit, and the shrine, in which stood a golden image of Bel, forty feet high, two other statues of gold, a golden table forty feet long and fifteen feet broad, and many other colossal objects of the same precious material."-*Encyclopaedia Britannica, art. Babylon.*

"The great palace was a building of still larger dimensions than the great temple. According to Diodorus, it was situated within a triple incloser, the outermost wall being twenty stades, the second forty stades, and the outermost sixty stades (nearly seven miles), in circumference. The outer wall was built entirely of plain baked brick. The middle and inner walls were of the same material, fronted with enameled bricks representing hunting scenes. The figures, according to this author, were larger than the life, and consisted chiefly of a great variety of animal forms."-*Rawlinson's Fourth Mon., chap.4, par.9.*

"But the main glory of the palace was its pleasure ground-the 'hanging gardens,' which the Greeks regarded as one of the seven wonders of the world. This extraordinary construction, which owed its erection to the whim of a woman, was a square, each side of which measured 400 Greek feet. It was supported upon several tiers of open arches, built one over the other, like the walls of a classic theater, and sustaining at each stage, or story, a solid platform, from which the piers of the next tier of arches rose. The building towered into the air to the height of at least seventy-five feet, and was covered at the top with a

great mass of earth, in which there grew not merely flowers and shrubs, but trees also of the largest size. Water was supplied from the Euphrates through pipes, and was raised (it is said) by a screw working on the principle of Archimedes."-*Id., par. 10.*

The city, thus briefly outlined, well deserved the title given to it by the prophet,—"The glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency." It was brought to this state of grandeur by Nebuchadnezzar, whose life almost measured the length of the empire, and did fully cover the period of its glory. The empire dates, however, from about the accession of his father as governor of Babylon, in 625 B.C. (Encyc. Brit.), and with whom Nebuchadnezzar was associated in the year 606, the date of the beginning of the seventy years' captivity of the Jews. Three years later, in 603, the prophecy under consideration begins.

To the mind of man it would seem that the city so substantially built must stand forever, but God had spoken to the contrary. Said he: It "shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation. . . . But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there," etc. See Isa. 13:19-22. Also Isa. 14:23: "I will also make it a possession for the bittern, and pools of water; and I will sweep it with the besom of destruction, saith the Lord of hosts."

Now learn how completely the "besom of destruction" did its work, and know that no word of the Lord shall ever fail:-

"The traveler who passes through the land is at first inclined to say that there are no ruins, no remains, of the mighty city which once lorded it over the earth. By and by, however, he begins to see that though ruins, in the common acceptation of the term, scarcely exist, though there are no arches, no pillars, but one or two appearances of masonry even, yet the whole country is covered with traces of exactly that kind which it was prophesied Babylon should have. Vast 'heaps or mounds, shapeless and unsightly, are scattered at intervals over the entire region where it is certain that Babylon anciently stood, and between the 'heaps' the soil is in many places composed of fragments of pottery and bricks, and deeply impregnated with nitre, infallible indications of it having once been covered with buildings."-*Rawlinson, Fourth Mon., chap. 4. par. 15.* E. J. W.

"Whom Shall We Obey?" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 35.

E. J. Waggoner

We have received the following from a subscriber in Ohio:-

"I have been a reader of your paper since last spring, and am much interested in the reading of it. I am of your belief in regard to the Sabbath, but am at a loss to know what to do. The commandment says Sabbath, and our civil law is very strict on Sunday observance. Paul says, 'Servants, obey your masters,' 'Obey the magistrates,' and many other passages teach us the same thing. If we disobey the law, we disobey the Testament; if we do that, we disobey God. Give me light."

This we can easily do. Once Peter and John were brought before the magistrates, and were commanded with threatenings as not to speak any more

in the name of Jesus. Without the least hesitation they replied: "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." Acts 4:19, 20. This refusal to obey the command of the magistrates was no idle boast, for when the two apostles were liberated, they went to preaching the same as before. Then the whole company of apostles were arrested and thrown into jail. When they were brought before the rulers, and reminded of the prohibition that had been laid on them, Peter, and all the other apostles answered boldly, "We ought to obey God rather than men." Acts 5:29.

It is the duty of every man to live a quiet, peaceful life. We are to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake (1 Pet. 2:13), and to be subject for conscience sake (Rom. 13:5). But it would be impossible for a man to break the law of God for the Lord's sake, or to disobey God for conscience sake. Therefore the sacred writers evidently mean that we are to obey men when civil laws do not interfere with the law of God. We are to be subject to the "higher powers," but there is no earthly power equal to God. He is the Most High. We say emphatically, that when human laws directly conflict with the law of God, those human laws must be broken. And the man who thus breaks human law, in order that he may keep God's law, will have a conscience void of offense both toward God and toward man.

This is one of the first principles of human law. Blackstone in his commentary says that if a law of man is in direct opposition to the law of God, we are in duty bound to break that law. Earthly rulers derive their power from God, therefore they have no power to contravene his will.

The three Hebrew children in the court of King Nebuchadnezzar, refused to obey the monarch's of unqualified demand for every one to bow before the image which he had set up. Dan. 3. The fact that their refusal would subject them to serious "inconvenience," did not affect them in the least. They boldly told the king that they would not disobey God in order to please him, took the consequences, and by their sturdy faithfulness gained a place in the inspired role of honor (Heb. 11) as those who through faith "quenched the violence of fire." They did not know, however, that they would be thus delivered, but that made no difference.

Daniel, also, the only man of whom it is recorded that the Lord sent him a message telling him that he was "greatly beloved," had a similar experience. He was a faithful servant of the king, leaving no duty unperformed, and yet when a decree was issued interfering with his duty to God, he paid no attention to it. In his forced disregard of the edict, he honored the king with all the respect possible, but much as he honored the king, he honored God more. Who does not know that these faithful men, who dared to obey God in spite of the laws and threats of kings, were more faithful in the surface of the rulers than were any of the troop of time-serving politicians who professed great respect for the

laws of men, while they despised the authority of God?

It is more difficult for people to reason correctly in regard to the Sabbath than about almost anything else. Christians who applaud Daniel and his companions for their course, are afraid to keep the Sabbath of the Lord, lest they should

offend man. Suppose the Government should pass a law making it obligatory on men to blaspheme the name of God; would the brother feel that he is in duty bound to swear? Suppose a law should be passed commanding him to steal, would the brother's conscience compel him to steal? If adultery were made legal, and severe penalties were pronounced against those who should refuse to engage in it, would he feel it to be his plain duty to violate the seventh commandment? Of course he would not. Well, the third, seventh, and eighth commandments are on the same foundation as the fourth. God says: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in yet thou shalt not do any work." No man, nor set of men, nor entire nation, has any right to pass a law conflicting with that. They have no right to say that any individual shall not keep that day, or to attempt to compel him to refrain from working on any other day; for the commandment which sets apart the seventh day for rest, also sets apart the other six days for work. If the civil law says, You must keep Sunday instead of the Sabbath, it is not only my privilege, but it is my duty to break that law. Under whatever circumstances we are placed, we must remember that "we ought to obey God rather than men." That sentence settles the whole matter.

So far as this special case is concerned, we would say that we have many hundred brethren in Ohio, and none of them have as yet found any serious difficulty in keeping the Sabbath. Should they be brought to the issue where they must decide between God's law and a conflicting civil law, we trust that they would have no hesitancy in deciding what to do. E. J. W.

September 17, 1885

"The Four Kingdoms" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST 6 OCT. 10

THE FOUR KINGDOMS

Last week's lesson gave us a view of Babylon in the height of its power and glory, an empire spreading over the inhabited portion of the earth, having a capital that was "the glory of kingdoms," the wonder of the world. We have also a prophetic view of its after condition, and learn from history how completely those prophecies have been fulfilled. We have now to learn how its royal power was broken.

"And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee." Dan. 2:39. That is all the space devoted to the overthrow of that mighty empire. With all of its greatness, it would pass away in a night, like the last snow of winter with the spring shower. A striking lesson of the fleeting nature of all earthly possessions, is taught in that brief statement concerning the proud kingdom of Babylon.

Elsewhere in the Bible we find the history which enables us to trace the succession of kingdoms; we shall first note that, and afterwards know the exact harmony with it, of the records of profane history.

In the fifth chapter of Daniel we learned that "Belshazzar the king made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand." Verse 1. From the second verse (margin), we learn that this Belshazzar was the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar. It was formerly supposed that he was a sole king, and that he was also called Nabonadius; but later researches have shown that Nabonadius was the king. He married the daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, and Belshazzar was his son, and was associated with him in the empire. On this occasion Belshazzar had charge of the city, because his father, having gone out to fight the Persians, had been defeated, and had retreated to Borsippa, a few miles below. Although an army was encamped under the walls of the city, Belshazzar gave himself up to the enjoyment of an idolatrous and licentious drunken debauch. The vessels of the house of God were brought out, in contempt of Him to whom they had been dedicated, and were used in the service of the abominable deities whom they adored as supreme. But in the midst of the wild revel a hand appeared on the wall, tracing unknown characters and letters of fire. Terror struck the hearts of all, and especially Belshazzar. Great rewards were promised to the one who should read the writing, and after some delay Daniel was brought in. Read the fifth chapter entire.

"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. 5:25-28. Short, but terribly plain. Notwithstanding Daniel had said, "Thy kingdom *is divided*, and given to the Medes and Persians," Belshazzar gave the promised gifts to Daniel, and went through the form of making him the third ruler in the kingdom, that is, next after himself, Nabonadius being first. The sentence thus announced by the prophet, was executed without delay. The record says, "In that night was Belshazzar, the king of the Chaldeans slain, and Darius the Median took the kingdom." Verses 30, 31. From the sacred record, then, we learn that the breast and arms of silver (Dan.2:32), represented the empire of Media.

The date in the margin of Daniel 5 (B.C. 538) is that which is uniformly assigned to the fall of Babylon. We have space for only a brief sketch of its capture, but before giving that, we shall note two or three prophetic utterances concerning it, that the student may see how accurately prophecy is fulfilled. "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 [compare Dan. 5:6], 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." Isa. 45:1, 2. "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." Jer. 51:57.

Now we will quote a few paragraphs from Rawlinson (Fourth Mon., chaps. 8, par. 51-53), says he gives the description in the most condensed form. As you read, compare with the above texts, and with Daniel 5. Bear in mind, also, the description of Babylon, as given last week:-

"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. . . . 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. 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, and then silently in the dead of night to turn the water of the river, and make his attack. All fell out as he 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. 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 access formed a strange and revolting medley.

"Meanwhile, outside the city, in silence and darkness, the Persians watched at the two points where the Euphrates entered and left the walls. 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 the suspicious circumstance, and sound an alarm to 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 indeed be 'caught in a trap.' Enfiladed on both sides by an 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.

"At last shadowy forms began to emerge from the obscurity of the river-bed, and on the landing places opposite the river-gates scattered clusters of men grew into solid columns,-the undefended gateways were seized-a war-shout was raised-the alarm was taken and spread-and swift runners started off to 'show the king of Babylon that his city was taken at one end.' In the darkness and confusion of the night, a terrible massacre ensued. The drunken revelers could make no resistance. The king, paralyzed with fear at the awful writing on 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 persons made their way to the presence of the monarch, and slew him on the scene of his impious revelry. Other bands carried fire and sword through the town. When morning came Cyrus found himself undisputed master of

the city, which, if it had not despised his efforts, might with the greatest ease have baffled them."

The historian says that if the city had not despised the efforts of Cyrus, it might with the greatest ease have baffled them. Very true; but it had been prophesied that they should be drunken, and the word of God, which foretold the destruction of Babylon, cannot fail. For further description of this affair, see Rawlinson, at length; and "Rawlinson Ancient History," Book 4, chap.1, article 2, sections 1-4.

"And Darius the Median took the kingdom." Says Rawlinson: "The genius of Cyrus was essentially that of a conjurer, not of an administrator. . . . In Babylon he gave the entire direction of affairs in the hands of a Mede, to whom he allowed the title and style of king."-*Fifth Mon., chap. 7, par. 35*. Rollin says (Book 4, chap. 1, art. 3, sec. 1): "When Cyrus judged he had sufficiently regulated his affairs in Babylon, he thought properly to take a journey into Persia. In this way thither, he went through Media, to visit his uncle Cyaxares, to whom he carried very magnificent presents, telling him at the same time that he would find a noble palace at Babylon, all ready prepared for him; and that he was to look upon that city as his own. Indeed, Cyrus, as long as his own uncle lived, held the empire only in co-partnership with him, though he had conquered and acquired it by his own valor. Nay, so far did he carry complaisance, that he let his uncle enjoy the first rank. It is Cyaxares who is called in Scripture Darius the Mede, and we shall find that under his reign, which lasted but two years, Daniel had several revelations." At the death of Darius, Cyrus very naturally assumed sole control of the empire. See Dan. 6:28.

"And another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth." Dan. 2:39. We have found two universal empires, Babylon and Medo-Persia, corresponding respectively to the head of gold, and the breast and arms of silver, of the image. We have seen (Dan. 2:38) that Babylon was a universal empire. Ezra 1:2 shows the same of the Persian monarchy: "Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth; and he hath charged me to build him an house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah." In harmony with this, Rawlinson says (*Fifth Mon., chap. 7, par. 26*): "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." In those days, whoever ruled Asia, ruled the world.

Now we have the third kingdom in succession. That it is also a universal monarchy, is stated in the verse just quoted. A very brief reference to another prophesy to identify this third kingdom, must suffice for this lesson. In the 8th of Daniel, verses 3-8, we find part of a vision which Daniel saw. He saw a ram standing by a river; the ram was so very powerful and fierce that no beast could stand before him, "but he did according to his own will." While the prophet was still looking, he saw a goat

come from the west, running with incredible swiftness. This goat came to the ram, with fury, and smote him, and cast him down to the ground, and stamped

upon him; and there was no power that could save the ram from the wrath of the goat. Verses 20 and 21 explain this: "The ram which thou sawest having two horns are the kings of Media Persia. And the rough is the king of Grecia." Then since the goat overpowered the ram, the prophecy teaches that Grecia succeeded Medo-Persia as mistress of the world.

"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. 2:42. In passing, we must ascertain the name of this fourth universal empire, for universal it must be, since it is more powerful than all the preceding. This is the last of a series of four kingdoms reaching from the time of the prophet to the close of earthly things. Three-Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Grecia-have already been identified. Now, although this one is nowhere named in prophecy, if we anywhere find mention of a universal empire, other than the three just named, we shall know that it is the fourth, the one represented by the legs of iron.

Such a kingdom we find mentioned in Luke 2:1: "And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from CÆsar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed." None but a universal monarch could issue such a decree, and his name is sufficient to identify him as a Roman. So, then, Rome was the fourth kingdom.

"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. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men; but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay." Dan. 2:41-43.

This partially explains itself; the full interpretation must be left for another lesson. We simply note the closing act. "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever." Verse 44. Here we have the fifth universal empire-the kingdom of the God of Heaven-represented by the stone, which dashed the image in pieces. That this kingdom is yet future, is clearly evident from the fact that the earthly governments are yet on this earth; when that is set up, no room will be found for them. Its subjects, moreover, will never die, for it is not to be "left to other people." Its king will be the one of whom David prophesied that his throne should endure "as the days of Heaven" (Ps. 89:29); and its subjects will be all who, at the coming of the Lord, are found "meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light." E. J. W.

"Another 'Check' Wanted" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

A little more than two years ago, one of our brethren went into Humboldt County, to hold meetings and do general missionary work. The weather was

unfavorable with four meetings, but by faithful labor several persons were brought to see the light of truth, and began to keep the Sabbath. As some of these have been members of the M. E. Church, the minister in charge, one Mr. Woodward, preached a sermon, in which he attempted to overthrow the work already done, and attacked every doctrine which he thought was believed by Seventh-day Adventists. This sermon, when duly endorsed by the President of the University of the Pacific as "cogent and timely," was labeled a "Check on Adventism," and sent out to the world, that it might stop the progress of Seventh-day Adventism, just as it had in Humboldt County.

Well, two years have passed, and we are now inclined to agree with the learned Doctor who pronounced the book "cogent and timely." At the time the "check" was given, there were six or eight Seventh-day Adventists in that county. Now there are more than one hundred who are firm in the truth, and zealous in its propagation; there are two good houses of worship completed and in use; one more is in process of construction; and the ground has been purchased for a fourth, which will be erected within two months. There is no other county in the State, where the cause is in so flourishing a condition. We have often wondered, of late, if it would not pay to get Mr. Woodward to visit some other county, and give Adventism another "check."

We do not wish to give him so much praise as to turn his head. Perhaps the same results would have been seen if he had not put on his little brake. The truth has power in itself, and must produce convictions in the hearts of the honest. "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. Yet we believe it is the providence of God that unreasonable men should open up the store-house of error, in attempts to overwhelm the truth of God, so that all may see the difference between the chaff and the wheat. So we do not get excited when some one threatens to "expose the whole thing," knowing that God can cause even the wrath of man to praise him, and that none can do anything against the truth, but for the truth. E.J. W.

"Death and the Coming of the Lord" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

In a sermon recently preached in New York by Dr. R. S. Storrs, from Rev. 22:20: "He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus." Then he proceeded to answer the question as follows:-

"It was only natural and proper, we may think, that he should utter this prayer to Christ. But we may not so freely repeat it after him. There is a certain tremor of hesitation, natural to the heart, in echoing the words. We would rather, for ourselves, know beforehand, if it might be, the moment when the summons is to come; we would rather see the Master after all, and in a gradual approach; we would rather make special and protracted preparation for the voice which is to call us from all the circles of life on earth, to go and be henceforth with him. At any rate, we do not feel at liberty to offer a prayer for sudden death, and in this

we are right. We have no right to offer such a prayer. Even John did not offer it until the Master had manifested to him his purpose of coming quickly."

If Dr. Storrs had studied the Bible as thoroughly as he studied history, he could not have spoken such words, and then have deliberately written them for publication. There is just one correct statement in the paragraph, and that is, that it is not right to pray for death. That is true; it is not right to pray for sudden death, nor for any other kind of death; but it *is* right to pray for the coming of the Lord, and to long for it, as the following texts clearly prove:-

"Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in the earth, as it is in heaven." Matt. 6:10. This is what Christ himself commanded us to pray. Now when we read these words: "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; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine." (2 Tim. 4:1, 2), we know that the kingdom comes only when Christ comes; therefore Christ taught his disciples that they should daily pray for his coming.

Again, Paul says: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." 2 Tim. 4:7, 8. The crown of life, then, is to be given only to those who love the coming of the Lord. Paul and Dr. Storrs do not seem to agree on this subject.

We have no disposition to carp at Dr. Storrs. He is an able man, and we admire his talent. He is no more out of the way than are thousands. The trouble with him is, that while in history he searches for himself, and draws his own conclusions, in matters of Bible doctrine he accepts unquestioningly what the multitude believe. From his standpoint, it was very natural to say that we ought not to pray for the coming of the Lord. But what a terrible doctrine it is which obliges its adherents to

569

deliberately throw aside the only hope which Christ left his church. What doctrine does this? The doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul-the theory that men go to heaven at death. The doctrine of the second coming of Christ is the "blessed hope" (Titus 2:13), the hope with which Christ comforted his sorrowing disciples; but the dogma of inherent immortality ignores all this.

People sometimes say that it makes no difference what we believe concerning the immortality of the soul; that it is not of any practical importance whether we believe that it is inherently immortal, or dependent on Christ for immortality. Does it make any difference whether or not we believe the words of Christ? Is it a matter of no importance that we lay hold on the only hope that Christ has left us? If there were nothing else against the doctrine of natural immortality, this alone would condemn it. Of course it will not do for people to say that the Lord is not coming at all, for the Bible is full of assertions that he is; and since the people have settled it for themselves that men receive their reward at death, they combine the two. Since the idea is getting so prevalent that death is

the coming of the Lord, it is proper for us to devote space to examine it in the light of Scripture.

First, Christ said to his disciples, "If I go away, I will come *again*." He did not promise to come *again and again*, but simply "another time; once more." Paul's words in Heb. 9:28 agree with this: "And unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Now since he comes only once more, it is certain that death cannot be that coming, for death is constantly occurring.

He promised to come "again." The word "again" indicates another of the same kind. Christ was on the earth in the flesh; he was seen by thousands. Now if he comes "again," a "second time," he must come in person. The departure of the soul for Heaven cannot be another advent of Christ. If any think this is a far-fetched argument, let them read the account of Christ's ascension: "And when he had spoken these things, *while they beheld*, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked stedfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, *shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven*." Acts 1:9-11. No amount of philosophical theorizing can ever wrest that scripture so as to make it teach a coming of the Lord at death. Those who hold to that theory, must deny the statement of the angels.

Something more in the same line. Read Rev. 1:7: "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him." Every eye does not see when a man dies. Thousands die in solitude, unseen by mortal eye. So here is another text that is either unknown to those who hold that the theory we are considering, or else is denied by them. Moreover, this shows that John knew what he was praying for when he uttered the words found in Rev. 22:20. He was not praying for death, but for the Lord to come in the clouds of heaven. Every follower of Christ may and should offer the same prayer.

Still further, we read in Matt.24:27, that "as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Who ever saw or heard of such a phenomena at the death of anyone? It is utterly impossible for a man to believe those words of the Lord, and still believe that death is the coming of Christ. Ought not the words of Christ to be believed rather than the theories of men?

When Christ comes, it is to take his people to himself. He doesn't take one before another, as Paul shows in 1 Thess. 4:15-17: "For 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 them which are asleep. 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."

Here we see that both the righteous dead and the righteous living are taken to be with the Lord at the same time, at his coming. And this is just what the same apostle teaches in 2 Tim. 4:6-8, already quoted. He says that the Lord will give

him a crown of righteousness "*at that day*." At what day? Why, the day referred to in the first verse, when Christ comes in his kingdom to judge the living and dead. "At that day," says Paul, the Lord will give me a crown, "and not to me only, but to all them also that love his appearing." Yes, at the coming of the Lord all who love him shall receive a crown, and all at the same time.

Look once more at 2 Thess. 4:15: "We which are alive and remain under the coming of the Lord." Now if it be true that the "coming of the Lord" is equivalent to "death," we can substitute the latter word in the verse, and we shall then have the sublimely ridiculous statement that "we which are alive and remain [alive] until death, shall not go before them which are asleep"! If there is one *special class* of persons who live until they die, what becomes of those who do not live until they die? We should like to have Dr. Storrs turn his logical mind to the solving of this conundrum.

We turn to the second chapter of 2 Thessalonians. Paul says: "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind. . . . as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." Verses 1-4. Paul assured them that the Lord would not come until after the great apostasy, and the full establishment of the papacy. The papacy was fully established in the sixth century; but would Dr. Storrs have us believe that between the first and sixth centuries no one died? He is too good a historian not to know all about the bloody persecutions during the reign of Nero, Domitian, and others, in which hundreds of Christians yielded up their lives for the faith. Yet Christ could not come until after the setting up of the papacy, and he has not come.

There is scarcely any limit to the texts that might be quoted to show the absurdity of the idea that death is the coming of the Lord. There is just one more passage that we wish to notice. It shows that none of Christ's disciples entertained the idea that death was his coming. Christ had met his disciples at the Sea of Galilee. He had questioned Peter concerning his love, and had showed him by what kind of a death he would be called upon to show his love. Then Peter looked around, and seeing John, asked, "Lord, and what shall this man do?" Jesus answered, "If I will that he tarry till I come? What is that to thee." John 21:21, 22. Suppose we substitute death for the coming of the Lord, and then we have the Master saying, "If I will that he tarry [remain alive] until he comes, what is that to thee?" What a horrible doctrine it is that makes such nonsense of our Lord's simple language.

But notice: Just as soon as Jesus asked Peter what difference it was to him if John should live until the coming of the Lord, the disciples, assuming that Christ had declared that John *should* remain until his coming, began to spread abroad the statement that John would never die! They knew very well that death and the coming of the Lord have nothing in common.

If all our readers do not agree with us in saying that the idea that death is the coming of Christ is both absurd and unscriptural, we have underrated their sagacity. If any hold that idea after carefully reading the texts we have quoted, we should be glad to hear from them, that we may together consider the matter further. We do not care to hear from any who cannot give a reason for their belief. We do not expect to hear from any. May the Lord help all to study well all that relates to the coming of the Lord, and to speedily learn to pray, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus." E. J. W.

October 1, 1885

"The Four Kingdoms of Daniel 7" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 37.

E. J. Waggoner

"In the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon Daniel had a dream and visions of his head upon his bed: then he wrote the dream, and told the sum of the matters." Dan. 7:1. The exactness of the Bible narrative is worthy of note. "In the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon." Concerning Belshazzar as king of Babylon, and the time of his reign, we extract the following from Rawlinson:-

"Nebuchadnezzar expired at Babylon in the forty-fourth year of his reign, B.C. 561, after an illness of no long duration. He was probably little short of eighty years old at his death. The successor of Nebuchadnezzar was his son Evil-Merodach, who reigned only two years, and of whom very little is known. . . . He had been but two years upon the throne when a conspiracy was formed against him; he was accused of lawlessness and intemperance; his own brother-in-law, Neriglissar, the husband of a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, headed the malcontents and Evil-Merodach lost his life with his crown. Neriglissar, the successful conspirator, was at once acknowledged king. . . . Neriglissar reigned from B.C. 559 to B.C. 556, and, dying a natural death in the last-named year, left his throne to his son, Laboroarchod, or Labossoracus. This prince, was a mere boy, and therefore quite unequal to the task of governing a great empire in critical times, was not allowed to retain the crown many months. . . . On the death of Laboroarchod the conspirators selected one of their number, a certain Nabonadius, or Nabannidochus, and invested him with the sovereignty. . . . It is probable that one of his first steps on ascending the throne was to connect himself by marriage with the royal house which had preceded him in the kingdom. . . . Very shortly after the accession of Nabonadius (B.C. 555) he received an embassy from the far northwest. . . . At the earliest possible moment-probably when he was about fourteen-he had associated with him in the government, his son, Belshazzar, or Bel-sharuzar, the grandson of the great Nebuchadnezzar."-*Fourth Monarchy, chap. 8, part. 38-50.*

This gives us the Babylonian succession from Nebuchadnezzar to the end of the monarchy. The monument contains the names of both Nabonadius and Belshazzar, and for a long time historians thought they referred to the same person. Further research has shown their true relationship. As Belshazzar was left in Babylon, never leaving it, so far as known, he is very properly termed king

of Babylon, the more so, as he really held that title, in conjunction with his father. Cyrus, king of Persia, is in one place (Ezra 5:13) called the king of Babylon, because that was his capital. As will be noticed, the date in the margin of Dan. 7:1, agrees with the historian, in placing the first year Belshazzar in B.C. 555.

"Daniel spake and said, I saw in my vision by night, and, behold, the four winds of the heaven strove upon the great sea. And four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another." Dan. 7:2, 3. The Scriptures never put a man under the necessity of guessing at anything that is intended for him to know-and whatever is revealed is designed for us. Deut. 29:29. So we find in this same chapter the clew to unravel the whole thing. In verse 17 we are told in plain words that "these great beasts which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth." And then, showing us that not individual kings but kingdoms are meant, the next verse continues: "But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever."

Another thing is shown by verse 17. We learn from it that these four kingdoms terminate with the kingdom of God, of which the saints are heirs, and in which they are to dwell for ever. We found that this was the termination of the four kingdoms of Dan. 2. Now when we note that these beasts came up one after another (see verses 4-7), and that they represent kings that bear rule over all the earth (see verse 25), we know that the four kings of Dan. 7 must be identical with the four kings of Dan. 2. For it is an utter impossibility that two series of universal kingdoms should exist in the earth at the same time.

There are two other symbols in this prophecy, but they are easily explained. We know that the winds and the sea are symbolical, for the beasts are symbolical, and literal winds and waters do not produce real kingdoms. Winds blowing on the ocean produce commotion; and since it is as the result of the commotion thus produced that the four kingdom arise, we must conclude that by the blowing of the winds on the sea, wars are indicated, since it is through strife and bloodshed that kingdoms arise. We shall find that prophecy bears us out in this conclusion.

It must be accepted as a fact that when a symbol is once used in a prophecy, with a certain meaning, it must have the same meaning in whatever other prophecy it is found. If this were not so, we would have no harmony in the Bible. By following this principle, all is harmonious. In the 17th of Revelation, John speaks of a woman that he saw, sitting on many waters (verse 1), and the angel told him (verse 15) that these waters were "peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and kings." Then the great sea of Daniel 7, represents the people of the earth. See also in Isa. 8:7, where the king of Assyria is called "the waters of river." If the sea means people, then of course the stirring up of the sea, by winds, denotes the stirring up of the people-strife. In harmony with this, we find in Jer. 25:32, 33, that as a result of a great whirlwind in all the earth, the slain cover all the earth. In Rev. 7:1-3 the wind,-the fierce passions of men-are represented as being held so that the earth may not be hurt.

The prophecy, then, simply brings to view the four universal empires,-Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, and Rome,-each arising as the result of the ungoverned passions of the people. The first, Babylon, with its power and glory,

was represented by a lion, with eagle's wings. Dan. 7:4. It was described as follows: "For, lo, I raise up the Chaldeans, that bitter and hasty nation. . . Their horses also are swifter than the leopards, and are more fierce than the evening wolves; and their horsemen shall spread themselves, and their horsemen shall come from far; they shall fly as the eagle that hasteth to eat." Hab. 1:6-8.

But the prophet beheld until the wings wherewith it was lifted up from the earth, were plucked, and it was made to stand on its feet as a man. Instead of flying over the country, in conquest, it came to a full stop. Then the second, Medo-Persia, was represented by a bear with three ribs in its mouth, indicating its ferocious disposition. Calmet, a Catholic commentator, in reference to this passage, says that the Persians have exercised the most severe and the most cruel dominion that we know of. The cruelty of the Medes is described in Isa. 13:17, 18. The third kingdom, Grecia, was represented by the leopard with four wings. Nothing could more fitly represent the Grecian empire under Alexander, whose very name is a synonym for celerity of movement. Says Rollin (Book XV, sec. 2. last part.), "Alexander, in less than eight years, marched his army upwards of seventeen hundred leagues, without including his return to Babylon." And he conquered enemies as he went.

But the fourth beast was the one concerning which Daniel wished information. He knew what they all represented, but the fourth was "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; and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns." Dan. 7:7. It needs no further argument to show that this represents Rome, for the 23rd verse says: "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth." For the more full proof that the fourth kingdom is Rome, see note in preceding number of the SIGNS.

"And the ten horns are ten kings that shall arise." Verse 24. This does not refer to ten *successive* kingdoms, because, "Another shall arise after them, and he shall subdue three kings." When the little horn arose, he plucked up three of the first horns by the roots. Verse 8. If the ten came up one after another, then there would simply have been eleven kings; and he could not have plucked up three out of the ten as he came up, if all had not existed at once. The ten horns refer to the ten divisions of Western Rome. While different commentators have differed slightly as to the names of these divisions, all agree that they were formed, and that they exist to-day as the various States of Europe.

These divisions are also indicated by the toes of the image. We know this from the statement that "in the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed." Dan. 2:44. The expression, "these kings," could not by any possibility refer to the four kingdoms, for the kingdom of God could not be set up in the days of all of them, since one succeeded the other. It could not have been set up in the days of Babylon, and also in the days of Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. Not until after the division of Rome, which took place in the fifth century, was that kingdom to be set up. When it is set up, it will fill the whole earth, to the exclusion of all human governments.

Comments on the kingdom represented by the little horn, must necessarily be reserve for other lessons. E. J. W.

"The Lord's Sabbath Definite" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 37.

E. J. Waggoner

"The great majority of Christians believe that the [fourth] commandment only requires the observance of one day in seventh, and that it believes the children of God at liberty to select the day, and they accordingly accept the first instead of the seventh day, because tradition and the habit of the church have hallowed it."-*Christian Union*.

We quote these words simply because they do express the belief of the "great majority of Christians," and therefore in what we say it may not seem that we are beating the air. We wish to call attention to the fourth commandment, and to the popular belief concerning it, in such a way that all who desire truth may be able to discern it.

1. What reason have the great majority of Christians, or any class of people, whether few or many, to believe that the fourth commandment requires the observance of one day in seventh, and not a definitely specified day? Is not the commandment plain enough in its declarations and injunctions? Let us read it and see. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Literally it reads, "Remember *the day of the Sabbath*." That certainly carries the idea of definiteness. Our attention is called not to "the Sabbath institution," but to "the Sabbath *day*." It is "*the* Sabbath day," indicating that there is only one, just as we say *the* Lord, for a while there be "lords many," to us "there is but one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things." Different people may have Sabbaths of their own, but the Bible knows but one Sabbath.

Having indicated that there is but one Sabbath, and that it is a definite day, the commandment goes on to tell what day the Sabbath is. "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 shall not do any work." Here is a definiteness. The Sabbath is "the seventh day." Note that it is not said, nor are we warranted in saying that the Sabbath comes, or did come, on the seventh day, but that the Sabbath *is* the seventh day. The seventh day and the Sabbath are inseparable. When God said, "Remember the Sabbath day," it was the same as though he said, "Remember the seventh day." And after it has been stated that "the seventh day is the Sabbath," when it is said that "God blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it," we know that God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed *it*.

This point is made emphatic in Gen. 2:3, to which the command of refers: "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created in made." If anyone thinks there is any doubt as to which day of the week the seventh day is, let him consult the almanac, the dictionary, or the first man he may meet on the street. Ask your neighbor some Sunday morning, "What day of the week is to-day?" and without an instant's hesitation he will answer, "The first." Read the extract at the beginning of this article, where it is said that "the great majority of Christians" observe the first day of the week *instead* of the seventh; and knowing

that "the day called Sunday" is the popular day of "rest and recreation," you can have no trouble in accounting and determining which is the seventh day.

That there may be no possibility for doubt, we will state another point, which has often been noted. The crucifixion of Christ, as is generally conceded, was on Friday; the record says, "And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on." Luke 23:54. "And the women. . . followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them." Luke 23:55, 56; 24:1. No first-day advocates ever dreams that these events did not occur in order on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday; and concede that the day on which the women rested was *the seventh day of the week*, because it immediately preceded the first day of the week. Therefore it is as clear as a mathematical demonstration that the fourth commandment declares the seventh day of the week to be the Sabbath. Now then, we ask, What right have "the great majority of Christians" to believe that the commandment requires simply one-seventh portion of our time, and not rest on a definite day? What right has anybody to so believe? None whatever. There is no excuse for such a belief on the part of one who can read the commandment.

2. Suppose that the commandment did leave it optional with us, as to which day we would observe, what would be the result? Nothing but confusion. If the commandment does not specify any day to be observed, then one person has as much liberty of choice as another. If it were so, then no man would have any right to require another for differing with him. Every man would be a law unto himself. It is a fact, however, that the majority of people do not believe that the commandment leaves to individuals the choice of selecting the day upon which they will rest; if they did so believe, they would exercise their right, and there would not be the uniformity which we now see. If there is uniformity of practice, some one must be recognized as competent to declare which day must be observed. This leads directly to popery, and it is a fact that Roman Catholics are the only Sunday-keepers whose practice is consistent with their profession. Given these two things, definiteness in the commandment, and the desirability of uniformity of practice, and a pope is an absolute necessity. For ourselves we will accept no pope, nor the dogmas of a pope, and the commandment does not lay us under any such necessity. It is as plain and definite as Infinite Wisdom could make it.

3. The people have accepted the first day, "because tradition and the habit of the church have hallowed it." And that is indeed all the hallowing that the first day of the week has ever received, and that is just none at all. Can the custom or decision of any man determine the sacredness of a day? No. Can the custom and decision of *two* men hallow the day. No; and so all will say. Then the question arises, How many men does it take to reverse the decrees of God, and make wrong right? If in comparison with God the inhabitants of the earth "are as grasshoppers" (Isa. 40:22), and all "the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance," yea, even as "less than nothing,

and vanity" (verses 15, 17), then the custom and decision of a majority of the people of the earth, or even of *all* of them, are of themselves of no more account than the custom and decision of a single man.

Man is sinful; he cannot hallow anything. Even if he were perfect, his power to hallow anything would be no greater. The mightiest angel in Heaven could not hallow any day which God had not hallowed. "God hath spoken one; twice have I heard this; that power belongeth unto God." Ps. 62:11. The "tradition and the habit of the church," when contrary to the word of God, are of no more consequence than the tradition and habit of infidels or pagans.

Compare the two days. Of the seventh day of the week it is said that "God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it." The most that can be said of the first day of the week, is that "tradition and the habit of the church have hallowed it." God hallowed the seventh; man "hallowed" the first. Reader, which will you choose? Whom will you obey? "Choose you this day whom ye will serve;" whether the Lord Jehovah, or the apostate church of Rome. May God help you to remember that under *all* circumstances "we ought to obey God rather than men." E. J. W.

October 8, 1885

"The Sure Foundation" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 38.

E. J. Waggoner

"If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" Ps. 11:3.

Every structure that is of any account must be built upon a foundation. In the close of the sermon on the mount, our Saviour graphically but accurately describes the consequence of building without any foundation. When "the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house," it fell, because it was built upon the sand. The same thing would have happened to the house which was built upon a foundation, if the foundation could be removed. The tendency of the present age is to superficiality, but a good, solid foundation is nevertheless as necessary as it ever was.

We believe that "the foundations," to which the psalmist refers in the text just quoted, are nothing else than the law of God-the ten commandment. To demonstrate this is the object of this article. The psalmist continues in the next verse: "The Lord is in his holy temple, the Lord's throne is in heaven; his eyes behold, his eyelids try, the children of men." This shows that there is an intimate connection between "the foundations," and the throne of God and the temple in heaven. What this connection is, we proceed to show.

In the 25th chapter of Exodus we find directions concerning the building of the sanctuary. The sanctuary was to be a dwelling-place for God. See verse 8. From the 26th chapter we learn that it was an oblong building, and inclosed on three sides with boards, and on the fourth by a cloth curtain, and that by a similar curtain it was divided into two apartments-the holy place and the most holy place. In the holy place there was an altar of incense, a golden candlesticks, and a table

of show-bread. Ex. 40:22-27. In the most holy place was the ark of the testimony (Ex. 26:37), and it is to this that we wish to call especial attention.

This ark was a wooden box overlaid and lined with pure gold. Its cover was termed the "mercy-seat," and was of solid gold, having on each end a cherub beaten out of the same piece of pure gold. "And the cherubim shall stretch forth their wings on high, covering the mercy seat with their wings, and their faces shall look one to another; toward the mercy seat shall the faces of the cherubim. And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee." Ex. 25:20, 21. Read carefully the preceding verses.

What this "testimony" was, we easily find by the comparison of a few texts of Scripture. In Ex. 24:12 we read: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Come up to me into the mount, and be there; and I will give thee tables of stone, and a law, and commandments which I have written; that thou mayest teach them." Moses went up, and was there forty days and forty nights, during which time he received the instructions found in chapters 25-31. After noting these instructions, the sacred narrative continues: "And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon Mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God." Ex. 31:18.

We notice that the tables of testimony were tables of stone. Tracing them further, we find (Ex. 32:15-19) that when Moses came down from the mount, with the two tables in his hand, he broke them at the foot of the mount, in his righteous anger at the idolatry of the people. This experience is detailed by Moses in the 9th of Deuteronomy, and in the 10th chapter he proceeds with the narrative as follows:-

"At that time the Lord said unto me, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first, and come up unto me into the mount, and make thee an ark of wood. And I will write on the tables the words that were in the first tables which thou brakest, and thou shalt put them in the ark. And I made an ark of shittim wood, and hewed two tables of stone like unto the first, and went up into the mount, having the two tables in mine hand. And he wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments, which the Lord spake unto you in the mount out of the midst of the fire in the day of the assembly; and the Lord gave them unto me. And I turned myself and came down from the mount, and put the tables in the ark which I had made; and there they be, as the Lord commanded me." Deut. 10:1-5.

We have now positive assurance that the "testimony" that was placed in the ark was the ten commandments, and that it was on this account that the ark of was called "the ark of the testimony." Now note again in Ex.25, that the cover to the ark was called the "mercy-seat," and that upon it were two cherubim, one on each end. The Lord said: "And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee. And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubim which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel." Ex. 25:21, 22. God dwelt between the cherubim upon the mercy-seat above the testimony, and it was this that made it necessary for the high priest to burn incense when he

ministered in the most holy place. The cloud of incense veiled the glory of God, which obscured, would have caused his death. Lev. 16:3, 13.

Now to the point of all this. The Jewish tabernacle, and all things connected with it, were patterned after something that Moses had seen in the mount. Ex. 25:9, 40. They were "patterns of the things in the heavens;" and "the holy places made with hands" were only "figures of the true" holy places in Heaven. Heb. 9:23, 24. There must be, then, a real tabernacle in Heaven, and this is plainly stated in Heb. 8: 1, 2: "Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum; we have such an high priest, who is set on 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."

"A minister of *the sanctuary*." There is but one, since that built by Moses was only a miniature representation of the true tabernacle in the heavens, which the Lord pitched. This temple in Heaven has been seen by mortal eye. The beloved disciple says: "And the temple of God was opened in Heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his Testament." Rev. 11:19. This temple in Heaven is the special dwelling-place of God. "The Lord is in his holy temple; let all the earth keep silence before him." Hab. 2:20. "The Lord is in his holy temple, the Lord's throne is in heaven." Ps. 11:4.

We already noted that not only the tabernacle, but all its furniture, was modeled after things in the heavens. Said the Lord to Moses: "According to all that I show thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it." Ex. 25:9. After giving directions concerning the ark, the table, and the candlestick, he repeated the injunction: "And look that thou make them after their pattern, which we showed thee in the mount." Ex. 25:40. Accordingly we find (Rev. 11:19) that the ark of the testament is one of the things in the temple in heaven.

Now remember that in the earthly tabernacle God's dwelling-place was above the ark, between the cherubim that were upon the mercy-seat. Ex. 25:21, 22; Lev. 16:3, 13. Then since the earthly tabernacle was a type of God's real dwelling-place, the temple in Heaven, it must be that the ark of the testament was a figure of God's throne in heaven. To corroborate this conclusion, we read that God's real dwelling-place is between the cherubim. Says David, in prayer to God: "Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a flock; that dwellest between the cherubim, shine forth." Ps. 80:1. Again: "The Lord reigneth; let the people tremble; he sitteth between the cherubim; let the earth be moved." Ps. 99:1. Here the fact that God *reigns* is connected with his sitting between the cherubim, showing conclusively that when reigning upon his throne he is between the cherubim. God sits between the cherubim; he reigns; therefore the people should tremble. When Hezekiah was in trouble, he "prayed for the Lord, and said, O Lord God of Israel, which dwellest between the cherubim, thou art God, even thou alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth; thou hast made heaven and earth." 2 Kings 19:15. And the Lord, speaking of Satan under the figure of the king of Tyre, said: "Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so; thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire."

These texts show plainly that the cherubim upon the mercy-seat, from between which God spoke to the people, were representations of the cherubim that cover the throne of God in heaven, and that therefore the mercy-seat, supported by the ark, was a figure of God's throne. This is why the most holy place and the ark were considered so sacred.

But if the ark and the mercy-seat were a representation of God's throne, then the tables of testimony-the ten commandments-which it contained must be considered as showing the relation existing between the real throne of God in heaven and the original copy of the ten commandments. The ark existed for the sole purpose of holding the law, and therefore the ten commandments must be considered as forming the foundation of God's throne. David says: "The Lord reigneth; let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad thereof. Clouds and darkness are round about him; righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne." Ps. 97:1, 2. Now when we read (Ps. 119:172) that God's commandments are righteousness, and further, that they are God's righteousness (Isa. 51:6, 7), we are assured that the ten commandments which God spoke from Sinai, and which were copied on tables of stone, form the foundation of God's throne.

A throne is the symbol of royal power and authority. We speak of "the throne of England," meaning the Government of England; therefore we state the literal fact, that the ten commandment are the foundation of God's throne, it is equivalent to saying that they formed the basis of God's Government; that all of God's judgments are in harmony with them, and that they cover every act of his in the government of his creatures.

From these facts thus briefly stated, the following conclusions are evident:-

602

1. The law of God-the ten commandments-is the law of the universe. "The Lord hath prepared his throne in the heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all." Ps. 103:19. Not only this earth, but all the world and the Heaven of heavens are subject to his authority, and amenable to his holy law. The highest angel in Heaven, and the lowest saint on earth; the arch deceiver and the most simple of his deluded victims, are alike judged by that perfect law. No righteous act or thought is outside of its sanctions, and no evil can be conceived that it does not condemn.

2. The law of God was in existence before the creation of the earth. When the foundations of the world were laid, "the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." Job 38:4-7. The "sons of God" were the subjects of his righteous Government, and therefore subject to the law of God, which is the basis of that Government. In proof of this, and also of the preceding proposition, read Psalm 103:20: "Bless, the Lord, ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, harkening unto the voice of his word." Since the ten commandment law is *perfect* contains, as we have seen, all the principles of God's Government, there can be no other commandments for the angels to obey. All commands of God are comprised within the precepts of Sinai.

3. The ten commandments can never have any end. Since they are the foundation of God's throne, they must endure as long as it endures, and it must

endure as long as God himself exists, for if he were not Supreme Ruler he would not be God. Now listen to the sublime words of the psalmist: "Lord, thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God." Ps. 90:1, 2. More emphatic language could not be used. But since it is impossible for God to exist apart from his Government, that must also be to everlasting, and the ten commandments, the basis of that Government, must have an equal duration.

4. The law of God, is unchangeable. Not only can it not be abolished, but not one of its precepts can undergo the slightest alteration. We speak not of mere verbal changes which do not affect the sense, but of changes in the force or application of law. Since the law is the foundation of God's throne, its 10 precepts may be considered as the ten pillars constituting the foundation. It was doubtless with this idea in mind that Bishop E. O. Haven named his book which contained his ten sermons on the law, -one sermon on each commandment, -"The Pillars of Truth." When workmen wish to make any repairs in the foundation of a building, they put up a prop underneath, to take the place of the defective foundation while repairs are being made. But what can be placed under the throne of the universe to uphold it while repairs are being made in any of its corner-stones? Nothing. Men may theorize about a change in the fourth commandment, but such a change is an impossibility. To make it would be to make a revolution in the Government of Heaven. It may be urged that God has power to make such a change, but one thing God cannot do: He cannot deny himself. "If we believe not, yet he abide faithful; He cannot deny himself." 2 Tim. 2:13. God's law is his will (Rom. 2:17, 18); it is his righteousness; a transcript of his own nature; a photograph of his character. Therefore for God to make a change in the law would show that his character had undergone a change, and that is an impossibility. With him is "no variableness, neither shadow of turning." James 1:17. If his law was the truth in the days of David (Ps. 119:142), it could not be changed without becoming a lie, and it is only the enemies of God who seek to do this. These facts absolutely prove the proposition that God's law is absolutely unchangeable. They enable us to better appreciate the words of the psalmist: "Thy word is truth from the beginning; and everyone of thy righteous judgments endureth for ever." Ps. 119:160.

5. It follows as a necessary conclusion, that the saints through all eternity will yield obedience to the law. To do otherwise would make them no more saints, but traitors. Some people tell us that a righteous man has no need for the law of God. But the psalmist thought otherwise, for He said: "If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?" Ps. 11:3. To say that because God's people are all righteous, therefore they have no need of the law, is like saying that because no one falls over a precipice at the top of which a strong barrier has been erected, therefore the barrier is unnecessary. None are more interested than the righteous, in having the law of God preserved intact through the ages of eternity. It alone attests their loyalty to God. It is to them a sure pledge that no power in the universe can endanger their rights as subjects of the God of Heaven. It shows them that it is not in vain that they make the eternal God their

refuge, and that he who in his excellency rides upon the heavens to the help of his people, is abundantly able to protect all who put their trust in him.

May the Lord hasten the day when his kingdom shall come; when his will shall be done in all the earth even as it is now done in Heaven (see Ps. 119:20); when his children shall all be righteous; when "his servants shall serve him; and they shall see his face; and his name shall be in their foreheads." E. J. W.

October 15, 1885

"Tributes to the Bible" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 39.

E. J. Waggoner

Quite frequently we have received articles which contain quotations from some eminent men, perhaps an infidel, who has been compelled to testify to the simplicity and beautiful consistency of the Bible, and of the Christian religion. At almost regular intervals we see such tributes in certain religious journalists, prominent among these tributes being Napoleon Bonaparte's testimony concerning our Lord, which he gave while on the island of St. Helena.

Perhaps some of our readers may have noticed the absence of such quotations from the columns of the SIGNS. There is a reason why they do not appear. That is, we do not believe that the Bible stands in any need of such tributes, or that it gains anything from them. Says Paul, "And without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better." Heb. 7:7. Therefore for men to give their solemn indorsement of the Bible and of Jesus Christ, is a reversal of the correct order of things. Especially is this so when those men are, or have been as long as they had opportunity, notoriously wicked men. If the Bible commends a man, it is the highest honor that can be given to human kind; it is more than all else in the world, and all that any man needs. To have any man commend the Bible, adds not one whit to its authenticity or force; and to quote such commendation seems to us to be ridiculous.

Further than this, we do not believe that the Bible needs to be "defended." Even if it did need to be defended, who shall defend it? Is it not rather turning things around to speak of a man defending the Bible? May it not be truly said of the Bible: "For thou hast been a strength to the poor, a strength to the needy in distress, a refuge from the storm, a shadow from the heat, when the blast of the terrible ones is as a storm against the wall"? Is it proper to speak of *defending* that from which we derive our sustenance, and upon which we depend for our lives?

The Bible is abundantly able to defend itself. We may expound it, and draw from the depths the wonderful truths which alone are capable of overthrowing error, but that is simply letting the Bible speak for itself. All the arguments that can be drawn from outside sources to meet the assaults of skepticism, are worthless when compared with a plain statement of some Bible doctrine. When the most profound argument in proof of the divine origin of the Bible have utterly failed to convert an infidel from the error of his ways, a clear exposition of the prophecies, and that the teaching of the Bible on the nature of man, the fate of

the wicked, and the reward of the righteous, have often proved successful. And we will here say that if this latter method will not cause an infidel to see the folly of his position, no other method need be tried.

Said Jesus: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth shall be damned." That is all. "Preach the word." Let the light from the sacred word shine forth in all its clearness, and the word which 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," will surely convict every soul that is not hopelessly entangled in the snares of Satan. That word carries with it its own defense; it bears the indorsement of heaven. To those who will not accept it *entirely*, there is but one alternative.

"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. 23:29, 29. E. J. W.

"One Cause of Unbelief" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 39.

E. J. Waggoner

A long letter has just been received at this office, from a man in the State of New York. We have not read the letter, and do not know that we shall find time to read it before the holiday vacation, but we have read a part of the first page. We gather from what we have read, that the writer has some views on the Bible which differ from those of his brethren. Now we do not wish to discourage investigation, or to shut out new light, yet we consider ourselves justified in condemning this writer's views without reading them. Perhaps if we quote a part only of what we have read it, the reader will not charge us with making a hasty decision. Here it is:-

"I will first try and tell you the reason why I have not exactly agreed with the church; I shall by the Lord's help try to tell the truth.¹ Because most of them, and especially the rulers, have, as I have yjought, slighted me," etc.

We have no need to read further. We have heard his story dozens of times. "My brethren have slighted meet, therefore I cannot agree with them in points of faith." We meet a man whom we used to know as a brother, and learn that he has left the church, and renounced his profession. What is the reason? "Well, brother -- did not use me well, and the rest of them got to thinking that they were better than I; so I left." Brother A or Elder B has slighted me, therefore I do not believe that "the seventh day is the Sabbath." I think my brethren feel above me, therefore it is evident to my mind that the Bible is not true. Is not that profound logic? Yet it is the only basis there is for a large portion of the turning away from the faith.

The first case of an apostasy for such a cause was that of Satan. He felt slighted, and therefore he would not accept the fundamental truth that God is Supreme Governor. And whenever we hear people preface their objections with the statement, "I have been slighted," we naturally think that they are actuated by

some of the same spirit which caused the great rebellion in heaven. Such persons have cause to tremble lest their case becomes as hopeless as that of the first grumbler.

When people begin to imagine that they are slighted, and are not rated according to their abilities, they may be sure that they are thinking of themselves more highly than they ought to think. Their brethren, no doubt, have not changed their behavior toward them, and rate them at their true worth. It is very seldom that a man's opinion of himself is more correct than that of all his brethren. But whether the slight be real or fancied, it is certainly the lamest excuse for unbelief that was ever invented; and when any man wants us to give a hearing to his new ideas, he must not make, as a cause for holding them, the statement that he has been slighted by the church. E. J. W.

October 22, 1885

"Some Facts about Roman Catholicism" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

A few weeks ago we received the following letter from a gentle man in Livermore, Cal., with an accompanying request that it be published at our convenience. Accordingly we give it publicity, as a matter of interest to our readers:-

"EDITOR OF THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES: Having received a few numbers of the SIGNS from a friend here, I have been reading some of Mrs. E. G. White's articles, and had begun to think that much good would accrue to Christians, as argued from her religious stand-point. But when, in the issue of August 20, in an article entitled 'Protestantism and Catholicism Uniting,' that lady assailed that ancient ark of truth, the Church of Rome, I must say that the writer stepped 'down and out' of her sphere of usefulness, and lowered pen to the trickery of Pixley and the fiction of Eugene Lawrence; and, moreover, I charge her with violating one of God's commandments.

"Another charge that stands against such writings is that of desiring to menace the peace of our country by stirring up the demons of religious prejudice and bigotry. It is insulting to the intelligence and liberality of the age we live in, for Protestant writers to use such methods of argument against that large body of Christians who acknowledge and follow the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. What does the writer mean by the following rather mysterious sentence in the article I refer to: 'The people of our land need to be aroused to resist this dangerous foe to civil and religious liberty'? I challenge the writer for an explanation of how, when, and wherein is Catholicism a foe to civil and religious liberty. Facts, not fiction, are wanted.

"Another sentence that may well bring the blush to the cheek of intelligence: 'A prayerful study of the Bible would show Protestants the *real character* of the papacy.' The truth, Mr. Editor, needs not the support of dark insinuation and mysteriously clouded sentences. It is an easy matter for these Protestant writers

to erect an imaginary gibbets, and manufacture imaginary instruments of persecution and torture, and array them as the work of the dim and distant ages of the past, with which to terrify and intimidate the weak minded of this world; but for the earnest seeker after truth, nothing but the naked facts and the ever-unchanging truth will stand the test of investigation.

"I agree with the writer when she says that '*Rome never changes.*' Her principles, founded on the Holy Scriptures, never change. The truth does not change.

"In regard to the Bible, there is another charge made frequently against the Roman Catholic Church, that of 'banishing the Bible from the Christian world.' What a preposterous idea! Comment is unnecessary, since the Bible can be seen in every Catholic house,-the only pure and unadulterated word of God. I would ask Mrs. E. G. White, Who is responsible for the recent revision of the Bible? Was this Rome's doing? Why is the sacred book curtailed, perverted, assailed, and, I may say, torn asunder leaf by leaf? Is the pope doing this? Why is even the definitive Christ being denied in your modern Protestant pulpits? and even [it is taught that] the ten commandments are to be disobeyed. The charge I lay at the doors of your modern Protestantism."

The above is the entire letter, with the exception of the last paragraph, which contains no new statement. We have given it, in order that we may have the opportunity of once more showing the reason why we are uncompromisingly opposed to Catholicism. But first we would say that the writer cannot have given Mrs. E. G. White writings a very careful reading, or he would not charge her with using "dark insinuations and mysteriously clouded sentences." As a rule, her writings are characterized by clearness and directness of expression, and concerning the Catholic Church she has given most decided utterance. Now to a consideration of the letter. The point over which the writer seems to be aggrieved is, that Catholicism is a foe to the civil and religious liberty. We therefore quote a few facts, not fiction.

On Dec. 8, 1864, Pope Pius IX. published the Papal "Syllabus of Errors." This document, also issued by his sole authority, became in an especial manner the utterance of the Catholic Church, when, less than eight years later, Pius IX. still being pope, the doctrine of papal infallibility was declared. In this Syllabus there are eighty distinct propositions, but each of which is held by the Catholic Church to be an error. We quote two of them:-

"77. In the present day, it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of other modes of worship.

"78. Whence it has been wisely provided by law, in some countries called Catholic, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the public exercise of their own worship."

To men who love liberty these propositions seem just, but the Catholic Church declares them to be errors, and thus plainly teaches that no Catholics ought to be allowed to enjoy public worship. If this does not show that the Catholic Church is the foe of religious liberty, what would?

In the reign of Hildebrand, the priests were bound by an oath of obedience to the pope, of which the following are a few clauses:-

"I will be faithful and obedient to our lord the pope and his successors. . . . In preserving and defending the Roman papacy and the Regalia of St. Peter, I will be their assistant against all men. . . . Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our same lord, I will persecute and attack to the utmost of my power."-*Decretum Greg. IX., lib.2, tit. 24.*

That certainly does not bear the stamp of liberty. That the Roman Church is a foe to liberty is also shown by its enmity to the Bible. This charge the gentleman calls a falsehood, but we repeat it, and offer *facts* for proof. After Luther had posted up his famous "Theses," directed especially against the sale of indulgences, Tetzel, the agent of the pope, came out with some counter propositions, among which is the following:-

"Christian should be taught that there are many things which the church regards as certain articles of the Catholic faith, although they are not found either in the inspired Scripture or in the earlier Fathers."-*Seckendorf, Hist. Lutheran., lib., 1, sec.12.*

If the Catholic Church is a friend to the Bible, how is it that, previous to the Reformation, not only the laity, but also the vast majority of the clergy, had never seen a Bible? Why was it so sedulously kept from the people that even very few priests had ever seen a copy of it? The fact is, that Wycliffe was condemned as a heretic and a sacrilegious man, simply because he gave the Bible to the people of England; and in 1408, an English council, with Archbishop Arundel at its head, enacted and ordained "that no one henceforth do, by his own authority, translate any portion of Holy Scripture into the English tongue, or any other, by way of book or a treatise, nor let any such book or treatise now lately composed in the time of John Wycliffe aforesaid, or since, or hereafter to be composed, be read in whole or in part, in public or in private, on the pain of the greater excommunication." Thus this popish council decreed that not only should Wycliffe's translation be taken from the people, but that in no coming age should they have any portion of the Bible in any living language.

But Bibles were printed in spite of papal anathemas, and soon the land was filled with them. Now what did the Roman Church do? It would have brought upon itself the condemnation of all virtuous people if it had continued its outspoken denunciations of the Bible, so, while pretending to exalt that book, it began to weaken its influence. Any one who possesses a Catholic catechism will find there a plain statement to the effect that common people are at full liberty to read the Bible, provided they do so in the original! That is, the farmer and the hod carrier, the brick layer and the errand boy, may read the Bible in Greek and Hebrew! This amounts to actual prohibition.

But this is not all. The Catholic Church gives her children a version of the Bible, but in it she has not scrupled to alter the text to suit her own dogmas. As an instance we quote Gen. 3:15 as it stands in the Douay Bible, and also in the Vulgate: "And I will put enmity between thee the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; she shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise her heel." In this

matter a prophecy concerning Christ is made to uphold the Catholic worship of the Virgin Mary.

Speaking of the Virgin Mary, we will notice one or two points which show the papal disregard for the Holy Scriptures. In Deut. 27:15, we read these plain words: "Cursed be the man that maketh any graven or molten image, an abomination unto the Lord, the work of the hands of the craftsman, and putteth it in a secret place." In the face of the second commandment, in this curse, a book entitled "Glories of Mary," published with the approval of the Archbishop of New York, on page 658 contains the following:-

"Father Thomas Sanchez never returned home until he had visited some church of Mary. Let us not be weary, then, of visiting our queen every day in some church or chapel, or in our own house, where it would be well for that purpose to have in some retired place a little oratory, with her image, adorned with drapery, flowers, tapers for lamps, and before it also the litanies, the rosary, etc., may be said."

Again, the apostle Peter, speaking of Christ, said: "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. But in the "Glories of Mary," page 279, among other blasphemous things we find the following:-

"In the Franciscan chronicles it is related of Brother Leo, that he once saw a red ladder, upon which Jesus Christ was standing, and a white one, upon which stood his holy mother. He sought persons attempting to ascend the red ladder; they ascended a few steps, and then fell; they ascended again, and again fell. Then they were exhorted to ascend the white ladder, and on that he saw them succeed; for the blessed virgin offered them her hand, and they arrived in that manner safe in Paradise."

Again, on page 177:-

"St. Bonaventure, moreover, says that Mary is called the gate of heaven, because no one can enter into heaven if he does not pass through Mary, who is the door of it."

And again, we read on page 17:-

"If the assertion is true and incontrovertible, as I believe it to be, and as I shall prove in the fifth chapter of this book, that all races are dispensed by the hand of Mary alone, and that all those too are saved, are saved solely by the means of this divine Mother; it may be said as a necessary consequence, that the salvation of all depends upon preaching Mary and confidence in her intercession."

We might quote pages to the same effect, but these quotations are sufficient to show that Catholicism is essentially an anti-Christian religion.

How about those "imaginary gibbets" and "imaginary instruments of persecution and torture" with which Protestant writers are said to "terrify and intimidate the weak minded of this world." Since *facts* are wanted on this point, we have selected the article on page 635, entitled "Tortures of the Inquisition." The instruments there mentioned are not imaginary; and, since "Rome never changes," and this very year Monsignor Capel has repeatedly defended (not apologized for) the Inquisition, and has contended that the heretic is as worthy of punishment as the thief or murderer, we are fully justified in saying that the papal

church would as readily torture heretics to-day and as did three hundred years ago.

It is a matter of fact, not of fiction, that on the 23rd of August, 1572, thousands of the Huguenots were brutally murdered in Paris, by order of the Catholic king, Charles IX., who himself joined in the massacre, and that the massacre received the sanction of the pope.

It is a *fact* of history that on the 18th of October, 1414, the Emperor Sigmund sent to John Huss a safe-conduct to attend the Council of Constance and to return. The honor of the empire was pledged for his security. Yet on the twenty-sixth day after

634

the arrival of Huss, he was seized, in flagrant violation of the safe-conduct, carried before the pope and the cardinals, thrust into a filthy prison, and afterwards burned at the stake, without being allowed to speak in his own defense, simply because he denounced the iniquities of the papacy. This was done by order of the council, and the conscience of the emperor was pacified by the decree that "no faith is to be kept with heretics to the prejudice of the church." This was the doctrine of the third Lateran Council, which affirmed that, "Oaths made against the interest and benefit of the church are not so much to be considered as oaths, but as prejudices."

Is a fact that the "true character" of the papacy may be learned from a study of the sacred Scriptures. Its character is especially portrayed in Dan. 7:21, 25; 2 Thess. 2:3, 4; Rev. 13:1-7, and 17:3-6. The Scriptures, together with the *facts* of history, compel us to coincide with the declaration of Luther, that "the papacy is a general chase led by the Roman bishop [pope] to catch and destroy souls."

In writing thus, we have not the slightest personal feeling against any Catholic, and we can readily believe that a large proportion of them are sincere in their devotion. That many of the clergy are honest, is shown by the fact that we frequently hear of priests who are abjuring the Catholic faith. We expect to see many more honest souls leave that communion. It is a fact that comparatively few Catholics are acquainted with the real character and history of their church. These things are kept from them. And so our attack is not on any individual Catholic, but on Roman Catholicism-"the mystery of iniquity"-the monster of organized deception, superstition, and crime.

We wish also to inform our correspondent that we have no apology to make for the perversions and curtailments of Scripture by modern Protestants.

"Modern Protestant pulpits" are very different affairs from those of three hundred years ago. A great deal that is called Protestantism is not worthy of the name-it is so much like Catholicism. This is the great danger of the day. Professed Protestants, who laud the work of Huss, Jerome, Luther, and Knox, will call a man a bigot if he presumes to speak against the Catholic Church, forgetting that that church has the same character to-day that it had when Luther so boldly assailed it. A temporary loss of power is all the difference there is between the papacy now and the papacy then.

It is impossible for us to recount the evils of Romanism every time we speak of that communion, and therefore the reader will please take these few

quotations, which might easily be multiplied a hundredfold, as evidence that we know whereof we speak when we warn people against the papacy. We do not design to use "mysterious sentences," but we hope ever to have grace and courage enough to speak boldly against the enemy of all civil and religious liberty-Roman Catholicism-and against all that savers of it, even though it sails under the banner of Protestantism. E. J. W.

October 29, 1885

"The Fourth Kingdom" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSONS FOR PACIFIC COAST—NOV. 14 AND 21

The Fourth Kingdom

In order to catch up, so that the notes may be of service to Sabbath-school scholars in the East, it is necessary this week to furnish notes on lessons 9 in 10. This may be done without any break in the notes, since the subject begun in the ninth lesson,-The Fourth Kingdom,-is continued through the tenth.

The fourth kingdom is described in Dan. 2, 7, and 8. It will therefore be our work to quote these several descriptions, to show that they all apply to the same power, and to show beyond question the name of that power. The basis of the whole is found in the second chapter of Daniel. In that chapter, as already learned, four universal empires are symbolized by the four different metals of which the image was composed. The fourth division of the image was the legs of iron, and the feet and toes of mingled iron and clay. Of this division the prophet said: "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.

This fourth kingdom is the only one that is not somewhere in the prophecy directly named; but by the data given we may identify it as readily as though it were called by name. Thus: There are to be but four universal monarchies from the time of Daniel's prophecy, since the fourth closes with the setting up of God's everlasting kingdom, which is to take the place of all others. See Dan. 2:34, 35, 44, 45. From Dan. 2:37, 38 we learn that Babylon was the first of these universal monarchies. Daniel 5 relates the history of the last night of Babylonian rule, and verses 28, 30, 31 tell what power succeeded. Ezra 1:2 shows that the Medo-Persian Empire, like its predecessor, was a universal dominion. In Dan. 8:3-7, 20, 21, we are plainly told that Grecia was to overthrow the Persian Empire, and fill its place; and history bears witness that such was the case. The Grecian Empire, especially under Alexander the Great, did "bear rule over all the earth." Dan. 2:39.

Thus we have identified three of the four universal kingdoms that were to reach from the prophet's time till the end of the world. Now if we can find any mention of the universal monarchy, other than Babylon, Persia, and Greece, we shall *know* that it is the fourth kingdom, the one represented by the legs of iron. This is as evident as it is that three from four leaves one. Now in Luke 2:1 a universal dominion is brought to view; for we read: "And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from CÆsar of Augustus, that *all the world* should be taxed." But everybody recognizes CÆsar as a Roman name, and CÆsar Augustus is the first Roman emperor. Then since his dominion extended over all the world, it follows that Rome was the fourth universal empire,-the one represented by the legs of iron in Dan.2:33.

Profane history coincides with sacred history in declaring Rome to be universal. Says Gibbon:-

"A modern tyrant who would find no resistance either in his own breast or in his people, would soon experience a gentle restraint in the example of his equals, the dread of present censure, the advice of his allies, and the apprehension of his enemies. The object of his displeasure, escaping from the narrow limits of his dominions, would easily obtain in a happier climate a secure refuge, a new fortune adequate to his merits, the freedom of complaint, and, perhaps, the means of revenge. 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 compelled 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 not hope to traverse without being discovered, seized, and restored to his irritated master. Beyond the frontiers his anxious gaze could discover nothing except the ocean, inhospitable desert, 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.*'"-*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, chap. 3, paragraph 37.*

The same historian, in another place, in recording the universal conquest of Rome, makes unmistakable reference to Dan. 2:40, in the following words:-

"The ambitious design of conquest, which might have been defeated by the seasonable conspiracy of mankind, was attempted and achieved, and the perpetual violation of justice was maintained, by the political virtues of prudence and courage. The arms of the republic sometimes vanquished in battle, always victorious in war, advanced with rapid strides 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* monarchies of Rome."-*Decline and Fall, chap.38, par. 44.*

In the seventh of Daniel, four beasts are seen coming out of the sea. These beasts denote four kingdoms. Verse 17. These four kings are universal; for it is

expressly said of the fourth: "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." Dan. 7:23. Then the four beasts must represent respectively Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. The description of the fourth kingdom, as given in verse 23, tallies exactly with the character of Rome as described by Gibbon. So we find that the "dreadful and terrible" beast of Daniel 7, is identical with the legs of iron of Daniel 2.

Again, in the eighth of Daniel we find the same succession of universal kingdoms referred to. The prophecy begins with the Medo-Persia, represented by the ram, and shows its conquest by Grecia, which was represented by the goat. The Great War between its eyes, represented the first king of Grecia as a universal monarchy, viz., Alexander the Great. When this horn was broken, four notable ones came up in its place (Dan.8:8), indicating that at the death of the first king, Alexander, four kingdoms should "stand up out of the nation, but not in his power." Verse 22. Alexander died B.C. 323, and the history of the kingdom after his death is just briefly summarized by Dr. Barnes in his notes of this passage:-

"Though the kingdom was not by him [Alexander] divided into four parts, yet, from the confusion and conflicts that arose, power was ultimately concentrated into four dynasties. At his death, his brother Arridaeus declared king in his stead, and Perdiccas regent. But the unity of the Macedonian power was gone, and disorder and confusion, and a struggle for empire, immediately succeeded. . . . In 305 B.C. the successors of Alexander took the title kings, and in 301 B.C. there occurred the battle of Ipsus, in which Antigonus, who reigned in Asia Minor, was killed, and then followed in that year a formal division of Alexander's empire between the four victorious princes, Ptolemy, Seleucus, Cassander, and Lysimachus. In the division of the empire, Seleucus Nicator obtained Syria, Babylonia, Media and Susiana, Armenia, a part of Cappadocia, Cilicia, and his kingdom, in name, at least, extended from the Hellespont to the Indies. The kingdom of Lysimachus extended over a part of Thrace, Asia Minor, part of Cappadocia, and the countries within the limits of Mount Taurus. Cassander possessed Macedonia, Thessaly, and a part of Greece. Ptolemy obtained Egypt, Cyprus, and Cyrene, and ultimately Coele-Syria. Phenicia, Judea, and a part of Asia Minor and Thrace. Thus the dominions of Seleucus were in the West; those of Ptolemy in the South; and those of the Lysimachus in the North."

The entire history of these four divisions of the Grecian Empire is given by Rollin under the head of "Alexander's Successors," thus showing that each one of the divisions, and all the kings of each division, are considered still forming a part of the goat,-Grecia,-and not as forming a kingdom which should take the place of Greece.

"And out of one of them [*i.e.*, one of the four horns of the goat], came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land." Dan. 8:9. The power here brought to view is described in verses 10-12 and 23-25. Before noticing any points in this description, we pause to state that from what we have already learned, we know that this little horn symbolizes Rome. We know it by the same means by which

we determined that the legs of iron symbolized Rome. Four universal monarchies cover the world's entire history, from the time of the prophet until the coming of the Lord. These four kingdoms we have found to be Babylon, the Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. The first three are named in the prophecy; the last one we determined by a mathematical demonstration. Well, in this prophesy we have Medo-Persia brought to view, with Greece succeeding it. These powers are respectively term "great" and "very great." Verses 4, 8. Now immediately following Greece, we have a power represented by a little horn, which is said to wax "exceedingly great." It must then have been more powerful than either Medo-Persia Greece, and consequently could not be less than universal. But if it was universal, it must have been Rome; for Rome was the only power, after Greece, which, as both sacred and profane history agree, was able to break in pieces and subdue all nations.

Lack of space prevents our noticing the further description of this little horn, and showing its exact fulfillment in the Roman Empire. These points will be noted next week, before commenting on the next lesson. E.J. W.

"From Adam to Moses" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

A brother writes as follows:-

"Do you think that in the expression in Rom. 5:14, 'Death reigned from Adam to Moses,' the apostle had reference to the resurrection of Moses; that the reign of death was there broken, as is inferred from Jude 9?"

ANS.-No; there is no hint of the resurrection of Moses in the fifth of Romans. We give, in brief, the following reasons for this statement:-

1. The subject of the resurrection is not under consideration. The subject of discourse is justification by faith in Christ. In order to show the importance of this, the apostle shows that all are under condemnation of death through transgression of the law. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men." Wherever there is death it is an evidence of the existence of sin; and since "sin is not imputed when there is no law," the fact that "death reigned from Adam to Moses," shows that during all that time God's law was known and transgressed. It was necessary to show the extent of the need, in order to show how greatly the grace of God abounded. In such an argument, to branch off upon the resurrection of Moses would be manifestly out of place.

2. The phrase "until the law," indicates what time in the history of Moses is referred to. "From Adam to Moses," then, simply means, from the creation to the giving of the law upon Sinai. Of course the text itself, speaking of sin, which is not imputed when there is no law, shows that the phrase "until the law," does not mean that the law did not exist before. But if the time indicated in the expression, "Death ranged from Adam to Moses," reaches only to the giving of the law upon Sinai, it certainly could have no reference to the resurrection of Moses, since he did not die till forty years later.

3. There can be no reference to the resurrection of Moses, since the fact that Moses died shows that death reigned over him as well as over anybody else. A subsequent resurrection would not alter the fact that death had extended its reign over him, anymore than the general resurrection would alter the fact that death has reigned over all mankind. If the resurrection of Moses shows that death did not reign over him, then the final resurrection of all men will show that death never reigned over anybody. That which proves too much, proves nothing.

4. In order to have the expression of any force as indicating the breaking of the reign of death by the resurrection of Moses, it would be necessary to show that up to the time of Moses all men had died; but the case of Enoch entirely destroys that argument. The translation of Enoch was certainly more of a break in the reign of death than was the resurrection of Moses. But the fact is, there has not been a moment since the fall when death did not reign, although some, as Enoch and Elijah, and Moses and the saints at the crucifixion of Christ, have been rescued from its power, as pledges of the time when its reign will be forever broken.

The fact that "the dead know not anything," but sleep, unconscious, in the grave (Eccl. 9:5; Ps. 146:3, 4; 115:17; 88:10-12; Job 10:18-22, etc.), and that fifteen hundred years after his death Moses was seen by Peter, James, and John, is proof enough that Moses was raised from the dead. Jude 9, which speaks of the dispute between Michael (Christ) and the devil over the *body* of Moses, corroborates this fact. There is not the slightest doubt but that Moses was raised from the dead, but there is no more doubt that Romans 5 contains no reference to such resurrection. E. J. W.

"Paul and the Revision Committee" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

In the eighth psalm, one of the most beautiful compositions ever written, occurs this passage, which has become familiar even to those not intimately acquainted with the Bible: "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; what is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him? For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour." Verses 3-5.

In the New Version the 5th verse reads thus: "For thou hast made him but lower than God, and crownest him with glory and honor." A religious journal, in noting some changes in familiar text, puts this text in a group of which it says: "The following changes have perhaps been necessary, but grate sadly against literary associations." For ourselves, we can say that the change grates sadly against Scriptural associations, and we do not believe it to be at all necessary. We give the following reason why we dare disagree with the learned Revision Committee:-

In the second chapter of Hebrews, the apostle, in showing how Christ, who had "by inheritance" a more excellent name than the angels, was made on a level with men, quotes the words of the psalmist concerning man, as follows: "But

one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honor." Heb. 2:6, 7. Here the Greek word is *angelos*, the word invariably rendered "angel." There is no question but that the apostle used the word *angeloi* (plural form) in quoting from Ps. 8:5, and the Revision Committee have agreed that it is correctly rendered "angels," since it is so rendered in the New Version. But if "angels" is the proper word to use in quoting from Ps. 8:5, and the authority of an inspired apostle ought certainly to settle that point, why should not the same word be used in the passage itself? By what authority did the revisers use the word "God" in rendering the Hebrew word which Paul translates "angels"?

It is true that the Hebrew word in Ps. 8:5 is *eloheem*, a word that is usually used with reference to a deity, either the true God or a false god, and there is no other place in the Old Testament where it is rendered "angels;" and therefore the revisers doubtless thought that consistency required them to render it "God" in this instance. But we are certain that consistency would require instead that the text should agree with the same text as translated by the inspired writer of Hebrews. In other words, even though the lexicons knew nothing

650

about such a rendering of *eloheem*, Heb. 2:7 would show that in one instance, at least, it undoubtedly refers to angels. And the Revision Committee, in retaining the word "angels" in Heb. 2:7, while they rejected it in Ps. 8:5, have convicted themselves of inconsistency.

Such renderings go a long ways toward making some people doubt whether the New Version is a decided improvement on the Old. At any rate, we do not feel inclined to use it to the exclusion of the Old Version. While we find it very valuable as a commentary, we regard it in that light, and cannot rely upon it with that confidence that we do upon the version commonly used. A translator of the Bible needs, far more than the commentator, to be acquainted with the entire Bible, and thoroughly imbued with its spirit. We very much doubt if it is possible for any body of men to agree upon a version of the Bible that will be superior to King James's version. E. J. W.

November 5, 1885

"The Little Horn of Daniel 7" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST 6 NOV. 23

The Little Horn of Daniel 7

Before making any comments on the "little horn" of Daniel 7, we wish to complete the notes on the "little horn" of Daniel 8, which was the subject of last week's lesson. By reference to the notes of last week, it will be seen that we proved conclusively that the "little horn" of Daniel 8 represents the Roman Empire. This proof cannot be repeated, but one or two additional proofs will be given. It will be remembered that the third kingdom-Grecia-represented by the goat with the notable horn, was divided into four parts after the death of Alexander, the four divisions being represented by the four horns which "came" after the great horn was broken. The prophet then introduces the fourth kingdom-Rome-as follows:-

"And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed *exceeding great*, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land." Dan. 8:9. This seems to some to be an objection to calling this little horn Rome; for how, they ask, could Rome be said to come forth from one of the divisions of the Grecian Empire? In point of fact, this is no objection at all; but on careful consideration is just what we might expect; for if Grecia was a universal empire, which is affirmed by both sacred and profane history, then any power which should rise up against it, must naturally come forth from some part of it. That Alexander's dominion was universal, extending even to Rome, is attested by the following statements:

"The Lucanians and Bruttians [inhabitants of Italy] are especially mentioned as having sent embassies to Alexander at Babylon." "'The Tyrrhenians also,' said Aristobulus and Ptolemaeus, 'sent an embassy to the king to congratulate him upon his conquests.'" "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."-*Arnold's History of Rome, chap. 30, part. 1 and 2.*

But there is still more direct evidence to show the propriety of speaking of Rome as coming out of one of the divisions of the Grecian Empire. We quote and abridge from Prideaux, who relates the history in a very entertaining manner. First, however, we will state that the four divisions represented by the four horns, were Macedon, Thrace, Syria, and Egypt. In the year 168 B.C., Antiochus Euphianes, then king of the Syrian division, determined to make himself master of Egypt, which was then governed by his nephew and niece, who were very strong, and incapable of successful resistance. Says Prideaux:-

"This he most certainly would have accomplished, but that he met a Roman embassy in his way, which put a stop to his further progress, and totally dashed all the designs which he had been so long carrying on for the making of himself master of that country."-*Connexion, Vol. 2, Book 3, "An. 168, Ptol. Philometer 13."*

The embassy was one which the Roman Senate had sent in response to the request of the young Egyptian monarch for assistance against Antiochus. The reader will not fail to note that only three ambassadors, and not an army, were

sent by the Romans to command Antiochus to desist from his intended war on Egypt. These ambassadors met Antiochus when he was only four miles from Alexandria, when he was on his way to be besiege that city. The chief ambassador was Popillius, with whom Antiochus had been intimate while he was in Rome as a hostage. On seeing Popillius, Antiochus reached for his hand to embrace him as an old friend. "But Popillius, refusing the complement, told him that the public interest of his country must take the place of private friendship; that he must first know whether he were a friend or an enemy to the Roman State, before he could own him as a friend to himself; and then delivered in his hands the tables in which were written the decree of the Senate, which they came to communicate to him, and required him to read it and forthwith give him his answer thereto. Antiochus, having read the decree, told Popillius he would consult with his friends about it, and speedily give him the answer they should advise; but Popillius, insisting on an immediate answer, forthwith drew a circle round him [Antiochus] in the sand, with the staff which he had in his hand, and required him to give his answer before he stirred out of that circle; at which strange and peremptory way of proceeding, Antiochus, being startled, after a little hesitation, yielded to it, and told the ambassador that he would obey the command of the Senate; whereupon Popillius, accepting his embraces, acted thenceforth according to his former friendship with him."

But the point of all this is found in the next two sentences of Prideaux. Says he: "That which made him [*i.e.*, Popillius] so bold as to act with him after this peremptory manner, and the other so tame as to yield thus patiently to it, was the news which they had a little before received of the great victory of the Romans, which they had gotten over Perseus, king of Macedonia. For Paulus Δ milius, having now vanquished that king, and thereby added Macedonia to the Roman Empire, the name of the Romans after this carried that weight with it as carried a terror in all the neighboring nations; so that none of them after this cared to dispute their commands, but were glad on any terms to maintain peace, and cultivate a friendship with them."

Now since it was the conquest of Macedon which gave Rome its prestige among the nations, and made it virtually a universal empire, having the power to dictate to other kingdoms, and to stop their projects by a single word, it is evidently very proper to speak of it as "coming out" of one of the horns of goat, viz., the Macedonian horn. The historian, in describing the rise of the Roman Empire, could not well employ a more fitting expression than that used by the prophet, 370 years before the occurrence. The quotation given above shows the immense superiority of the Romans over Antiochus Epiphanes, and thus of itself effectually demolishes the theory held by some that that pusillanimous king was the "exceeding great" power represented by the little horn.

Now we must turn our attention to the present lesson, "The little Horn of Daniel 7." The student must be careful not to confound this little horn with that of Daniel 8. The little horn of Daniel 8 represents the Roman Empire as a whole; the little horn of Daniel 7 represents the Roman Empire only under one phase, the whole empire being represented by the fourth beast, of which the little horn was

only a part. We quote the description of the beast and of the little horn, as given by the prophet.

"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; and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns. I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things." Dan. 7:7, 8.

When Daniel was troubled over the explanation of this vision, an angel gave him the interpretation, and in beginning said: "These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever." Dan.7:17, 18. So the beasts represented the four universal kingdoms that cover the history of the world till the coming of the Lord. These four kingdoms have already been named, and therefore we well know that the fourth beast represents the Roman Empire. See the further description in Dan. 7:23.

But Daniel was not satisfied with the first answer given by the angel. From his connection with Nebuchadnezzar's dream he must have known the main features of these four kingdoms; but there were some particulars upon which he desired more light. "Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast [answered again verse 23]. . . . and of the ten horns that were in his head, and of the other which came up, and before whom three fell; even of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows." Dan. 7:19, 20. The answer to this request was given as follows:-

"Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth. . . . and the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise: and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings." Dan. 7:23, 24. The fourth beast was the fourth kingdom-Rome-and the ten horns, it is plainly stated, "are ten kingdoms that shall arise," that is, ten parts into which the Roman Empire should be divided. This division is mentioned in Dan. 2:41. It was effected by the incursions of the barbarous tribes which dismembered the Roman Empire in the fourth and fifth centuries, so graphically described by Gibbon. The division was complete, and the undivided empire of Western Rome had ceased to exist, before the close of the fifth century B.C.

After the division of Rome into ten parts another power was to arise, diverse from the others, and having the characteristics mentioned in Dan. 7:8, 20, 21, 25. These characteristics are met in the papacy, and in no other power. It uprooted three powers to make room for itself, and as if to identify the papacy as the power here referred to, the pope's tiara is a triple crown; such a crown is worn by no other ruler.

"And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time." Dan. 7:25. If we find that these three specifications apply to the papacy, then it will be

useless to look further for an application for the little horn. We can give to each specification only a brief notice.

1. "He shall speak great words against the Most High." It is a notorious fact that the pope is styled the "Vicar of the Son of God," indicating that he fills the office of Christ. Paul, speaking of the papacy, which he calls the "man of sin" (2 Thess.2:3, 4), says that he "exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped." This is parallel to Dan. 7:25. It is fulfilled in the pope's claim to have power to grant indulgences, a thing which

663

God himself has never promised to do. Further, it is fulfilled in the papal dogma of infallibility. This dogma was ratified by the Council of 1870, and the following is a portion of the decree:-

"And since by the divine right of apostolic primacy the Roman pontiff is placed over the universal church, we further teach and declare that he is the *supreme judge of the faithful*, and that in all causes the decision of which belongs to the church, recourse may be had to his tribunal, and that none may re-open the judgment of the apostolic, than whose authority *there is no greater*, nor can any lawfully review its judgment."-*The Vatican Decrees, by Dr. Philip Schaff*. Although this dogma was ratified in 1870, it has been held for centuries, as is shown by the following monstrous assertion in one of the Roman decretals:-

"If the pope should become neglectful of his own salvation, and of that of other men, and so lost to all good that he draw down with himself innumerable people by heaps into hell, and plunge them with himself into eternal damnation, yet no mortal man may presume to reprehend him, for as much as he is judged of all, and to be judged of no one."-*Quoted by Wiley, History of Protestantism, Book 4, chap. 10*.

2. "And shall wear out the saints of the Most High." When we come to this particular, the evidence is overwhelming. Both time and language would fail to do justice to the matter. Prominent among papal atrocities is the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. On the 24th of August, 1572, was begun in Paris one of the most horrible cold-blooded massacres that history records,-that of the Huguenots. The king himself, Charles IX., took part in it, shooting down many of those who were attempting to escape the fury of his soldiers. The number slain throughout France on this occasion is placed by the best authorities at 70,000. To show Rome's connection with the massacre, we quote:-

"At Rome, when the news arrived, the joy was boundless. The messenger who carried the dispatch was rewarded like one who brings tidings of some great victory, and the triumph that followed was such as old Pagan Rome might have been proud to celebrate. . . . Through the streets of the Eternal City swept, in the full blaze a pontifical pomp, Gregory and his attendant train of cardinals, bishops, and monks, to the church of St. Mark, there to offer up prayers and thanksgivings to the God of Heaven for his great blessing to the See of Rome and the Roman Catholic Church. . . . On the following day the pontiff went in procession to the church of Minerva, where, after mass, a jubilee was published to all Christendom, 'that they might thank God for the slaughter of the enemies of the church lately executed in France.'"-*History of Protestantism, Book 17, chap.16, par. 15*.

But the saints were to be *worn out*. This implies more than outright slaughter. We quote one paragraph from the account of the imprisonment of the Waldenses, when, at the command of Louis XIV., who was the obedient servant of the pope, they had been driven from their valleys:-

"We know not if ever before an entire nation were in prison at once. Yet now it was so. All of the Waldensian race that remained from the sword of the executioners were immured in the dungeons of Piedmont. . . . And how were they treated in prison? As the African slave was treated on the 'middle passage.' They had a sufficiency of neither food nor clothing. The bread dealt out to them was fetid. They had putrid water to drink. They were exposed to the sun by day, and to the cold at night. They were compelled to sleep on the bare pavement, or on straw so full of vermin that the stone floor was preferable. Disease broke out in these horrible abodes, and the mortality was fearful. 'When they entered these dungeons,' says Henri Arnaud, 'they counted 14,000 healthy mountaineers, but when, at the intercession of the Swiss deputies, their prisons were opened, 3,000 skeletons only crawled out.'" -*Hist. Protestantism, Book 16, chap. 13, par. 18.*

In the above instance, we see how an entire nation was literally worn out, yet we have scarcely more than hinted at the atrocities visited upon the innocent Waldenses. In the following brief extract from the account of the martyrdom of Cranmer, we see a sample of how Rome proceeded to "wear out" individuals:-

"The fire was lighted, and then withdrawn, and lighted again, so as to consume him piecemeal. His scorch and half-burned body was raised on the pikes of the halberdiers, and tossed from one to the other to all the extent of his chain would allow; the martyr, says the martyrologist, 'lifting such hands as he had, and his finger ends flaming with fire, cried unto the people in these words, "None but Christ, none but Christ," and so being let down again from their halberds, he fell into the fire, and gave up his life.'" -*Wiley, Book 23, chap. 10.*

Certainly more is not needed to identify papal Rome as the little horn that was to "wear out the saints of the Most High." Rome has more than met the demands of the prophecy. And the one who reads the history from which these extracts are taken, must of necessity exclaim, Surely the Roman Catholic power is the woman whom the seer of Patmos saw "drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." Rev. 17:6. Happy would it be for the saints of God if they could be assured that she is sated with blood. But such assurance cannot be given; for says the prophet, "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." Dan. 7:21, 22. E. J. W.

"What Is the Use?" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

This is called a practical age. Men always ask before engaging in any business, Will it pay? And this is correct. It is useless to work to no profit, and so we have Scripture warrant for counting the cost before beginning any enterprise. But men are not always wise in their estimates. Sometimes, indeed in the

majority of instances, the results will show that the entire cost has not been counted. Some factor has been omitted, or else the individual has not looked far enough ahead. We might cite two instances:-

It is generally considered a prudent thing for men to amass wealth. "Men will praise thee, when thou doest well to thyself." Ps. 49:18. Indeed, so fixed is the idea that to get rich is the one thing essential, that few, before praising the prosperous men, stop to inquire by what means he obtained his wealth. But according to the Bible standard, the gathering of great wealth may be the most foolish thing a man can do.

The wise man says: "He that by usury and unjust gain increaseth his substance, he shall gather it for him that will pity the poor." Prov. 28:8. If people knew that men who are toiling and planning night and day in order to accumulate property, were simply working for someone else, and that they themselves should enjoy none of their savings, they would say, "How foolish to work so hard for nothing." Well, that is just what the Bible says. "He that getteth riches, and not by right, shall leave them in the midst of his day, and at his end shall be a fool." Jer. 17:11. How many foolish people there are, who by the world are counted wise.

All this exposes another shortsighted calculation that is very common, viz., that it is safe to do anything which is done by the majority of people. Precedent is a thing that has great weight, both in court and public opinion, oftentimes to the exclusion of justice. But numbers can never make wrong right, nor will the Lord remit the punishment due for the commission of crime, because very many are engaged in it. "Though hand show in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished." Prov. 11:21. And the truth of this statement has often been demonstrated. In the days of Noah, "the earth was filled with violence," because "every imagination of the thought" of man's heart "was only evil continually." Gen. 6:5, 11. Only Noah was found righteous. Yet the Lord preserved Noah, and destroyed all the wicked, "bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly." 2 Pet. 2:5.

In the days of Lot, "the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before the Lord exceedingly." Gen. 13:13. In all that city, careful search was made (Gen. 18:23-33; 19:12-14), and, besides Lot, not a righteous man was found. But the Lord had no respect to numbers, "and turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes condemned them with an overthrow, *making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly.*" 2 Pet. 2:6.

There was also a time when a single man, Elijah, stood out against the whole kingdom of Israel. He was not content with simply disagreeing with the majority, but he was earnest in reproofing both monarch and subject. Baal-worship was popular, and was, moreover, the State religion. How presumptuous that one man attempt to teach the priests and rulers! How was it possible that he alone of all the people should have the truth? And even allowing his claims, what headway could one man hope to make against a nation? What was the use of his engaging in such an unprofitable task? Thus, the doubt, many reasoned at that time. But God vindicated the faithfulness of his servant. The prophets of Baal were slain; the wicked king and queen had the death of a dog; the apostate nation was carried into captivity; and he Elijah, who was not afraid to engage in

an unpopular and seemingly unprofitable work, was taken to heaven in a chariot of fire. Who will now say that his work was to no profit? Not one.

But why is it that men can now approve Elijah's course? Simply because the sins which he particularly denounced are not now popular. For proof of this assertion, we quote from the *Friend*, a religious journal published at Honolulu, H. I. It says:-

"We have for a year or more had a couple of good brethren who among us, who have been devoting their time and strength, and the means of the organization that sent them, to the task of disseminating the idea that Saturday instead of Sunday should be observed as the day holy until Lord. We have often wished that the two brethren might see their way clear to engage in a worthier and more promising enterprise. One of them, Brother Scott, we think has gone back to whence he came, and we wish him well. The other brother still tarries among us, and we would not have him depart; but we hope in his behalf for more useful employment."

And then it quotes as follows from an exchange, concerning those were working in behalf of the Lord's Sabbath:-

"We are sorry to see such a waste of time and pain. If the past shows anything, it shows that the vast majority of Christendom always has been, and it is now, firmly persuaded that the first day of the week is the day of rest by divine appointment. Can this judgment be reversed? Is there the remotest possibility that it ever will be? It seems to us that there can be but one answer to these questions. If so, then all the good intentions and conscientious convictions of our brethren do not hinder their efforts from being thrown away. Besides, there is the injurious effect of turning men's thoughts away from the due observance of the day to the very subordinate question of its numerical designation."

Not one hint of a question do we find in the above, as to whether those who educate the observance of the seventh day are really in the right, but only the consideration of popularity. "The vast majority of Christendom always has been, and it is now, firmly persuaded that the first day of the week is the day of rest." "And since there is no probability that this verdict will ever be reversed, what is the use of trying to show its fallacy?" So the people might have talked in the days of Noah. "We are fully persuaded that the course which to us seems good is right, and you might as well quit your preaching. Better come and join us."

Likewise when Lot went out to warn the inhabitants of Sodom, "he seemed as one that mocked." No doubt he was called an old fool for his pains. And in both of these cases it was found that there was not any possibility of changing the universal verdict. Will the *Friend* say that they ought to have ceased preaching? What does the Lord say?

"Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people there transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins." Isa. 58:1. "Son of man, I send thee to the children of Israel, to a rebellious nation that hath rebelled against me; they and their fathers have transgressed against me, even unto this very day. . . . And thou shalt speak by words unto them, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear; for they are most of rebellious." Eze. 2:3-7.

The question to be asked, then, is not, "Is the prevailing sentiment favorable to my message?" or, "Is there any hope of changing the general opinion?" but, "What is truth?" As a matter of fact, the majority of people have never been in the right, in spite of all efforts to lead them in the right way, and there is indeed no hope that they ever will be. Let us cite two authorities.

Luther, as a reformer, was very much like Elijah. In reality he was more alone than was the prophet. But the strongest arguments brought against his work was that the pope, bishops, divines, counsels, and universities were against him, and that he could not hope to convince them that they were in error. The majority never were convinced, but Luther replied as follows:-

"Moses was alone when the Israelites were led out of Egypt; Elijah was alone in the time of King Ahab; Ezekiel was alone at Babylon. God has ever chosen for his prophet either the high priest, or any other person of exalted rank; he has generally chosen men of a mean and low condition,-in the instance of Amos, even a simple shepherd. The saints in every age have been called upon to rebuke the great of this world,-kings and princes, priests and scholars,-and to fulfill the office at the peril of their lives. . . . I say not that I am a prophet; but I say that they have the more reason to fear *because* I am alone, and they are many. Of this I am sure, that the word of God is with me, and that it is not with them."

"But it is further objected that men high in station pursued me with their censures. What then! Do not the Scriptures clearly show. . . That the majority has always been on the side of falsehood, and that the minority only on the side of truth? It is the fate of truth to occasion an outcry."-*D'Aubigne's Hist. Reformation, Part 1, Book 7, par. 168, 173.*

The second authority, we have only to refer to the overwhelming wickedness in the times of Noah and Lot, and then read these words of Christ, which brings the matter home to our own day:-

"And as it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all. Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." Luke 17:26-30.

These illustrations are sufficient to show us that instead of appealing to common custom for proof of the correctness of any practice, that very fact ought to cause us to doubt. "The customs of the people are vain." Jer. 10:3. And it will not do to say that, in the instances mentioned, those who were in the majority, and wrong, were heathen, while, in the matter of Sunday observance, the majority are Christians. In Elijah's time it was the house of Israel-the church-that had taken Baal in preference to Jehovah. Ezekiel was sent with his warnings to the church of God; and in order that he might perform his thankless task, it was necessary that his face should be made "harder than flint." Moreover, he was plainly told that the house of Israel would not listen to him. Eze. 3:4-9. Isaiah was commanded to show God's people their transgression. John the Baptist lifted up his voice in the wilderness against the sins of the very leaders of the church. And

it was solely on account of the corruption of the church that Luther began to preach the reformation. Since our reverence for God is measured only by our obedience, and not by our profession, all those who persist in violating any of God's commandments are termed heathen. Throughout the Bible, the judgments of God are pronounced only against the heathen; and many who say, "Lord, Lord," will receive those judgments. So in this matter, if it can be shown that God has commanded us to keep the seventh day of the week, those who work to that end are engaged in a profitable business, even though the professed church will not hear. Those who do his commandments shall have right to the tree of life.

Next week we shall continue this subject, and

665

show that the "numerical designation" of the day is not a "subordinate question," and that whatever "injurious effects" may follow the preaching of truth, no blame can be attached to the few who thus labor against the majority. E. J. W.

"The Best Argument for Sunday" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

From the *Review* of October 27th, we learned that Sabbath-keepers in Arkansas are being put to serious trouble on account of their faith. Formerly there was provision made in the Sunday law of that State, so that those who conscientiously observed the seventh day of the week were not liable to arrest for working on the first day of the week. Last spring, however, this provision was repealed, and now all who do any work on Sunday are liable to heavy fines and imprisonment.

As a natural consequence of the law as it exists at present, quite a number of Sabbath-keepers have been arrested, and Elder Wood, who is laboring there and knows the state of feeling, thinks that there will be scores of arrests before the holidays. The brethren in Arkansas are poor, and can ill afford the expense and loss of time incident to court proceedings, even should they not be convicted; any persons wishing to aid them in their time of need can forward money for that purpose to F. N. Elmore, Springdale, Ark., and it will be thankfully received and properly applied.

The leaders of the so-called National Reform party have been constant in their assurances that no harm was intended by them to the conscientious observers of the seventh day. They have often seemed to feel grieved and indignant because we have said that persecution would be the necessary result of their efforts to enforce Sunday observance. But, in spite of their pacific assurance, it has happened that, at every time the law would allow, Seventh-day Adventists have been promptly indicted for working on Sunday. If this is not a persecution because of religious convictions, then the popes of Rome never conducted such persecution.

None of our brethren need be surprised when such persecution comes. For years we have been suspecting it, knowing that it would come, because the "sure word of prophecy" plainly said that it would. The fulfillment of this prophecy is only a warning that the end is near, and an admonition to us to redouble our diligence. Here in California we have had an opportunity to see how quickly the

spirit of persecution becomes rampant as soon as there is the slightest prospect of enforcing a Sunday law. And we shall watch with prayerful interest the proceedings in Arkansas. Whatever the immediate result, we are certain that God will make the wrath of man to praise him. E. J. W.

"Where Shall the Line Be Drawn" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Weekly*, after making a statement that polygamy is not the only evil of Mormonism, says:-

"Its unrepresentative hierarchy, that exalts the church above the Government, and demands unconditional obedience to its requirements, whatever may be the law of the land, makes it a dangerous institution in a country where the ballot box should be free from each ecclesiastical domination."

With the truth contained in the above quotation, there is also a very popular error. It is a truth that cannot be too often repeated at the present day, that the ballot box should be free from ecclesiastical domination. We say that this truth cannot be too often repeated at the present day, because there is not an influential and rapidly increasing party (not Mormons) whose great aim is to have the State legislate on matters pertaining to religion; or, in other words, to place the ballot box under the control of the church. When this state of things shall be brought about, the liberties of American people will be at an end. We protest, therefore, against the ecclesiastical domination in political affairs, whether it be by Mormons or by Christians; with either class the results would be the same, for no matter how pure a church may be, if it has civil power it will persecute just as quickly as will the corrupt church. So Mormon domination of the ballot box is to be objected to, not simply because it is Mormon domination, but because it is ecclesiastical domination.

The error in the quotation is in supposing that it is wrong in principle to obey the requirements of the church, "whatever may be the law of the *land*." We are no apologists for the Mormonism, but we say that this principle is not the one at issue. The question for individuals to settle is, Are the teachings of the church in strict harmony with the Bible, making unperverted Bible truth the sole standard? If fair and candid investigation shows that these teachings are in perfect accord with the Bible, then he should obey them, whatever may be the law of the land. "The powers that be are ordained of God." Then certainly they have no right to contravene the laws of God.

As a matter of fact, the Mormons are guilty of a sin, not against God alone, but against man as well. Murder, adultery, and theft are sins which destroy the well-being of society. If these things were allowed to be practiced with impunity, human governments, which God has ordained, would be overthrown. Therefore they must not be tolerated. On this ground, and this alone, the pet abomination of the Mormons should be suppressed by the Government. But a practice which is in strict accord with God's word, will not be detrimental to society; and against such a practice the Government has no right to enact a law; if it should, the people would be in duty bound to break that law.

No one need be confused over this matter. The Christian's duty is plain: "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29); and if people would always remember this, and live accordingly, they would never make laws to suit their own inclinations or propensities, and try to palm them off on the people as the laws of God. E. J. W.

November 12, 1885

"The 1260 Days" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST 6 DEC. 5

The 1260 Days

Our lesson this week is confined to the last clause of Dan. 7:25: "And they shall be given into his hands until a time and time and the dividing of time." The "they" of course refers to the "saints of the Most High" and the "time and times and the dividing of time," then, indicates the period of papal supremacy; for we have already seen that the little horn symbolizes the Roman Catholic power.

In the first place we may notice that in the Douay Bible, as well as in the Revised Version, "time and times and the dividing of times," is rendered, "time, and times, and *half* a time." We have no need to conjecture what this means, for the Bible is its own interpreter. In Rev. 12:14 we find the same period of time mentioned: "And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent." Now in verse 6 of the same chapter the same event is brought to view in these words: "And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and threescore days." From these two verses we learn that "a time, and times, and half a time" is only another expression for twelve hundred and sixty days. Then the little horn of Daniel 7 was to have supremacy for twelve hundred and sixty days.

But the question now arises, "Is it possible that only twelve hundred and sixty days, three years and a half, covers the whole time which the prophecy allows to the papacy?" We answer, No; and the explanation is simple. The prophecy is symbolic; four mighty empires are represented by beasts; the Roman Catholic power is represented by a little horn of one of the beasts. It is obvious, then, that the prophecy would not be consistent if it should express the duration of those powers in literal years. The time would be out of proportion to the nature of the symbol representing the power. Therefore it is evident that the time must also be symbolic. We inquire, then, What is the standard of time when used in symbolic prophecy? In Eze: 4:4-6 we read the answer:-

"Lie thou also upon thy left side, and lay the iniquity of the house of Israel upon it; according to the number of the days that thou shalt lie upon it thou shalt bear their iniquity. For I have laid upon thee the years of their iniquity, according to the number of the days, three hundred and ninety days; so shalt thou bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. And when thou hast accomplished them, lie again on thy right side, and thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days; *I have appointed thee each day for a year.*"

The next question to be settled is, When does this period of time begin and end? There are several dates given by various authors to mark the rise of papal supremacy, but 538 A.D. seems to be the one that has the only just claim to consideration. The prophet in describing the rise of the little horn, says "He shall subdue three kings." Dan. 7:24. This is in explanation of the fact that three horns were to be plucked up before it. Of course the only powers that would be rooted up to do make room for the Catholic power would be those were all opposed to it. Now long before 538 A.D., paganism, as a State religion in the Roman Empire, was dead. Since the time of Constantine, and had been nominally Christian. The barbarous tribes by which the empire was divided into the ten parts, also embraced the Christianity of the empire. Says D'Aubigne:-

"Already the forests of the North poured forth the most effectual promoters of the papal power. The barbarians who had invaded the West and settled themselves therein,-but recently converted to Christianity,-ignorant of the spiritual character of the church, and feeling the want of an external pomp of religion, prostrated themselves in a half savage and a half heathen state of mind at the feet of their chief priest Rome."-*Hist. Reformation, Book 1, chap. 1, part. 31.*

But not all of these tribes were favorable to the pretensions of the bishops of Rome. Some of them, especially the Heruli, the Vandals, and the Ostrogoths, were Arian in faith. The contest between the Catholics and Arians was bitter and unrelenting, and so long as these powers held Italy and the adjacent country, no Catholic bishop could rule in Rome. In the year 494 A.D., the power of the Heruli was annihilated by the death of one Odoacer. From that time it is impossible to trace them in history. In 534 the Vandals were conquered by Belisarius, the general of Justinian; and in 538 A.D., Rome, which until that time had been in possession of the Arian Ostrogoths, was occupied by the Roman army, and the Catholic religion was established. These conquests are described in detail in the 39th and 41st chapters of Gibbon.

When these Arian powers were overthrown (A.D. 538), previous imperial decrees concerning the bishop of Rome could go into effect. Speaking of the way in which the fallen bishop gradually usurped power over other churches, D'Aubigne says:-

"To silence the cries of the churches, Rome found new allies. Princes who in those troublesome times often found their thrones tottering, offered their adherence to the church in exchange for her support. They yielded to her spiritual authority, on condition of her paying them with secular dominion. They left her to deal at will with the *souls* of men, provided only she would deliver them from their enemies. The power of the hierarchy in the ascending scale, and of the

imperial power which was declining, leaned thus one toward another, and so accelerated the twofold destiny.

"Rome could not lose by this. An edict of one Theodosius II. and of Valentinian III. proclaimed the bishop of Rome 'ruler of all the churches.' Justinian issued a similar decree. These decrees did not contain all that the popes pretended to see in them. But in those times of ignorance it was easy for them to gain reception for that interpretation which was most favorable to themselves."-*Hist. Ref., Book 1, chap. 1, par. 29, 30.*

To show plainly the object of these wars against the Arian powers, and what was gained by them, we make two brief quotations from Gibbon. After having rehearsed the defeat of the Vandals and the capture of Carthage by the Romans, the historian speaks as follows concerning Justinian:-

"He received the messengers of victory at the time when he was preparing to publish the pandects of the Roman law; and the devout or jealous emperor celebrated the divine goodness, and confessed in silence the merit of his successful general. Impatient to abolish the temporal and spiritual tyranny of the Vandals, he proceeded without delay to the full establishment of the Catholic church. Her jurisdiction, wealth, and immunities, perhaps the most essential part of the episcopal religion, were restored and amplified with a liberal hand; the Arian worship was suppressed, the Donatist meetings were proscribed; and the Synod of Carthage, by the voice of two hundred and seventeen bishops, applauded the just measure of pious retaliation."-*Decline and Fall, chap. 41, par. 11.*

The victory of Belisarius over the Ostrogoths (A.D. 538) is thus described:-

"The Goths consented to retreat in the presence of a victorious enemy; to delay till the next spring the operations of offensive war; to summon their scattered forces; to relinquish their distant possessions, and to trust even Rome itself to the faith of its inhabitants. Leuderis, an aged warrior, was left in the capital with four thousand soldiers; a feeble garrison, which might have seconded the zeal, though it was incapable of opposing the wishes, of the Romans. But a momentary enthusiasm of religion and patriotism was kindled in their minds. They furiously exclaimed that the apostolic throne should no longer be profaned by the triumph or toleration of Arianism; that the tombs of the Cæsars should no longer be trampled by the savages of the North; and without reflecting that Italy must sink into a province of Constantinople, they fondly hailed the restoration of a Roman emperor as a new era of freedom and prosperity. The deputies of the pope and clergy, of the senate and people, invited the lieutenant of Justinian to accept their voluntary allegiance, and to enter the city, whose gates would be thrown open for his reception. . . . The first days, which coincided with the old Saturnalia, were devoted to mutual congratulation and the public joy, and the Catholics prepared to celebrate, without a rival, the approaching festival of the nativity of Christ."-*Decline and Fall, chap. 41, par. 22, 23.*

These quotations show most conclusively that in A.D. 538 the bishop of Rome did become literally "the pope," *i.e.*, the father, or head and ruler, of the churches. The last opposing horn had then been plucked up, and the papacy was free to enter upon that career of ecclesiastical tyranny which it had long been preparing

for. And since this career was to continue 1260 years, it is evident that it must have been stopped in the year 1798 A.D. Let us see if at that time anything happened to justify this conclusion. From "Chambers' Cyclopaedia," art. "Pius," we quote:-

"At length the [French] Directory ordered the invasion of Rome; Berthier entered the city February 10, 1798, took possession of the castle of St. Angelo. Pius [VI.] was called on to renounce his temporal sovereignty, and on his refusal, was seized, February 20, and carried away to Siena, afterwards to the celebrated Certosa, or Carthusian Monastery, of Florence. On the threatened advance of the Austro-Russian army in the following year, he was transferred to Grenoble, and finally to Valence on the Rhone, where, worn out by age and by the rigor of confinement, he died in August, 1799, in the 82nd year of his age, and the 24th of his pontificate. . . . After the death of Pious VI., Cardinal Chiaramonte was chosen his successor (March 14, 1800). Rome, which up to this time had been in the occupation of the French, was not restored to the papal authority, and the July of that year Pious VII. entered into his capital."

Thus we see that from 538 to 1798 A.D. there were 1260 years of unbroken power. Plainly fulfilling the prophecy. It would be interesting to study the position of papal Rome before and after this period of supremacy, but that will have to be deferred till another time. E. J. W.

"Which Is Evangelical?" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

The following is a portion of an editorial note in the *Pacific* of June 10:-

"The election of the Rev. Edward White to the chairmanship of the Congregational Union of England and Wales is sure to be noted as indicating the tendencies of belief among the Independent there. Mr. White is by far the most pronounced and prominent advocate of the doctrine of 'eternal life only in Christ.' Of course, he was not elected because of his advocacy of that tenet. He is a man of great energy and ability, and has done yeoman service for the Free Churches of England. He is also a thoroughly Evangelical minister, if we act except this particular divergence."

And "evangelical minister," according to Webster, is one who is "earnest for the truth taught in the gospel; fervent and devout; strict in interpreting Christian doctrine;" and the *Pacific* says that one who believes that we have a "eternal life only in Christ," is not, in that particular, evangelical. Let us see whether Mr. White or the *Pacific* is evangelical on the immortality question. The New Testament must, of course, decide the matter.

To start with, we take that most wonderful of texts, John 3:16:

681

"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." What do we learn from this verse?

1. That God's love for the world was so great as to cause him to send his Son for their rescue. We can judge something of God's love for his Son, when we remember that Christ was the brightest of the Father's glory, "and the express

image of his person," that he was "heir of all things," the one by whom the worlds were made (Heb. 1:2, 3); and that "in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." Col. 2:9. God is infinite in all his attributes and therefore his love for his Son was infinite. And since he gave his Son for the world, we know how great was his love for the world. It was infinite.

2. The worth of the sacrifice shows the extent of the need. God would not lightly give his Son to suffer and die; it must be that without that gift there was no possibility for man to be rescued from his condition, and to receive that which was offered to him.

3. We are plainly told that this wonderful sacrifice was made that those who would believe in Christ might not perish, but that they might have everlasting life. Men can believe in Christ and have everlasting life, or he can disbelieve and perish. There is no other alternative. The choice is not between happiness and misery, but between life and death. With eternal life in the presence of God, happiness must necessarily be associated, but it is secondary. Eternal life is what Christ says we get by believing on him. To deny that we get to eternal life only through Christ, is to deny the words of Christ. Mr. White accepts the words of Christ; the *Pacific* says, Not so. Which is evangelical?

Let us imagine that Nicodemus held to the doctrine of inherent immortality, as advocated by the *Pacific* and many others. Then when Christ said, "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," Nicodemus would have recorded, "Well, he needn't have gone to all that trouble, for we shall have the eternal life any way. If that's what you came for, you came to no purpose." Do you say that such language would be insulting? We admit it, but how many are saying the same thing to-day!

The doctrine of "eternal life only in Christ" is not evangelical, says the *Pacific*. Then the author of the gospel must be declared unevangelical; for he says, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." John 3:36. Is not this eternal life only in Christ?

Other texts are simply a repetition of the statement already made. Says Christ, "I am come that they might have life." John 10:10. Says the *Pacific*, "You are too late; we have it already."

Again the Saviour said to the unbelieving Jews: "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." John 5:40. We can imagine the pitiful tone in which he spoke these words, and the sorrow of his heart, as "he came unto his own, and his own received him not." And then to think that he knew all that this coming implied, -the agony in the garden, the brutal insults and cruel scourging in the judgment hall, and the shameful death on the cross, what for? "That they might have life." Was Christ deceived? Was his anxious solicitude for man called a mistake? and was his sacrifice a useless waste of life? Evidently so, if men could have life outside of Christ. But he was not deceived; none so well as he could know man's terrible need, and the eternal destruction that must follow if the sacrifice was not made. Then how terribly deceived must those be who, in response to Christ's pathetic appeal, virtually say, "We don't need to come to you that we might have life; we

can get it without your assistance." Fatal delusion! What an insult to the Son God!

Once more. Said Christ, in that wonderful prayer which was not for the apostles alone, but for them who should believe through their word: "Father, . . . glorify thy Son, . . . as thou hast given him power over all flesh, *that he should give eternal life* to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." John 17:1-3. Would the *Pacific* say that Christ was "thoroughly evangelical, if we except this particular divergence"?

Perhaps the *Pacific* has another standard of evangelicalism. But for "this particular divergence," Mr. White would be "a thoroughly Evangelical minister." Divergence from what? Not from the Testament and the teaching of Christ, as we have clearly seen. What then? Ah, now we have it. The Rev. Edward White is a Congregationalist, and in general holds to the doctrines which the Congregationalist body holds in common with the great mass of professed Christians. But this same mass of professed Christians does not accept the doctrine of "eternal life only in Christ," and it is in "this particular divergence" that Mr. White is unevangelical. If it were not for that, he would be "thoroughly evangelical." Then it is evident that, according to the *Pacific*, popular belief, and not the New Testament, is the standard of evangelical principles. Popularity seems to be the accepted standard; but in spite of the great number on the popular side, we can't help believing that the Bible is true, and that Jesus meant what he said.

What is a record? "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." 1 John 5:11, 12. Is not this "eternal life only in Christ"? It certainly is, and it is evangelical doctrine, too.

"For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life of Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6:23. "No, no," says the *Pacific*, "Paul is mistaken; eternal life doesn't come 'through Jesus Christ our Lord;' or, even if it does sometimes come through him, we can get it without him just as well." Again we ask, Which is evangelical?

Sometimes people say, "Well, it is of no practical importance what you believe concerning the immortality of the soul." We think that the intelligent reader can see that it is of a great deal of importance. It is a question of whether we shall give Christ the honor that is his due, or whether we shall withhold from him all his honor. One of his titles is "our life." See Col. 3:4. Nowhere in the Bible can we find that he came for any other purpose than to give life to those who would believe on him. His sole object in coming to earth to suffer and die, was to give life. And now if we say that Christ did not bring "life and immortality to light through the gospel," but that Socrates or Plato brought it to light, then we exalt a heathen philosopher above Christ, and rob the Lord of glory of his crown. The work of Spiritualism to-day is to convince men that they have life in themselves, instead of in Christ; and thousands who profess to be evangelical, and to abhor Spiritualism, are doing their best to help along that delusion of Satan. And this popular doctrine, which is so flattering to the pride of the human heart, that man

is not dependent for eternal life on any source outside of himself, is that which will eventually sweep millions of professed lovers of the Lord into the ranks of those who openly blaspheme his name.

Reader, where do you stand? Do you profess to love the Lord Jesus Christ? Then do not any longer refuse to acknowledge that which will constitute his crown of glory and rejoicing. "My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth." 1 John 3:18. E. J. W.

November 19, 1885

"The Little Horn of Daniel 8" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST DEC. 12

The Little Horn of Daniel 8

In a previous lesson we have had mentioned of the little horn of Daniel 8, and we there took occasion to state that this little horn must not be confounded with that of Daniel 7. The latter, as we of seen, refers to the papacy only, to Rome during only a part of its career; the former refers to the whole duration of Rome, both in its pagan and papal forms, and covers the same ground as the fourth beast and all of its horns. The truth of this may be verified by an examination of the prophecy.

Verses 20, 21 of chapter 8, plainly tell us that the ram and the goat, the two powers that preceded the little horn, represented Medo-Persia and Grecia. But these two empires were the second and third in a series of four universal empires which cover the entire history of the world from about 625 B.C., beginning with Babylon. The prophecies of Daniel 2 and 7 show that there were to be but four kingdoms. Then since there was but one to come after Grecia, whatever universal empire we find after that empire must be the one. From Luke 2:1 we have seen that Rome filled the specifications as a universal empire; and therefore it must be represented by the little horn, for that was to be greater than any of its predecessors.

We will now notice a few of the characteristics of this little horn, and show their fulfillment in the Roman power. Verses 23 and 24 described it best: "And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of *fierce countenance*, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power; and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people." Compare this with Deut. 28:49, 50: "The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth; a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand; a nation of fierce countenance,

which shall not regard the person of the old, nor show favour to the young." Note the similar expressions in the two passages. Fierceness of countenance may well be applied to a power that in Dan. 7:7 is represented by a beast, "dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly;" and its destructive propensities, as brought out in the two passages, correspond to the statement in Dan. 7:7. "Understanding dark sentences," said the angel to Daniel; "whose tongue thou shalt not understand," said Moses. This also applies to the Romans, whose language, in the Latin, was entirely different from the Hebrew. With the languages of the neighboring countries, Assyria, Babylon, etc., the Hebrew tongue was closely related, but it had no connection with the Latin.

Read carefully the whole of Deut. 28:49-57, which, as has been shown above, refers to the power mentioned in Dan. 8:23, 24, and then compare with it the following from the account by Josephus of the siege of Jerusalem by the Romans:-

"Now, of those that perished by famine and the city, the number was prodigious, and the miseries were unspeakable; for if so much as the shadow of any kind of food did anywhere appear, a war was commenced presently; and the dearest friends fell a-fighting one with another about it, snatching from each other the most miserable supports of life. Nor would men believe that those who were dying had no food; for the robbers would search them when they were expiring, lest anyone should have concealed food in their bosoms, and counterfeited dying, nay, these robbers gaped for want, and ran about stumbling and staggering along like mad dogs, and reeling against the doors of the houses like drunken men; they would also, in the great distress they were in, rush into the very same houses two or three times in one and the same day. Moreover, their hunger was so intolerable, that it obliged them to chew everything, while they gathered such things as the most sordid animals would not touch, and endured to eat them; nor did they at length abstain from girdles and shoes; and the very leather which belonged to their shields they pulled off and gnawed; the very wisps of old hay became food to some; and some gathered up fibers, and sold a very small weight of them for four Attic (drachmae). But why do I describe the shameless impudence that the famine brought upon men in their eating inanimate things while I am going to relate a matter of fact, the like to which no history relates, either among the Greeks or barbarians!-it is so horrible to speak of it, and incredible when heard! I have indeed willingly omitted this calamity of force, that I might not seem to deliver what is so portentous to posterity, but that I have innumerable witnesses to it in my own age; and besides, by country would have had little reason to thank me for suppressing the miseries that she underwent at this time.

"There was a certain woman that dwelt beyond Jordan, her name was Mary; her father was Eleazar, of the village Bethzob, which signifies *The House of Hyssop*. She was eminent for her family and her wealth, and had fled away to Jerusalem with the rest of the multitude, and was with them besieged therein at this time. The other effects of this woman had been already seized upon; such I mean as she had brought with her of Perea and removed to the city. What she had treasured up of besides, as also what food she had contrived to save, had

been also carried off by the rapacious guards, who came every day running into her house for that purpose. This put the poor woman into a very great passion, and by the frequent reproaches and imprecations she cast at these rapacious villains, she had provoked them to anger against her; but none of them, either out of the indignation she had raised against herself, or out of commiseration of her case, would take away her life; and if she found any food she perceived her labors were for others, and not for herself; and it was now become impossible for her any way to find any more food, while the famine pierced through her very bowel and marrow, when also her passion was fired to a degree beyond the famine itself; nor did she consult with anything but with her passion and the necessity she was in. She then attempted a most unnatural thing; and, snatching up her son, who was a child sucking at her breast, she said, "O thou miserable infant! for whom shall I preserve thee in this war, this famine, and this sedition? As to the war with the Romans, if they preserve our lives, we must be slaves? This famine also will destroy us, even before that slavery comes upon us; yet are these seditious rogues more terrible than both the other. Come on; be thou my food, and be thou a fury to these seditious variets and a by-word to the world, which is all that is now wanting to complete the calamities of us Jews.

"And soon as she had said this she slew her son; and then roasted him, and ate the one half of him, and kept the other half by her concealed. Upon this the seditious came in presently, and smelling the scent of this food, they threatened her that they would cut her throat immediately if she did not show them what food she had gotten ready. She replied that she had saved a very fine portion of it for them; and withal uncovered what was left of her son. Hereupon they were seized with a horror and amazement of mind, and stood astonished at the sight; she said to them, 'This is mine own son; and what hath been done was mine own doing! Come, eat of this food; for I have eaten of it myself! Do not you pretend to be either more tender than a woman, or more compassionate than a mother; but if you be so scrupulous, and do abominate this my sacrifice, as I have eaten the one half let the rest be preserved for me also.' After which, those men went out trembling, being never so much affrighted at anything as they were at this, and with some difficulty they left the rest of that meat to the mother. Upon which the whole city was full of this horrid action immediately; and while everybody laid this miserable case before their own eyes, they trembled, as if this unheard-of action had been done by themselves. So those that were thus distressed by the famine were very desirous to die; and those already dead were esteemed happy, because they had not lived long enough either to hear or to see such miseries."- *Wars of the Jews, Book 6, chap. 8.*

If only one more point can be noted concerning this little horn, and that is to show the change from pagan to papal Rome, for that is expressly noted. We quote: "Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host [evidently referring to Christ, see verse 25, last clause], and by him the daily was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. And a host was given him against the daily by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground, and it practice, and prospered." Dan. 8:11, 12. In this quotation we have purposely omitted the word *sacrifice*, because it is superfluous. There is nothing

in the original that gives even the slightest hint of such a word. From verse 13 we learn what should be understood after "daily." "How long shall be the vision concerning the daily and the transgression of desolation?" The daily what? Why, the daily desolation, of course. So then we have in this chapter a mighty desolating power brought to view under two phases,-the daily desolation, and the transgression of desolation. These two expressions can refer to nothing else but the two great phases of Rome, paganism and papacy.

"By him the daily was taken away." The change from pagan to papal Rome was effected by Rome itself, and not as a measure forced upon her by an outside power. It was the Roman emperors themselves, who, influenced by the bishops, decreed that Christianity should be the religion of the empire.

"And an host was given him against the daily." Although the change from paganism to papacy was begun and consummated within Rome itself. It was not without help. The hordes of barbarous tribes came from the North and overran the Roman Empire, became identified with it, accepted its religion, and were active agents in converting (by force of arms) others to that religion. Says D'Aubigne:-

"But already the forests of the North had poured forth the most effectual promoters of papal power. The barbarians who had invaded the West, and settled themselves therein,-but recently converted to Christianity,-ignorant of the spiritual character of the church, and feeling the want of an external pomp of religion, prostrated themselves in a half savage and half heathen state of mind at the feet of the chief priest of Rome. At the same time the people of the West also submitted to him. First the Vandals, then the Ostrogoths, a short time after the Burgundians and the Alains, then the Visigoths, and at last the Lombards and the Anglo-Saxon came bowing the knee to the Roman pontiff. It was the sturdy shoulders of the idolatrous children of the North, which elevated to the Supreme throne of Christendom a pastor of the banks of the Tiber."-*Hist. Ref., Book 1, chap. 1, par. 51.* E. J. W.

"Making Trouble" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

"And it came to pass, when Ahab saw Elijah, that Ahab said unto him, Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" 1 Kings 18:17. This question was asked when Elijah met Ahab as he and his servants were searching for water. What had Elijah done, that he should be accused of troubling Israel? He had rebuked them for their idolatry, into which they had been led by Ahab and his father. In consequence of the almost universal wickedness, Elijah had declared, from the Lord, that there should be no rain. For three years there had been no rain, and yet idolatry did not cease, nor did Ahab abate his wickedness. To some people it would seem that Elijah's preaching was in vain, and that, since no one heeded it, it would have been better to leave the people to worship their idols in peace. And no doubt Ahab voiced the sentiment of the people, when he accused Elijah of being the author of all their trouble.

But what did Elijah say? "And he answered, I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father's house, in that ye have forsaken the commandment of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim." Here Elijah threw the entire responsibility upon Ahab and his family, because they have led the people into idolatry. How could that be, when the people were enjoying the peace and quiet until Elijah came with his stern message? The reason is, the people were violating God's commandments, a thing which always brings his displeasure. The judgments of God will be visited upon those who persist in violating his law. But God never punishes any people until he has faithfully warned them of their sin. This was the part which Elijah had performed. He was God's messenger. After he had warned them to no purpose, a slight manifestation of God's wrath against ungodliness was made. But who was responsible for this manifestation of wrath? Was it Elijah? All will agree, with Elijah that the responsibility rested upon those who had done the wrong. The case against them is clear.

Now another point. Since even the people of Israel could not be induced to leave their idols and serve Jehovah (for although they acknowledge that the Lord is God, they went back into idolatry, and were destroyed as a nation in consequence), would it not have been better to leave them alone? If they were determined not to serve Jehovah, was it not wrong for Elijah to cause them to lose confidence in Baal, by showing his lack of power? Who will say yes? Not one. Baal-worship would do no good, and they might better worship nothing. There was no power in Baal to reward them for worshiping him, or to protect them from the wrath of Jehovah, and therefore they might as well be atheists as to serve Baal. No person will have the hardihood to say that the worship of Baal was any improvement on no worship at all. Now for the parallel.

In these days we find that a large majority of the people professing Christianity call the first day of the week the holy rest-day-the Lord's day. But God says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." Moreover, as he commanded the people anciently to break their images, so he commands people to trample upon Sunday as a day of rest, saying, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work." "Six days thou shalt work; but on *the* seventh day thou shalt rest." Ex. 34:21.

But now it comes to pass when the truth on the Sabbath question is preached, while very many acknowledge, and many more are convinced at heart, that the seventh day-Saturday-is the Bible Sabbath, very few have the courage of their convictions, and walk in obedience to the commandment. Still further, the most of those who are convinced that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and do not keep it, having seen the utter absence of any Bible proof to sustain the Sunday-Sabbath, very naturally lose much of their respect for that day. And on this account it is often said that the preaching of the seventh-day Sabbath has an injurious effect; it unsettles the faith of many in regard to their present practice, while few make a radical change. We now ask, Is this an injury? and if it is, who is responsible for the injurious effects.

Is it more pleasing in the sight of God to keep Sunday than to regard no day as holy? To keep the first day and violate the seventh, is direct disobedience to God's law. Any transgression of the law is sin. To break the Sabbath, and keep

no day at all, is also direct violation of the law. This also is sin. Who can say that the latter sin is worse than the former? And if it be decided that the second is the greater sin, what is the advantage, since both are sins? God does not tell us to choose the smaller of two sins, but to put away all sin.

Question: Is it simply a spirit of worship that is required by the first commandment, or is it the worship of a special object? You say, It is the worship of one particular Being,-the Lord of heaven and earth. Then the design of the commandment can in nowise be met by worshiping some other object? Of course not; for that commandment particularly forbids the worship of anything except the true God. Well, the fourth commandment requires the observance of a special day of the week-the seventh-and forbids the observance of any other. The commandment does not simply require rest in the abstract, but rest of the day which he has appointed. To offer him any other day, is simply to ask him to be satisfied with a counterfeit.

When a laborer goes to his employer's office to receive his wages, he confidently expects to receive the amount before agreed upon, in good coin. Will he be satisfied with counterfeit money? By no means. But will not the counterfeit money be better than nothing? Not a bit; indeed, it may prove to be worse than no money; for while he cannot purchase a morsel of bread with it, he may get into serious trouble if he attempts to pass it. We think the illustration will hold good in every particular when applied to the Sabbath question. The seventh day is the genuine Sabbath; it has God's stamp upon it. The Sunday is only a base counterfeit; it bears none of the marks of genuineness. Now while this counterfeit Sabbath is worth nothing, it may get us into serious trouble if we persist, in attempting to pass it instead of the genuine. See Rev. 14:9-12. As with the counterfeit coin, so with the counterfeit Sabbath,-*honest* ignorance that it is counterfeit may be accepted as an excuse; but when the man is told, or has an opportunity to know, that the coin is counterfeit, what excuse can he make? His unbelief will not save him.

The one who detects a counterfeit coin, and informs the one who holds it that is of no value, is not called a troublesome fellow, although he materially mars the peace of the possessor of the coin. The one who made the base coin, and they who persist in circulating it, are the real enemies of their fellows. So those who make known the truth concerning the Lord's Sabbath and its counterfeit are the friends, not the enemies, of their fellow-men. They are obeying the command of God: "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people there transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins."

The man who detects a counterfeit coin in his neighbor's possession does not offer a good one in its place; but those who show the worthlessness of the Sunday-sabbath, offer in its stead the Sabbath which bears the stamp of Jehovah, and which will be accepted at the gate of Heaven. If men refuse to accept the genuine, and go without any, it is their own fault. When the true Sabbath is presented, "Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil." Isa. 56:2. E. J. W.

"Numerical Designation' in the Sabbath Commandment" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

In an article recently quoted from the *Friend*, was the statement that the agitation of the Sabbath question tends to turn men's thoughts "away from the proper observance of the day, to the very subordinate question of its numerical designation." In that sentence the writer expressed a very popular idea, one which we regard as a grave error, namely, that the "numerical designation" of the day is a minor affair in Sabbath observance. It seems to be the general idea that the main question concerning the Sabbath is, *How* should it be kept? and not, *When* should it be kept? We consider both questions highly important, but think their order should be reversed.

What is impossible to say that one of two things is more important than the other when both are absolutely essential, we may readily determine which of them must first be considered. We have therefore no hesitation in saying that the "numerical designation" of the day is the first thing of importance in considering the question of Sabbath observance. If a man is told, "You ought to keep the Sabbath day," the first question he would ask, if he knew nothing at all about the subject, would be, "What is the Sabbath day?"

Now if we read the commandment we shall find that this is indeed the first point considered. "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

We see that in the commandment the Sabbath is introduced as an institution already well known. Then the first thing after the commandment proper, which is contained in the first clause, is the "numerical designation" of the day. "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." So important did the Lord regard the "numerical designation" of the day, that he fixed that the very first thing. Then come directions for the proper observance of the day: "In it thou shalt not do any work." That is, any of *thy* work, which must be performed in the preceding six days.

There are but seven days in a week, and the first day is the one commonly called Sunday. Every calendar and dictionary bears witness to this. More than this, the chief and indeed the only reason given for Sunday observance is that it commemorates the resurrection of Christ. But the resurrection of Christ was on the first day of the week; and thus Sunday observance everywhere and always record their belief that Sunday is the first day of the week.

697

To deny that fact would be to overthrow their only argument for Sunday observance. But just as surely as Sunday is the first day of the week, Saturday is the seventh day. Well, the Lord says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the

Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." If the "numerical designation" of the day is a matter of minor importance, will our friends please explain the fourth commandment?

We repeat that before we can consider the "proper observance of the day" of the Sabbath, it is absolutely necessary that we determine what particular day of the week the Sabbath is. For no matter how strictly we observe a day, abstaining from our own labor on it, and devoting its hours to the worship of God, that cannot constitute a "proper observance of the Sabbath," if the day itself is not the Sabbath. This fact seems so self-evident as to make argument useless. Moreover, if the rest and worship mentioned above be upon some one of the six days which God has devoted to labor, then that rest is not a proper observance of that day. We do not say that Sunday or Monday or any other day of the week may not be used, on occasions, for religious worship, but we do say that for a regular practice, the only "proper observance" of Sunday, as well as of the five days following, is labor. And the only "proper observance of the Sabbath" is rest and worship on the seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday. And this we say "by the word of the Lord." See Ex. 16:22-30; 20:8-11; Luke 23:54-56. E. J. W.

"How It May Be Done" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

Says the Portland *Baptist*: "Let our ambition be *first* to make men Christians, *then* Baptists." And the *Herald of Truth* says: "All genuine denominational feeling responds to this, Amen." We confess that we cannot understand such expressions. Is a Baptist more or less than a Christian? Neither of the papers referred to will claim that a Baptist is *more* than a Christian. To be a *Christian* is the highest point to which sanctified ambition can look. Well, then, is a Baptist *less* than a Christian? If so, why should the good brethren who conduct these papers wish to lower the standard of any who are in such a desirable position? We know that they would not, and therefore we conclude that according to their idea a Baptist *is* a Christian. We have no disposition to deny this; but if it is so, why do they not say directly that their ambition is to make men Baptists?

There is a spirit which, for want of a better name, might be called "denominational cowardice." It makes men fear to seem to place their own denomination above any other. We confess that we have no sympathy with such a spirit. We like to see people have decided convictions. If a man unites with a certain denomination, it should be because that denomination is, so far as he can learn, more nearly correct than any other; because it has more truth. And if it has more truth than any other, it certainly is better than any other; and if that is so, why should he be afraid to say so? And why should he not strive earnestly to bring into it both worldlings and members of those bodies that have not so much light?

We are strongly of the opinion that the true reason for this "undenominational" talk that is so common, is the underlying belief that there is really no vital difference between different religious bodies, the name being the chief one. The

points of divergence are called "non-essentials." Well, then, this shows the weakness of the "National Reform" assertion that their work cannot result in a union of Church and State, because the men who are in the movement are representatives of all denominations, and of course would not single out any one for prominence to the exclusion of the rest. So we say, of course they would not; but, singing party names and "non-essentials," they would all unite as members of one body, for the enforcement of the "essentials" which they hold in common. And when we inquire for the points held by all denominations in a common, and which are regarded as the *essentials*, we find simply, Natural Immortality and Sunday.

If any one says that a union of one Church and State cannot be effected on this basis, and that it is not imminent, he certainly is blind to the things that are taking place all around him. E. J. W.

November 26, 1885

"Pagan and Papal Rome" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

The vision of the eighth chapter of Daniel begins with the supremacy of Medo-Persian dominion, B.C. 538, and covers the remaining portion of the world's history till the close of time. The 25th verse says that the power represented by the little horn, Rome, "shall be broken without hand." This evidently refers to the same thing that is mentioned in Dan. 2:34, 44, 45, where the stone cut out without hands is represented as smiting the image on the feet and breaking up the entire image—all the kingdoms of earth—in pieces.

Paganism was the prevailing religion during the Medo-Persian and Grecian rule, during the first portion of the Roman Empire. In the vision of the second chapter of Daniel there is no distinction made between pagan Rome and Rome papal, but in every other prophecy the distinction is clearly marked. In the seventh chapter, pagan Rome is represented by the "dreadful and terrible" beast with teeth of iron and nails of brass. Papal Rome is represented by the "little horn" which came out from this beast. In reality, the beast, after the rise of the little horn, is papal Rome, *i.e.*, Rome under the popes.

In the 12th and 13th of Revelation the Roman power is brought to view. It is not difficult to identify the red dragon with seven heads and ten horns. It is represented as standing ready to devour a certain child as soon as it was born. This child we know is Jesus, from the fact that he is to "rule all nations with a rod of iron" (verse 5, compared Ps. 2:7-9), and he was "caught up to his throne." These particulars will apply to no one but Jesus. And Rome, through Herod as its representative, stood ready to slay Jesus when he was born. See Matt. 2. The dragon, represents Rome. The question is, Does it represent the whole of Rome, or only a part? This can be answered when we have identified the next beast.

"And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a

leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion; and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority. . . . And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them; and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations."

Compare this description with what we are already familiar in Dan. 7, and there will be no difficulty in deciding that it also represents Rome. What! two symbols in succession representing the same thing? The answer must be that they represent two phases of Rome. Now we know that Rome in the time of Christ was pagan; therefore this second phase, represented by the leopard beast, must be papal Rome. Notice its blasphemous words, and its work of persecuting saints, and compare with the description of the little horn of Daniel 7. Notice also a time during which it was to have power to continue-"forty and two months." This, at thirty days to the month, is just 1260 days (as prophetic symbols, years), which we have already learned was the period of papal supremacy. Here, then, as in the seventh of Daniel, the prophecy marks a change from pagan to papal Rome.

Once more we turn to the Roman power as brought to view in the eighth of Daniel. The little horn that waxed "exceeding great," we have already seen to be Rome. There is no possibility of its representing any other power. But it is to be "broken without hand," which shows that the little-horn power covers the whole of Roman history, reaching even to the coming of the Lord. This being the case, it is evident that here also we must have the two phases of Rome,-pagan and papal. How are these two phases indicated? First, we repeat that the word "sacrifice" which occurs in verses 11, 12, and 13, is not found in the original, and there is nothing in the text that gives any idea of sacrifice. In the face of this, the Revision Committee, as if to get as far as possible from the true meaning of the passage, have placed "burnt-offering" in the Revised Version, in the place of "sacrifice." This is simply making a bad matter worse. They could have used the word "persecution," or "prophesying," or "dreaming," with just as much reason. Some one will ask, If there is no word in the original where the translators have placed "sacrifice," why did they place any word there at all? It would have been better if they had not, for then no one would have been misled. Try it in verse 13: "Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden underfoot?" A very slight examination will convince anyone that the only word that can be properly supplied after "daily," is 'desolation;' thus, "How long shall be the vision concerning the daily desolation and the transgression of desolations?" By supplying a word that is already in the text (and we have no right to go outside of the text for a word), we make harmony, and get rid of the real sense of the passage.

Rome, then, is here termed to a desolating power. Examine Matt. 24:15, 16, and Luke 20:21, 22, and you will find the Roman armies spoken of as the "abomination of desolation." And this term, "desolation," is a very fit one to apply to a power that shall "break in pieces and bruise," and "shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces." Then we have two forms of desolation, at the "daily" and the "transgression." Rome in its pagan form was well indicated by the term "daily," or "continual," because paganism had been the main religion of the world from almost the beginning. A few people worshiped the true God; but these were so very few that it might well be said that paganism have always been the religion of the world. But under the Roman dominion a change was to take place. Paganism in the civilized world was to receive its death blow, and a form of worship professedly Christian was to take its place; yet this new form of religion was to be of such a character, as compared with paganism, that it was called the "transgression." It is doubtful if the abomination of paganism for four thousand years equaled the crimes perpetrated by papal Rome in its twelve centuries of supreme power.

This same change is set forth by Paul in the second chapter of 2 Thessalonians. He told the Thessalonians brethren that the day of the Lord could not come until there had come an apostasy, and the "man of sin" had been revealed, and had accomplished his work of blasphemy and opposition to God and history. Said he, "Remember ye not that when I was yet with you, I told you these things?" That it is, when he was in Thessalonica he preached to them from the book of Daniel concerning the rise of the papacy. "And now he know what withholdeth that he the man of sin might be revealed in his time." That is, you know what now hinders the setting up of the papacy; it is paganism, which still has a controlling influence in the government. "For the mystery of the iniquity doth already work; only he who now letteth hindereth will let hinder, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed." Verses 7, 8. The apostasy had begun in Paul's day. "Grievous wolves" had already begun to devour the flock, and men speaking perverse things had drawn many away. This spirit of the papacy-"the mystery of the iniquity"-was already existing; but it could not fully develop itself until paganism-the hindering power-should be "taken of the way," and then "that Wicked" should stand forth undisguised.

Note the similarity in the terms used by Paul and the angel in describing the papacy. The angel calls it "the transgression of desolation;" Paul calls it "that Wicked," just as though the papacy embraced all the wickedness in the world, and so it did. The papacy was to be so pre-eminently wicked that it could be sufficiently designated by the expression "*that* Wicked."

In Rev. 13:2, the change from paganism to papacy is noted in these words: "And the dragon [pagan Rome] gave him of [that is, the beast, papal Rome] his power, and his seat, and great authority." If any one, however supposes that this change was an instantaneous one, accomplished by a sudden revelation, he is greatly mistaken. For several hundred years the papal power was growing almost unnoticed, before it succeeded in exalting itself above the ruins of paganism. Paul, 2 Thess. 2:6-8, brings this state of things to view, when he represents the "mystery of the iniquity" as working, but obliged to wait for its full development

until paganism should be removed. We propose to give a few quotations that will indicate, as fully as is possible in our brief space, the rise of the papacy and the overthrow of paganism.

"In the last great persecution under Diocletian [A. D. 284-305], the bishops of Rome probably fled once more to the Catacombs. Their churches were torn down, their property confiscated, their sacred writings destroyed, and a vigorous effort was made to extirpate the powerful sect. But the effort was vain. Constantine soon afterward became emperor, and the Bishop of Rome emerged from the Catacombs to become one of the ruling powers of the world. This sudden change was followed by an almost total loss of the simplicity and purity of the days of persecution. Magnificent churches were erected by the emperor in Rome, adorned with images and pictures, where the bishop sat on a lofty throne, encircled by inferior priests, and performing rites borrowed from the splendid ceremonial of the pagan temple. The Bishop of Rome became a prince of the empire, and lived in a style of luxury and pomp that awakened the envy or the just indignation of the heathen writer, Marcellinus. The church was now enriched by the gifts and bequests of the pious and the timid; the bishops drew great revenues from his farms in the Campagna and his rich plantations in Sicily; he rode through the streets of Rome in a stately chariot and clothed in gorgeous attire; his table was supplied with a profusion more than imperial; the proudest women of Rome loaded him with lavish donations, and followed him with their flatteries and attentions; and his haughty bearing and profuse luxury were remarked upon by both pagans and Christians as strangely inconsistent with the humility and simplicity enjoined by the faith which he professed. The bishopric

711

of Rome now became a splendid prize, for which the ambitious and unprincipled contended by force or fraud."-*Historical Studies*, pp. 17, 18.

Constantine became sole emperor of Western of Rome in 312 A.D. Shortly after (March, 313), he issued the famous Edict of Milan, which restored all forfeited civil and religious rights to the Christians, and it secured to them equal toleration with the pagans throughout the empire. This was an important step in advance. Gibbon, speaking of Constantine's relation to Christianity, says: "By the edicts of toleration, he removed the temporal disadvantages which had hitherto regarded the progress of Christianity. . . . The exact balance of the two religions continued but a moment; and the piercing eye of ambition and avarice soon discovered that the profession of Christianity might contribute to the interest of the present as well as of the future life. The hopes of wealth and honors, the example of an emperor, his exhortations, his irresistible smile, diffused conviction among the venal and obsequious crowds which usually filled the apartments of a palace. . . . As the lower ranks of society are covered by imitation, the conversion of those who possessed any imminence of birth, of power, or of riches, was soon followed by [the conversion of] dependent multitudes."-*Decline and Fall*, chap. 20, par. 18.

In his "History of Latin Christianity," book one, chapter 2, Milman quotes a single paragraph from an ancient historian, which shows the advancement made by the bishop of Rome by the close of the fourth century: "No wonder that for so

magnificent a prize as the bishopric of Rome, then should contest with the utmost eagerness and obstinacy. To be enriched by the lavish donations of the principal females of the city; to ride, splendidly attired, in a stately chariot; to sit at a profuse, luxuriant, more than imperial, table,-these are of the rewards of successful ambition."

In the same chapter, Milman again says:-

"The Pontificates of Damasus and Siricius [A.D. 367-398] beheld almost the last open struggles of expiring Roman paganism, the dispute concerning the Statue of Victory in the Senate, the succession of a large number of the more distinguished senators, the pleadings of the eloquent Symmachus for the toleration of the religion of ancient Rome. To such humiliation were reduced the deities of the Capitol, the gods, who, as was supposed, had achieved the conquest of the world, and laid it at the feet of Rome. But in this great contest the Bishop of Rome filled only an inferior part; it was Ambrose, the bishop of Milan, who enforced the final sentence of condemnation against paganism, asserted the sin, in a Christian emperor, of assuming any Imperial title connected with pagan worship, and of permitting any portion of the public revenue to be expended on the rites of idolatry. It was Ambrose who forbade the last marks of respect to the titular divinities of Rome in the public ceremonies."

The final triumph of the pseudo-Christian religion was gained in the early part of the 6th century, when Pope Symmachus anathematized the Emperor Anastasius. See Cyclopedias, art. "Anastasius," and "Decline and Fall," chap. 47, par. 22. At the same time, paganism in the West was overthrown by Clovis, king of Franks, a cruel and bloodthirsty tyrant, who had been converted to the Christianity that was then popular, by his wife, Clothilde, who was a Catholic. Clovis had promised her that if he were victorious in a battle which he was about to fight near Cologne, A.D. 496, he would turn Christian. After a severe struggle, he gained the victory, and soon after had and several thousand of his followers were baptized. He afterward, A.D. 507-8, by virtue of his superior skill and strength in battle, succeeded in "converting" the entire nation of the Visigoths, so that Christianity became the nominal religion of the entire Roman world. (See "Decline and Fall," chap. 38, par. 1-30; Guizot's "History of France," vol., chap. 7.) Because of these Christian acts, he received from the pope the title of "Most Christian King."

Thus was the "continual desolation" taken away that the "transgression of desolation" might run its course. In A.D. 538, as previously shown, the papacy became supreme by the conquest of its rivals, and it pursued its career unchecked until 1798. Since then its temporal power has gradually become extinct, but its spiritual power, though seemingly limited, is greater than ever. Its opposition to "all that is called God, or that is worshiped," has not diminished, nor will it cease until the Lord shall consume that Wicked with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy it with the brightness of his coming. 2 Thess. 2:8. E. J. W.

"Judged by the Law" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

"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 the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ." Rom. 2:12-16.

In the two verses here quoted, there is matter for our most serious consideration, which does not appear from a casual reading. In them are brought to view the Judgment. We speak of the day of Judgment as "The day of wrath, that dreadful day," and it is doubtful if any one can really *think* of that day without feelings of awe or terror; yet no one can have any just appreciation of its awfulness unless he has carefully studied the law of God, by which men are then to be judged; and our sense of the terrors of that day will be exactly in proportion to our understanding of the far-reaching sanctions of that holy law.

The verses before us mention two classes,-those who have sinned without law, and those who, having sinned in the law, are to be judged by the law. The second class is the one with which we are specially concerned; but before we can fully comprehend what is said of it, we must briefly notice the class with which it is contrasted.

This text gives no authority whatever for the theory that there are any people in the world on whom God's law has no claims. The term "without law" is fully explained in verses 14 and 15, which are parenthetical. "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature of 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, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another."

In the first chapter of Romans, the heathen, here spoken of as those "without the law," are described. There it is plainly shown that their ignorant blindness is due to their own willful disobedience. "Because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but because vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was

713

darkened." Rom. 1:21. There was a time when all men knew God; but now many have been given over to "a reprobate mind." Notwithstanding this, every man who has not driven the Spirit of God from him forever, has as a legacy from Adam in his purity, some trace of the law of God in his heart. It was not alone in outward form, but in character as well, that Adam was formed in the image of God. Man in his first estate was like God, holy, because God's law, which is the transcript that his character, was within his heart. When he fell, this image was marred. Each successive sin makes an additional blot upon that copy of the law in the heart, until, by a long course of sin, it is completely obliterated. Christ, the sinless One, said "I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, I law is within my heart." Ps. 40:8. The work of the gospel is to bring men back to their lost allegiance, to reconcile them to God (2 Cor. 5:20), and write the entire law once more in their hearts (Jer. 31:33; Heb. 8:10), that thus they may be wholly conformed to God's image,-"partakers of the divine image."

Paul says that the heathen, who have not the written law, give evidence of traces of the law written in their hearts, from the fact that when they do things that are commanded or forbidden by the law, their conscience bears witness, and

their thoughts either accuse or else excuse the commission of those deeds. The contrast, then, between "without the law," and "in the law," is simply a contrast between no revelation and God's written word; and the two classes brought to view are those who have not the Bible, and those who have the full light of the written word of God.

It is evident, then, that those who "perish without law," are those who are punished for the sins which they have committed in face of the law which they had by nature. They had the law; for sin is imputed to them (verse 12), and "sin is not imputed where there is no law." Rom. 5:13. But they did not have the written law; consequently the written law, in its wondrous breadth, is not brought against them in the Judgment; they are judged simply by as much of the law as they had, and this alone is sufficient to condemn them.

Now it is still further evident that this judgment of the heathen can go but little, if any, further than the bare letter of the law. That is, for instance, the law will take cognizance, in the case of the heathen, only of the actual murder which he committed when he knew that he ought not to kill, and will not bring before him the envy and jealousy, which, in the absence of the written word, he perhaps did not recognize as being wrong. But "*all* unrighteousness is sin" (1 John 5:17), and "the wages of sin is death" (Rom. 6:23), and therefore "for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die." This, in brief, is what is meant by "not having the law," and by perishing "without law."

Now what of those to having "sinned in the law," are to be "judged by the law"? We have already seen that this class comprises those who have the light of the written revelation. Then since they are to be judged by what they have, it is evident that they are to be judged by all that may be learned from the word of God. Instead of being judged according to the mere letter of the law, *i.e.*, by that which may be understood by merely *reading* the law, they are to be judged according to the fullest intent of the law,-by all that may be understood by earnest, prayerful meditation in the law.

In Heb. 4:12 we read that 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 *discerner of the thoughts and intents* of the heart." From the sermon on the mount,-that sermon that moralists are so fond of quoting, we learn that he who is unjustly angry with another is in as much danger of the Judgment as he who takes another's life; and John plainly declares that "whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer." 1 John 3:15. Again our Saviour said: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery." Matt. 5:27. Here Christ quotes the seventh commandment as something known of old. All knew the penalty for violating it; but the scribes and Pharisees had taught that nothing but adultery as an actually accomplished fact could be considered a violation of the commandment. But Christ said of it, "But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh upon a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart."

These two instances, which are but samples of what might be said of all the commandments, serve to give us some idea of what the psalmist sought in the law when he said, "I have seen an end of all perfection; but thy commandment is

exceeding brought." Ps 119:96. So broad is it that it takes notice of an unexpressed thought or a single glance of the eye.

We claim that it is the law in its depth and breadth, the law as it discerns the thoughts and intents of the heart, to which Paul refers when he says of a certain class that they shall be "judged by the law." This claim is sanctioned by the verse which says that this judgment shall take place "in the day when God shall judge the *secrets* of men." It is evident there is a difference between the judgment of those who sin "without law" and that of those who sin "in the law." Now what can this difference be, since, as we have already seen, the law is the standard of judgment in both cases? The only difference can be that the latter class endure a more rigid test than the former.

Notice, further, that the phrase "in the law" refers to *all* who have the written word, and that therefore this rigid test, which is going to take into account the remotest thoughts of the heart, is to be applied to every one who has the Bible, that is, to all the inhabitants of so-called Christian lands. That is that which may well cause us all to tremble at the thought of "that dreadful day." Multitudes who pride themselves on their strict morality will be found in that day to be but whited sepulchers, fair without, but full of corruption within. Thousands of professed Christians who stand high in the estimation of their brethren, perhaps also in their own estimation, will then be bidden to depart as "workers of iniquity;" "for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart."

In this connection we also have another thought worthy of serious consideration. After enumerating the vices of the heathen (Rom. 1:24-32), Paul continues: "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest *doest the same things*." Rom. 2:1. Now there is not an individual who has ever read Rom. 1:24-32 who has not decided that the things there set forth are exceedingly wrong. But the apostle says, "Thou that judgest *doest the same things*." What! have we all committed murder and adultery? are we all guilty of all that list of outbreaking sins? Not openly; so far as the actual *deed* is concerned, we may have committed scarcely any of those acts. But we have all harbored the thoughts which, if cherished and allowed to pursue their actual course, would develop into those very sins. We have already seen that a wrong desire is counted as a violation of the commandment; but here we learn something further. We learn that the *evil thought* cherished by one who has the light of God's word, is in the sight of God as great a crime as the actual deed is when committed by a heathen. The professed Christian who indulges in anger or harbors evil thoughts is as guilty before God as the benighted heathen who kills and eats his enemy.

We begin to see that the commandment is indeed "exceeding broad;" we may also feel a little less satisfied over the superiority above the heathen, which we fancy we enjoy. As we read of the Hindoo throwing himself before the car of Juggernaut, or perchance see the Chinaman bowing before his horrid-looking Joss, or think of the barbarous rites with which savage worship is accompanied, we shudder at the depth of wickedness revealed. But when we read that "rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry," we may well turn upon ourselves the look of pity and scorn. How many professed

Christians are there who are never stubbornly set upon carrying out their own plans, regardless of the wishes of their brethren? Comparatively few, we fear, always follow the directions laid down in 1 Cor. 1:10 and 1 Peter 5:5. How many who profess to keep "the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus," never indulge any rebellious feelings? It may be rebellion against duty which God has made known through the spirit of prophecy, or against those placed in authority. Whatever it is, the rebellious or stubborn one is as vile in God's sight as the one who "in his blindness bows down to wood and stone." Is there not cause for us all to cry out, "God be merciful to me, *the sinner*"?

And to give force to these thoughts we have the assurance that, "the great day of the Lord is near, it is near, and *hasteth greatly*." The Lord is near, "even at the doors," and when he comes, he will "bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts." 1 Cor. 4:5. And what weight against us those hidden and seemingly insignificant thoughts will have. How often we would gladly forget them; sometimes we succeed. But sooner or later they will be made known in all their terrible heinousness. What shall we do? Let us face them now. Let us pray in the Lord, "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." "Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord;" "let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts;" and we have the blest assurance that if we do this God will "abundantly pardon," and will "cleanse us from all unrighteousness." E. J. W.

"Shifting Responsibility" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

The following paragraph we recently came across in a religious exchange:-

"In a recent address Professor Drummond said that he was once conversing with an infidel, when a well-known gentleman passed them on the road. 'That gentleman,' said the infidel, pointing to the passer-by, 'is the founder of our infidel club.' 'What,' said Mr. Drummond, in startled tones, 'why that is Mr. So-and-so, an influential man in such a church!' 'Yes,' said the infidel, 'we know he professes Christianity; but his inconsistencies have driven many of us into infidelity, and led to the founding of our club.'"

From the above, which is undoubtedly true, there are two lessons to be learned. The first is that Christians, if they are not consistent in their life, are active agents of the devil. Says Christ: "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad." Matt. 12:30. Many professed Christians would be shocked to be told that they are doing missionary work for Satan, yet they can easily convince themselves that such is the case. Let them seriously ask, Am I doing my duty? Do I honor Christ and the profession that I make? Is my influence positive on the Lord's side? Unless these questions can be answered affirmatively, they may know that they are driving men away from Christ. The name of God is blasphemed because of the lives of any of his professed followers. Rom. 2:21-24. How terrible to think that there is more blasphemy than

there would be if many who profess to love God were not in existence.

Some professors think to make amends by acknowledging their false position without correcting it. They will try to teach unbelievers, but will say, "Don't take me for an example; you must not judge of Christianity by me." But that is just what the world must do. Christians are here in order that this world may be able to judge of Christianity. Said Christ to his disciples; "Ye are the light of the world;" and he prayed that they might "be made perfect in one," so that the world might know that he was from God. One of the first things the professor of Christianity should think about is that worldlings will watch him closely, and that they will know whether he is really a Christian or not. They can tell the genuine article every time.

And this brings us to the second lesson that may be learned from the paragraph quoted. It is this: The fact that professed Christians do not fulfill their obligations, is not the slightest excuse for anybody's unbelief. Whenever worldlings criticize the inconsistencies of professed Christians, they at once condemn themselves; for by their criticisms they show that they know what ought to be done. And their punishment for evil-doing will be none the less because it was a professed Christian who led them astray. As for the professor, the Judgment alone will reveal the responsibility that attaches to him for his scattering influence. Taking it all together, neither Christians nor infidels have anything from which to derive comfort for a course of wrong-doing. E. J. W.

December 3, 1885

"Vain Customs" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 46.

E. J. Waggoner

In an editorial on "Infant Baptism," in a recent number of the *California Christian Advocate*, we find, among others equally sound, the following 'argument' for that practice:-

"Is it not an assumption almost amounting to impudence, to be told that infant baptism has no foundation whatever, when its history is so prominent and its practice so general through all the ages? Can it be possible that a small portion of the church has all the truth, and the rest of us, constituting a vast majority in every century, has [*sic.*] none at all?"

Before answering this question, let us have a few figures. The population of the earth is not far from fourteen millions of people. Of this number about 480,000,000 are Buddhists and followers of Confucius; about 230,000,000 are barbarous tribes that practice fetichism,-the very lowest form of heathenism; something over 120,000,000 are Mohammedans, and about the same number are Brahminical Hindoos. Less than 400,000,000 our nominally Christian, of this number nearly 300,000,000 are members of the Roman Catholic and Greek Churches, leaving only a little over one hundred million of so-called Protestants of all denominations, including infidels, etc. That is, over seven hundred million people, one-half the population of the earth, are heathen, and less than one-third

of the inhabitants of the earth have even a knowledge of the religion which teaches that there is one God, and of Jesus Christ whom he sent.

729

Now we might answer the *Advocate's* question by the Yankee method of asking another: "Is it not an assumption almost amounting to impudence, to be told that" the worship of images "has no [Biblical] foundation whatever, when its history is so prominent and its practice so general throughout of the ages?" Can it be possible that a small portion of mankind has all the truth, and that the rest, constituting a vast majority in every century, has none at all?

We have stated that of the so-called Christians, only one-fourth are Protestants. The rest believe in purgatory, prayers to and for the dead, and various other things which the *Advocate* considers pernicious. Is it not "an assumption almost amounting to impudence," for a few Protestants to oppose the doctrine held by so large a body of "Christians," many of whom are skilled in all the learning of the schools? Hear what the Catholic Dr. Eck said, over three hundred years ago, to Luther, who was opposing the presumptuous claims of the pope:-

"I am astonished at the humility and diffidence with which the reverend doctor undertakes to stand alone against so many illustrious Fathers, thus affirming that he knows more of these things than the sovereign pontiff, the councils, divines, and universities! . . . It would no doubt be very wonderful if God had hidden the truth from so many saints and martyrs, till the advent of the reverend father."

Just compare this paragraph with the first one quoted. We might almost accuse the *Advocate* of plagiarizing from the learned chancellor of Ingolstadt. If the *Advocate's* argument for infant baptism be sound, then Dr. Eck's sarcastic remarks proved the fallacy of Luther's position; and the same argument proves that paganism is the only true religion! We have no sympathy nor respect for that sort of argument.

Let us turn the tables. The Bible says, "He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved." Infants are not capable of belief; but since they have committed no sin, they are saved by virtue of Christ's atoning blood, without belief. If they die in infancy, they never have any personal knowledge of sin. No one who does not or cannot is a subject for baptism, according to the Saviour's testimony. Now we ask, Is it not an assumption which is even worse than impudence, for men to say that infant "baptism" is a Christian ordinance, when in the whole Bible there is not a syllable in favor of it? We claim that the presumption is all on the side of the seeming majority; for one man with the Bible to sustain him, may without presumption withstand the world.

If numbers and custom prove the correctness of any theory or practice, then all error must be correct. A few hundred years ago everybody believed that the earth was flat. According to the *Advocate's* reasoning, the earth at that time *was* flat; but since the time of Galileo it has gradually been assuming a spherical shape, until, now that nearly everybody believes it to be round, it is quite round, being only a little flattened at the poles! And this is no more absurd than that the most common argument for infant "baptism" and Sunday-keeping.

So true is it that the majority of people are, and always have been, in the wrong, that whenever we hear a person quote custom in favor of any practice, we at once decide, (1) That he has nothing better to offer, and (2) That the practice is, without doubt, wrong. We so decide because many hundred years ago, the prophet of God declared that "The customs of the people are vain" (Jer. 10:3), and inspired statements are true in all ages of world's history. E. J. W.

"Comments on Psalm 15" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 46.

E. J. Waggoner

"Lord, who shall abide in thy tabernacle? who shall dwell in thy holy hill?" Ps. 15:1.

This is certainly a most pertinent question. If a person desires to go to a certain place, his first inquiry will be as to how he is to get there. Now there are few persons who do not have a desire for eternal life; few do not entertain a faint hope, though often without reason, that they will at last by some means have an entrance into the holy city. Then the question of the psalmist should be constantly on their minds; that is, they should constantly be searching for an answer to it. That no one will enter Heaven by accident; no one will dwell in the "holy hill" without knowing positively by what means he got there. As surely as the joys in the presence of the Lord are real, so surely are the steps to them real. "We must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God." Acts 14:22.

Fortunately, we are not left to grope in darkness for the way to Zion, nor need we be at a loss to know when we have found it. The inspired psalmist has answered his own question. Let us then examine it together. Here is the first part of the answer:-

"He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart. He that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbour, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbour." Ps. 15:2, 3.

The first clause seems to cover it all: "He that walketh uprightly." We hear a great deal nowadays about "crooked" dealings. The way that leads to life is too narrow to allow any "crooked" person to walk in it. Every one in it must be upright. Reader, do you realize what that means? Do any of us fully appreciate what it is to *do right*? It is simply to "keep straight" all the time; to be *upright*; to not deviate at all from a perfect standard. It is to "make straight paths for your feet," and to walk in them continually, and not simply occasionally. The great reason why many professed Christians make so little progress in the Christian life, is that they have so low a standard of Christianity.

What is the proper standard? John says: "He that saith he abideth in Him, ought himself also so to walk even as he walked." 1 John 2:6. Christ is the perfect pattern. He is the way and the truth. He "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." 1 Peter 2:22. This was because the law of God was in his heart. Ps. 40:8. Then if we would walk "uprightly," as Christ walked, we must also have the law of God in our hearts; for David says of the one who has the law of God in his heart, that "none of his steps shall slide." So if one wishes to know how much the law of God requires of him, let him examine carefully the life of

Christ. In his life we see a living exemplification of the law. But if the law requires a walk like that of Christ, if perfect obedience to the law's requirements makes a man like Christ, then certainly the law will condemn the one whose life is not like Christ's. If we deviate from the pattern which Christ has set, then we are condemned. Surely it is no small thing to be a Christian. But the psalmist has specified some things.

"He that . . . speaketh the truth in his heart." Outwardly a man's deportment may be correct; his morals may be fully up to the standard of the very best society, and yet he may be a gross violator of the law, and may be more guilty before God than one who sins openly and recklessly. "Man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart." But no one must fall into the error that he can keep the law in his heart, and break it openly. Many have fallen into this error; for this is just what they mean when they talk about keeping the law in spirit and not in letter. "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh;" and as a man "thinketh in his heart, so is he." A man may keep the law outwardly, and violate it really, in his heart; but it is an utter impossibility for any one to keep the law in his heart, and violate the letter of it. So if a man keeps the fourth commandment "in his heart," if he keeps the spirit of that commandment, he will keep holy the seventh day of the week, and no other.

"He that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbour, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbour." Verse 3. Webster gives the following definition of the word "backbite"; "To censure, slander, reproach, or speak evil of, in the absence of the person traduced." Notice that according to this definition, backbiting is not necessarily speaking falsely against an absent one; the things said may be true, and yet it may be backbiting. It is speaking evil of a neighbor that is condemned. This is still farther shown by the expression, "Nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbor." If a man commits a sin, that is a reproach to him; for Solomon says that "sin is a reproach to any people." Now if one neighbor has actually done wrong, and we take up his case and make it a subject of conversation, criticizing it of course, we are backbiting. This of course does not include those instances in which a man's case is considered by those in positions of authority, with a view to reclaiming him, or of preventing him from leading others astray.

If it is a sin to speak evil of one when the things uttered are true how much worse must it be when the reports are false? The ninth commandment says: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." This does not mean simply that we must not swear falsely against him in court, or that we must not at any time tell what we know is not true; but it means that we must not tell what we do not know to be true. The man who hears something to the detriment of his neighbor, and repeats it to others, not knowing that it is true, is guilty of bearing false witness, as well as of taking up a reproach against his neighbor. The ninth commandment means a great deal more than we are apt to think it does. And so it is with all the commandments. They are, indeed, "exceeding broad."

Here is a safe and simple rule to follow with our fellowmen: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." He who does this fulfills the whole law, so far as it relates to man. That means that we must be as careful of our brother's reputation

as we would be of our own. When we are about to repeat some thing to the detriment of any one, stop and consider whether we would like to have him repeat such a thing about us. If this rule were followed, it would shut out a great amount of gossip and slander.

For there is such a thing as going to extremes. There are proper times to speak about another, even to tell things that are to his detriment. In a court of law, a man must witness to the truth, that justice may be done. So, also, the proper authorities in the church are to be notified when a brother persists in wrong-doing. This is in the interest of good order and discipline. The Bible says: "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart; thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor, and not suffer sin upon him." Lev. 19:17. He who covers up wrong in another, neither trying to restore him nor informing those who could restore him, becomes a "partaker of other men's sins." Here is another specification:-

"In whose eyes a vile person is contemned; but he honoreth them that fear the Lord." This does not mean that we are to despise and shun sinners, nor that we are to be uncivil to anybody. We are to show "all meekness unto all men" (Titus 3:2), and we are to be like Christ, who came to save that which was lost. While he hated sin, he was the sinner's friend, and he sought their society, not for

730

the sake of their society, but that he might do them good. But a "vile person," a reprobate, is not to be esteemed. Remember that the text does not discriminate. It does not say that you must despise a vile person if he is poor, but that you may honor a reprobate who is wealthy. That is the way of the world, but it is not the Lord's way. If society would adopt as a rule the fourth verse of this psalm, it would very soon be purged of a terrible load of corruption.

"But he honoreth them that fear the Lord." One of the special requirements of an elder is that he be "a lover of good men" (Titus 1:8); and one of the sins charged against the people of the last days is that they are "despisers of those that are good." 2 Tim. 3:3. There is to be no discrimination; the poorest and most ignorant man, if he is a God-fearing man, is worthy of more honor than the profligate prince or millionaire. There is no honor that a man can receive that will outrank the honor which God gives, in imparting his grace to the humble. "Thus saith the Lord, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches; but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord." Jer. 9:23, 24.

"He that putteth not out his money to usury, nor taketh reward against the innocent." By comparing this text with Ex. 22:25; Lev. 23:35-37; Deut. 23:19, 20, we see that the entire prohibition of taking usury was only from brethren; from strangers it was allowable to receive usury. This was no injustice; for extortion or unjust gain is expressly condemned everywhere. We are commanded to do good to all men as we have opportunity, but "especially unto them who are of the household of faith." Gal. 6:10. It is just for a man to receive reasonable compensation for means which represents his own labor; still the Bible clearly

teaches that a man must not be a taker of usury, that is, that must not be his business. It is almost impossible for a man to engage in the business of money lending without taking advantage of the necessities of others, and thus violating the command to love his neighbor as himself. This is why we are positively forbidden to exact usury from the poor. "But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition." 1 Tim. 6:9.

"He that doeth these things shall never be moved." Let a person live fully up to the 15th psalm, and he will surely have eternal life. He who does so, will be a perfect man; he will fulfill all the law. "Why," says the objector, "you don't take Christ into the account of all." Not so fast. We said that the one who should carry out the regulations laid down in psalm 15 would have eternal life, and in so saying we only echoed the words of the inspired writer. But who can fulfill them? Says Christ, "Without me ye can do nothing." John 15:5. The unrenewed man would find it an utter impossibility to do what is required. Even his best endeavors would come so far short of the standard as to sink him into perdition.

More than this, supposing that it were possible for a man to do in his own strength what is required; where could the person be found who has ever come anywhere near the standard? With the exception of Christ, no such person ever lived on earth. Then how much profit could one derive from his future good deeds, even if he could perform them? Not a particle. The blood of Jesus Christ, and that alone, can cleanse from sin. He whose sins are forgiven is a new creature in Christ, and it is not till then that he can perform works that are acceptable to God. "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Eph. 2:8-10. E. J. W.

December 10, 1885

"Sabbath-School Notes" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 47.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JAN. 2

Sabbath-School Notes

The lesson for this week is a continuation of the recapitulation begun last week, and we know not how to present it better than to give the lesson entire, with our comments in the form of answers to the several questions.

1. During the period covered by the kingdoms of Babylon, Medo-Persia and Grecia, what form of religious worship prevailed?

Paganism was the prevailing religion, not only from the rise of the kingdom of Babylon, but from the fall of Adam. The worship of idols soon almost entirely displaced the worship of God, so that the light of truth was at times wholly obscured. The moral condition of the world under heathenism is very briefly and delicately described by Paul in Rom. 1:22-32; Eph. 4:17-19; 5:11, 12.

2. What name is given to this form of religion in Dan. 8:11-13?

Paganism is referred to in Dan. 8:11-13 by the term "the daily," not "the daily sacrifices," but "the daily desolation." The term "daily" or "continual" is aptly applied to it, since it was for ages the continual form of worship.

3. How long did this religion prevail after Rome became supreme?

For about five hundred years after Rome acquired universal dominion, paganism continued to be the prevailing religion. In Constantine's time (A.D. 311-337) it ceased to be *the* religion of the empire; but it did not wholly lose its place as the State religion until about two hundred years later.

4. What religion then gained the ascendancy?

5. Who was the first Roman emperor that favored the Christian religion?

6. When did this emperor reign?

Those three questions we answer together, for the sake of convenience. The Christian religion was that which superseded paganism in the Roman world. When we say "the Christian religion," we do not mean the Christian religion as we find it portrayed in the gospels, but a corrupted form of Christianity. "Pure religion and undefiled before God," has never met with general acceptance in this world, and will never be the *prevailing* religion until sin and sinners are destroyed, and the new heavens and new earth appear, "wherein dwelleth righteousness."

Constantine is properly styled "the first Christian emperor." He began to reign in a subordinate position in A.D. 306; in 311 A.D. he became sole emperor of Western Rome, and it is from this time that his conversion to Christianity is dated; ten years later, in 323 A.D., he became sole emperor of the Roman Empire, or of the world. He died in A.D. 337. For a brief but vivid view of his life, see "Encyclopaedia Britannica," art. "Constantine." When we say that he nominally accepted Christianity in A.D. 311, we have said all that can be said. Conceive of an autocrat with the vices of a heathen ruler and the name of a Christian, and you have a picture of "the first Christian emperor." The following extract is a fair picture:

"The sublime theory of the gospel had made a much fainter impression on the heart than on the understanding of Constantine himself. He pursued the great object of his ambition through the dark and bloody paths of war and policy; and after the victory, he abandoned himself, without moderation, to the abuse of his fortune. Instead of asserting his just superiority above the imperfect heroism and profane philosophy of Trajan and the Antonines, the mature age of Constantine forfeited the reputation which he had acquired in his youth. As he gradually advanced in knowledge of truth, he proportionately declined in the practice of virtue; and the same year of his reign in which he convened the council of Nice [A.D. 325], was polluted by the execution, or rather murder, of his eldest son."-*Decline and Fall, chap. 20, par. 17.*

7. How did he try to make the Christian religion popular?

8. How did he cause unprincipled men to profess to be Christians, when they were really heathen at heart?

The mere fact that the emperor professed Christianity would tend to make it popular; but the form which would be popular can be imagined by the character of Constantine, and the means which he used to propagate his religion, which are described by the historian as follows:

"By the edicts of toleration, he removed the temporal disadvantages which had hitherto retarded the progress of Christianity; and its active and numerous ministers received a free permission, a liberal encouragement, to recommend the salutary truths of revelation by every argument which could affect the reason or piety of mankind. The exact balance of the two religions continued but a moment; and the piercing eye of ambition and avarice soon discovered that the profession of Christianity might contribute to the interest of the present as well as of a future life. The hopes of wealth and honors, the example of an emperor, his exhortations, his irresistible smiles, diffused conviction among the venal and obsequious crowds which usually fill the apartments of a palace. The cities which signaled a forward zeal by the voluntary destruction of their temples, were distinguished by municipal privileges, and rewarded with popular donations; and the new capital of the East gloried in the singular advantage that Constantinople was never profaned by the worship of idols. As the lower ranks of society are governed by imitation, the conversion of those who possessed any eminence of birth, or power, or of riches, was soon followed by dependent multitudes. The salvation of the common people was purchased at an easy rate, if it be true that in one year twelve thousand men were baptized at Rome, besides a proportionable number of woman and children, and that a white garment with twenty pieces of gold, had been promised by the emperor of every convert."-*Decline and Fall, chap. 20, par. 18.*

9. How was the church affected by such a course?

As might be expected when men by the thousands gave a nominal assent to Christianity without the slightest knowledge of its spirit, the church speedily became very corrupt. Mosheim, the learned church historian, says that in the second century "a large part of the Christian observances and institutions" "had the aspect of heathen mysteries."-*Eccl. Hist., Book 1, century 2, part 2, chap. 4, sec. 5.* If this was the case in the second century, how much more would it be true in the fifth? In describing the church after Constantine's "conversion," Mosheim says:-

"Genuine piety was supplanted by a long train of superstitious observances, which originated partly from opinions inconsiderately embraced, partly from a preposterous disposition to adopt profane rites and combined them with Christian worship, and partly from the natural predilection of mankind in general for a splendid and ostentatious religion. . . . Further, the public supplications by which the pagans were accustomed to appease their gods, were borrowed from them, and were celebrated in many places with great pomp. To the temples, to water consecrated in due form, and to the images of holy men, the same efficacy was ascribed and the same privileges assigned as had been attributed to the pagan temples, statues, and lustrations before the advent of Christ. Images, indeed,

were as yet but rare, and statues did not exist. And shameful as it may appear, it is beyond all doubt that the worship of the martyrs-with no bad intentions indeed, yet to the great injury of the Christian cause-was modeled by degrees into conformity with the worship which the pagans had in former times paid to their gods. From these specimens, the intelligent reader will be able to conceive how much injury resulted to Christianity from the peace and repose procured by Constantine, and from an indiscreet eagerness to allure the pagans to embrace this religion."-*Eccl. Hist., Book 2, cent. 4, part 2, chap. 3, sec. 2.*

10. What disgraceful course was taken about the middle of the fifth century by several of the leading bishops?

11. How was this question decided in A.D. 533?

12. When and how was the supremacy of the bishop of Rome fully established?

During the fifth century there was a great contest among the leading bishops of the churches, each struggling for the supremacy. Among the most active in this disgraceful strife were the bishops of Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem. In A.D. 533, the matter was decided by a decree of the Emperor Justinian, declaring the pope of Rome to be head over all the churches. The three powers that opposed this decree were the three horns that were to be plucked up by the little horn of Daniel 7. The last of these was conquered in A.D. 538, and the great papal hierarchy was then established?

13. What is this papal religion called in Dan. 8:13?

It is justly styled "the *transgression* of desolation."

14. How is pagan Rome symbolized in the seventh of Daniel?

15. How is papal Rome symbolized in the same chapter?

In the seventh of Daniel, pagan Rome is symbolized by the "dreadful and terrible" beast with ten horns (verse 7), and papal Rome is symbolized by the same beast after the "little horn" with the eyes of a man, and the mouth speaking great things, had arisen and plucked up three horns. The "little horn" itself represents the papacy.

16. What is meant by the terms "pagan Rome" and "papal Rome"?

"Pagan Rome" means Rome when idolatry was the prevailing religion; "papal Rome" applies to the same power after Christianity had nominally become the religion of the empire. The word "pagan" is from the Latin *pagus*, meaning a district, from which comes *paganus*, belonging to the country. Changes are made much more rapidly in cities than they are in the country or remote villages; and so it happened that for some time after Christianity had been accepted by the court of Constantine, and by the inhabitants of the larger cities, the people residing in the country still worshiped idols. Therefore those who worshiped idols received the appellation of "pagans." This term was not used to designate the heathen until the first centuries of the Christian era. "Papal" is derived from *papa*, father, a name applied to the bishops of Rome, from whence comes also the name "pope."

Lack of space makes it impossible for us to give the remaining questions with specific answers. Specimens of the "great words" which the Romish Church has spoken against the Most High have been given in the SIGNS in notes on

previous lessons. We have also given quotations to show that the prediction that the little horn should "wear out the saints of the

743

Most High," has been fulfilled by the Roman Catholic Church. We have seen how its power was curtailed in 1798, at the close of the 1260 years (time and times and the dividing of time), and that its blasphemous pretensions have increased until the present time. This check that was put upon the papacy is represented in Rev. 13:3 by the statement that one of the heads received a deadly wound. The prophet saw this deadly wound healed, so that "all the world wondered after the beast." This was partially fulfilled when Pius VII. was set in the papal chair, in place of the pope who had been deposed two years before. Its complete fulfillment, however, is yet future; for the prophet saw that the 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." Dan. 7:21, 22. A complete restoration to its former power yet awaits the papacy. But its triumphing will be short; for the Lord will soon come, and destroy "that wicked," utterly consuming it (Dan. 7:11; 2 Thess. 2:8), and then "the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High." Dan. 7:27. E. J. W.

December 17, 1885

"The Everlasting Kingdom" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL.

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JAN. 9

The Everlasting Kingdom

When is the everlasting kingdom to be set up?

"And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever." Dan. 2:44. "In the days of *these* kings." These words occur at the close of the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the great image. The kings (kingdoms) referred to cannot refer to the four universal monarchies,—Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome,—because these follow in succession, and it would be impossible for one kingdom to be set up in the days of each of them. The expression can refer to nothing else than the kingdoms into which Rome was divided, and which are referred to in Dan. 2:41. This division was completed before the close of the fifth century A.D.

The expression, "in the days of *these* kings," shows conclusively that in no sense was the kingdom of God set up at the time of Christ's first advent. There was at that time only one kingdom-Rome-and it exercised universal dominion. There was then nothing to indicate that the proud empire would ever crumble into fragments. This fact alone is sufficient to show that the setting up of the kingdom was not in the days of Christ or his apostles.

By what special symbol is it represented?

The verse above quoted says that the kingdom of the God of Heaven "shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms." In the statement of the dream, Dan. 2:31-35, we are told that the stone which was cut out without hands, "smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces," and that "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 threshing-floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them." When we remember that these various metals represent the kingdoms of earth, which are to be broken in pieces and consumed by the kingdom of God, we know that in this prophecy, the kingdom of God is represented by the stone.

Where is the image to be smitten by this stone?

What part of the world's temporal history is represented by the feet of the image?

"Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his *feet*." Dan. 2:34. It is self-evident that the feet of the image represent the last portion of this world's history, or, rather, of the history of nations on this earth. We say this is self-evident, because in the time represented by the feet, the image is to be totally demolished and consumed. After it is smitten, no place is to be found for its fragments, showing that from that time the nations of earth are to have no place in history. It is evident, then, that this smiting of the image on the feet is the thing to which the disciples referred when they asked Christ, "What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" Matt. 24:3.

Did either of the four great kingdoms utterly destroy, or exterminate, the kingdoms that ruled before it?

Repeat a scripture that seems to allude to this fact.

In speaking of the fourth and last beast, Daniel says: "I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame." Dan. 7:11. But in direct contrast with this, he speaks of the three preceding beasts as follows: "As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away; yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time." Dan. 7:12. This shows that none of the kingdoms are utterly destroyed until the last. When Cyrus conquered Babylon, the Medo-Persian kings began to rule over the territory and subjects over which the Babylonian kings had formerly ruled. It was the same way, also, when Alexander conquered the Persians. When one universal empire succeeded another, the world simply changed rulers. Had it been otherwise, the conqueror would not have had much dominion. The characteristics of the conquered nation modified to a great extent the nation which subdued it. This is plainly indicated in the symbol of the fourth kingdom, as seen by John (Rev.

13:1-10). That beast was like a leopard (third kingdom); its feet were as the feet of a bear (second kingdom); and its mouth as the mouth of a lion (first kingdom). Besides these characteristics, it had the seven heads and ten horns peculiar to Rome, and did the same work that is ascribed to the fourth beast of Daniel 7.

These facts of Scripture are in harmony with the statement in Daniel 2, that when the stone smites the image, the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold are all broken to pieces together. It is in the days of "these kings," the ten divisions of the Roman Empire, that the smiting is done, but the consequent destruction takes in all that remains of all the preceding kingdoms.

What is to be the effect of this smiting?

When will this utter destruction take place?

Dan. 2:34, 35, 44, which have already been quoted, answer question 8. All earthly kingdoms are to be destroyed utterly, to make room for the everlasting kingdom of God. This smiting is many times referred to in the Bible. God, speaking through the prophet David, says to Christ: "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt *dash them in pieces* like a potter's vessel." Ps. 2:8, 9.

The prophet Habakkuk had a view of this terrible dashing to pieces of the nations, and he describes it thus: "The mountains saw thee, and they trembled: the overflowing of the water passed by; the deep uttered his voice, and lifted up his hands on high. The sun and moon stood still in their habitation; at the light of thine arrows they went, and at the shining of thy glittering spear. Thou didst march through the land in indignation, thou didst thresh the heathen in anger." Hab. 2:10-12. Compare the last clause with Dan. 2:35.

Isaiah also bears testimony similar to that given by David: "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots; and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, . . . and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears; but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall *smite the earth* with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked." Isa. 11:1-4. Compare 2 Thess. 2:8.

And lastly we read the graphic prophetic description given by John: "And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. . . . And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him. . . . These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were

slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh." Rev. 19:11-21.

Let the reader carefully compare these texts, and he will be convinced that they refer to the same time to which Peter does, when he says: "But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and *perdition of ungodly men.*" 2 Pet. 3:7. And this is, in part, the fulfilling of the promise of Christ's coming.

But the destruction of the wicked of earth is only a part of the work to be done. Habakkuk says, immediately following the words before quoted from him: "Thou wentest forth for the salvation of thy people, even for salvation with thine anointed." Immediately following the statement quoted from Isaiah, is a description of a wonderful state of peace, closing with these words: "They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for *the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord*, as the waters cover the sea." Isa. 11:9. And this agrees with the statement in Dan. 2:35, that, after the destruction of the image, the stone, representing the kingdom of God, "became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." This shows conclusively that the kingdom of God is to be finally established on this earth; that it is to be as real and literal a kingdom as were the Babylonian, Medo-Persian, and Grecian; that it is not yet set up, because when it is set up it immediately consumes the kingdoms of earth; and that it is to be absolutely universal, because it is to fill *the whole earth*, and no place is to be found for any opposing power.

How will the earth itself be purified from the effects of sin and the curse?

"But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." 2 Pet. 3:10. That this results in the purification of the earth, is evident from verse 13: "Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

How will all the righteous, both the dead and the living, escape this terrible destruction?

Habakkuk says that when the Lord brings these terrible judgments upon the earth, he goes forth for the salvation of his people. Since the preservation of his people is the object, they may fearlessly "abide under the shadow of the Almighty." Resting on the promise of Jehovah, that, "Because thou hast made, the Lord. . . thy habitation, there shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling" (Ps. 91:5-10), the righteous can sing: "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea." Ps. 46:1, 2.

But the people of God are not to be left on the earth during the great conflagration which destroys the wicked and melts the elements. "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. As the trumpet sounds, the dead are raised incorruptible, and the living are likewise changed from mortal to immortal, "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye" (1 Cor. 15:51, 52); so that when they go to be with Christ, and to inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world (Matt. 25:34), they are equal unto the angels, for they cannot die any more. And thus is fulfilled the statement in Dan. 2:44: "And the kingdom shall not be left to other people."

Not forever are the people of God to remain away from this earth. Says John: "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection." Rev. 20:4, 5. Here the first resurrection, the resurrection of the righteous, is brought to view, with the statement that a thousand years is to intervene between that and the resurrection of the wicked. During that time the earth is in a state of chaos, an abyss, as it was in the beginning. Isaiah describes it thus: "Behold, the Lord maketh the earth empty, and maketh it waste, and turneth it upside down, and scattereth abroad the inhabitants thereof." "The land shall be utterly emptied, and utterly spoiled; for the Lord hath spoken this word." Isa. 24:1, 3. And Jeremiah says: "I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was without form, and void; and the heavens, and they had no light. I beheld the mountains, and, lo, they trembled, and all the hills moved lightly. I beheld, and, lo, there was no man, and all the birds of the heavens were fled. I beheld, and, lo, the fruitful place [was] a wilderness, and all the cities thereof were broken down at the presence of the Lord, and by his fierce anger. For thus hath the Lord said, The whole land shall be desolate; yet will I not make a full end." Jer. 4:23-27.

During this period of desolation, those who have had part in the first resurrection, upon whom the second death has no power (Rev. 20:6), are sitting on thrones of judgment (Rev. 20:4), judging the world and wicked angels. 1 Cor. 6:1-3. They are in the kingdom of God, because they are in the Jew Jerusalem, the capital of that kingdom. The gates of the "strong city" will have been opened, "that the righteous nation which keepeth the truth" might enter in. Isa. 26:1, 2. At the close of the thousand years, when "the holy city, New Jerusalem," comes down "from God out of Heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband" (Rev. 21:2); the wicked dead are then raised, and the prophetic declaration is, that "they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and fire came down from God out of Heaven, and devoured them." Rev. 20:9.

This devouring is the same as the destruction described in the nineteenth chapter, a portion of which has been quoted. It is the same as the casting of the tares into the fire, spoken of by Christ in Matt. 13; and when this has been done, "Then shall the kingdom shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."

Reader, would you be one of the happy subjects of that kingdom? If so, you must do the will of God, and that means that you must keep his holy law; for only "the righteous nation which keepeth the truth" shall have a place in that kingdom. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." Rev. 22:14. E. J. W.

"Principles and Precepts" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

The word "law" is derived from the same root as the words "lie" and "lay," and primarily has the same meaning. "A law is that which is laid, set, or fixed, like statute, constitution, from Lat. *Statuere*."-*Webster*. And in harmony with this, the same authority gives as the first definition of the word "law," "a rule of order or conduct established by authority." It is a favorite saying with those who would make void the law of God while professing allegiance to his word, that the ten commandments are good, but that they are adapted

761

only to fallen beings, and hence cannot bind angels nor redeemed saints, nor even people in this world who have been converted. Let us see how such a theory agrees with the definition of law.

We will suppose that the angels are free from law, and that redeemed saints are to have a like freedom. In that case there would be nothing "laid down" for their guidance-no rule or order of conduct established by authority. In fact, there would be no authority, and each one would act independently of all the others. There would then exist in Heaven the same thing that would exist on earth if there were no law, namely, anarchy; for that means "without rule." But "God is not the author of confusion," and therefore such a state of things cannot exist in Heaven, and if not in Heaven, then of course not among the saints still on earth. The case may be stated thus: 1. When there is no law there is anarchy and confusion; there can be nothing else. 2. Confusion cannot exist among God's people, whether in Heaven or on earth. 3. Therefore, the people of God are always and everywhere subject to his law.

Seeing that it will not do to claim that any beings are absolutely free from law, the enemies of the truth have invented a specious theory, with which, unfortunately, many firm believers in the law of God have been captivated. It is this: "The law," they say, "as it exists in the ten commandments, is adapted only to fallen beings. These commandments hang on the two great principles of love to God and love to man, and it was these principles alone that existed before the fall, and these alone will be the law for the redeemed." And some there are who claim that these *principles* are all the law there is now for Christians. We regard this theory as more dangerous than the one which claims that all law is abolished; for it is the same thing in reality, while it has the *appearance* of great deference to the truth of God. Let us examine it.

It is utterly impossible for anyone to be guided by an abstract principle. Certain principles may have a controlling influence on our lives, but they must be embodied in definite precepts. As an illustration, we will relate a portion of a conversation which we once had with a gentleman who claimed that Christians

have nothing to do with the ten commandments. The question was asked him, Is there, then, nothing for Christians to do? *Answer*-*"Yes, they must love the Lord."* Very good, but how are they to show that they love the Lord? *Answer*-*"By doing what he tells them to do."* Well, what is it that contains specific statements of what the Lord requires us to do to show our love for him? *Answer*-*"Young man, I am older than you are."* The reader will wonder, as we did, what bearing this had on the subject. It showed that the man saw that the only possible *answer* was, "The law of God," an answer which would not agree with his theory, hence he chose to give none. But the illustration serves to show that principles, to be obeyed, must be embodied in precepts.

Says the beloved disciple: "This is the love of God, that we keep is commandments." 1 John 5:3. So when we read that the first great commandment is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." (Matt. 22:37), we know that it means nothing more nor less than that it is our first and highest duty to keep, both in letter and in spirit, all those commandments which define our duty to God. In no other way can we show that we love him.

Suppose for a moment that a man were placed here on earth with nothing to serve as a rule of life except the statement that he must love God supremely and his neighbor as himself. He sets out with a firm determination to do his whole duty. But ere long he is found doing something which God abhors. We will suppose that he is adoring the sun and moon. When reprov'd for this, he might well reply, "I did not know that I was doing anything wrong; nothing was said to me about this matter. I had a feeling of love and gratitude to God, and did not know how to manifest it in any better way than by paying homage to the most glorious of his created works." By what law could the man be condemned? He could not justly be condemned, because the will of the Creator on that point had not been made known to him, and he could not reasonably be expected to know the will of God if it had not been revealed.

It will be seen by a very little consideration, that to put a man on the earth with nothing but a general command to love God, and at the same time to expect him to do nothing displeasing to God, would be to assume that the man had infinite wisdom. For God is infinite; and if a man, without being told, finds out what God requires, it can only be because he can comprehend infinity. But this is an impossibility. "Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection?" No indeed; the creature that could know the mind of God any further than it was directly revealed by him, has never existed.

Then since, as we have conclusively proved, there must be a law for all creatures, and since this law must be definitely expressed, and since, moreover, the whole duty of man is to love God above all things, and his neighbor as himself, we are shut up to the conclusion that the ten commandments always have been and always will be the rule of life for all created intelligences. In direct support of this, 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." Eccl. 12:13. This settles the matter, at least for the present time. John also says that the love of God is to keep his commandments; but it will be our duty to love God

to all eternity; therefore it will always be our duty to keep the commandments of God. And it makes it no less a duty because it becomes our highest pleasure. To the natural man, duty is irksome; the object of making him a new creature in Christ, is that it may be a pleasure for him to do his duty. Paul says that God sent his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, thus condemning sin in the flesh, in order that the "righteousness [requirements] of the law might be fulfilled in us." Rom. 8:3, 4. The object of the gospel is to make us like unto Christ, who said, "I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart." Ps. 40:8.

In addition to the above, we offer the words of the prayer which Christ has commanded us to pray to God: "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven." Matt. 6:10. Now the will of God is his law. See Rom. 2:17, 18; Ps. 40:8. We are taught by this prayer, then, that when the kingdom of God is established on this earth, God's law will be kept here even as it is now kept in Heaven. And David says by inspiration, that the angels that excel in strength "do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word." Ps. 103:20. That is, they are anxious and delight to keep God's commandments. Duty is with them a pleasure. And when God's kingdom comes, we also, if permitted to become subjects of it, will delight to do God's will, and will keep all his commandments, of which "every one" "endureth forever." We shall then do perfectly what we now are (or should be) striving to do in spite of the weakness of the flesh.

This subject will be continued in another article, in which we shall consider the objection that there are certain commandments of the Decalogue which angels or glorified saints could not violate if they wished to, and that therefore it is absurd to suppose that obedience to those commandments is required of them. E. J. W.

"The High-License Delusion" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

The following we find credited to the San Francisco *Alta*:-

"The only bulwark so far thrown up against the encroachment of prohibition is the high license. Prohibition has outlawed beer and wine in Maine, Vermont, Iowa, and Kansas. Wisconsin, with her great brewing interest, has only saved herself by adopting high license. Nebraska, with her enormous distilleries and breweries, has taken the same shelter. Southern States, like Georgia and Texas, have their feet upon the very threshold of prohibition. Will the dealers in California hear and heed in time?"

This wail does not sound much as though high license were the grand, desirable thing which many misguided temperance people imagine it to be. There is a large number of influential men in California who are earnestly striving for what they call "high license." Will they hear and heed in time? or will they persist in throwing up this "bulwark against the encroachment of prohibition"?

The first thing to do in dealing with the liquor traffic is to determine its character. Is it wholly good and beneficial? or are there some evils connected with it? or is it an unmixed evil? The first question will be universally answered in the negative. No one will claim that there are no dark features to the liquor traffic. Well, then, is it partly good? This must be answered in the affirmative, if it can be

shown that the use of liquor has any tendency to make men better, or wiser, or more kind to their families, or wealthier, or that it in any way conduces to their real happiness. Not one of these things can be claimed for it. On the contrary, it is brutalizing and degrading in its tendency; ignorance and poverty everywhere accompany it; and misery of every description is caused by it. The use of liquor is a promoter of vice in every form; and it is safe to say that more murders and suicides result from it than from all other causes combined. It cannot be denied that the use of alcoholic liquors is evil, and only evil, continually.

Now what about licensing a traffic that is so unmitigated an evil? What does the word "license" mean? It means liberty. To license the sale of liquor, is to give men full liberty to dispense that which will entail all the evils above enumerated, and thousands more. Why not with just as good reason license murder outright? It will be claimed, of course, that those who sell liquor do not murder anybody. No, they do not directly; but it is well known that what they sell cannot possibly produce any good results, and tends directly to all manner of evil. An apologist will doubtless say that we do not prohibit the sale of fire-arms, and men often buy them with the sole design of committing murder. The case is not a parallel one; for weapons may be, and most commonly are, used for inoffensive purposes. If it were impossible to use them for any other purpose than that of murder, we think there would be a quite general demand for the prohibition of their sale. As it is, we are not championing the sale of fire-arms. Even if fire-arms were also an unmitigated evil, the question of their sale would have no bearing on the liquor traffic; for the existence of one evil is no just reason for the existence of another.

But the friends of license say we must not consider it as a *permission*, but as a *tax*. That is a distinction with no difference. We must consider it just as it is. A liquor license is simply a permission to certain men to sell that which will ruin their fellows, but with the provision that the profits of the unholy traffic are to be divided with the Government. And so, in spite of all casuistry, it is a fact that the Government becomes a partner in crime.

Whether any kind of license will serve as a step toward temperance, may be easily determined by a moment's thought. People who are addicted to the use of liquor will get it if it is to be had. Then, if the license tax be placed so high that the small dealers cannot afford to continue the business, the result will be that instead of having a given quantity of liquor sold by one hundred dealers, we shall have the same quantity sold by seventy-five or less. But since these have to pay a heavier tax than before, they will make greater efforts to increase the profits, either by increased sales, or by adulterating the liquor still more, so that nothing is gained in the way of temperance.

The great argument which misguided temperance men urge in support of high license, is that public sentiment is not ready for prohibition, but that high license can be carried, and therefore we must take when we can get. True, and if they would lower the price of the license, they could carry their measure by a still greater majority. The question to be considered is not, What measure will secure the largest support? but, What measure is best? Let the latter question be settled, and then work for the support of what is right.

"But it is impossible to stop the sale of liquor entirely, even by the most stringent prohibitory laws; therefore the best thing to do is to secure as much revenue from it as we can." This is another argument often used, but it is very fallacious. There are places where the sale of liquor is absolutely prohibited, and what has been done may be done. It is true that in large cities it is next to impossible

762

to eradicate the evil; but the same thing may be said of all crime. We have a prohibitory law against murder, with severe penalties attached; but it has never been effectual in causing murders to cease. In our large cities the law is violated daily; yet no one thinks of licensing the evil. It is very certain that there are far fewer murders than there would be if there were no prohibitory law against murder; and no one can doubt that if the law were abolished, and any form of license substituted, murder would be rampant.

When the question of the resumption of specie payments was under discussion, a prominent statesman solved the problem by saying, "The way to resume is to resume." So the way to prohibit is to prohibit. It is true that it would take more time and a greater effort to secure prohibition than it would to secure even a very high license; but when secured something would be accomplished. Nothing is ever gained by parleying and compromising with evil. Vigorous measures alone are of any value, whatever the evil against which we are striving. We are firm in the belief that absolute prohibition is what all temperance people should labor for, no matter how impossible it may seem to secure such a result. The extract quoted at the beginning of this article, followed as it was by the statement, "We are opposed to prohibition," should open the eyes of temperance people who are courting "high" license. We do not doubt that license is a practical measure, but we have no faith in the results of such practice. It would not be so difficult a matter to secure prohibition as it seems, if men were in earnest. But whether difficult or not, makes no difference. We are not to abandon a good measure for a bad one simply because the bad one may be more easily executed. What we consider the proper method to adopt to secure prohibition may be discussed at another time. E. J. W.

December 24, 1885

"The Law of God-for Whom Made" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 49.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week, under the head of "Principles and Precepts," we showed that not simply the great principles of love, but the embodiment of those principles in the ten commandments, are the rule of life for all men in all ages; that the law is adapted to pure and holy beings, and is kept even by the angels in Heaven. After one additional thought on this point, we shall proceed to notice in detail some things that are offered as objections to this view.

The difference between sinful man and the law of God, is shown by Paul in the following words: "For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold

under sin." Rom. 7:14. Between things spiritual and things carnal there is no possibility for the slightest union, as is proved by Gal. 5:17: "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other." And therefore, as a consequence of this implacable enmity, the words of Paul follow very naturally: "So that ye cannot do the things that ye would." This last statement is made more emphatic in Rom. 8:7: "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be."

That by the term "law" Paul refers to the ten commandments, and not to certain abstract principles, is easily seen from Rom. 7:7 and 2:17-23. The fact, then, is made plain that men cannot meet the requirements of the ten commandments, because the commandments are spiritual, and men are carnal. "They that are in the flesh cannot please God." Rom. 8:8. Now it is required of all men that they please God, and therefore the apostle proceeds to show how it may be done: "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you." Rom. 8:9. A man in whom the Spirit of God dwells is certainly spiritual, and therefore just in harmony with the law of God, which is also spiritual. And so we see that instead of the law being adapted only to sinful beings, it is especially adapted to the righteous; for they are the only ones who can continue in its requirements. It is the keeping of the ten commandments (which can be done only by those who are "in Christ") that makes men spiritual; when they cease to keep the law, they cease to be spiritual.

In supposed opposition to the position which we have taken, is 1 Tim. 1:9, 10: "Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine." Whoever imagines that this text means that a righteous man is not under obligations to keep the law, has never read more than the first clause. Since the law is "made for" those who steal, lie, kill, commit adultery, blaspheme, etc., we should gather that it forbids all those things, and so it does. Then according to the common supposition, the righteous, for whom the law is *not* "made," are not prohibited from these practices! A necessary conclusion which is so absurd, shows plainly that the premises are wrong.

But if it is the duty of Christians to keep the law, how shall we understand Paul's statement that the law is "made" for the wicked, and not for the righteous? We can answer this question in no better way than by quoting a portion of Dr. Clarke's comment on 1 Tim. 1:9:-

"He [the apostle] does not say that the law was not MADE for the righteous man; but *ou keoti*, it does not LIE against a righteous man, because he does not transgress against it; but it *lies against* the wicked; for such, as the apostle mentions, have broken it, and grievously too, and are condemned by it. The word *keittai*, *lies*, refers to the custom of writing laws on boards, and hanging them up in public places, within reach of every man, that they might be read by all; thus all would see against whom the law *lay*."

This is exactly in harmony with the primal meaning of the word law,—"something laid,"—as given in the article last week. The law is "laid" for the benefit of all; it lies *against* the man who violates it, and crushes him if he persists in his disobedience; but it does not lie *against* the righteous, because they "walk in the law of the Lord." There is no opposition between them and the law; to them the law is indeed "the way of peace," because they delight in it. But let one of the righteous ones step out of this way, and that step will bring the law *against* him.

And now to the statement that Christians are in duty bound to keep the ten commandments, and that, in fact, that is the badge of their discipleship, we must add another statement which necessarily follows, namely, that this delightful duty will be theirs throughout eternity, just as it has been that of the angels ever since they were created. "Angels that excel in strength" do the commandments of God, "hearkening unto the voice of his word." Ps. 103:20. And when the kingdom of God is established upon earth, God's will (the ten commandments) will be done on earth even as it is now done in Heaven. Matt. 6:10. As long as the throne of God endures, the ten commandments will be the law by which God rules his vast Government, the foundation of his throne. E. J. W.

"How Does It Happen" *The Signs of the Times* 11, 49.

E. J. Waggoner

When people for the first time hear or read the truth concerning the Sabbath, the nature of man, the coming of the Lord, and other Bible doctrines held by Seventh-day Adventists, they frequently ask, "If these things are so plainly taught in the Bible, why is it that they have not been taught by Bible students in past ages? Why is it that Luther, Calvin, Wesley, and other learned and pious theologians did not see these doctrines?"

A satisfactory answer to these questions may easily be given. We must consider the circumstances under which those men began their labors. We must remember that when the Reformation began, the Bible had been for several hundred years a proscribed book. The art of printing was unknown, and books were necessarily copied by hand. This was a tedious process, and made it impossible for poor people to own them. Besides this, the only copies of the Bible in existence were in the original Greek and Hebrew, or in Latin; and when we remember that Greek and Hebrew were rarely taught, even in the universities, and that few learned men had any knowledge of those languages, Latin being the only language of educated people, we see that the number of people who could use the Bible, even had they possessed a copy, was very limited. Still further, when we remember that the few manuscript copies of the Bible that were in existence were the property of the Catholic Church, which had no interest in circulating them among the people, but on the contrary, kept these copies carefully concealed, we see that it was next to impossible for anybody to have any personal acquaintance with the word of God. Says D'Aubigne:-

"The priests having taken into their own hands the disposing [of] a salvation which belonged only to God, had thereby secured a sufficient hold on the respect of the people. What need had they [the priests] to study sacred learning? It was

no longer their office to explain the Scriptures, but to grant letters of indulgence; and for the fulfilling of that ministry, it was unnecessary to have acquired any great learning. In country parts, says Wimpfeling, they appointed as preachers poor wretches whom they had taken from beggary, and who had been cooks, musicians, huntsmen, stable-boys, and even worse.

"The superior clergy themselves were sunk in great ignorance. A bishop of Danfeldt congratulated himself on never having learned Greek or Hebrew. The monks asserted that all heresies arose from these languages, but especially from the Greek. 'Greek,' continued he, 'is a modern language but recently invented, and against which we must be upon our guard. As to Hebrew, my dear brethren, it is certain that whoever studies that immediately becomes a Jew.' . . . Thomas Linacer, a learned and celebrated divine, had never read the New Testament. Drawing near his end (in 1524), he called for it, but quickly threw it from him with an oath because his eye had caught the words, 'But I say unto you, Swear not at all.' 'Either this is not the gospel,' said he, 'or we are not Christians.' Even the schools of theology in Paris did not scruple to declare before the Parliament. 'There is an end of religion if the study of Hebrew and Greek is permitted.'

"If here and there among the clergy some learning existed, it was not in sacred literature. The Ciceronians of Italy affect great contempt for the Bible on account of its style. Men who arrogated to themselves the title of priests of Christ's church, translated the words of the Holy Ghost into the style of Virgil and of Horace to accommodate them to the ears of men of taste. The Cardinal Bembo wrote always instead of 'the Holy Spirit,' 'the breath of the celestial zephyr;' for 'remission of sins' he substituted 'the pity of the manes and of the gods;' and instead of 'Christ the Son of God,' 'Minerva sprung from the brows of Jupiter.' Finding, one day, the respectable Sadoletus employed on the translation of the epistle to the Romans, 'Leave these childish productions,' said he, 'such puerilities do not become a sensible man.'"

It was only a few weeks ago that a Catholic priest in Montreal, speaking of the Protestant Bible, said to his congregation: "I want to be understood that the Church forbids you to read those Bibles. If you have any of them in your house, burn them; and if you do not want to burn them, bring them to me, and I will burn them."

It was amidst influences like these that the Reformation began. Luther was twenty years old before he had even seen a copy of the Bible. Now if any one wonders why he did not, in his lifetime, grasp all the truths which it contains, let him try an experiment: Let him give the Bible to a man who has never seen the book, and see how long it will take him to thoroughly understand it. Let the reader consider his own case, and see how great an understanding he has of the Bible; then remember that there can scarcely be a parallel to Luther's case nowadays, because the influence of the Bible is everywhere. The people who have never read it have met its teachings in books, or perhaps in sermons, or in their intercourse with other people. When we think of these things, instead of wondering that Luther did not understand more of the Bible, we are lost in astonishment that he was able to grasp so many of its truths as he did.

When we come to the time of Wesley, we find that he had a still better understanding of the Bible than Luther had. This was not because he was a more talented or a more devoted man than Luther, but because he had better advantages. He had the benefit of all of Luther's study and experience, as well as of that of many other learned men. And as we come down a hundred years later, to our own time, it is no egotism to say that we may have a deeper insight into the truths of the Bible than Wesley had, because we have the aid of his research, and that of Bible students since his time. It would indeed be a cause for shame to any intelligent Bible student if he did not profit by the light thrown upon the

778

word by those men of God. Besides this, we must remember that there are special truths for special occasions. Peter speaks of the "present truth." There is such a truth for every age. The special truth for the time of Luther was justification by faith. The people were swallowed up in dead forms and useless ceremonies, and needed instruction in the first principles of the gospel, of which the world was totally ignorant. All the preaching needed to be directed to that one thing. As the Bible became a common book, and the doctrine of justification by faith and not by works was more generally understood, other points could be brought in. As we come down to the early portion of this century, we see a special prominence given to the doctrine of Christ's second coming. Ministers of all denominations seemed moved by a common impulse to study the prophecies, and to teach them to the people. A little later the doctrine of eternal life only in Christ, and that received at the resurrection, began to be preached quite extensively. This was a natural consequence of the preaching of the second advent. And still later we find special attention given to the law of God, and the Sabbath, until now the truth on this point has been circulated throughout the world. To be sure, there have been a few people in all generations who have held all, or nearly all, of these truths; but the attention of the people as a whole has been directed to only one new truth at a time.

Our Lord, in speaking to his disciples, recognized the fact that the human mind must be led into truth step by step when he said: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." John 16:12. It will be noticed, however, that while in different generations one truth has been made especially prominent, the truths which have been brought out in preceding generations are not ignored, but the new truths are added to them; and thus is fulfilled the statement that "the path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." Prov. 4:18.

It is not for us to spend time wondering why former generations did not have certain doctrines preached to them, but simply to inquire, Are these things so? This may be easily determined by the Bible, and we should, instead of questioning, rejoice that new light is given to us, and should walk in the light while we have the light, lest darkness come upon us. E. J. W.