

# **The Signs of the Times, Vol. 5 (1879)**

**February 13, 1879**

## **"Answers to Questions" *The Signs of the Times* 5, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

To W. H. SWAIN.-We do not believe that the false prophet of the book of Revelation is the Mohammedan power. In Rev. 19:20 it is said the false prophet wrought miracles before the beast, "with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshiped his image." Chapter 13 says it is the two-horned beast which deceives them that dwell on the earth by the miracles which he does in the sight of the beast, and causes the dwellers on the earth to worship the beast, to make an image to him, and to receive his mark. Comparing these two chapters of this book we learn that the two-horned beast is the false prophet. But Mohammedanism never caused men to worship the first beast-the papacy. These powers have always been in antagonism; therefore Mohammedanism cannot be the false prophet, for it has always acted just the reverse of what is ascribed to the false prophet. For a full exposition of the subject, see a pamphlet for sale at this office entitled, *The United States in the Light of Prophecy*.

To W. M. SMITH.-The propriety of partaking of the Lord's supper with other denominations does not at all depend on the nature of the invitation given. We consider it quite inconsistent by those who keep all the commandments of God to commune with those who ignore the keeping of them, either in whole or in part.

How do you harmonize Rev. 21:1, where it says "there was no more sea," with Rev. 5:13, where it speaks of every creature *in the sea* praising God? E. J. W.

ANSWER.-Several translations, as Anderson's Whitting's, Sawyer's, and the Syriac, give the more literal rendering, "and the sea was no more." Doubtless this referred to the sea which was connected with the first earth, which was also "passed away." The old earth and the old sea were passed away and were no more. The new earth will then have a sea of its own.

## **The Signs of the Times, Vol. 7 (1881)**

**March 24, 1881**

## **"Questions" *The Signs of the Times* 7, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

1. Why did Micaiah, being a true prophet of the Lord tell the king of Israel (1 Kings 22), to go and prosper, for the Lord would deliver it into his hand when it turned out differently?

The question is based on a misapprehension of the text. Read carefully the first 14 verses to understand the conditions. In verse 15 we read, "And the king said unto him, Micaiah, shall we go up against Ramoth-gilead or shall we forbear? And he answered him, Go, and prosper, for the Lord shall deliver it into the hand of the king." Now although this seems to be a favorable answer, the king did not understand it so, for he was dissatisfied with it. Micaiah then proceeded to tell him plainly what the result would be. But did Micaiah utter a falsehood in the first answer. No, and the king was not deceived. From the fact that the first reply, the *words* of which were favorable, produced the same effect on the king as the second reply which was unfavorable, it is evident that Micaiah spoke in a derisive manner in the first instance. For another instance of irony, when a meaning is conveyed directly opposite from the words used, see Job 12:2.

1. Why did the Lord put a lying spirit into the mouth of all the king's prophets to deceive him?

Had the king really desired to know what he ought to do, the lying spirits would not have been sent; but the king was fully set in his determination to go up against Ramoth-gilead, and the Lord let him have his own way. In chap. 21:25 we read: "But there was none like unto Ahab which did sell himself to work wickedness in the sight of the Lord." Now concerning persons of this stamp we read in 2 Thess. 2:11, 12: "And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." Notwithstanding; the fact that nothing could turn Ahab from his purpose, God gave him the truth by his own prophet, so that he was left wholly without excuse. E. J. W.

**June 2, 1881**

**"Whose Law Is It?" *The Signs of the Times* 7, 21.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following paragraph, which is going the rounds of the religious press, shows the careless manner in which most people handle the word of God:-

"Moses with his decalogue, could never accomplish what has been achieved by Christ and his cross. The bonds of the old morality could, like green withes, be easily broken; but the ties of this morality are strong, just because they are tender."

It is evident that the writer of the above is trying to place Christ in antagonism to the ten commandments; but where in the Bible do we find any record of the decalogue of Moses? Moses did not originate the law, he did not speak it to the people, God called Moses into the mount, and there gave him the ceremonial law, and directions concerning the building of the sanctuary. But the decalogue was not intrusted to Moses to be transmitted to the people. Thus we read, "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; and in chapter 32:15, 16, we read, "And Moses turned, and

went down from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony were in his hand: the tables were written on both their sides; on the one side and on the other were they written. And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables." And still later, when Moses rehearsed the ten commandments to Israel, 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." Deut. 5:22.

When these first tables were broken, the Lord said to Moses: "Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first; and I will write upon these tables the words that were in the first tables, which thou brakest." "And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments." Ex. 34:1, 28.

This law thus spoken and written by God is always called his. "Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; a blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the Lord your God, and a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God." Deut. 11:26-28. "And they left all the commandments of the Lord their God." "Also Judah kept not the commandments of the Lord their God." 2 Kings 17:16, 19. David in his charge to Solomon, said: "Only the Lord give thee wisdom and understanding, and give thee charge concerning Israel, that thou mayest keep the law of the Lord thy God." 1 Chron. 22:12. See also Ps. 1:2; 19:7, 8; 119; Isa. 5:24, and many other texts in which the commandments are distinctly called the law of God.

There is a law that is sometime called Moses' law, but it was distinct from the decalogue. It was the law of ceremonies which God gave to Moses while he was in the mount. Of this law it is said, "And Moses wrote this law," and, "And it came to pass when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book," etc. Deut. 31:9, 24. But although Moses wrote this law for the use of the people, and it is sometimes termed his law, it is nowhere claimed that Moses had any further connection with it than as the mouthpiece of God. Thus in Lev. 27:34, after this law had been rehearsed, the statement was made, "These are the commandments which the Lord commanded Moses for the children of Israel in Mount Sinai;" and in Neh. 9:13, 14, the distinction between the law of God and that of Moses is clearly made, while God is still represented as the author of both. "Thou camest down also upon mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments; and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath, and commandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant."

The clearness of these statements leaves no room for

248

mistake as to the authorship of the decalogue. It is easy to discern, however, whence such carelessness as the above arises. The same spirit which leads men to speak of the Sabbath of the Lord as the "old Jewish Sabbath," leads them to speak of the law of which it is a part as the "decalogue of Moses." The antipathy felt toward the Sabbath will naturally extend to the whole law, and instead of repudiating the fourth commandment merely, men will reject the whole law. The

respect which men have for a law is in proportion to the respect felt for the maker of it. Cannot these religious teachers see that their efforts to diminish immorality and extend the gospel of Christ can meet with no real success while they thus "pervert the right ways of the Lord"?

**June 9, 1881**

**"Precept and Practice" *The Signs of the Times* 7, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

An insuperable objection, in the minds of some against the Sabbath of the Lord, and a reason for the observance of Sunday, is the supposed example of the apostles. It is quite a commonly received opinion that the apostles were in the habit of meeting together for worship on the first day of the week, and of using the Sabbath as a secular day. Even a superficial reading of the New Testament by an unprejudiced person, would show the utter fallacy of any such supposition. If apostolic example were our only guide, the weight of evidence would be in favor of the Lord's Sabbath, for we have accounts of many meetings held on the Sabbath, while we have the record of only one meeting on the first day of the week. But it is urged that the apostles met to preach on the Sabbath because then only could they gain access to the people in the synagogues. This again has hardly the shadow of a supposition to support it, for we read that on one occasion Paul and his companions, on a Sabbath day, "went out of the city by a river side where prayer was wont to be made," and spoke to the people. Acts 16:13.

But it may well be said on either side, that *mere example* without any precept is not sufficient ground upon which to base faith and practice. To this we heartily agree, and would that our first-day friends would ever abide by it, for precept for Sunday observance is even less than supposed example.

But again, our friends say that even though there may be no law in the New Testament for Sunday keeping, there is none for the Sabbath, and, therefore, Christians may do as they please. "If Christ and his apostles," say they, "had designed that people under the new dispensation should keep the Sabbath, they would have made formal declaration of some law to that effect." The fact that the law was not thus formally re-enacted is claimed as proof that it was intended

259

to be ignored. Let us see if this be reasonable. Ninety-two years ago the United States' Constitution, the fundamental law of the land, was ratified. Officers were chosen who administered in the affairs of State under that Constitution. Since that time there have been nineteen different dispensations, and not once has the Constitution been re-enacted. No one has seemed to think it necessary to do so. An act which in the days of Washington would have been treasonable, would be punished as such to-day, and by the same authority now as then. Now if the Constitution of the United States holds good through nineteen dispensations, surely the law of God must remain valid through two. Indeed, a moment's reflection would convince any one that a law must be in full force until it is formally annulled. And since in the case of the law of God, as in the Constitution,

no repeal of the law had been made known, a re-enactment would have been labor thrown away.

But some one, following out the illustration, will say that although our legislators do not, at every session or new administration, re-enact the Constitution, they have to affirm their allegiance to it. True, and we shall find exactly the same thing in regard to the law of God in the Christian dispensation. At the very outset we find Christ stating his position in regard to it: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." Matt. 5:17. Then with divine authority he states that whosoever should break one of these commandments, and should teach men so, should be counted of no esteem in the kingdom of God. Christ's teaching was ever in accordance with this declaration. See Matt. 19:17; 22:36-40; Ps. 40:7, 8; Isa. 42:21.

We come now to the apostles, and we shall see that they likewise acknowledged their allegiance to the law. Paul was the most prominent among them, and being the "apostle to the gentiles," he certainly would consider himself exempt from its observance if any of them could. Hear him declare his faith before Felix: "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." Acts 24:14.

We have here the expressed belief of Christ and Paul. Now who dare say that their practice was different from their teaching? Did not Christ live out his own precepts? It was said of him (Ps. 40:8) that he came to do the will of God, and that God's law was "within his heart." Was Paul a hypocrite? No one would dare make such an assertion, and yet those who claim that he desecrated the Sabbath, virtually call him a hypocrite professing one thing and doing another. When Paul said that he *believed* "all things which were written in the law," we cannot have the slightest doubt but that he *practiced* all things contained in the law, the Sabbath with the rest.

This testimony is not ambiguous. It is clear and explicit. None need fail through ignorance. As a last stand, does any one plead force of habit, old associations, inconvenience, or the ridicule of friends? Christ says "What is that to thee? follow thou me." "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments."

**June 30, 1881**

**"When Does the Sabbath Commence?" *The Signs of the Times* 7, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

This has been a puzzling question to very many. They cannot understand why Sabbath-keepers should commence their rest at the setting of the sun, while other people regard the day as commencing at midnight. Some have thought that it was all arbitrary distinction, more for the purpose of peculiarity than anything else; but a little reference to the Scriptures will suffice to clear the subject of all doubts.

In the first place we have evidence that the first day of time began in the evening. That is, the dark portion of the day preceded the light portion. "The evening and the morning were the first day." Gen. 1:5. That this was necessarily the case, may be seen from the order of events in the creation. Time, as distinguished from eternity, commenced with the first creative act of God. The first act was the bringing of the earth into existence. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Gen. 1:1. That this occupied but a brief space of time, and not a long extended period, is proved by the context, also by Ps. 33:6, 9: "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth. For he spake, and it was done, he commanded, and it stood fast." But at that time there was no light, nothing but intense darkness, for we read that "darkness was upon the face of the deep." The next act was to create light. "And God said, Let there be light, and there was light" (Gen. 1:3). God then ordained that darkness and light should henceforth succeed each other in continuous round, and a period of darkness and one of light, called respectively night and day, should constitute one entire day. This completed the first day's work. The first day commenced with darkness, and ended as darkness began once more to overspread the earth. As though to establish beyond question the fact that this was to be the order of all days, it is stated of the first six days that the "evening and the morning" constituted the day. But if the first six days commenced with the evening, and ended with the following evening, it is evident that every succeeding day, the Sabbath with the rest, must begin and end in the same manner. This is further verified by Lev. 23:32, where the Lord says, "From even to even shall ye celebrate your Sabbath."

Having settled the fact that the day begins and ends at evening, the only thing necessary to an understanding of the main question is to find when the evening commences. This is easily settled by the following passage: "But at the place which the Lord thy God shall choose to place his name in, there thou shalt sacrifice the passover *at even at the going down of the sun.*" Deut. 16:9. "And the king of Ai he hanged on a tree *till eventide*; and, *as soon as the sun was down*, Joshua commanded that they should take his carcass down from the tree." Josh. 8:20. Also, Josh. 10:26, 27: "Joshua smote them, and slew them, and hanged them on five trees; and they were hanging upon the trees *until the evening*. And it came to pass at the *time of the going down of the sun*, that Joshua commanded, and they took them down off the trees." These texts plainly show that the evening and the setting of the sun are identical. In the New Testament we have additional testimony. In the first chapter of Mark we have an account of the events of one Sabbath in the life of Christ. First he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and taught. Verse 21. Here he found a man with an unclean spirit, whom he healed. Verses 20-31. The rest of the people, however, dared not ask him to heal their sick during the hours of the Sabbath, but waited till its close. We read in verse 31, "And *at even, when the sun did set*, they brought unto him all that were diseased, and them that were possessed with devils." Thus we see that the people unanimously regarded sunset as the close of the Sabbath, and, of course, of its commencement. This was the divinely appointed order.

The question then arises, How does it happen that people nowadays commence and end the day at midnight? The answer is this: When men became idolaters, and did not like to retain God in their knowledge (Rom. 1:28), they soon lost all knowledge of the institutions and commandments of God, so that their forms of worship and daily life differed entirely from those of God's people. Each nation had gods of its own, and customs peculiar to itself. The Persians and Assyrians worshiped the sun, and commenced the day at sunrise. That the Jews, during their captivity, did not lose their reckoning, and conform to that of the Babylonians, is proved by the passage in Mark already quoted. The Romans, for some reason, selected midnight as the time for the beginning and ending of their day. The barbarous tribes that conquered Rome, accepted her customs, and transmitted them to their descendants. Thus the Roman method of commencing the day has become the settled custom in Europe and America. Since it is an established custom, it is necessary, in order to be understood, to conform to the usage in speaking with others, also in business, since the custom is fixed by law. But in the observance of the Sabbath, God's order is unchangeable. Those who accept the Sunday festival, which is a man-made institution emanating from Rome, may be allowed to keep it in such a manner as man decrees; but those who keep God's rest-day-the memorial of his creative power-will take the day just as God gave it, and not offer a substitute by patching a portion of two days together.

**July 15, 1881**

**"Was the Bible Inspired?" *The Signs of the Times* 7, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

A few years ago, any one who manifested any doubt as to the Inspiration of the whole of the Bible, would have been set down at once as an infidel. Now, however, professed Christians and ministers in good standing and high repute, not only express doubts, but openly avow their disbelief in the inspiration of different positions of the Bible. This, although as deserving of the name "infidelity" as ever, is termed "liberality," and is extolled as a product of the advanced thought of the nineteenth century.

The following, from the *Christian Union*, in answer to the question, "Do you believe the account of the creation and the fall of man, as given in the Bible?" is a very fair specimen of what may be termed "religious infidelity":-

"There is no claim made by Moses, and none made for him by any other writer in the Bible, that the account of the creation and the fall of man, as given in the first chapters of Genesis, was a revelation from God to Moses. In the absence of any such claim, we see no reason why the church or the theologian should make it for him. The presumption is that he obtained his facts as other historians obtain theirs; that is, that his history of the events prior to his own time was compiled from an acquaintance with the traditions of his age, and this presumption is confirmed by parallel and analogous traditions recently discovered in other very ancient Assyrian writers. The essential truths in the first

chapters of Genesis are the religious truths, and these are unaffected by the question whether the story is to be regarded as purely historical or partially allegorical and parabolic."

To prove that it is no injustice to call such teaching as this infidelity, it will be necessary to show that it really strikes at the whole Bible. This is the case, as can easily be shown.

There are only two ways in which Moses could have received the account of the creation and the fall of man, as recorded in Genesis, chapters 1-3. One is by revelation from God, the other is the way suggested above, namely, by tradition. Now if the latter is the case, the credibility of all of Moses' writings is destroyed, for no one will place any confidence in an author's narrative, if he himself should give evidence of his credulity on the very start, by telling as a fact what is manifestly absurd. There is nothing in the narrative to lead one to suppose that Moses had any doubts as to its authenticity. The account of the exodus of the children of Israel which occurred under Moses' direct supervision, is in no more positive terms than is the history of the creation. If this be not true, then the whole of Genesis is discredited, for Moses knew nothing of the events personally.

Supposing then, with the *Christian Union*, that Moses was deceived, and that what he wrote as facts never occurred, what effect does it have on the rest of the Bible?

The ten commandments are universally recognized by Christians as embodying all the principles of right, as the foundation of all law, and as emanating from God himself. The Bible teaches this. Now the fourth commandment depends entirely upon the narrative of creation as recorded in Genesis. It is just as reliable as the first chapter of Genesis and no more so. The author of the one must be the author of the other.

The only reason given for its observance is that "in

332

six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is."

If God is the author of the fourth commandment, then the reliability of the Mosaic account of creation is attested; and, on the contrary, if the first and second chapters of Genesis are *not* true, then the fourth commandment, and all the other commandments are a forgery, for they purport to come from God himself. Thus we see that not only the reliability of Moses' writings, but also the whole system of morality and religion, depends on the correctness of the Scripture record of creation.

Of course, then, none of Moses' writings can be accepted, for whether we say that Moses was himself deceived, or willfully deceived others, he would manifestly be an unsafe guide.

But let us go still farther. Throughout the Bible we have continual reference to the books of Moses either as a whole or in part. We will notice only a few, for they are almost innumerable. In 2 Chronicles, in Nehemiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, especially, we have it stated that God brought calamities upon the Jews for their violation of the Sabbath. Nehemiah states expressly that God spoke through Moses. Neh. 9:13, 14. In the Psalms, the reference to the law are in nearly every chapter, the 19th and 119th being especially prominent instances. The 8th, 33rd,



and 136th Psalms make special mention of the creation as given in Genesis. In short, it is an undisputed fact that all the Old Testament writers placed implicit confidence in the writings of Moses. But if Moses, through lack of inspiration, fell into error, and recorded absurdities, none of the writers who quote him, or base arguments on his statements, can have been inspired. Had God prompted them in their utterances, he would not have allowed them to follow one who willfully deceived, or wrote from mere hearsay. Therefore we must place a large portion if not the whole of the Old Testament in the same category with the writings of Moses.

But this is not the only result of discrediting Moses' writings. The New Testament writers make frequent references to Moses, and all quote him as authority. Paul quotes him more than any other, and in his second epistle to Timothy he commended him for his knowledge of the Scriptures, said they were able to make him wise unto salvation, and actually claimed that they were given by inspiration of God. The Old Testament Scriptures are here referred to, for none of the New had been written when Timothy was a child. Paul also makes special mention of the fall of man, showing that he believed it implicitly. Of course, then, Paul derived his knowledge from the same sources that other historians did theirs, namely, tradition. But above all, Jesus Christ himself testifies as to the validity of Moses' writings, for in Luke 16 he says that "Moses and the prophets" are sufficient, if heeded, to keep one from eternal destruction. And in John 5:45-47 he makes the faith of the Jews in Moses a test of their belief in him. Certainly the testimony of Christ should at once dispel every doubt from the heart or head of a professed Christian.

Those, therefore, who disbelieve the Mosaic account of the creation, must necessarily take one of two positions, as follows: 1. Moses was an honest but extremely credulous man, who accepted all tradition as truth, without raising a question in regard to it, and the other writers of the Bible, equally simple-minded, followed him blindly; or, 2. Moses was an imposter like Mahomet, who willfully deceived the people for his own selfish purposes, and all the other Bible writers, and Christ himself, leagued together to perpetrate the imposition. The first is highly improbable, the second absolutely impossible, and both are blasphemous.

One important step in our investigation is now reached, and that is, that the whole Bible is so closely linked together that if a part of it is false, the whole is unreliable, and if a part is given by inspiration of God, the whole is likewise a revelation from the same source.

It must not be supposed that those, at least many of them, who thus lightly esteem the writings of Moses, realize what important consequences their position involves. It would be well for them to consider whether or not they are willing to throw away the whole Bible.

"Every word of God is pure; he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him." Prov. 30:5.

"Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you." Deut. 4:2.

**August 25, 1881**

**"Religious Infidelity Against the Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 7, 32.**

E. J. Waggoner

In noticing a statement of the *Christian Union* that the account of the creation and the fall of man as given by Moses was a mere matter of tradition, and not a revelation from God, we saw that the truthfulness of the whole Bible depends on the truthfulness of the writings of Moses. If they are not what they purport to be, plain declarations of facts, given by inspiration of God, then the entire Bible is unreliable, and the whole fabric of the Christian religion falls to the ground. All can see, then, the danger of, in any way, diminishing the confidence of men in this portion of the Bible-the foundation of the whole structure. And yet, strangely enough, this is the very part of which religious teachers are accustomed to speak the most slightly. And their disbelief is the more dangerous that it is veiled under a semblance of belief. Men can be on their guard against an open enemy, but the insidious foe that comes under the guise of friendship, can destroy the strongest. So the rantings of the atheist may make no impression, but the teachings of one virtually repudiating the very groundwork of the Bible while professing reverence for it, cannot fail to lead some astray.

In the article noticed, the following passage occurred:-

"The essential truths in the first chapters of Genesis are the religious truths, and these are unaffected by the question whether the story is to be regarded as purely historical, or partially allegorical and parabolic."

As stated before, the first chapters of Genesis have not the appearance of an allegory, but are given with as much positiveness as is the account of the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, and their journeyings through the wilderness. Now the only things in the first chapters of Genesis that pertain to religion, are the creation and the fall of man, and if these be not true, what religious truth can they teach? If these are allegorical are not the gospels also allegorical? The plan of redemption can be no more extensive than the fall, and if this is allegorical, that must certainly be. Then the prophecies of David and Isaiah concerning Christ are of no account. The statement of the angel concerning Jesus, "Thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins," must be a myth also; for if the story of the fall of man be not true, there is no such thing as sin, and consequently no need of a Saviour.

It must not be supposed, however, that those professed religious teachers who discredit the Mosaic account of creation, intend to deny the authority of the Bible as a whole. They do not usually look so far ahead for the result of their teachings. But there is a reason for their doubts, and it seems to be made quite plain in the following paragraph from an article on the Sabbath question in quite a prominent religious paper:-

"If we believe that the days of creation were periods, as geology quite conclusively shows, then it is difficult to say which day of our week was first observed as a Sabbath."

It is very evident that the writer of the above paragraph knows that if the days of creation were not long periods, but literal days, then we *can* tell which day was the Sabbath at first, and what day ought now to be kept. He recognizes the plain fact that the fourth commandment and the first and second chapters of Genesis have the most intimate connection. He might have added that if the days of creation were vast periods, it makes no earthly difference to us what day was first kept as the Sabbath; for since the fourth commandment and Genesis 1 and 2 are so interdependent, if the latter is not literally true, the former cannot be.

But is it true geology conclusively shows that the creation days were not literal days? It has been well said that "whether or not geologists contradict Moses, it is certain that they contradict each other." Although many professed scientists claim that the creation covered a vast period of time, no two of them have ever come within a million years of agreeing as to how long that period was. If a case were in court, and of fifty witnesses each hold a different story, their testimony would not be worth much. And after all, the authors of these theories of creation claim no more for them than that they are hypotheses. *If* a certain stratum is so many thousand years in forming, and *if* another stratum was formed in the same manner and at the same rate, then the earth must have been so many millions of years forming itself into its present shape, to say nothing of the myriads of years that it took it to evolve itself from the self-evolved protoplasm. And what is the object of this theorizing. Simply to prove that the Bible is inconsistent with itself. Infidels propound these theories and call them "science"; religious teachers who know a little of science and still less of the Bible, fearful that they may be thought ignorant if they do not acquiesce in everything asserted by "science," eagerly swallow down these theories, reckless of consequences, and with as little understanding of the real point at issue as the ancient Ephesians had are ready to exclaim, "Great is science of the nineteenth century!" Let us rather say with Paul, "Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar."

A few words must suffice to show how these so-called scientific theories make the Bible inconsistent with itself. The day is declared to be composed of the "evening and the morning"-the darkness and the light. Gen. 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31. In verse 16 it is declared that "God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night." The days mentioned in this chapter, then, are such as are marked by the appearance and disappearance

380

of the sun. To say that they are long periods is to make nonsense of the chapter.

Again in Ex. 20:8-11, we are commanded to do our work in six days, and rest on the seventh, because God, after working six days in creating the heavens and the earth, rested on the seventh, as recorded in Gen. 2:1-3. To say that God labored during six long periods, and rested on the seventh period, and that he commanded men to do likewise, would be to charge God with folly.

But, says one, it does not seem reasonable that God created the world in six literal days, we cannot comprehend it. Paul says that "the world by wisdom knew not God," and the world by wisdom cannot expect to know his works. Are we not to believe anything that we cannot comprehend? If so our creeds will be exceedingly limited. "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out

the Almighty to perfection?" If we could comprehend the works of God, he would be on a level with ourselves, and would not be a God worthy of worship. The work of creation is an infinite work, and cannot be grasped by a finite mind. It is just as much beyond the comprehension of man how God could perform the work of creation in a hundred million years, as it is that he could do it in six days. As the child has to receive his first ideas on trust and wait for maturer years to teach him the reason, so in the things pertaining to God, we must, with our limited understanding, accept them as truth, content to "know in part," and wait till the time when we shall "know even as we are known" for their full solution. In regard to those things which relate to our duty to God, the Bible is not obscure. There is no commandment that is more explicit than the fourth. A child can understand it. Indeed, if all spent as much time and energy in trying to ascertain the will of God, as they do in conjectures over what could not benefit them, even if it were possible for them to understand it, none would go astray.

"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.

**September 8, 1881**

**"Blind Guides" *The Signs of the Times* 7, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner

The ancient Pharisees were very punctilious about following the traditions of the Elders in regard to external cleanness. So fearful were they of defilement that every time they came into the house they washed their hands, fearing that they might accidentally have touched some unclean thing while without. Many of their duties had to be performed by others who were not so fearful of becoming ceremonially unclean. At the same time, however, they were teaching and practicing those things which could proceed only from a heart defiled with sin. So long as their sin remained concealed, they were complacent.

Our Saviour very justly characterizes these Pharisees as "blind leaders of the blind." Like a blind man, they stumbled over the very obstacle they seemed anxious to avoid. Of course those who depended on them for instructions, must necessarily be in the same condition.

But the race of "blind guides" did not cease with Pharisees. There are those to-day, who are blindly rushing into that which they profess to condemn. The following item from an article in the *Christian Herald* seems to be a case in point. The writer is relating an incident by which his life was saved when in great danger:-

"I cannot now tell what it was, but then I did not doubt it was from God. Might it not have been the spirit of my mother who then was dead, sainted guardian of my youth, permitted to act as guardian angel of her son, then near a death of despair? God knows; but I then did not doubt, and plucked up hope."

Another religious paper contains the following similar paragraph:-

"Whatever others may say; or however they may try to account for such a remark at such a time, and under such circumstances, I have not the shadow of a doubt but that the spirit of that dear girl saw the spirit of the father, who had been dead for some years, and recognized it; and there is not philosophy enough in the world to convince me to the contrary."

In almost any religious journal similar passages may be found. At the same time they denounce Spiritualism, and express no sympathy with it whatever. They do not realize that the immortality of the soul, and the possibility of communion between the living and the dead, constitute all there is to Spiritualism proper. The immortality which characterizes many of its devotees, is only a natural out-growth of their disbelief of the Bible-the foundation of morality-and is not upheld by most Spiritualist papers. Once admit the theory of the unconditional immortality of the soul, and Spiritualism follows as a natural sequence. So-called orthodox ministers have no ground whatever on which to attack Spiritualism. We once heard a minister denounce Spiritualism in no measured terms, and in the same hour he tried to console the mourners by telling them that the spirit of their dead friend would hover near them and minister to them. It is difficult to see why such teachers do not justly merit the appellation, "blind guides," and how they, with those who blindly follow them, can escape the natural result,—"They shall both fall into the ditch."

**September 15, 1881**

**"Which Day?" *The Signs of the Times* 7, 35.**

E. J. Waggoner

"The question of obedience, and the observance of the Sabbath is a real question with us, far more than whether we should keep the first, third, or seventh day of the week as the Sabbath."

Such are the closing words of a recent article on the Sabbath question. It has been said that words are used to conceal ideas, and it must be the case in the above instance; for if the writer had any idea in his mind, he most effectually concealed it. A great amount of study on the paragraph has failed to show the logical connection of its two parts.

"The question of obedience, and the observance of the Sabbath is the real question." That is plain enough. It is correct too. Just such a statement as any one might make, who earnestly desires to obey God. What next? We will therefore consult the word of God, to see how the Sabbath should be kept? We should expect that, but we are disappointed. "Obedience and the observance of the Sabbath is the question with us, far more than whether we should keep the first, third, or seventh day of the week is the Sabbath." If he had said, "The observance of a Sabbath is the real question with us," there would be nothing inconsistent in what follows. Since "Sabbath" simply means "rest." A Sabbath may be kept on the first or the third day of the week. But he says "the observance of *the* Sabbath," and the only Sabbath the Bible recognizes is the seventh day. See Gen. 2:1-3; Ex. 16: 4, 5, 19-30; 20:8-11; Luke 23:54-56; 24:1.

And yet, our friend seems to have the idea that the Sabbath may be kept on any day of the week. It is as if he had said: "Patriotism, and the celebration of our independence anniversary, is the real question with us, more than whether we should observe the first, third, or fourth day of July."

The amount of fog that hangs around questions of Bible truth and religious duty is perplexing to the seeker for truth, and would be truly wonderful did we not remember that just such a state of things has been predicted. Paul said that in the latter days men would not endure "sound doctrines," it would "turn away their ears from the truth and be turned unto fables." Our Lord himself said to his disciples, "If they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also," plainly intimating that the manner in which his teaching was received would be an index of the manner in which the truth would be received in subsequent times. When we consider the skepticism, the blind, and reasoning disbelief, and the cavils that opposed Christ's teachings even when accompanied by the most wonderful miracles, we cannot wonder that so few nowadays

416

receive "the love of the truth that they might be saved." The "god of this world" has blinded the minds of men in all ages, and will continue to do so until the end. And it is a fact that the same reason that hindered so many from believing on Christ eighteen hundred years ago, still operates to keep men from observing the Sabbath, viz., self-interest,-the immediate result upon themselves, and their own convenience.

These considerations are very weighty. It does not take much argument to persuade a man that a certain course is right, if his inclination is in that direction. And so the idea obtains to a greater or lesser extent, that it doesn't make so much difference what a man does if he is only sincere. Thus men get the idea that the *rest* is the all-important point in the fourth commandment, regardless of when that rest is taken. In other words the principle or spirit of the law is to be kept, and not the letter. This course of proceeding may be illustrated as follows: A farmer tells his son that he wishes him on the next day to go to a certain village five miles to the east, in order to buy some necessary articles. On the following day John mounts his horse, and deliberately rides off to a town five miles to the west, and there makes his purchases. His father calls him to account for his disobedience. He replies that although he did not strictly obey the letter of his instructions, he did obey the spirit-the essential part. He claims that the principle contained in his instructions was to get the articles, and that although the place where he should get them was definitely specified, yet this was not necessary to obedience to the requirement. Anyone can see that the boy disobeyed his father, by going west when he was told to go east, yet many who would so decide, claim that men may go as far as possible in the opposite direction from the requirement of the fourth commandment, and still be obedient.

A good illustration of how strict God is in his requirements is found in the case of Nadab and Abihu recorded in Lev. 10:1, 2. God had specified the fire that should be used in the services of the Sanctuary. Certain fire was set apart for this use and called holy. None other was to be used. Nadab and Abihu could not perceive the difference between the fire that was holy and that that was

unsanctified, and came before the Lord with strange fire. For this rash act they were instantly slain. They might have reasoned thus: "The spirit of the Lord's requirement is that fire should be used. It makes no difference what fire we use if we only do it in the right manner. There is no difference in the fire." Precisely the same language is used now in regard to the Sabbath. But God showed his displeasure, and taught the people that he was particular to have them "put difference between the holy and unholy, and between the unclean and clean." Is it possible that God is less particular now than he was then? Several hundred years later than that event that we find him using similar language to the above, and in regard to the Sabbath, speaking by the mouth of the prophet Ezekiel, he says: "Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy thing; they *have put no difference between the holy and profane*, neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean, and *have hid their eyes from my Sabbaths*, and I am profaned among them. . . . Therefore I have poured out mine indignation upon them; I have consumed them with the fire of my wrath; their own way have I recompensed upon their own heads, saith the Lord." Eze. 22:26-31. God testifies of himself thus: "I change not," therefore we are not justified in assuming that he will look with any degree of favor upon any deviation from the letter of his requirements. Indeed, if we consider carefully the context of the above passage, we shall find that while the words were addressed to the Jews, and were applicable to them, they have a special application to these last days. The words of Christ were addressed to his disciples and the Jews who were with him, but they apply to all men even to the close of time. So it is with the words of the prophet. But men were careless of their duty to God in the days when they saw visible manifestations of his displeasure, and it is to be expected that they will be so still, when his judgments are reserved. "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil." Nevertheless the long-delayed punishment will surely come.

"He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination."

**September 22, 1881**

**"A Definite Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times* 7, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the article concerning the Sabbath, which was noticed last week, in which the ground was taken that it is of no particular importance which day of the week is observed as the Sabbath, the following passage occurs: "Doubtless all would prefer the regular hebdomadal successor of the original, if there was no doubt as to which was the original." Although the theory that the Sabbath has been lost is by no means a new one, it is sometimes interesting to note the reasons which different ones give for their expressed belief that it has been lost.

The writer starts out with the statement that "under the Mosaic dispensation, our Saturday, the seventh day of the week, was observed as the Sabbath day."

He goes on further to say that there is no doubt that "the Sabbath was ordained and observed, together with the law of marriage, in Paradise, and that both these statutes survived the fall, and were observed by the sons of God."

Having admitted these facts it would not seem that there could be much doubt as to the identity of the Sabbath, for the Mosaic dispensation brings us down to the time of Christ. If the seventh day was observed in Paradise, was kept by the patriarchs, and was the recognized Sabbath under all the Mosaic dispensation, all the time that has been lost must be in the Christian era, the possibility of which will be duly considered.

But our friend is evidently bound to be in doubt as to which was the original seventh day, although he has stated facts which clearly prove that there can be no doubt. He says:-

"After the flood Noah may have begun a series of Sabbaths quite irrespective of the regular day according to the customs before the flood, for we find him upon his coming out of the ark, sacrificing to God. It is not likely that he moved out of the ark upon the then ordained Sabbath, but it is probable that he observed every seventh day after this worship-day-the eventful day of beginning life anew upon the earth-as his Sabbath to the Lord."

This is at best only a feeble supposition that the day was lost; but since there are many with whom a supposition against the Sabbath is of more force than a command in favor of it, we will see if this one has any foundation. The fact that Noah sacrificed to God, shows that he was in communication with him, and is therefore evidence that he did not forget God's commandments. Can we suppose that the man who, in the wicked generation before the flood walked with God, should forget him immediately after his miraculous deliverance? Our friend has admitted that the seventh day was the God-ordained Sabbath in Paradise, and through the Mosaic dispensation. And the wise man says: "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." Prov. 28:9. The fact, therefore, that God accepted Noah's sacrifice, proves conclusively that in no respect had Noah willfully neglected to keep God's law.

The mistake which our friend makes is in supposing that sacrifices were offered only on the Sabbath, or on the day which was observed as such. In the 29th chapter of Exodus, where the directions are given for consecrating the priests and the altar, we read the following: "And thou shalt offer *every day* a bullock for a sin offering for atonement." Verse 36. Again in the 38th verse: "Now this is that which thou shalt offer upon the altar; two lambs of the first year day by day *continually*." Again in Lev. 4, we read the directions for sin offerings. When a person had committed a sin through ignorance, "if his sin, which he hath sinned, come to his knowledge, then he shall bring his offering, a kid of the goats," etc. Thus we see that although special provision was made for sacrifices on the Sabbath, sacrifices were not limited to that day.

But to make assurance doubly sure, our friend has the Sabbath changed once more, at the time of the exodus from Egypt. Referring to the supposition that Noah lost the day, he says:-

"Though this is not surely known, yet it is true, and well known, that the Jewish Sabbath was fixed upon the day before the rest-day of the patriarchs and



the gentile nations; and that it was so fixed, not because it was, or was not, the regular seventh day from the original Sabbath, but simply to commemorate the redemption of Israel from Egypt."

It would have been more satisfactory if he had given his authority for the statement that the Sabbath was changed at that time. To be sure he cites another individual who says the same thing, but how either of them found it out remains a mystery. The Bible gives no hint of it. On the contrary, when the law was given on Sinai, only a short time after the Israelites left Egypt, they were plainly told that the Sabbath which they were to remember was the one which was sanctified in Eden. That should be allowed to settle all controversy.

But right here we notice a curious inconsistency in the statements of our friend. He says that the Sabbath which God gave to the Jews, was fixed upon the day before the Sabbath which the patriarchs kept. The Jews, as all know, have adhered to the observance of that day until the present time. It was the seventh day of the week, the day before the day which is observed by Catholics and the majority of Protestants. He has stated that the Sabbath ordained in Paradise, and kept throughout the Mosaic dispensation, was the seventh day of the week (our Saturday), a fact which we fully believe. Now if this be true, how could the Jews keep the day previous to this, and also keep the seventh day? Were there two seventh days in close succession? There is something very curious about the Sunday. Notwithstanding the numerous changes which are alleged to have been made, and the great amount of time which we hear has been lost beyond the possibility of recovery, this wonderful day preserves the identity, and ever comes to the front as the true Sabbath beyond a doubt. Its vitality is marvelous.

Besides the cases already noticed, it is claimed that the Sabbath was lost at the time of the Babylonish captivity. But when we remember that this calamity was brought upon the Jews as a direct punishment for their violation of the Sabbath, and that in consequence of this terrible lesson, they observed the Sabbath with unusual strictness from that time until the time of Christ, any one can readily see that such a thing as a loss of the Sabbath was impossible.

To complete the evidence that the Sabbath observed by the Jews, and by some Christians, is the original seventh day which God sanctified at Creation, we have only to consider the period of time since Christ's ministry on earth. At that time the Jews were keeping the day for their violation of which they had been severely punished. It certainly was the Sabbath, or there would have been no justice in their punishment. Christ himself recognized it, and kept it. Matt. 24:20; Luke 4:16. Even allowing that the day had been lost centuries before, there cannot be the shadow of a doubt that the original Sabbath was known and kept at this time. Since then, the Jews, who have constantly adhered to the observance of the same day, have been scattered among all nations, but there is a remarkable unanimity among them as to which day is the seventh day. If the Sabbath had been lost, there would be a disagreement among them. Again, all Catholics and Protestants agree with the Jews in their reckoning, for they unite in the observance of the first day, the day following the seventh day, and urge as one reason for doing so that our Lord rose from the dead on that day. This shows that they do not believe that any time has been lost. They would not

commemorate Christ's resurrection on that day, if they did not believe that he rose on that identical day.

We have now examined the indefinite theory of an indefinite Sabbath, very briefly, it is true, but still to greater length than its real merits deserve. It remains only to notice in what position those persons place themselves, who argue that the Sabbath of God's appointment has been lost. God rested upon and blessed the seventh day in the beginning, and sanctified it, and he commanded Adam, and through him, all his posterity, to keep it holy. Gen. 2:2, 3. He afterwards repeated the commandment on Mt. Sinai, and by his prophets frequently enjoined it upon all people. The

428

law of which this commandment is a part, is declared to be the standard by which God judges men; those who keep it shall have eternal life, and those who violate it will have death everlasting. Eccl. 13:14; James 2:12; Matt. 19:16, 17; Isa. 48:18; Deut. 7:9-15; Rom. 6:23; Rev. 22:14. Moreover, he has stated that he changes not. Mal. 3:6, and has repeatedly stated in his word that these commandments by which men are to be judged, are to endure forever. Ps. 119:89, 142, 144, 152, 169; Isa. 40:8; 51:6-8; Matt. 5:17-19. Now those who allow that there is even a *possibility* of enlightened people losing the Sabbath, thus making it impossible for them to keep the law, impeach God's justice. They virtually say that God will punish men for violating his commandments when he has put it out of their power to keep them.

It is very easy for a person to convince himself that he has a good excuse for disobeying God's law, but we have no reason to suppose that God will accept man's opinion as the standard of the Judgment. The very fact that people offer excuses for not keeping the Sabbath is no proof that in their hearts they believe that the Sabbath law is still binding. If it were not, there would be no need of an excuse.

**October 27, 1881**

**"Uncertain Trumpetings" *The Signs of the Times* 7, 39.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is nothing that can work so much injury to any cause, as the inconsiderate zeal of its professed friends. Its enemies may circulate false reports, and misrepresent it, but these can injure only for a time; but when the professed friends of a cause misrepresent it, no matter how zealous they may be, the result cannot fail to be damaging. Especially is this true with respect to Bible truths. A great responsibility rests upon those who take upon themselves the task of teaching the people. Earnestness and zeal are commendable, but care should be taken that the zeal be "according to knowledge."

The apostle Paul, in seeking to impress upon the Corinthians the necessity of clearness in all their attempts to teach, said: "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" This was written with direct reference to those who spoke in an unknown tongue, which could not edify the

hearers; but it may with equal propriety be applied to those who teach that which is manifestly inconsistent.

No cause has suffered more from "uncertain sounds" than the Advent cause. Many professed believers in it seem to spend their time as did the ancient Athenians, "either to tell, or to hear some new thing." They have repeatedly set the time for the Lord to come, and have projected vague and indefinite theories in regard to the prophecies, till with many the word "Adventist" is a synonym for "visionary fanatic."

In a late number of the *World's Crisis*, there appeared a novel exposition of the prophecy in Rev. 14:18, and 16:8, 9. These texts read: "And another angel came out from the altar, which had power over fire; and cried with a loud cry to him that had the sharp sickle, saying, Thrust in thy sharp sickle, and gather the clusters of the vine of the earth; for her grapes are fully ripe." Rev. 14:18. "And the fourth angel poured out his vial upon the sun; and power was given unto him to scorch men with fire. And men were scorched with great heat, and blasphemed the name of God, which hath power over these plagues: and they repented not to give him glory." Rev. 16:8, 9.

In reference to these texts, the writer says:-

"The important question of this subject is, Has this angel of fire commenced to do his work as foretold in the Scriptures. We answer, There is much proof that he has. It is a fact that just such fires as the prophets predicted should come as special judgments in the last days, are rapidly increasing. It is known everywhere that incendiary fires are alarmingly on the increase. One writer has described this as being terrific in some parts of Russia, where the incendiaries torch lights up the heavens nearly every night."

Besides this, he cites the recent destructive fires in Michigan and Canada, as proof that the angel referred to in text, has begun his work. The veriest tyro could not have made a more fanciful exposition. The sixteenth chapter of Revelation is devoted to an account of the seven last plagues. The plague referred to by the article in question is the fourth. If that is in process of fulfillment, then the first three must be in the past. Is this so? We read: "And the first angel went and poured out his vial upon the earth; and there fell a noisome and grievous sore upon the men which had the mark of the beast." "And the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea; and it became as the blood of a dead man; and every living soul died in the sea." "And the third angel poured out his vial upon the rivers and fountains of waters; and they became blood." Surely these plagues are not of so trivial a nature that they can be poured out and no one be conscious of it, for we read that "in them is filled up the wrath of God."

Again, these fires have destroyed the lives and property of all classes, good and bad; but when the plagues are poured out, only the wicked suffer, while the righteous are unscathed. "Only with thine eyes shalt thou behold and see the reward of the wicked. Because thou hast made the Lord, which is my refuge, even the most High, thy habitation, there shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling." Ps. 91:8-10.

But the writer adds:-

"This plague of fire comes while the men upon whom it falls are in probation, for they were charged with the sin of not repenting, which would be no sin if these plagues had not been designed to cause them to repent."

The fact that in these plagues "is filled up the wrath of God," Rev. 15:1, proves this. Sinners can repent and find pardon only while there is mercy, but when the wrath of God is "poured out with mixture," there is no mercy. Men may not repent for two reasons. One is because they *will not*, which is the case with those who do not repent at the present time. The other is because they *cannot*, which will be the case of those who suffer under the seven last plagues. Of Esau we read that "he found no place of repentance though he sought it carefully with tears;" and in Prov. 1:24-28 we are told that this at the last, shall actually be the case of those who persist in violating the commands of God.

But the theory in question is so absurd that in itself it does not merit so much consideration. And in this lies its only danger. People are becoming so used to such vagaries, that many will reject sound expositions of prophecy, without any consideration.

We firmly believe that the "day of the Lord is near, and hasteth greatly." We do not pretend to know how near it is, but believe that it is so near that we have no time to waste in idle speculation. We believe that the following command should be fulfilled by the people of this generation. "Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain; let all the inhabitants of the land tremble; for the day of the Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand." Joel 2:1; but we do not believe that false alarms will make the inhabitants of the land tremble, but that they will have the opposite effect.

The coming judgments of God are of too serious a nature to allow of childish trifling. The words of prophecy which warn of their near approach are of awful solemnity, and are wonderfully clear and consistent. See Habakkuk 2:2. That false teachers and false expositors should arise, is not to be wondered at; but no one need be misled by these, if he will but remember that "God is not the author of confusion."

**December 1, 1881**

**"The Promise of His Coming" *The Signs of the Times* 7, 45.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the second epistle of Peter, the third chapter, and the third and fourth verses, we find the following statement: "Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." From this, we indirectly learn two things: First, that in the last days there will be some who are teaching that the Lord is coming; for if no one were asserting that there is a promise to that effect, there would be no reason for the inquiry as to where that promise may be found. And, second, we learn that there is such a promise, and that those who teach it are correct, for they who question it are "scoffers" who walk after their own lusts.

The question in itself is a perfectly legitimate one, if it is asked from a sincere desire to know the truth. It is only when asked by those who are "willingly ignorant," that there is in it the element of mockery. For the benefit of the first class, a Scriptural answer to the question will be given.

The question "Will Christ come?" does not admit of argument. The answer is given in the Bible in plain and unequivocal language. Admit the Bible to be the inspired word of God, and the question is at once answered in the affirmative. In this article, therefore, little more can be done than to cite the reader to a few of the passages which positively affirm that Christ is coming again to this earth. Those passages only will be quoted which state the simple fact. Other questions as to the time, manner, object etc., of his coming will be considered hereafter.

Perhaps the oldest direct testimony concerning Christ's second advent is found in the 14th verse of Jude. "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints." This testimony, although second-hand may not be impeached, for it is from one who "walked with God," and is vouched for by "the servant of Jesus Christ."

Another testimony is found in Numbers, the 24th chapter, and 17th verse. It may be objected that Balaam was a wicked man, and, therefore, not entitled to credit; but we must remember that at this time he was under the influence of the Spirit of God, and unable to say anything except as God permitted him. Speaking of what shall happen "in the latter days," he says: "I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but not nigh; there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Scepter shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth." The language used, as well as the context, shows that Christ is referred to; and it is his second coming that is spoken of for it is then that Christ's enemies are to be destroyed. See 2 Thess. 1:7-9; 2:8.

But we have still more positive testimony in the Old Testament. Job, in the midst of his afflictions, comforted himself in the following manner: "Oh that my words were now written! oh that they were printed in a book! That they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever! For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that *he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth*: And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me." Job 19:23-27. This language is very positive; and Job shows his sense of its importance by wishing it to be preserved by all the means of writing then known.

Passing to the Psalms we read the testimony of David. That David was inspired of God, we learn from 2 Sam. 23:2: "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue." He 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." Ps. 50:3. Again: "Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad; let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof. Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein: then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord; for he cometh, for he cometh to judge the earth." Ps. 96:11-13.

We come now to the New Testament, and we shall see that the testimony is even more positive. Paul's words in Heb. 9:27, 28 are very explicit: "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." There is nothing figurative or uncertain about these words. They are a plain declaration of fact. Either Christ will come the second time, or else Paul is an unreliable witness. The latter, no Christian will admit.

Again Paul writes: "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." Could language be made plainer than this? This is a statement of what shall actually occur. No more definite language can be found in the Bible. It will not do to evade this testimony by saying that Paul did not understand what he wrote. There is not the slightest evidence that he did not fully comprehend the force of every line that he wrote; but even allowing that he did not, the Holy Spirit, which inspired him, certainly did understand what he wrote, and had an object in giving it.

Although no clearer evidence can be given than that quoted above, yet the words which come to us direct from the lips of our Lord himself, have a peculiar force. In Matt. 16:27 he says: "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." The twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew is devoted entirely to a description of his coming, but as we are now giving direct answers to the question "Will he come?" we pass this by for the present. The same subject, however, is carried on in the twenty-fifth chapter, and in the 31st verse Christ 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." He here speaks of his coming as a settled fact, so that his words amount to a positive statement.

In John 14:1-3, we have a statement by our Lord, which, if such a thing is possible, is even stronger than any of the foregoing. As Jesus was about to leave this earth, he comforted his sorrowing disciples with the following words: "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." The point of comfort in the above is the promise that he would come again. The disciples were sorrowing because he had said he was going away. He says, Be not troubled; I will come again. He did not deceive them with a false hope; he will certainly come again. His word is pledged to this and it cannot fail.

These are only a few of the many passages which teach that Christ will come again, but they are sufficient. They are so simple that a child can understand them. No other meaning can possibly attach to them than that Christ is coming the second time to this earth. The Bible abounds with testimony to the same effect. And yet there are people who profess to believe the Bible, who say that

the second coming of Christ is a non-essential doctrine. If it is not essential, why is it given so large a place in the Bible?

**December 8, 1881**

**"Enforcement of the 'Christian Sabbath'" *The Signs of the Times* 7, 46.**

E. J. Waggoner

The fact that people are sincere and earnest in their purposes, does not prove that they are correct in their motives. Inspiration has declared, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." And then, to show that this declaration is needed as a revelation to man, the question is asked, "Who can know it?" Without the aid of God's word and Spirit man can never know himself. It is scarcely less difficult for the heart to know itself than for the eye to see itself.

By many, sincerity is held to be as good as the truth-an acceptable substitute for the truth. But a person may be quite sincere and still quite selfish. Indeed, intensely selfish people are always sincere; but they never understand their motives. There is no evil more prevalent than self-deception. Earnest belief, or strong feeling, is, in the estimation of some, better religion than right doing, or obedience to the commandments of God.

We have no idea that they who projected the Inquisition, or that which grew up into the inquisition, had any intention to war upon human rights. They intended to advance the cause of religion and the honor of God upon the earth. Their error was that they set out to serve God by a way of human devising, contrary to the method marked out in the Scriptures. God sent them forth as ambassadors' they chose rather to be legislators and executioners.

It is a common saying that, "History repeats itself." The Lord, by the prophet Isaiah (chapter 66), gives us a view of the religious world near the end of time. Verse 5 says:-

"Hear the word of the Lord, *ye that tremble at his word*; Your brethren that hated you, that cast you out for my name's sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified; but *he shall appear to your joy*, and they shall be ashamed." Comp. Verses 15, 16.

This indicates that another persecution shall arise before the Lord shall appear; that it will be against those who tremble at the word of God; that it will be-not against religion, but, professedly in the cause of religion; by those who affect to act for the glory of God; that, though they say, let the Lord be glorified, they are moved against those who tremble at the word of the Lord. Evidently they will hold something else-their traditions-above the word of God.

So it was in the dark ages. Persecutors were zealous for the glory of God, and tenacious of tradition; but careless of the written word. What the Doctors of the church had said was of more worth to them than what Jehovah had said. Their bitterest persecutions, even to the burning of Christians, were "Acts of Faith." Theirs was truly and literally a *burning zeal*. Who were more faithful to

religion than they? We doubt whether the followers of the present age will be able to excel them.

The Apostle Paul, in 2 Tim. 3:1-5, gives a similar view of the religious world of the last days. Though they have "the form of godliness," they will be boastful and proud, false accusers, and despisers of those that are good. We recognize no standard of goodness but that which is erected in God's word. It is obedience to God. Where is obedience to God to be found, if not among those who keep his commandments? In Eccl. 12:13, 14, we are informed that we are to keep his commandments because he will bring every work into Judgment. Of course his commandments are the rule of the Judgment, and the measure of acceptance with him. And it is known to everybody that the religious world are violently opposed to those who keep the commandments of God *just as God gave them* . If they can have the privilege of amending them, or putting a construction upon them which their words will never justify, then no objection will be raised. And so the most willful child will obey the order of his parents, if he is permitted to do it *in his own way* . But what kind of obedience is that? Can it be acceptable to God?

They who accuse their brethren of wrong, because they adhere closely to the commandments of Jehovah, are veritably "false accusers." In their accusations there is neither truth nor justice. While they profess to seek God's glory, they would do well to examine their motives to see if they are not seeking to have their own way; to see if their pleasure in having the law of the land to sustain them is now somewhat increased by their consciousness that the law of God, strictly construed, is against them.

Before we examine some other scriptures which speak of these last-day persecutions, we will further trace the parallel between the position taken by these last-day religionists and their prototypes of five to ten centuries ago. We are informed by the Protestant ministry that the law under which they are not acting is not *a religious law* , but merely *a police regulation* . And that may be the position assumed by a Court. But it is not a correct statement of the case. The law of California protects the first day of the week under the name of "the Christian Sabbath." But this phrase, in both its terms, both "Christian" and "Sabbath," gives it a religious character. Neither Judge nor minister can deny this. And yet we are told it is only "a police regulation," and not at all of a religious character. Never was there a more decided mixture of "church and State" than this. Never was there a more evident deception indulged or practiced than is contained in the pretext that it is only a police regulation, and does not affect the question of religion.

Again, what is the object of the ministers in their zeal to have the law enforced? Are they working in behalf of a mere "police regulation," or in the interests of their religious predilections? *The State* is doing the work; this is their plea. Are they helping it on for the sake of the State, or for the church. Why do they act as pastors, in concert? Do they think any are so blind as not to discern motives in this matter?

This excuse of a secular law or police regulation is a very flimsy one. It is known to every person who is informed upon the subject that Catholics deny that



the church put to death those who feel under the ban of the inquisition. The execution was performed by the civil authorities; the church not holding itself responsible. Indeed, the recommendation of the church was often to mercy. But who is deceived thereby? Was not the church using the secular power as an instrument to carry out its religious tenets and to persecute those who chose to stand closely by the word of God rather than popular traditions? And is not history repeating itself to-day? Are not the churches combining to secure an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by which they may use the arm of civil power to compel everybody in the land to observe their so-called Christian Sabbath? What is now being done in California is only a step taken in that direction.

In this land we have been accustomed to consider ourselves exempt from the worst troubles which befell the old world, because of the entire separation of church and State in our government. We have looked upon religious persecution as almost impossible here, because we have never seriously contemplated the possibility of a union of church and State. The dungeon, the rack, and the stake, were looked for as a matter of course where the State was so far controlled by ecclesiastics as to enact penalties for the observance of non-observance of religious duties, real or supposed. But what do we see to-day? We are fast approaching this very state of things. If the American people realized the snare into which they are walking they would enter a protest which would secure the equal rights of every American citizen, and leave the question of religious ordinances where they belong, in the field of theological discussion.

To show the entire fallacy of the position assumed by the religious advocates of Sunday it is necessary to examine the Sabbath commandment, and the claims of the pseudo-Christian Sabbath. This we must do very briefly.

First, The commandment. This embraces four points, namely: (1) The requirement. (2) The prohibition. (3) The permission. (4) The reason.

1. The perceptive part of the commandment is: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Connected with this is the explanatory remark: "The Seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." This explanation is definite, and precludes all evasion. The "day of the Sabbath," literally, or the day of the rest-the Lord's rest-is the subject of this precept.

2. The prohibition. "In it thou shalt not do any work." The prohibition is also explicit. In *it*, the day of the Lord's rest, no work shall be done. To this day alone it refers.

3. The permission. This part, though permissive, is inseparable from the precept. "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work." Some have taken the position that this also is perceptive. Be that as it may; no one can deny that it contains *a divine grant* to labor on the six days, excluding the seventh.

But we are told that it is no infringement on our rights if we are compelled to rest also on the first day, as it does not at all interfere with our resting on the seventh day. That appears plausible, but it is very deceptive. There are thousands of honest and industrious citizens of California who are compelled to use the closest economy to make their weekly wages supply the wants of their families. Forcibly deprive them of one-sixth of their earnings and they would

thereby be deprived of the necessities of life. Many business men are barely able to keep their business in operation, who would become bankrupt if regularly deprived of one-sixth of their income. You concede our right to

547

keep the seventh day "according to the commandment," Luke 23:56, as our conscience compels us to do. But do you not see that by forcibly depriving us of the God-given privilege of working six days, you are driving some into a state of destitution and suffering, or to a violation of their religious convictions by compelling them to work on the seventh day to support their families? Is it possible that California has an intelligent jurist or a thinking minister who cannot see that the enforcement of this law does work hardship and injustice and even distress to a certain class who live out their religion just as they read it in the Bible? We appeal to those who are trying-honestly trying-to enforce this law, who firmly believe that they are religiously bound to keep the first day of the week. Many of you are just able to make a living for your families by economizing both your time and your resources. Now if the law of the State compelled you to rest the seventh day, and your consciences led you to keep the first day, and this loss of time deprived your families of the comforts of life, and you were pressed to decide whether to let your families suffer, or to violate the law of the land, or to violate your religious convictions, would you believe the man, let him be judge or minister, who should tell you that the law of the State did not interfere with your religion?

Forcible as this illustration is, it does not fully meet the case-the parallel is not complete-because *for the keeping of the seventh day we have the commandment of God; for the keeping of the first day you have not*. We give you the benefit of the supposition that you have never considered the subject in this light. But why have you not? Is it not because your neighbor, not yourself, has to suffer the injustice? Did it affect you as it does us, would you not very readily have made this application of it? Do you walk Christianly toward your neighbor when you subject his conscience to a test to which you would not be willing to have your own subjected? Please to put this upon a more reasonable basis. Say at once that your convictions are more sacred than ours, notwithstanding that we have the plain reading of the decalogue to sustain us; but do not deceive yourselves (you cannot so deceive us,) by saying that this law interferes with no man's religion. Do not present to the world the inconsistency shown by New Englanders more than a century ago, who declared it to be every man's right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience,-with the *practical proviso* that his conscience did not lead him to be a Baptist or a Quaker!

4. The reason. As there is but one commandment in all the Bible for the observance of a *weekly Sabbath* (the fourth commandment of the decalogue), so there is but one reason in the Bible for the institution and sanctification of the Sabbath. This is given in the following words: "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." The reason and the sanctification refer to the seventh day, and to no other. This is confirmed by

Gen. 2:3, "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."

But our friends, knowing they can produce no other commandment, tell us that they keep the first day of the week in obedience to this. Will they allow us to plead that we obey the present law of California by keep the seventh day? If not, why not? If keeping the first day is obedience to the law which commands to keep the seventh day, why is not the keeping of the seventh day obedience to the law which requires to keep the first day? Or is such caviling admissible only when the law of God is in question? But, to make the fourth commandment justify the keeping of the first day, you must be able to read the commandment inserting therein the first day instead of the seventh. Then it will tell us that God created all things in six days and rested the first day. *But that is not true*. He did not rest the first day. He did not bless and sanctify the first day. Now if you cannot read the first day in the commandment without making it contradict the facts on which it is based, you surely cannot enforce the first day by the commandment. Justice Morrison, (in whose decision so great delight is taken at this time), as a jurist would admit this position, as it is always admitted by the teachings of the church of his choice. It is only by Protestants that the inconsistent-yes, the absurd-claim is set up that you can enforce a certain thing by a law to which the terms of the law cannot possibly be made to apply.

We shall resume this subject next week, and examine the claims of the so-called "Christian Sabbath."

### **"Manner of Christ's Coming" *The Signs of the Times* 7, 46.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is most unfortunate that the tendency nowadays is almost entirely against a literal interpretation of the Scriptures. It seems difficult for people to understand that Christ and the apostles ever spoken plain, simple language, such as one person would use in speaking to another. Whenever a passage is read, the first thought with many is, What hidden meaning is there in it? What lesson is conveyed? Any one who reads the popular Sunday-school comments will see this tendency conspicuously displayed. Now it is proper to search the Scriptures; and if there be a difficult text, it is right to find out its meaning, by comparing it with other texts; but there are some things that are so plain that any attempt at explanation only obscures the meaning. And this is the case with by far the greater part of the Bible.

It is true that there are parables, but these are readily distinguished from the direct, simple statements, and are usually either explained, or in such common use as to need no explanation. When Christ was on earth, one of the proofs of his divine mission was that the poor had the Gospel preached unto them; consequently we should expect his teaching to be such as could be understood by poor people who have not had the advantages of an education. And this is the case. The Bible is a model of simplicity; it uses the language of the common people.

We have seen how very plain and direct the statements are in the Bible concerning the second coming of Christ. No believer in the Bible pretends to deny these statements, for to do so would be to deny the Bible. But there are very many who evade these statements, and virtually deny them, by claiming that Christ's second coming is spiritual. Some claim that Christ comes when a good man dies; and others claim that his coming is at conversion; while others still, carrying the latter idea out still further, claim that there will sometime in the future be a temporal millennium, when all men shall have been converted, and that Christ will then come and reign over his people spiritually, and that this is what is meant by the second coming of Christ.

Now the Bible is just as definite in regard to the manner of Christ's coming, as it is in regard to the fact of his coming. It plainly says that Christ will come personally and visibly. The texts which prove this will of course furnish additional evidence that Christ will certainly come.

And first it may be well to notice Heb. 9:28: "And unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Christ is to come the *second* time; but if the theory that he comes at death or conversion be correct, he would already have come many thousands of times.

Again, the time of Christ's ministry here on earth, of which we have a record in the New Testament, is conceded by all to be his first advent. But men had been converted previously to that time, and for thousands of years good men had been dying. If Christ comes at conversion or at death, he must have come millions of times before his first advent. Anyone can see the absurdity of those theories.

It is not denied that Christ has, at different times in the world's history, met and conversed with certain of his devoted followers, or that he is ever present with his people by his Spirit; but nothing of this kind can be referred to in the texts under consideration.

It would, however, be manifestly inconsistent to refer to any one of these times as the second coming of Christ. One of them has no precedence over another. But there was one time when he was here in person, when he talked with thousands, and was seen by thousands more. At that time there was probably no nation on earth that did not know of him and his mighty works; and there has been no nation since then that has not heard of that wonderful event. Now at that time he said he was coming "*again*," and Paul speaking of that first advent and its object, said that he would come the "*second* time." Consistency, therefore, would demand that his second coming be also personal and visible, and no less conspicuous nor less widely known than his first. And this we are positively told shall be the case: "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye *shall see him*, and they also which pierced him." Rev. 1:7.

Again we read: "For the Son of Man shall, in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." Matt. 16:27. Those who place the second coming of Christ at death, or at conversion, must have a very faint conception of the glory of the Father. When the Lord came down on Sinai, "the whole mountain quaked greatly" (Ex 19:18); and when the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle, even Moses was not able to enter. See Ex.

40:34, 35. The glory of a single angel, at the resurrection of Jesus, caused the Roman guard to fall as dead men. Matt. 28:4. What then will be the manifestation when he comes in his own glory, and that of the Father, and all the holy angels? This glory which will attend Christ's coming is thus described: "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him." Ps. 50:3. Paul says that when Christ comes he will be "revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire." 2 Thess. 1:7, 8. That this glory will be seen by all is proved by Rev. 1:7 already quoted, and by the words of our Saviour in Matt. 24:27: "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." Any one who has seen the lightning flash across the sky in the sheets so tensely bright to that even the closed eyelids could not wholly shut out the impression, can appreciate to a faint degree the terror of that day. Of the key facts of that glory, we learn again 2 Thess. 2:8: "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." The fire that David says shall "devour before him," is the glory of his presence.

Nothing further is needed to prove that the coming of the Lord will be nothing like the quiet of a death-bed scene, or the hour when an individual gives his heart to God. There are, however, a host of other texts on this point, no less strong than those already quoted. Two only will be given to show how literal and personal that coming is. The first is Acts 1:9-11: "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 in 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." The second is 1 Thess. 4:16: "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."

These texts speak for themselves. The language is clear and plain, and anyone can understand them. And yet, who can realize the terrible scene which they foretell? The human mind cannot conceive of the awful grandeur of that hour when the Lord of heaven and earth shall be revealed. Let each one ask himself the question:-

"How will my heart endure  
The terrors of that day,  
When the earth and heaven, before the judge,  
Astonished, shrink away!"

**December 15, 1881**

**"Enforcement of the 'Christian Sabbath'" *The Signs of the Times* 7,  
47.**

E. J. Waggoner

SECONDLY, we shall examine the claims of the so-called Christian Sabbath.

Christian institutions are peculiar to the gospel of Christ-they are institutions erected by Christ. We have gospel precepts for certain ordinances, such as baptism and the Lord's supper. These are peculiar to the gospel, wherein they are plainly instituted. We might quote to a great length from the best of Protestant writers to prove their general agreement in this, that *gospel duties are based only on plain and positive precepts*. We cannot say, however, that they are all and always consistent with this declaration, for it is made to meet the Catholics in their argument for tradition. It does not seem to have been made strictly for home use! This principle, applied to Sunday, will rule it out, as not being a gospel institution. There is not precept for its observance; no reason was ever given why it should be observed; no instance of its having been observed. A few inferences, anything but necessary, are all that is ever adduced in its favor. But these can never institute an ordinance; nothing but an express precept will suffice for this.

We have another principle to apply to it which must be decisive. While the gospel enforces morality, it does not originate it. Gospel institutions, therefore, are *not moral*, but *positive*. This truth is, and must be, acknowledged by all. We do not mean that positive institutions are not obligatory; they are, but not in the same sense that moral duties are, because we are differently related to them. And this distinction is not merely one in theory; it is universally recognized in practice. This we will show.

Christian ordinances are for the household of faith; not for infidels or disbelievers; while moral duties are of universal application. By a simple statement of facts, of ordinary occurrence, this may be made clear to every mind. Two persons-a young gentleman and a young lady-call upon a minister and ask to have the rite of marriage solemnized. As a matter of professional duty the minister may inquire if they are, or intend to become, followers of Christ. But this is not a requisite to marriage. He will marry them if they are unbelievers, because he recognizes the truth that marriage is not a Christian institution. Marriage was instituted before the fall of man; it was given to the race, and does not belong to any class or nation. It was never restricted to a class. If it were a religious institution there would be no legitimate children except those born in the church. But the Bible will not justify such a position. Doubtless the minister does right in marrying them, though they are not Christians. And for this reason it is proper for legislators to enact laws for the protection of the marriage rite and tie; it is in no sense religious legislation, or legislation for the church. It is for all classes-for the people at large.

But suppose that the same couple return to the same minister and ask to be baptized. Now the question of their belief in Christ is relevant-it is a necessity. Suppose they both declare their entire disregard of Christ and his gospel-will he baptize them? Of course he will not. And why not? Because baptism is a *Christian institution*, and they are not competent to receive it. But if they cannot be baptized, may they not at least partake of the Lord's supper? Again they are refused. This, too, is a Christian ordinance, *and they who reject Christ have no right to observe the institutions of Christ*.

This being an accepted fact, we never find the pastors and their flocks asking the legislature to enact laws compelling all classes-believers and unbelievers-to be baptized and to partake of the Lord's supper. So far are they from this, they would reject as a monstrous innovation any legislation to that end by the civil government. As ordinances of Christ-Christian institutions-they may not be the subjects of civil enactments. No church would for a moment accept a law of the State which required infidels to observe these ordinances of Christ. No minister would comply with the terms of such a law if it were enacted. We repeat it: this distinction is clearly defined, easily recognized, and universally accepted in practice.

And now we inquire, In this classification of institutions, where does the Sabbath belong? We have denied and repeatedly asked the clergy of the Protestant churches to make good their position, that the Sabbath is a Christian institution. But we have never succeeded in getting one to argue the position. We declare that there is no such thing as "the Christian Sabbath." It has no existence. We point to the chapter and verse where baptism was commanded; we can show the act of instituting the Lord's supper; but who will show us when, and by whom, a "Christian Sabbath" was instituted? What are the terms in which it was enacted? It has no foundation in the Scriptures. And our Sunday-Sabbath friends virtually acknowledge their weakness on this point by acting inconsistently with their own position. They affirm, that the Sabbath is a Christian institution, and then, in contravention of every principle which governs their actions in regard to Christian institutions, they ask the legislature to make and enforce a law to compel infidels and atheists to observe it! To be perfectly consistent they should unite in asking for "a police regulation" in behalf of baptism and the Lord's supper, and thus place all Christian institutions on an equal footing!

While we declare, and produce the proof, that there is no Christian Sabbath, we freely admit that the Sunday-rest is a church institution. It is a creature of the church;-but it is of the Roman Church. History fully justifies the claims put forth by the Catholic Church in this behalf. This claim we briefly present. In "A Sure Way to Find the True Religion," a Catholic book, is an argument for tradition, in which are the following words:-

"The keeping holy the Sunday is a thing absolutely necessary to salvation; and yet this is nowhere put down in the Bible; on the contrary, the Bible says, Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Ex. 20:8, which is Saturday, and not Sunday; therefore, the Bible does not contain all things necessary to salvation."

In the "Plain Talk about Protestantism," by M. Segur, is the following:-

"It is worth its while to remember that this observance of the *Sabbath* [Sunday]-in which, after all, the only Protestant *worship* consists-not only has no foundation in the Bible, but it is in flagrant contradiction with its letter, which commands rest on the Sabbath which is Saturday. It was the Catholic Church, which, by the authority of Jesus Christ has transferred this rest to the Sunday in remembrance of the resurrection of our Lord. Thus the observance of Sunday by the Protestants is an homage they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the church."

This is pointed and true. From a Catholic tract we copy the following, being part of an appeal to Protestants on this subject:-

"You tell me that Saturday was the *Jewish* Sabbath, but that the *Christian* Sabbath has been changed to Sunday. Changed! but by whom? Who has authority to change an express command of Almighty God? When God has spoken and said, Thou shalt keep holy the seventh day, who shall dare to say, Nay, thou mayest work, and do all manner of worldly business on the seventh day; but thou shalt keep holy the first day, in its stead? This is the most important question, which I know not how you can answer.

"You are a Protestant, and you profess to go by the Bible, and the Bible only; and yet in so important a matter as the observance of one day in seven as a holy day, you go against the plain letter of the Bible, and put another day in the place of that day which the Bible has commanded. The command to keep holy the seventh day is one of the ten commandments; you believe that the other nine are still binding; who gave you authority to tamper with the fourth? If you are consistent with your own principles, if you really follow the Bible, and the Bible only, you ought to be able to produce some portion of the New Testament in which this fourth commandment is expressly altered, or, at least, from which you may confidently infer that it was the will of God that Christians should make that change in its observance which you have made.

"Now mind, in all this, you would greatly misunderstand me if you supposed I was quarreling with you for acting in this manner on a true and right principle-in other words, a Catholic principle, viz., the acceptance, without hesitation, of that which has been handed down to you by an unbroken tradition. I would not tear from you a single one of those shreds and fragments of divine truth which you have retained. God forbid! They are the most precious things you possess, and by God's blessing may serve as clues to bring you out of that labyrinth of error in which you find yourself involved, far more by the fault of your forefathers, three centuries ago, than by your own. What I do quarrel with you for is, not your inconsistency in occasionally acting on a true principle, but your adoption, as a general rule, of a false one. You keep the Sunday, and not the Saturday; and you do so rightly, for this was the practice of all Christians when Protestantism began; but you have abandoned other Catholic observances, which were equally universal at that day, preferring the novelties introduced by the man who invented Protestantism, to the unvarying tradition of above fifteen hundred years.

"We blame you, not for making Sunday your weekly holiday, instead of Saturday, but for rejecting tradition, which is the only safe and clear rule by which this observance can be justified."

And in the "Doctrinal Catechism" of that church we find the following language:-

" *Ques* . Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept?

" *Ans* . Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her;-she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday, the seventh day, a change for which there is no scriptural authority."



Now if our Protestant pastors deny this position of "the church," will they please to produce the Scriptural authority," will they please to produce the Scriptural authority? Not fine-spun inferences, but such authority as is demanded in questions of law. Here we might fill pages with admissions that no such authority exists. Dr. Buck, in his Theological Dictionary, admits that there is no law for keeping Sunday, but argues for the correctness of it. Argument in the entire absence of law is self-condemnatory. Dr. Scott says it came into practice gradually, without a precept; as did, we add, every traditional innovation. Dr. Matthew Henry says the Sunday was not called the Sabbath in the first two centuries of the Christian era. We add a century or more to his statement, and are still on safe ground. Dr. Clarke observes an ominous silence in regard to any evidence for a change, which he certainly would not do if the evidence existed. Dr. Heylyn, an eminent historian of the church of England, says there was no law to restrain from labor on the first day of the week in the first three centuries. Constantine's edict is the first which can be produced, A.D. 321, and this has often been referred to as the law of the "first Christian emperor," many overlooking the fact that the emperor had yet made no profession of Christianity when he made this decree. Of this decree Dr. Schaff, in his Church History, says he "enjoined the civil observance of Sunday, though not as *dies Domini* [Lord's day], but as *dies solis* [day of the sun], in conformity to his worship of Apollos." That such is the origin of Sunday consecration is beyond dispute. A late edition of the "Sunday-school Union Bible Dictionary" contains the following:-

"Sunday was a name given by the heathen to the first day of the week, because it was the day on which they worshiped the sun."

Dr. Webster said:-

"The heathen nations in the north of Europe, dedicated this day to the sun, and hence their Christian descendants continue to call the day Sunday."

The Religious Encyclopedia says:-

"The ancient Saxons called it by this name, because upon it they worshiped the sun."

The Douay Catechism says:-

"It is also called Sunday from the old Roman denomination of *dies solis*, the day of the sun, *to which it was sacred*."

We have not space to extend this point. We only add that, inasmuch as we are enjoined to keep God's commandments because he will bring every work into Judgment, we would much rather risk our case in the Judgment standing on what God has commanded, than on what he has not, even though *all the world* may choose the things which God has not commanded.

With this proof of our statement, that it is a creature of the Roman Church, we see the consistency of Justice Morrison in deciding in its favor. Reverence for the church is enjoined as the first consideration with all who acknowledge allegiance to her, and this would lead him, yea, compel him to give the decision he has given. All his educational bias; every feeling of his heart, would coincide with this decision, because his church holds that nations and governments should be in subservience to the church, and enforce the decrees of the church. But his decision is inconsistent with the very instincts of Protestantism-contrary to every

principle which it professes. It is a triumph of Catholicism in this professedly Protestant and Christian land, which is well calculated to strengthen the assurance expressed by the declining power at Rome, that what the church is losing in Europe she is gaining in the United States. Protestants, American freemen, may affect to think that this is a small matter; but they may remember that the greatest abuses and usurpation

559

that the world has ever witnessed arose from small beginnings.

The ministry may meet our argument on "the Christian Sabbath" and the nature of Christian institutions with silence,-they may ignore it and act as if no such facts and truths existed, because they are in the majority. Our experience in past efforts to get the truth before them, and our knowledge of the spirit of majorities, and of human nature, gained from our reading of history and the Bible, incline us to fear that this will be the course mostly pursued. But if so it will be additional proof that the spirit of Protestant Christianity is on the wane; that power of majorities, not truth, is the arm on which they depend.

We will conclude our remarks on this subject next week, with a brief examination of the prophecies relating to the approaching warfare against the commandments of God and those who keep them.

**December 22, 1881**

**"Enforcement of the 'Christian Sabbath'" *The Signs of the Times* 7, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

Having compared the claims of the Sabbath and the Sunday, we must return to the consideration of the prophecies. We regret that so few take any interest in this important and interesting part of the sacred Scriptures. They who do not examine our position on this point cannot appreciate the stand we take upon the fourth commandment. They think the subject of this commandment a matter of comparative indifference. We firmly believe that the restoration of the Sabbath of the Lord is the great religious reform of the age. The Sunday has long usurped its place in the Christian world. And this elevation of the day of the sun to the honors of the Sabbath of the Lord, has been attended with the most disastrous consequences to the churches. Not willing to acknowledge that the Roman power has authority "to command holy days under sin," and not willing to reform their practice and exchange popular tradition for the commandment of God, they have been reduced to the greatest straits in their vain efforts to uphold Sunday by the Scriptures. To do this they have not only done violence to the language of the commandment, but, again, to justify this, they have adopted rules of interpretation which make the Bible a plaything for their fancies, and cause it to be scorned by many thinking men. If, in as plain a matter as *law*, words may be made to mean the opposite of what they say, and applied to anything except that of which they speak, what is the value of the Bible as a revelation?

In speaking of the prophecies we quoted from 2 Tim. 3:1-5 to show Paul's estimate of the prevailing religion of the world in the last days. With all other Bible writers he gives it a low place. Having said that they who will have the form of godliness will be despisers of those that are good, and false accusers, he adds, that "all that will lively godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." It cannot be questioned that there have been many godly people in this favored land who have lived respected, and quietly and peaceably served God to the end of their days. Has the prophecy, therefore, failed? By no means. We must look at it right where Paul placed it-"in the last days." The evidence is so strong and so clear from the "sure word of prophecy," and its fulfillment even to the present hour, that we are in the last days, that it is more than a mere *belief*; it has the force of a demonstration. Our Saviour, speaking of his second coming, gave certain signs (as unmistakable in their import as the budding trees are evidence of coming summer), and said, "So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, *know* that it is near, even at the doors." We have seen "these things" and do not doubt the ability and duty of the disciples of the Lord to "know that it is near." And no parts of the prophecies are more clear to us than those which point to a persecution for the truth-the truth of the commandments of God.

In Rev. 14 is a prophecy of the coming of the Son of man to reap the harvest of the earth. Jesus said, "The harvest is the end of the world," or age-the gospel age. Matt. 13:39-41. Preceding the advent a message of warning is given to the world to which is added: "Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:12. It is a significant fact that *patience* is so often spoken of in connection with the near coming of Christ. Compare Heb. 9:28; 10:25, 35-37; Jas. 5:1-9; Rev. 3:10, 11. Patience is called for, not in prosperity, but under afflictions. This accords with the statement of Paul that all the godly will suffer persecution in the last days; also with the text first quoted in Isa. 66.

There is much evidence on this subject which we would be pleased to present, and it would give clearness and strength to our argument could we present it all. But our limited space will only permit us to give a compend of it. The following points may easily be verified by any one who will read the Scriptures to which reference is made. Very little knowledge of history is needed to see the correctness of our applications.

1. Nebuchadnezzar's dream, with Daniel's interpretation, revealed the succession of the empires of Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome, with the breaking up or division of the Roman empire. Dan. 2.

2. Daniel's vision in chapter 7, explained by an angel, gives the same succession of kingdoms, and, in addition, the rise of a "diverse" power, after ten kingdoms had arisen on the Roman territory.

3. The explanation shows that governments or nations are represented in the prophecies by "beasts;" the term "beast" being no index to their character.

4. A "horn" is also used to represent a kingdom or power.

5. "Horn" is a comprehensive term, not only used as a symbol of governments or powers, but is used as a figure of emblem of power, no matter what may be its nature. See the Psalms, etc.

6. The terms "kind" and "kingdom" are used interchangeably in the prophecies. As a king represents the kingdom in which he rules, the word king is sometimes used when the kingdom is meant.

Rome was broken up, and ten kingdoms had arisen on its territory before the close of the fifth century. At this time a power "diverse" from those kingdoms was becoming prominent. It was an ecclesiastical power, which, in the words of the prophecy, became "more stout than his fellows," becoming even so strong as to rule over all the other kingdoms. Of the action of this power it is said:-

"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.

In Dr. Scott's Commentary on this text are these words, speaking of Papal Rome:-

"It had also a mouth speaking great things, and we shall have frequent occasion to speak of the arrogant claims, blasphemous titles, and great swelling words of vanity of this horn. The style of 'his holiness,' and the claim of infallibility, and of a power to dispense with God's laws, to forgive sins, and to sell admittance into heaven, may serve as a specimen of the great things which this mouth hath spoken."

The reader will find copious extracts from Scott on this subject, in Dr. Nelson's work, "Cause and Cure of Infidelity." Dr. Clarke on this verse says:-

"'He shall speak as if he were God.' So St. Jerome quotes from Symmachus. To none can this apply so well and so fully as to the popes of Rome. They have assumed infallibility, which belongs only to God. They profess to forgive sins, which belongs only to God. They profess to open and shut Heaven, which belongs only to God. They profess to be higher than all the kings of the earth, which belongs only to God. And they go beyond God, in pretending to loose whole nations from their oath of allegiance to their kings, when such kings do not please them. And they go against God, when they give indulgences for sin. Th is is the worst of all blasphemies.

"And shall wear out the saints. By wars, crusades, massacres, inquisitions, and persecutions of all kinds. What, in this way, have they not done against all those who have protested against their innovations and refused to submit to their idolatrous worship? Witness the exterminating crusades against the Waldenses and Albigenses. Witness John Huss, and Jerome of Prague. Witness the Smithfield fires in England. Witness God and man against this bloody, persecuting, ruthless, and impure church."

This is strong language, but perhaps none too strong, considering the tortures of the Inquisition; the millions immured in its dungeons and put to death; and the martyrs at the burning stake. To no power but the Papacy, "diverse" from all kingdoms, will this symbol apply.

On the expression: "He shall think to change times and laws," Dr. Clarke says:-

"Instituting new modes of worship utterly unknown to the Christian church; new articles of faith, new rules of practice; and reversing with pleasure the laws both of God and man."

Alexander Campbell, in his celebrated debate with Bishop Purcell, said:-

"I have here two Catechisms published by the authority of the church. They have both wholly expunged the second commandment."

On being told that it was not expunged from the Douay Bible, he replied as follows:-

"It is a poor apology for this expurgation of the Decalogue, that it is not so done in the Douay Bible. [Because so many have the Catechism who never read the Bible.] What myriads then, through this fraud, must have lived and died in the belief that the second commandment was no part of God's law. It is clearly proved that the pastors of the church have struck out one of God's *ten words*, which, not only in the Old Testament, but in *all revelation*, are the most emphatically regarded as the synopsis of all religion and morality."

And again:-

"License is given to violate in some way or other, every precept of the decalogue. The Sabbath, as a divine institution, is set aside."

In harmony with this is the proof offered from Catholic books wherein they claim that "the church" substituted the Sunday for the Sabbath of the fourth commandment of the decalogue. This tampering with the decalogue, the only instrument which Jehovah ever revealed in person, is the boldest act of treason which a mortal could commit, and in releasing (or professedly releasing) man from obligation to the law, or any part of it, that power has well earned the title which inspiration has conferred upon it-"that man of sin." 2 Thess. 2:1-8.

Protestants have been nearly unanimous in applying the symbol of the "little horn" of Dan. 7 to Romanism; and it is equally evident that Paul's man of sin has the same application. 2 Thess. 2. The man of sin was to be revealed by reason of a "falling away" in the church-it is a church power. The influences were already working in Paul's day which brought it into existence; it was developed at an early age in the church. He was to sit in the temple of God, "setting himself forth as God." (Revised Version). He should exalt himself above all that is called God. And surely, if he has authority to revise the law of Jehovah, and to absolve men from its claims, no higher position in the universe than his can be found. Yet this he claims. No power but the Papacy ever fulfilled this prophecy.

We now turn to the book of Revelation. This book of symbols is given mostly in series, as the seven churches, the seven seals, and seven trumpets, each series reaching to the second coming of Christ. The fourth is a series of beasts. This we now briefly examine.

The first in this line is a great red dragon. Rev. 12. This has been applied, by a well-known writer on Romanism, to the Catholic Church, but the application is not correct. It represents the Roman Empire before the church obtained supremacy. It was Pagan Rome that put the man-child to death-that stood ready to devour him as soon as he was born. Matt. 2. This child was Jesus Christ, for to no other will these words apply-"her child was caught up unto God, and to his throne." The empire gave civil authority to the Bishop of Rome, (see letter of Justinian, A.D. 535), which laid the foundation of all his usurpations. Paganism exalted the church, and affiliated with the church; it infused its principles into the church; it was honored upon the altars and in the institutions of the church; its

spirit pervaded the church throughout its long and bloody reign. Hence the dragon, with other earthly powers, is said to persecute the people of God even to the end of time. It makes war with the "remnant"-the very last stage of the church-which "keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." This coincides with Rev. 14:

571

12. "The patience of the saints" indicates afflictions; they "keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus;" and this also just before the Son of man comes to reap the harvest of the earth.

The second of this series is a beast, which has all the characteristics of the four beasts of Dan. 7, namely, the lion's mouth, the bear's feet, the leopard's body, the ten horns of the terrible beast, with the blasphemous arrogance of the "little horn" of that chapter. This description proves its location and the extent of its power. It is the inheritor of the power possessed successively by Babylon, Persia, Greece, and the Roman empire; not on their several seats of empire, but, as they, so strong that "no beast might stand before him." Dan. 8. "All the world wondered after the beast," and they said, "Who is able to make war with him?" Rev. 13:3, 4. It had ten horns, showing its supremacy over the kingdoms. "The dragon [Pagan Rome] gave him his power [civil power], and his seat [the city of Rome], and great authority." All this was literally fulfilled. The dragon transferred his seat to Constantinople, and gave his seat, Rome, to the Popes. "And he opens his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name [for he bore that name himself,] and his tabernacle [claiming that the seat of his Pontificate is the temple of God,] and them that dwell therein;" degrading the holy angels, by making the "ministering spirits" to be the souls of dead men.

"It was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them;" and this power was to continue forty-two months-twelve hundred and sixty days, or years. The time, times, and half a time allotted to the little horn in Dan. 7:25, is the same period. Comp. Rev. 12:6. This computation may be found in the comments of Clarke, Scott, Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, and others. Justinian's letter to the Bishop of Rome in 535, taking effect in 538, was really the beginning of his power-the foundation was then laid. One thousand two hundred and sixty years from 538 brings us to 1798, at which time Pius VI. Was taken prisoner by the French, a blow from which the papacy never recovered, so far as the civil power was concerned. Pius VI. died in exile, and the power to "wear out the saints of the Most High" was taken away. Nominally, a little civil power was left to the pope, when another was created, but this was taken from Pius IX. The prophecy says the beast received a deadly wound, and yet lived. A deadly wound, when its head was forcibly removed, and its power to "correct heretics" entirely destroyed.

We regret that these comments must be so brief; but our limits make this necessary. We pass to the third of this series, which more particularly interest us now.

"And I beheld another beast coming up out the earth." Verse 11. The first beast came out of *the sea*. Waters represent peoples and nations. Rev. 17:15. The first ruled the nations; this *grows up* as a tree comes up from the earth. So

did our country, of which this beast is clearly a symbol. Its rise and progress was by immigration and growth-not by subduing nations, or ruling over them. Where no government existed, there it sprang up and grew.

"And he had two horns like a lamb." We have seen that horns represent powers of any nature-civil or ecclesiastical. The first beast was a union of Catholicism and Paganism. The second a union of Protestantism and Republicanism. We owe our remarkable growth and prosperity as much to the former as to the latter. "A State without a king, and a church without a pope," or earthly head, was the ideal of our fathers. Lamb-like in profession and appearance.

"And he spake as a dragon." This is mostly yet to be developed. Yet it is worth while to raise the question whether the *civil policy adopted* by our fathers (to the deep sorrow of the present generation), was consistent with their Declaration of Independence; and whether the *Protestant avowal* that all in this land might worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, was consistent with their treatment of Baptists and Quakers and of Seventh-day Adventists.

"And causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed." An important point to notice is, that the action here point out occurs after the first beast is wounded to death, or this side of 1798. The worship here referred to-the worship of the first beast enforced-is the great point of interest in this inquiry. 1. He causeth the earth-to worship the first beast. The earth may be, and sometimes is, used for its inhabitants; but it is not here, as both are mentioned. The earth is caused to worship, and them that dwell in the earth are caused to worship. How can this be? Consider the evidence which has been produced, that the Sunday festival is a Catholic institution, and the following words from a Catholic author: "Thus the observance of Sunday by the Protestants is an homage they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the church." This is true. And in this manner the very earth is made to worship that power. Baptists and others have tried to apply this prophecy to various papal institutions, as to infant baptism, and to sprinkling for baptism; but all in vain. God commanded that man should rest upon the Sabbath, in seed time and in harvest. But now, according to an ordinance of "the church" the land must be neither sowed nor reaped on the Sunday. The earth must thus do homage to the papal power. In this, and in this alone, can the prophecy be fulfilled. No other institution of Catholic appointment can meet the case. We may reasonably ask two things of those who dissent from this; 1. Show that the Sunday is to be observed by divine appointment. 2. Produce some institution, or something, wherein the earth, as well as them that dwell therein, is caused to worship that power. Here we have a most important prophecy, coming home to every one of us, in process of fulfillment by the enforcement of the Sunday-Sabbath, in Protestant-Republican America. True, it is mild and lamb-like yet, even in this; but the dragon spirit is fast asserting itself wherever the issue is made.

We have no space to notice all the points of this prophecy, but the following assists in identifying this power, and must be noticed.

"And he doeth great wonders. . . . and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by those miracles which he had power to do." The wonders of "Modern Spiritualism" sprang up in this country. They are not all mere pretence; they are just what this scripture says they are-miracles to deceive; to turn man away from God and the Bible. As these take in this work it is well to remember that hosts of church members and many ministers, even eminent ones, are firm believers in the phenomena of Spiritualism.

"Saying to them that dwell on the earth that they should make *an image* to the beast which had a wound by a sword and did live." The first beast was a union of church and State. An image of that will be the same. There seems to be a great and general misapprehension of what constituted a union of church and State. It consisted in an arrangement by which the State was so far subservient to the church that it enforced the decrees of the church, and punished those who dissented-who were heretics. And in times of persecution minorities are always heretics, no matter how strongly they sustain themselves by the Bible. It was an arrangement by which "police regulations" were made to enforce religious observances. The church excused herself in the iniquity because it was a "police regulation" which the State alone enforced. And the State excused itself because it was persuaded that the peace and welfare of society required it. When the National Association, which is now clamoring for a Religious Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, shall be successful and the General Government is called upon to enforce the "Christian Sabbath," that, too, will be a police regulation, but who instigates it? Let no one be deceived. *The "Christian Sabbath" is a church regulation enforced by the police of the State!* It is to all intents a union of church and State; it is a complete image of the first beast. Here are facts which cannot be met, nor fairly evaded. And when religious bigotry is once let loose, where will it stop?

"And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive *a mark* in their right hand or in their foreheads; and that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." It is easy to show by the Scriptures, as Rom. 4:11; Rev. 7:3; Eze. 9:4-6, etc., that sign, seal, and mark are used as equivalents, in the Bible. God gave the Sabbath as a *sign* of his work of creation, and of himself as Creator. Ex. 31:13-17. Eze. 20:11, 12, 19, 20. In six days the Lord made heaven and earth: the seventh day-the rest day or Sabbath-commemorates that work. It is a sign of the Creator; a perpetual reminder of his power; a safeguard against heathenism, if observed by the nations. Had not man turned away from the Sabbath he *could not* have forgotten God. "The things that are made" attest "his eternal power and Godhead." Rom. 1:20. He himself gave the Sabbath as a sign of this. How presumptuous is feeble man to treat with contempt this God-given sign, and displace it by another sign without a sentence of Scripture to warrant the action. We will listen again to a Catholic Catechism:-

" *Ques* . How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days?



" *Ans* . By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves by keeping Sunday strictly, and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church.

" *Ques* . How prove you that?

" *Ans* . Because by keeping Sunday they acknowledge the church's power to ordain feasts, and to commend them under sin," etc.

That is, they virtually acknowledge that that church has power to make that sinful of which God has never spoken, and to make it right to neglect that which God has commanded and never repealed. This is the highest possible assumption of power, and "the church" offers the church festival of Sunday as a standing monument of that power. The Sabbath is Jehovah's sign of power; the Sunday is the Pope's sign of power. In this the very earth is caused to worship Papacy; this is his peculiar *mark* of allegiance, for in this (they say) the Protestants, "in spite of themselves," do homage to "the church." Who can gainsay the declaration?

We are watching with interest those passing events which show that *this image* will soon be made, and this *mark* or *sign* will be enforced. Prejudice is proving stronger than reason, and men refuse to be warned. But our Heavenly Father, who watches over every step of his people, and notes every weapon formed against them, has inspired his prophets to speak on this subject. A solemn warning has been put on record against the very work which is already being started and pushed forward to completion. Just before the Son of man comes, the following message is given:-

"If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name."

"Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:9-12.

This is the most solemn warning-the most terrible denunciation to be found in the Holy Scriptures. And it is easy to see why it is given in such terms. It is founded upon the most daring usurpation of the rights and prerogatives of the divine government that the world has ever seen. And it is in close proximity to the coming of the Lord, when he shall have ceased to act as a priest or mediator between God and man. The judgments threatened are to fall "without mixture" upon the incorrigible and presumptuous. No mercy can reach them in that day, and they will call upon rocks and mountains to shield them from "the wrath of the Lamb." Terrible day when he that is filthy must remain filthy still; Rev. 22:1-12; and the blessed Son of God, who is now pleading for all, shall come to take vengeance on his foes. 2 Thess. 1:7-9.

While this article is longer than we desire for one number of our paper, we regret that it is not possible to give more fully the proof of our position. The reader will find a work at our office entitled, "The United States in the Light of

Prophecy," to which we refer him. It is a small book, but big with facts and strong in argument. No one can read it impartially, divested of prejudice, and not feel that we have a reason for the hope that is in us.

Now the reader can judge something of our feelings in regard to the impending crisis and to the present state of the "Sunday Law" question. It would be a pleasure to us to act in harmony with our fellow citizens, especially that class who love order and sobriety. But while their action requires of us to violate our convictions, based on the plain reading of the commandment of God, we *dare not* do different from what we are doing.

We have carefully, for a long time, even for more than a quarter of a century, and with many prayers, examined the ground covered by the present Sunday enforcement excitement. We have anticipated it, and have announced its coming to those who persisted in their incredulity. And even now, those who engaged in arousing the popular enthusiasm in its behalf have no idea of the lengths to which it will be carried when once it is fairly set in motion. *Every Catholic in the land is watching the issue with interest*. They all favor it, but are politic enough to say little, satisfied that what they so strongly desire will be done more readily in their absence than with their presence.

Our patriotism is appealed to. Alas! we tremble for our country when we see what is coming. But more than all we "tremble at the word" of God. We plant ourselves on the commandment of God, and with Luther we say-We cannot go back!