

The Signs of the Times, Vol. 14 (1888)

January 6, 1888

"The Burden of Egypt" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 1 , pp. 7, 8.

EGYPT was one of the very first of nations to attain to power and civilization. She attained to such a height of power that for ages she was the strongest nation in the world; and to such a height of civilization that "the wisdom of the Egyptians" was proverbial even among the wisest people in the world. It was a commendable qualification in Moses that he "was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." And the Scripture, after stating that "God gave Solomon wisdom and understanding exceeding much, and largeness of heart, even as the sand that is on the sea-shore," proceeds to give the measure, or at least some sort of an idea, of it, by adding, "And Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the East country, and all the wisdom of Egypt." 1Kings 4:29, 30.

Esarhaddon and Asshur-bani-pal, the last of the great kings of Assyria, invaded Egypt, and in fact subdued it, but she soon recovered strength, and not only assisted Babylonia and Media in the utter destruction of the Assyrian kingdom, but also received as her share all the Assyrian possessions west of the Euphrates, with her stronghold at Charchemish on the Euphrates. 2 Kings 23:29; 2 Chron. 35:20, 21. In a few years, however, Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, took all these possessions, even as far as to the very border of Egypt itself. "And the king of Egypt came not again any more out of his land; for the king of Babylon had taken from the river of Egypt unto the river Euphrates all that pertained to the king of Egypt." 2 Kings 24:7. This was in B.C. 598. But yet the king of Egypt was "like a young lion of the nations," and "as a whale in the seas," and in 588-586, Ezekiel took up a lamentation for Egypt, and declared that her ruin should come as the ruin of Assyria had gone before. Egypt was given to Nebuchadnezzar by the Lord, for the service which he wrought in the destruction of Tyre, and the spoil of Egypt was the wages of Nebuchadnezzar's army, for their work which they did for the Lord in the ruin of Tyre. Eze. 29:18-20. The secret of this was that Egypt had helped Tyre in her resistance.

We have not space to notice all the prophecies concerning Egypt, but the following passage of Scripture is worthy of special notice:—

"Thus saith the Lord God: I will also make the multitude of Egypt to cease by the hand of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon. He and his people with him, the terrible of the nations, shall be brought to destroy the land; and they shall draw their swords against Egypt, and fill the land with the slain. And I will make the rivers dry, and sell the land into the hand of the wicked; and I will make the land waste, and all that is therein, by the hand of strangers; I the Lord have spoken it. Thus saith the Lord God: I will also destroy the idols, and I will cause their images to cease out of Noph; and there shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt; and I will put a fear in the land of Egypt." Eze. 30:10-13.

We have none of the particulars of Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of Egypt. It is known, however, that he did invade it twice, and that he was thoroughly successful, and carried large numbers of the Egyptians captive to Babylon. But aside from this, there are three points in the above quotation which stand forth in such perfect fulfillment that no objection can justly be made by any man, to the faithfulness of the word spoken by the prophet Ezekiel nearly twenty-five hundred years ago. We shall notice them in reverse order, taking the last one first.

"There shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt." Although Egypt was subdued by Esarhaddon and Asshur-bani-pal, by Nebuchadnezzar, and by Cambyses, the Egyptians still ruled within the country itself. But in B.C. 344 Ochus of Persia invaded the land with 334,000 troops, while the Egyptian king Nectanebo had an army of only 100,000 with which to meet him, and 20,000 of these were Greek mercenaries. The king of Persia was wholly successful. "All Egypt submitted to Ochus, who demolished the walls of the cities, plundered the temples, and after amply rewarding his mercenaries, returned to his own capital with an immense booty." "Nectanebo in despair quitted the country and fled southward to Ethiopia," and from that day till this there has been no native ruler of Egypt. Nectanebo was the last Egyptian king that Egypt ever had.

"Thus miserably fell the monarchy of the Pharaohs after an unexampled duration of nearly three thousand years. . . . More than 2,000 years have since passed, and though Egypt has from time to time been independent, not one native prince has sat on the throne of the Pharaohs. 'There shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt' (Eze. 30:13) was prophesied in the days of Apries [the Pharaoh-hophra of Jer.44:30] as the final state of the land."—*Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Egypt.*

Beside the princes of the monarchy itself, there were "local princes" throughout Egypt; these continued for about twelve years, to the time when Alexander the Great took possession of Egypt, and then they too disappeared.

"With Alexander, the Macedonian dominion began. . . . From this time the Egyptian local princes, who for five centuries, except only during the rule of Psametik and his house, had caused all the divisions of Egypt, *disappear from the scene.*"—*ib.*

Thus the word has been literally fulfilled that "there shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt."

2. "I will also destroy the idols, and I will cause their images to cease." This is a most remarkable prediction. For of all nations that have ever lived on the earth, the Egyptians were the most abundantly idolatrous. Bodies heavenly and bodies earthly, bodies animate and bodies inanimate, real and imaginary, fish, flesh, fowl, and vegetable, all were worshiped as gods in Egypt; and it was literally true that in Egypt it was easier to find a god than a man. "The basis of their religion was Nigritian fetichism, the lowest kind of nature worship. . . . The fetichism included, besides the worship of animals, that of trees, rivers, and hills." The principal gods, such as Phtah, Ra, Shu, Isis, Osiris, etc., numbered up into the hundreds. Of the animals universally sacred, the principal were cows and heifers, apes, ibises, cats, hawks, asps, and dogs. Others, whose worship was more

local, were lions, crocodiles, wolves, jackals, shrew-mice, hippopotami, antelopes, ibexes, frogs, goats, vultures, fish, ichneumons, and others too numerous to mention.

Yet as numerous as the idols were, and as base as the idolatry was, the idols have been totally destroyed and the images have ceased utterly.

.3. "I will make the land waste, and all that is therein, by the hand of strangers." All history from the conquest of Egypt by Ochus, before mentioned, till this day, bears continuous testimony to the literal fulfillment of this prophecy. From the day that King Nectanebo fled into Ethiopia till now, strangers have spoiled Egypt of her wealth and drained her of her treasures. When Alexander the Great had defeated Darius at Issus, he was welcomed by Egypt as a deliverer. In the final division of Alexander's dominion, Egypt fell to Ptolemy the Macedonian, and he and his successors ruled and rifled it for two hundred and ninety-four years. It fell next under the dreadful dominion of Rome, whose iron hand held it for six hundred and seventy years, until A.D. 641. Then the Saracens took it and spoiled it for six hundred years. In 1250 the Mamalukes seized it, and held it two hundred and sixty-seven years, and "if you consider the whole time that they possessed the kingdom, especially that which was nearer the end, you will find it filled with wars, battles, injuries, and rapines."—*Pococke*. In A.D. 1517 the Turks conquered the Mamalukes, and took possession of the whole country, which they still hold. And a hundred years ago, Gibbon, in describing the condition

8

of Egypt under their rule, stated not only what is still its condition, but gave the best statement in existence of the fulfillment of the prophecy. He said:—

"A more unjust and absurd constitution cannot be devised, than that which condemns the natives of a country to perpetual servitude, under the arbitrary dominion of strangers and slaves. Yet such has been the state of Egypt above five hundred years. The most illustrious sultans of the Baharite and Borgite dynasties, were themselves promoted from the Tartar and Circassian bands; and the four and twenty beys, or military chiefs, have ever been succeeded, not by their sons, but by their servants. They produce the great charter of their liberties, the treaty of Selim the First with the republic; and the Othman emperor still accepts from Egypt a slight acknowledgment of tribute and subjection."—*Decline and Fall*, chap. 59, paragraph 20.

And that is exactly as the prophet of God, nearly twenty-five hundred years ago, said it would be.

The statement of these facts has prepared the way for the statement in a few words of the fulfillment of another notable prophecy concerning Egypt. After the scattering of the people by Nebuchadnezzar, the Lord said: "I will bring again the captivity of Egypt, and will cause them to return into the land of Pathros, into the land of their habitation; and they shall be there a base kingdom. It shall be the basest of the kingdoms; neither shall it exalt itself any more above the nations; for I will diminish them, that they shall no more rule over the nations." Eze. 29:14,

15. In view of the fact that that nation has been so sold into the hands of strangers, and so spoiled by them, it is easy to see how, from the wisest of nations, she could become the basest of kingdoms. A hundred years ago Volney wrote this:—

"In Egypt there is no middle class, neither nobility, clergy, merchants, nor land-holders. A universal air of misery in all the traveler meets points out to him the rapacity of oppression, and the distrust attendant upon slavery. The profound ignorance of the inhabitants equally prevents them from perceiving the causes of their evils, or applying the necessary remedies. Ignorance, diffused through every class, extends its effects to every species of moral and physical knowledge. Nothing is talked of but intense troubles, the public misery, pecuniary extortions, and bastinadoes."

In 1875 Dr. Robert Patterson wrote this:—

"The wretched peasantry are rejoiced to labor for any who will pay them five cents a day, and eager to hide the treasure in the ground from the rapacious tax-gatherer. I have seen British horses refuse to eat the meal ground from the mixture of wheat, barley, oats, lentils, millet, and a hundred unknown seeds of weeds and collections of filth, which forms the produce of their fields. For poverty, vermin, and disease, Egypt is proverbial." "I have seen the population of several villages, forced to leave their own fields in the spring, to march down to an old, filthy canal, near Cairo, and almost within sight of the gate of the palace, men, and women, and little boys, and girls, like those of our Sabbath-schools, scooping up the stinking mud and water with their hands, into baskets, carrying them on their heads up the steep bank, beaten with long sticks by the task-masters to hasten their steps, while steam dredgers lay unused within sight."

Twelve years later Mrs. Susan E. Wallace wrote of Egypt and her people, as follows:—

"The valley of the Nile produces three crops a year; and sowing, plowing, reaping go on at the same time. Women worked in the fields with the men, each wearing one loose garment. There was no machinery but the *shadof*, like our old-fashioned well-sweep, the most primitive of pumps, and a rush basket. Swinging the water-tight basket, they moved with machine-like precision, these forever oppressed Egyptians, without recollections of a great past or ambition pointing to a better future. Their very souls are enslaved by centuries of grinding tyranny, knowing no change but a change of task-makers. The locomotive gives them no impulses, and they do not lift their heads as the herald of a new civilization, a chariot mightier than Pharaoh's, rolls past. Among the low-bending figures we saw the tattooed faces and painted blue lips, forbidden by the Levitical law.

"In a slow, heart-broken way they moved steadily, swinging the rush basket, in the hard service of the field named in Deuteronomy, drawing up water from the river and emptying it on the fields in the higher levels. Sometimes the passer-by may hear a dull, droning sound from the unpaid toilers, a melancholy chorus

chanted by gangs of boys and girls degraded unspeakably, who are set to work together along the Nile banks. The Arabic scholar tells us these are the words of the slow, sad song:—

GIRLS

'They starve us, they starve us!

BOYS

'They beat us, they beat us!

CHORUS ALL TOGETHER

'But there's someone above,
There's someone above,
Who will punish them well,
Will punish them well.

"Another burden in full chorus is:—

'The chief of the village,
The chief of the village,
May the dogs tear him, tear him tear him."

There is no more a prince of the land of Egypt; the idols have utterly ceased; the land is wasted by the hand of strangers; Egypt is the basest of the kingdoms; the prophecy is literally fulfilled; and this word which Ezekiel wrote, as he dwelt among the captives by the river of Chebar, two thousand four hundred and seventy-four years ago, is the WORD OF GOD.

"Believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established; believe his prophets, so shall ye prosper."

J.

January 13, 1888

"Babylon, Cyrus, and the Jews" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 2 , pp. 22, 23.

WITH the exception of Jerusalem, there is more said about Babylon in the Bible than there is about any other city or power in the world. in the history it occupies a large place; in the prophecies a much larger place. Gen. 10:10; 11:8. In the time of Isaiah she was called "The lady of kingdoms." Isa. 47:5. Isaiah himself called her "The glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency," and "The golden city." Chap. 13:19; 14:4. Jeremiah called it "The praise of the whole earth." Chap. 51:41.

Herodotus, who lived about 484-430 B.C., says of it:—

"The city stands on a broad plain, . . . and is an exact square, 120 furlongs in length each way, so that the entire circuit is 480 furlongs. While such is its size, in magnificence there is no other

city that approaches to it. It is surrounded, in the first place, by a broad and deep moat, full of water, behind which rises a wall 50 royal cubits in width, and 200 in height. (The royal cubit is longer by three fingers' breadth than the common cubit.)"—*Her., book 1, chap. 178.*

And of its walls and fortresses Nebuchadnezzar, the great king of Babylon, says:—

"Imgur-bel and Nivit-bel, the great walls of Babylon, I built them square. . . . I repaired, with bitumen and bricks, the sides of the ditches that had been dug. I caused to be put in order the double doors of bronze, and the railings and the gratings, in the great gateways. I enlarged the streets of Babylon so as to make them wonderful. I applied myself to the protection of Babylon and Vale Saggatu (the pyramid), and on the most elevated lands, close to the great gate of Ishtar, I constructed strong fortresses of bitumen and bricks, from the banks of the Euphrates down to the great gate, the whole extent of the streets. I established their foundations below the level of the waters. I fortified these walls with art. I caused Imgur-bel, the great wall of Babylon, the impregnable, such as no king before me had made, to be measured, 4,000 mahargagar."

"This measurement," says Lenormant, "corresponds exactly with the 480 stades [sixty miles] given by Herodotus as the circuit."—*Ancient History of the East, book 4, chap. 5, sec. 3, par. 16.*

The city, as stated above, lay in the form of a square, 15 miles on each side, making 60 miles around it. It was surrounded by a wall 350 feet high, and about 85 feet thick at the top. On the top of the wall, at irregular intervals, were built towers to guard the most accessible parts. Of these towers there were 250. The open space on the wall, within the line of these towers, was of sufficient breadth to allow a four-horse chariot to turn with safety. Twenty-five gates pierced the wall on each side, making one hundred gates in all in the outer wall. These were double gates of solid brass, with brazen lintels and posts, and fastened with bars of iron. Around the wall on the outside ran a moat, corresponding in width and depth to the greatness of the wall. Under the wall and diagonally through the city, from corner to corner, so as to obtain the greatest length of water, ran the river Euphrates. On each side of the river, inside of the city, was built a strong wall, each wall being pierced with twenty-five gates opening into the streets that ran from the outer gates. These were also brazen gates like those in the outer wall. The banks of the river were lined throughout with brick laid in bitumen, with sloping landing-places at the gates. Boats were always ready at these landing-places by which to pass from side to side of the river. Over the river about the middle of the city was a drawbridge thirty feet wide, supported on stone

piers. At the two ends of the bridge were the two grand palaces of the city. Of course the vast area within the city was not built up solidly with houses, as is a

modern city. There were gardens, orchards, and fields interspersed among the houses, and about the palaces and temples. It was expected that if ever the city should be besieged, they could grow sufficient provisions within the walls to support the population, so that they might shut their gates, man the towers, and dwell securely, with no fears of ever being overcome by any besieging force.

The houses were mostly three or four stories high, magnificently built, and both houses and grounds grandly adorned. Its temple were marvels of architecture, and most richly furnished; and its temple of Bel and its hanging gardens were among the wonders of the world. "The spoils of Nineveh, Jerusalem, and Egypt had enriched it; its armies had swept like a torrent over the finest countries of the East; the arts and sciences, driven from Phúnicia and Egypt, were centered here; and hither the philosophers of the West came to imbibe instruction." The astronomers of Babylon were the leading ones of the world in her time. The following quotation from Rawlinson gives a just view of Babylon's place in regard to the arts and sciences:—

"Babylon seems to have been the source from which Assyria drew her learning, such as it was, her architecture, the main ideas of her mimetic art, her religious notions, her legal forms, and a vast number of her customs and usages. *But Babylonia herself*, so far as we know, *drew her stores from no foreign country*. Hers was apparently the genius which excogitated an alphabet—worked out the simplest problems of arithmetic—invented implements for measuring the lapse of time—conceived the idea of raising enormous structures with the poorest of all materials, clay—discovered the art of polishing, boring, and engraving gems—reproduced with truthfulness the outlines of human and animal forms—attained to high perfection in textile fabrics—studied with success the motions of the heavenly bodies—conceived of grammar as a science—elaborated a system of law—saw the value of an exact chronology—in almost every branch of science made a beginning—in almost every branch of science made a beginning, thus rendering it comparatively easy for other nations to proceed with the superstructure. To Babylonia far more than to Egypt, we owe the art and learning of the Greeks. It was from the East, not from Egypt, that Greece derived her architecture, her sculpture, her science, her philosophy, her mathematical knowledge—in a word, her intellectual life. And Babylon was the source to which the entire stream of Eastern civilization may be traced."—*Seven Great Monarchies, Fourth, chap. 8, last par.*

Yet as great as Babylon was, the Lord said she should be "as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation." "I will also make it a possession for the bittern, and pools of water; and I will sweep it with the besom of destruction, saith the Lord of hosts." And he has done it. The prophecies concerning the fall and the final ruin of Babylon are many and remarkable, and they have been so perfectly fulfilled that the subject forms a most interesting study. That which

makes it the more so is the fact that in this case the history is so full and authentic. About all that there is to do is to quote the words of the prophecy and set alongside of it the statements of the history.

The first mention of Babylon in any prophecy is in Isaiah 39:1-7. Hezekiah king of Judah had been sick unto death, and the Lord told him by Isaiah to set his house in order, for he should die, and not live. Then he prayed that he might live longer, and the Lord granted him fifteen years, and the prophet told him he should recover. Hezekiah asked what should be the sign that the Lord would heal him, and Isaiah answered, "This sign shalt thou have of the Lord, that the Lord will do the thing that he hath spoken; shall the shadow go forward ten degrees, or go back ten degrees?" Hezekiah asked that the shadow might go back ten degrees. "And Isaiah the prophet cried unto the Lord; and he brought the shadow ten degrees backward, by which it had gone down in the dial of Ahaz." 2 Kings 29:8-11. The Babylonians, being great astronomers, noticed the phenomenon, and in their inquiries in regard to it, learned that Hezekiah had been sick and was recovered, and that this solar phenomenon had occurred in connection with the matter. Therefore Merodach-baladan, who was then king of Babylon, sent ambassadors with letters and a present unto Hezekiah, "*to inquire of the wonder that was done in the land.*" "And Hezekiah hearkened unto them, and showed them all the house of his precious things, the silver, and the gold, and the spices, and the precious ointment, and all the house of his armor, and all that was found in his treasures; there was nothing in his house, nor in all his dominion, that Hezekiah showed them not." Then Isaiah came and asked Hezekiah who these men were, and what they had seen. Hezekiah told him they came from Babylon and that there was nothing among all his treasures that he had not showed them.

"Then said Isaiah to Hezekiah, Hear the word of the Lord of hosts: Behold, the days come, that all that is in thine house, and that which thy fathers have laid up in store until this day, shall be carried to Babylon; nothing shall be left, saith the Lord. And of thy sons that shall issue from thee, which thou shalt beget, shall they take away; and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon." 2 Chron. 32:31; Isa. 39:2-7.

All this occurred about 712 B.C., and from one hundred and six to one hundred and fourteen years afterward, this prophecy was literally fulfilled. For then Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, captured Jerusalem. "And the king spake unto Ashpenaz the master of his eunuchs, that he should bring certain of the children of Israel, and *of the king's seed*, and of the princes . . . to stand in the king's palace, and whom they might teach the learning and the tongue of the Chaldeans." One of these was Daniel, and God "brought Daniel into favor and tender love with the prince of the eunuchs." Dan. 1. After that, in the eighth years of his reign, Nebuchadnezzar again besieged and took Jerusalem. "And he carried out thence all the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the king's house, and cut in pieces all the vessels of gold which Solomon king of Israel had made in the temple of the Lord, as the Lord had said." 2 Kings 24:13.

But Isaiah not only prophesied that the people should be carried captive to Babylon, he also said they should be released from captivity, and that without price or reward, and even gave the name of the man who should release them.

"Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him;" "for Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even called thee by thy name; I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me." "He shall build my city, and he shall let go my captives, not for price nor reward, saith the Lord of hosts." Isa. 45:1-4, 13. When the Medes and Persians had taken Babylon, Daniel was made prime minister of the empire. He showed to Cyrus this prophecy which called him by name, and told him of the true God; and in his very first year, Cyrus, king of Persia, "made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, and put it also in writing, saying, Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, All the kingdoms of the earth hath the Lord God of Heaven given me; and he hath charged me to build him an house in Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among you of all his people? The Lord his God be with him and let him go up." 2 Chron. 36:22, 23; Ezra. 1:1-11.

Now we have found that Isaiah told of the captivity more than a hundred years before the people were carried captive; and the captivity lasted seventy years. Therefore Isaiah prophesied their release, and named the man who should release them, one hundred and seventy-six years before it came to pass. But Cyrus was about sixty-three years old when he issued this proclamation. Therefore Isaiah called him by name one hundred and thirteen years before he was born. At that time there was no such country as Persia, and the ancestors of Cyrus were only wandering tribes. This word of Isaiah was as though, in A.D. 1619, someone in England had called Washington by name, and had said to king James I. that the American colonies would be set free from the power of Britain, and that Washington would be the man who should set them free.

The word which Isaiah spoke is the word of God. In the case of Babylon and Cyrus, and the captivity and release of the Jews, it was literally fulfilled. Other prophecies concerning Babylon will be noted hereafter.

J.

January 20, 1888

"The Fall of Babylon" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 3 , pp. 38, 39.

ISAIAH called Cyrus by name one hundred and thirteen years before he was born, and said, one hundred and seventy-six years before it came to pass, that he should let the people of Israel go from captivity. But Babylon was to fall before Israel could go free. And the prophet also said that Cyrus should take that mighty city. Isa. 45:1-5. In the fourth year of Zedekiah, B.C. 597, Seraiah was sent as an ambassador to Babylon on business to the king; and by him Jeremiah sent a copy of the prophecies contained in the fiftieth and fifty-first chapters of Jeremiah. Seraiah was to take the prophecy with him, and when he reached Babylon, he was to read it all, and when he had finished the reading of it he was to bind a stone to it, and cast it into the midst of Euphrates, and say, "Thus shall Babylon sink, and shall not rise from the evil that I will bring upon her." Jer. 51:59-64.

In that prophecy which Jeremiah had sent to be read in Babylon, it was said to the people of Israel: "My people, go ye out of the midst of her, and deliver ye every man his soul from the fierce anger of the Lord. And lest your heart faint, and ye fear for the rumor that shall be heard in the land; a rumor shall both come one year, and after that in another year shall come a rumor, and violence in the land, ruler against ruler." Jer. 51:45, 46. Here was given a definite sign by which the people of Israel might know when to escape from Babylon, and from the ruin that was to fall upon her. There were to be two rumors of danger to Babylon, and the rumors were to be a year apart. As stated above, Cyrus started for Babylon in early spring, B.C. 539, but he went only about half way that year. The cause of this is thus stated by Herodotus:—

"Cyrus on his way to Babylon came to the banks of the Gyndes, a stream which, rising in the Matienian Mountains, runs through the country of the Dardanians, and empties itself into the river Tigris. . . . When Cyrus reached this

39

stream, which could only be passed in boats, one of the sacred white horses accompanying his march, full of spirit and high mettle, walked into the water, and tried to cross by himself; but the current seized him, swept him along with it, and drowned him in its depths. Cyrus, enraged at the insolence of the river, threatened so to break its strength that in future even women should cross it easily without wetting their knees. Accordingly *he put off for a time his attack on Babylon*, and dividing his army into two parts he marked out by ropes one hundred and eighty trenches on each side of the Gyndes, leading off from it in all directions, and setting his army to dig, some on one side of the river, some on the other, he accomplished his threat by the aid of so great a number of hands, *but not without losing thereby the whole summer season*. Having, however, thus wreaked his vengeance on the Gyndes by dispersing it through three hundred and sixty channels, Cyrus, with the first approach of the ensuing spring, marched forward against Babylon."—*Book I, chap. 189, 190.*

Here then were the two rumors which Jeremiah said there should be: First, when Cyrus started from Ecbatana, the rumor reached Babylon, and the Babylonians made all ready to meet him in defense of the city. But he stopped and stayed a year, and then started again for Babylon, which would be the cause of the second rumor. This was what the people of Israel were waiting for; then they knew it was the time to get out of Babylon, for then would surely be violence in the land, ruler against ruler. And thus that prophecy was certainly fulfilled beyond all reasonable dispute.

In the spring of B.C. 538 Cyrus proceeded to Babylon without hindrance. The king of Babylon drew up his forces in the plain outside of the city, prepared to give battle. Cyrus attacked him at once and easily defeated him. The king, Nabonadius, himself took refuge in Borsippa, while the greater part of his army escaped within the walls of the city, where Belshazzar was in command. When

they all got within the mighty walls of Babylon, with all the brazen gates securely fastened with the heavy iron bars, they felt perfectly secure, and laughed defiance at Cyrus and all his forces, and at all his efforts to force his way in. But Cyrus had already made a success of turning the river Gyndes out of its banks, and he determined to do the same thing for the Euphrates. The Euphrates ran directly through the city, under the walls, and Cyrus determined to turn the waters out of the channel, and then, under cover of darkness, follow the bed of the river into the city. This also was in fulfillment of prophecy: "A drought is upon her waters; and they shall be dried up." "And I will dry up her sea, and make her springs dry." Jer. 50:38; 51:36. Thus spake the prophet sixty years before, telling what should be, and the following are the words of the historian telling what was:—

"Withdrawing the greater part of his army from the vicinity of the city, and leaving behind him only certain corps of observation, Cyrus marched away up the course of the Euphrates for a certain distance, and there proceeded to make a vigorous use of the spade. His soldiers could now appreciate the value of the experience which they had gained by dispersing the Gyndes, and perceive that the summer and autumn of the preceding year had not been wasted. They dug a channel or channels from the Euphrates, by means of which a great portion of its water would be drawn off, and hoped in this way to render the natural course of the river fordable."

Isaiah was shown in vision that Babylon would fall in a time of feasting: "Prepare the table, watch in the watch-tower, eat, drink;" and that in the midst of it she would be attacked: "Arise, ye princes, and anoint the shield." Chap. 21:5, 9. And thus says the history:—

"When all was prepared, Cyrus determined to wait for the arrival of a certain festival, during which the whole population were wont to engage in drinking and reveling, and then silently in the dead of night to turn the water of the river and make his attack. All fell out as he hoped and wished. The festival was held with even greater pomp and splendor than usual; for Belshazzar, with the natural insolence of youth, to mark his contempt of the besieging army, abandoned himself wholly to the delights of the season, and himself entertained a thousand lords in his palace."

Daniel was in Babylon that night, and tells what happened there: "Belshazzar the king made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand. Belshazzar, while he tasted the wine, commanded to bring the golden and silver vessels which his father [grandfather, margin] Nebuchadnezzar had taken out of the temple which was in Jerusalem; that the king, and his princes, his wives, and his concubines, might drink therein."

Jeremiah said it was "a land of graven images," and prophesied that they would be "mad upon their idols." Chap. 50:38. And Daniel says that in that night's feast which he saw "they drank wine, and praised the gods of gold, and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone." Dan. 5:1-4.

Isaiah, one hundred and seventy-six years before, said that their night of pleasure should be turned into fear. Chap. 21:3, 4. Daniel tells what did it: "In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaster of the wall of the king's palace; and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote." Chap. 5:5.

Isaiah in vision pictured him thus in his fear: "My heart panted, fearfulness affrighted me;" "therefore are my loins filled with pain; pangs have taken hold upon me; . . . I was bowed down at the hearing of it; I was dismayed at the seeing of it." Daniel tells what was the reality: "Then the king's countenance was changed, and his thoughts troubled him, so that the joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote one against another." Dan. 5:6.

Isaiah showed that he would call in the astrologers: "Let now the astrologers, the star-gazers, the monthly prognosticators, stand up, and save thee from these things that shall come upon thee;" "none shall save thee." Isa.47:13, 15.

Daniel says the king did so: "The king cried aloud to bring in the astrologers, the Chaldeans, and the soothsayers; . . . but they could not read the writing, nor make known to the king the interpretation thereof. Then was king Belshazzar greatly troubled, and his countenance was changed in him, and his lords were astonished."

This was the scene in the king's banqueting-house, but it was only a sample of what was going on all over the city, for it was a national feast. Says William Hayes Ward, in the *Sunday School Times*:—

"We are told in Daniel that Babylon was captured on the night of a great feast to the idol gods, at which the wives and concubines joined in a wild revelry. But the women were not in the habit of feasting with men—how is this? An account, by Cyrus himself, of his capture of Babylon, was dug up only three or four years ago. In it he declares that Babylon was captured, 'without fighting,' on the fourteenth day of the month Tammuz. Now the month Tammuz was named in honor of the god Tammuz, the Babylonian Adonis, who married their Venus or Ishtar; and the fourteenth of Tammuz was the regular time to celebrate their union, with lascivious orgies. On this day of all others, the women took part in the horrible rites; and it was in this feast of king, princes, wives, and concubines, that Babylon was taken and Belshazzar slain. The Bible is here fully and wonderfully corroborated."—*Vol. 25, No. 42, pp. 659, 660.*

J.

(*Concluded next week.*)

"The Image of the Beast" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 3 , pp. 39, 40.

WE have shown that the National Reform movement, or the movement to unite religion and the State in this nation, is in the direct course of the fulfillment of Rev. 13:11-17. We have shown that this movement to unite religion and the State is but to form an image to the Papacy, and is a fulfillment of the prophecy

which speaks of its being said "to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live." Verse 14. We now propose to show that the logic of the National Reform movement is the exact fulfillment of the words which immediately follow: "And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed. And 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." By the proposed amendment to the Constitution, the National Reformers propose to have this nation acknowledge God as sovereign, and as "the source of all authority and power in civil government." When that shall have been done, then, according to their own statements, what will follow? Let us see.

First, they say that "the keeping of the Sabbath is an acknowledgment of the sovereign rights of God over us."

Secondly, they say, "Sunday is the Sabbath." Therefore it inevitably follows that whoever refuses to keep Sunday denied the sovereignty of God.

Now the nation, in declaring that God is Sovereign, virtually takes upon itself the obligation to maintain that sovereignty within its jurisdiction; and as the keep of Sunday is declared to be the acknowledgment of that sovereignty, the nation thereby sets itself to maintain the proper observance of Sunday, and so the proper recognition of the sovereignty of God. And the refusal to keep Sunday, being counted a denial of the sovereignty of God, will also be treason against the State, and if persisted in can only receive the punishment due to treason, and that is death.

It is even now claimed by the leading Sunday advocates, that the terrible calamities that so often occur, are the judgments of God sent upon the nation because of the desecration of Sunday; and that all manner of Sunday work must be stopped, or the nation will perish. Therefore, according to their argument, as Sunday work imperils the nation, whoever persists in working on Sunday and in disregarding the day, thereby sets himself against the life of the nation. Then, in the view of the National Reformers, the only question will be, Which is the most valuable, the life of the nation or the life of the few who persistently refuse to keep Sunday? To this question there can be but one answer, of course. It will readily be argued that it is better that the few shall die than that the whole nation perish.

The awful train disaster that occurred last summer at Chatsworth is attributed by the National Reformers to the national disregard of Sunday. Therefore when the nation espouses the cause of Sunday sacredness, suppose there shall yet be those throughout the land who persistently and intentionally work on Sunday, then suppose a train runs off the track and a number of persons are killed; as the desecration of Sunday causes the accident by which these are killed, it necessarily follows that those who desecrated the Sunday are guilty of their death. And as these persons still refuse to keep Sunday, the only thing that remains will be to put them to death.

This is the plain, straightforward logic of the National Reform Sunday law propositions. And this is precisely what is pointed out in the scripture which speaks of the making of the image of the beast: "he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed." But in direct opposition to this work stands the warning of the Third Angel's Message, that whosoever worships the beast and his image "shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God." It is therefore certain that no person who loves the truth of the Third Angel's Message, will ever obey any law which forbids work on Sunday, even though death be involved in his working on that day. If the law says he shall not work, he, like Daniel when he was forbidden by the law to pray to God, will do exactly as "he did aforetime," and just as if there was no such law in existence. Of course, he will have to face fine and imprisonment, and the time will come when he will have to face death to do it. This is plainly set forth in the Third Angel's Message. But it is far better to face fine and imprisonment and even death itself, than to worship the beast and his image.

Let no one think that we are writing extravagantly in thus setting forth the logic of the Sunday-law propositions. We have their own arguments, which show the very thing which we have here pointed out. And to show that we are not talking

40

at random, we shall not give some of their own testimony on the subject. Last August there was a National Reform W.C.T.U. Convention held at Lakeside, near Sandusky, Ohio. One of the questions, with its answer, was as follows:—

Question—"Will those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week, be required to keep Sunday also?"

Answer (by Dr. McAllister, editor of the *Christian Statesman*)—"I will say, not in the way of compelling them to wait upon services on that day. No man should be compelled to attend public worship. But let a man be what he may—Jew, seventh-day observer of some other denomination, or those who do not believe in the Christian Sabbath—let the law apply to everyone, that there shall be no public desecration of the first day of the week, the Christian Sabbath, the day of rest for the nation. They may hold another day of the week as sacred, and observe it; but that day which is the one day in seven for the nation at large, let not that be publicly desecrated by anyone, by officer in the Government, or by private citizen, high or low, rich or poor."

At one of the meetings, Mrs. Bateham, the head of the W.C.T.U.'s Department of Sunday Observance, made a speech on the subject. After the speech there was a short time given for questions. There were many questions asked, all of which involved the point of work on Sunday. We shall choose one question and its answer, which contain the substance of many. A member of the W.C.T.U. said:—

"This subject was called to my attention just a few days ago, by a lady in our town who is an observer of the seventh day, and she said: 'Oh! I hope you women of the Christian Temperance Union will

never press this question of Sunday observance into the law of the State. Don't you see that if they make it a legal Sabbath day, it will persecute us? for it is just as binding a command of God that we labor six days of the week, as it is to rest one. Of Course, I have not given much attention to it; but I was forcibly impressed with the manner in which she expressed herself. She said if we put anything into the Constitution of the United States, or the laws of the State, that compels all labor to cease on our Sunday, then they would be obliged to disobey God, or else the laws of the land, or their own consciences. Now I would like some light on this point."

Answer (by Mrs. Bateham)—"I believe myself that the fourth commandment not only commands to rest on one day but to labor on the other six; but I believe there is abundance of labor which could be performed upon that day and would not draw public attention. There are many things that are right and proper for others who are not observers of the first day of the week, to do on that day. But when the good of the whole country requires that this day should be kept as a holy day, *they must not be allowed to infringe upon the rights of the people.*"

Now look at the argument. She admits that the commandment of God not only enjoins rest on one day of the week, but also enjoins labor on the other six. Here are a people who obey the commandment by resting on that one day, and who also desire to obey the commandment by laboring on the other six. But the W.C.T.U. says, through Mrs. Bateham, "They must not be allowed to labor on the other six days." That is to say, They must not be allowed to obey the commandment of God—even that which Mrs. Bateham herself confesses to be the commandment of God. She says, "The fourth commandment not only commands rest on one day but to labor on the other six." These people rest on that one day, and then in addition to that the W.C.T.U. proposes to compel them to rest on one of the other six, on which the commandment of God commands them to labor. Therefore the W.C.T.U. deliberately proposes to compel a whole people to break the commandment of God.

And why? Oh! because "they must not be allowed to infringe upon the rights of the people." What a specious plea indeed! Let the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union be told that the rights of the people never can involve the breaking of the commandment of God. Let the Woman's Christian Temperance Union be told that obedience to the commandment of God *never can* infringe upon the rights of the people.

How perfectly the Third Angel's Message applies right here! Just at this time, when this vast organization deliberately sets itself to compel a people to *break* the commandment of God, how appropriate it is that the Third Angel's Message should cry with a mighty voice, "Here are they that *keep* the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus."

But suppose these people refuse to break the commandment of God, what then? Amid further questions and answers, there was said this:—

"There is a law in the State of Arkansas enforcing Sunday observance upon the people, and the result has been that many good persons have not only been imprisoned, but have lost their property, and even their lives."

Reply—"It is better that a few should suffer than that the whole nation should lost its Sabbath."

Exactly! That is the very argument by which the Saviour was condemned to death by the popular religionists of his day; and "If they called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household? Fear them not therefore: for there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known. What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the house-tops. And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." "Yea, I say unto you, Fear him." J.

January 27, 1888

"The Fall of Babylon. (Continued.)" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 4 , pp. 54, 55.

(Continued.)

JEREMIAH had said sixty years before: "And I will make drunk her princes, and her wise men, her captains, and her rulers, and her mighty men: and they shall sleep a perpetual sleep, and not wake, saith the King, whose name is the Lord of Hosts." "In their heat I will make their feasts, and I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice, and sleep a perpetual sleep, and not wake, saith the Lord." Jer. 51:57, 39.

The following is the statement of Rawlinson as to what was going on outside of the king's palace, as well as in it:—

"Elsewhere the rest of the population was occupied in feasting and dancing. Drunken riot and mad excitement held possession of the town; the siege was forgotten; ordinary precautions were neglected. Following the example of their king, the Babylonians gave themselves up for the night to orgies in which religious frenzy and drunken excess formed a strange and revolting medley."

As all this was being so wildly carried on in the city, outside of it the Medes and Persians were waiting for the waters to run low enough to allow them to wade in the bed of the river, even as Jeremiah had said long before, "Set up the watchmen, prepare the liars in wait." Chap. 51:12, margin. And thus says the history:—

"Meanwhile, outside the city, in silence and darkness, the Persians watched at the two points where the Euphrates entered and left the walls. Anxiously they noted the gradual sinking of the

water in the river bed; still more anxiously they watched to see if those within the walls would observe the suspicious circumstance and sound an alarm through the town. Should such an alarm be given, all their labors would be lost. If, when they entered the river bed, they found the river walls manned and the river gates fast-locked, they would be indeed 'caught

55

in a trap.' Enfiladed on both sides by the enemy whom they could neither see nor reach, they would be overwhelmed and destroyed by his missiles before they could succeed in making their escape. But, as they watched, no sounds of alarm reached the—only a confused noise of revel and riot, which showed that the unhappy townsmen were quite unconscious of the approach of danger."

That the Babylonians should be taken, entirely unconscious of their danger, was just what Isaiah had said away back in his day: "Therefore shall evil come upon thee; thou shalt not know from whence it riseth; and mischief shall fall upon thee; thou shalt not be able to put it off; and desolation shall come upon thee suddenly, which thou shalt not know." Isa. 47:11. And Jeremiah had said: "I have laid a snare for thee, and thou art also taken, O Babylon, and thou wast not aware; thou art found, and also caught." Chap. 50:24. And that the river gates would not be fast-locked Isaiah had promised one hundred and seventy-four years before: "Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two-leaved gates; and *the gates shall not be shut.*" Chap. 45:1.

Jeremiah had also said, "The Lord of hosts hath sworn by himself, saying, Surely I will fill thee with men, as with caterpillars; and they shall lift up a shout against thee." Chap. 51:14. And the history says:—

"At last shadowy forms began to emerge from the obscurity of the deep river bed, and on the landing-places opposite the river gates scattered clusters of men grew into solid columns. The undefended gateways were seized; a war-shout was raised; the alarm was taken and spread, and swift runners started off to 'show the king of Babylon that his city was taken at one end.'"

"In the darkness and confusion of the night a terrible massacre ensued. The drunken revelers could make no resistance. The king, paralyzed with fear at the awful handwriting upon the wall, which too late had warned him of his peril, could do nothing even to check the progress of the assailants, who carried all before them everywhere. Bursting into the palace, a band of Persians made their way to the presence of the monarch, and slew him on the scene of his impious revelry. Other bands carried fire and sword through the town."

Jeremiah had said that fire and sword should be carried through the town: "A sword is upon the Chaldeans, saith the Lord, and upon the inhabitants of Babylon, and upon her princes, and upon her wise men. A sword is upon the

liars; and they shall dote; a sword is upon her mighty men; and they shall be dismayed. A sword is upon their horses, and upon their chariots, and upon all the mingled people that are in the midst of her; and they shall become as women." "Thus saith the Lord of hosts: The broad walls of Babylon shall be utterly broken, and her high gates shall be burned with fire; and the people shall labor in vain, and the folk in the fire, and they shall be weary." Jer. 50:35-37; 51:58.

Thus fell Babylon, and all the graven images of her gods were broken unto the ground.

But this was not all. The prophets also spoke of the utter ruin of Babylon as well as of her fall. Isaiah wrote thus: "And Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation; neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there; neither shall the shepherds make their fold there. But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and owls shall dwell there, and satyrs shall dance there. And the wild beasts of the island shall cry in their desolate houses, and dragons in their pleasant palaces; and her time is near to come, and her days shall not be prolonged." Isa.13:19-22.

The city continued to be a place of considerable importance throughout the Persian dominion, although it was injured a good deal by some sieges brought on by the revolt of its inhabitants, and it also suffered damage from the effect of the waters of the river that were turned aside by Cyrus, and never fully turned back. Alexander the Great made Babylon an important point in his expedition. There he held the "states-general of the world," and decided to re-establish it in its old importance, and make it the grand capital of his empire. He set ten thousand men at work to repair the Euphrates, and planned other restorations, but his death put a stop to it all. Soon afterward Seleucus built Seleucia, forty-five miles up the river, which in a comparatively short time became a city of 600,000 inhabitants, governed by a senate of three hundred nobles. On the building of Seleucia, Babylon was wholly deserted, and the great temples, the pleasant palaces, and the grand houses were all left desolate, only to be filled with doleful creatures, and to echo with the dismal cries of owls.

The prophet said not only that wild beasts of the deserts should lie there, but that wild beasts of *the islands* should cry in the desolate houses; yet Babylon was an inland city, more than a hundred miles from the nearest point of the Persian Gulf, and many hundreds from the nearest islands. But the Macedonian kings of the East made Babylon a hunting-park, and kept the wild animals in the desolate houses, letting them out for a chase as occasion required. And for this purpose wild beasts from the far-off islands were brought away inland there and put in the desolate houses and pleasant palaces that had witnessed the pomp and the glory of the greatest kings of the earth. The prophecy was literally fulfilled.

Again, Isaiah said: "I will also make it a possession for the bittern, and pools of water; and I will sweep it with the besom of destruction, saith the Lord of hosts." Chap. 14:23. Mr. Layard, who visited it about 1845, says:—

"Besides the great mound, other shapeless heaps of rubbish cover for many an acre the face of the land. The lofty banks of ancient canals fret the country like natural ridges of hills. Some have been long choked with sand; others still carry the waters of the river to distant villages and palm groves. On all sides, fragments of glass, marble, pottery, and inscribed brick, are mingled with that peculiar nitrous and blanched soil, which, bred from the remains of ancient habitations, checks or destroys vegetation, and renders the site of Babylon a naked and a hideous waste. Owls (which are of a large gray kind, and often found in flocks of nearly a hundred) start from the scanty thickets, and the foul jackal skulks through the furrows."

The prophecy says, "Neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there; neither shall the shepherds make their fold there." The natives regard the whole place as actually haunted, and will not pitch their tents there, nor will the shepherds make their fold there. And so is accomplished in perfect faithfulness the word of the Lord concerning Babylon, that "it shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation." And Babylon *has* "become heaps, a dwelling-place for dragons, an astonishment, and a hissing, without an inhabitant." Jer. 51:37.

And "this is the purpose that is purposed upon the whole earth; and this is the hand that is stretched out upon all the nations. For the Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? and his hand is stretched out, and who shall turn it back?" Isa.14:26, 27. J.

February 3, 1888

"The Working of Satan" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 5 , p. 71.

ONE of the principal truths presented by the Third Angel's Message is the second coming of the Lord. It is the nearness of this event that makes so very urgent the necessity of obeying the truths announced by the message. And in fact the Third Angel's Message and the events directly connected with it only close with the coming of the Lord in his glory. Immediately following the announcement of the message, the prophet says: "And I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle. And another angel came out of the temple, crying with a loud voice to him that sat on the cloud, Thrust in thy sickle, and reap: for the time is come for thee to reap; for the harvest of the earth is ripe. And he that sat on the cloud thrust in his sickle on the earth; and the earth was reaped." Rev. 14:14-16. "The harvest is the end of the world." Matt. 13:39.

More than forty-seven years the world has been told that the Lord is coming, that his coming is at the doors, and that men must be ready to meet him in peace or they cannot be saved. But the world—the so-called Christian world as well as

any other—has rejected the message of his glorious coming. ministers have put far off the day of his coming, saying it would not be for a thousand, or may be ten thousand, or even a million years. Almost all have said in their hearts, "My Lord delayeth his coming," and some have even said openly that they did not care to have him come. The message of his coming has not only been rejected, but it has been made a subject of reproach to those who have accepted it, and have lived in the hope of seeing him, whom, having not seen, they love.

Thus it has been all these years, and in fact, thus it still is so far as the real truth of the coming of the Lord is concerned. But the signs which he has given of his coming are so abundant, and are being so rapidly and plainly fulfilled, and the message which announced the truth of his coming and the duties, which, if observed, will fit men to meet him when he comes, is so widespread over the world that the matter can be concealed no longer. It is making an impression that can no longer be resisted. And as it has gained such power that Satan can no longer blind men's minds to it, he now whirls about and counterfeits it. Having led men to reject the truth, until, in spite of all, it has gained such power that it can no longer be hidden, he now turns about and makes the coming of the Lord almost the watch-word of the popular movements of the day; but, as is naturally to be expected, it is so wrapped about with falsehood that, in such connection, the truth itself is made in effect to serve the purposes of falsehood.

In this is another evidence that through what is called the National Reform movement, is to be developed "the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, because they receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." The National Reform proposition is, by amendment to the Constitution, to turn this republic of men into a kingdom of Christ. And they declare that when that shall have been done, *then* Christ will come into his kingdom and reign, and the millennium will begin. In a speech in the New York National Reform Convention, 1874, "Rev." J. P. Lytle likened that movement to a train of cars going up a grade, and said:—

"When we reach the summit, the train will move out into the mild yet glorious light of millennial days, and the cry will be raised, 'The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ.'"

In the same convention Rev. John Hogg, of Massachusetts, said:—

"Let us acknowledge God as our Father and Sovereign and source of all good, and his blessing will be upon us, crime and corruption will come to an end, and the benign reign of Jesus, our rightful Lord will be established."

Again in the same convention, Dr. A. M. Milligan said:—

"Either like them [the Jewish nations] we will reject him and perish, or, becoming a kingdom of our Lord and his Christ, we shall fill the earth and endure forever."

They claim that they will thus make this nation the kingdom of Christ, that then he will come into his kingdom here, and from this the other nations of earth will acknowledge him, and so they say will be fulfilled the words, "The kingdoms

of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ." Therefore, at noon of every day, the National Reformers repeat the words, "Thy kingdom come." But the word of God says that when Jesus comes it will be with "flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2 Thess. 1:8), and that when the God of Heaven sets up his kingdom "it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms." Dan. 2:44.

The National Reform Association is anxious to secure the support of the "working men." We are fully assured that the movement will yet be heartily supported by that whole element. And their minds too are being prepared for it on the very point that we are now showing. Dr. McGlynn starts out as the champion of the "workingmen," bearing, as he says, "the cross of a new crusade." And in a speech last May, in Pittsburg, to the thousands of those whose champion he is, he said: "It shall be the high and holy purpose of this crusade to prepare the world for the coming of the Lord."

As this matter of the counterfeit coming of the Lord is Satan's device to oppose the Third Angel's Message, it might very naturally be supposed that Spiritualism, being one of his very chiefest instruments of evil, would also be active in favor of it. And such is precisely the case. Spiritualism promises a new messiah, and announces his coming "to this very generation." The *World's Advance-Thought* is the *avant-courier* of the new spiritual dispensation, and in its issue of April 5, 1886, says:—

"Another Sun of righteousness is called for on earth, and the messenger cannot be far off whose life mission it shall be to practically illustrate the new truths that will be vouchsafed. He will not be a mere racial messiah nor a half-world messiah as was the great Nazarene; but steam locomotion and lightning communication, and the harmonizing influences of commercial intercourse, have made a whole-world messiah possible, and such the next one shall be. Though themselves ignorant of the fact, as a body, the great and multiplying army of mediums are his *avant-couriers*." "The unanimity of the immortals' answers may thrill the world with the promise of a new messiah."

Thus through counterfeiting the doctrines of the coming of the Lord, Satan is preparing the world to receive a false Christ who will show great signs and wonders, insomuch that if it were possible he will deceive the very elect. Matt. 24:24. It is high time that every soul should study the word of God as never before, to know the truth concerning the coming of the Lord, and then to receive such a love of that truth as shall resist all the deceptions of Satan, whatever they may be. He will deceive all but the very elect. Who will be of the elect? Who will be faithful?

J.

February 10, 1888

"The Image of the Papacy" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 6 , pp. 87, 88.

WE have already shown in our examination of the Sunday question as connected with the image of the beast that death to dissenters if the logical result of dissent from the National Reform doctrines, when that doctrine shall have been given a legal basis; and that thus the scripture will be fulfilled which says that "he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed." We shall now show the same thing from their false doctrine of the coming and kingdom of Christ.

We have shown by their own words that they intend by constitutional amendment to acknowledge Christ as king of this nation, and so to make this republic the kingdom of Christ. When that shall have been done, then, Sunday being the supreme test of Christianity, to refuse to keep it will be treason to the State. We have this in their own words. July 4, 1887, "Rev." Wm. Benton Greene, Jr., pastor of the Tenth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, preached a sermon which the *Christian Nation* commends as containing "sound National Reform doctrine." In that sermon, after having to his own satisfaction proved that this should be a Christian nation, Mr. Greene proceeded to call attention to some of the consequences flowing from it, and said:—

"Indifference to Christ is treason to the State."

This being so, then it surely follows that anyone who persists in showing what these men pronounce to be indifference to Christ, will have to suffer the penalty of confirmed treason, which is death. But this ardent "reformer" is not willing even to wait for a constitutional acknowledgment of Christ as king; he is willing to count it so already, and to carry into effect his evil principles and their infamous consequences. He says:—

"Let him [the citizen] see to it that all civil enactments harmonize with the spiritual law of his King. . . . If deliberate failure to do this be treason to the State, we have among us many traitors. Those there are who oppose the observance of the Sabbath [Sunday]; who demand that the law be not controlled by the gospel; that the Government must be administered on the principle that Christ has nothing to do with the State. The secularists are more numerous and more dangerous than the infidels. Professedly aiming at keeping asunder Church and State, they aim chiefly at secularizing public education, as if there were no God and no future for the human soul. . . . Such education must be equally false and unscientific, and when we permit it we are sanctioning the worst treason, the most oppressive tyranny, and conniving at the destruction of our nation."

If this is the way in which these men talk now, when they are are powerless to act, what will be the result when they shall have secured the constitutional authority to make their principles effective in acts. Woe then to the man who is so presumptuous as to have any opinions of his own, and thrice woe to him who shall be guilty of the treason of uttering dissent. If there be any of our readers

who think yet that we are not living in a time of which the Third Angel's Message speaks, or who think that we are talking at random when we speak of persecution coming, and of an image of the Papacy arising here, we only hope that something may occur that will wake them up before it is too late.

Nor is this all. The Saviour says that "there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." Matt. 24:24. This shows that those who show these great signs and wonders will do so under the pretense that they are Christ; in other words, these signs and wonders will be shown under the form of false Christ's. Now the very greatest of those wonders are to be wrought by Satan (2 Thess. 2:9); therefore, it follows that Satan will at that time reveal himself, and do his great wonders in the form of a false Christ. Then, as the National Reformers expect Christ to come as soon as they shall have finished their testimony, when they shall have succeeded in making this nation a kingdom of Christ, and stand expectantly waiting for Christ to come into his kingdom, Satan through the mighty working of his great power will appear as an angel of light, and say, "I am Christ," and all the multitude—infidels, atheists, anarchists, Spiritualists, all—with the National Reform D.D.'s at their head, *will receive him as Christ and king*. Then will be indeed fulfilled the scripture that tells of "the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish." Then to speak against their devil-king will be blasphemy, and to refuse to receive him as king will be treason, to be visited only with death. Yet there will be come who will refuse to receive him, and will openly say that he is the devil. These will be those who have received the love of the truth of the Third Angel's Message, that they might be saved, and who utterly refuse to worship either the beast or his image. They will refuse to working the Papal Church by keeping Sunday, and they will refuse to acknowledge the devil as either Christ or king.

To refuse to do either of these things will be treason, and to refuse to do both will be doubly so. These alone of all the people will so refuse, and they will be but a "little flock." What then shall be done with them? They will be but confirmed traitors. It will be argued that they are only bringing destruction upon the nation, and above all that they refuse to acknowledge Christ as king. What shall be done? The prophecy tells: "He had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed." Besides this, did not the Saviour say that when he should return, having received the kingdom, "those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me"? And when Satan shall have come a false Christ, and shall have been received as the true, this scripture will be enforced by the National Reformers in his behalf. They have already quoted it in this very connection, and with this very meaning. National Reform Secretary M. A. Gault, in replying to one who is opposed to National Reform, said to him:—

"Have you forgotten that the day is coming when all professed Christians who deny the kingship of Christ over the nations, together with their infidel confederates, will at Christ's command be

slain before his face, because they would not have him to reign over them?"

Nor is this all. When Satan, as a false Christ, shall have come, then, then among the "great signs and wonders" that he will show, there will be fulfilled Rev. 13:13: "And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men." Now Elijah was a prophet of the true God, and fire came down from heaven in testimony that he was the servant of the true God, and in testimony that what he taught was the commandments of God. 1 Kings 18:17-39; 2 Kings 1:10, 12. But in this test that is coming, this same miracle is to be performed to prove that the devil is God, and tht the one distinguishing institution of the Papal Church—Sunday—must be kept instead of the commandments of God. There will be those who out of love to the truth of the Third Angel's Message will be keeping "the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." They will be keeping the seventh day according to the commandment, and will be waiting for the Lord from Heaven. On the other hand, there will be the multitude saying that Sunday is the Sabbath and that those who keep it are the servants of the true God.

Then to those who keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, Elijah's challenge will be made by those who keep Sunday. It will be said, If Sunday is the Sabbath of the Lord, and if we be the servants of the true God, let fire come down from heaven. And fire will come down from heaven. But instead of accepting the evidence, those who have received the love of the truth of God will reply, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," and the seventh day *is* the Sabbath of the Lord, even though heaven itself comes down. Then these people, having refused to accept the evidence of such a stupendous wonder, and still persisting in their "rebellion" and "treason,"—what can be done with them? Nothing at all but to go on with the perversion of the story of Elijah, and exclaim, Take these traitors, let not one of them escape. And then as the prophets of Baal were slain, so will those be commanded to be who receive the love of the truth of the Third Angel's Message, and through it keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. But not one of them will be slain, for, says the prophet, "I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire; and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God." Rev. 15:2.

And so the contest will be finished; and thus those who have received the love of the truth, and keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, will gain the everlasting victory through him "that hath loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood."

To some of our readers, these things may seem very strange. But they are true, nevertheless. These things will come to pass as surely as this nation runs into the iniquity of religious legislation, and the union of religion and the State. These things will come to pass as surely as this nation makes Sunday the national sabbath, and that is as certain as that the word of God is true. And the only protection for anybody on earth is to "keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus" with such a love for the truth that all the power and signs and

lying wonders of Satan cannot swerve him from it in the least degree. This nation is going to make an image of the Papacy. The Papacy made war with the saints, and

88

the image of the Papacy will do likewise. The Papacy blasphemes God, and his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in Heaven; and the image of the Papacy will do likewise. Rev. 13:6, 7, 14-17. This war with the saints is because they keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ (Rev. 12:17); and with the purpose of making all men worship the Papacy. But God says: "And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus."

Reader, we beseech you to take heed to the message; receive the love of its truth; stand firmly for the righteousness of God; and so obtain a part in the promised victory.

J.

"Did He Invade It?" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 6 , p. 89.

SUNDAY evening, January 15, the Rev. Dr. Barrows, of the First Congregationalist Church, San Francisco, preached on the subject of "Futurity." He prefaced his sermon with the statement that he had been repeatedly requested to direct his thought to this subject for a sermon, but that he had a "disinclination to acceded to this request, as the question is one of considerable moment, and he did not care to invade it." This is a queer sort of a confession for a Doctor of Divinity to make. What is he there for if it is not to invade questions of considerable moment? There is not the least doubt, however, that the Doctor's statement expresses the exact truth, not only in his own case, but also in the cases of the great majority of the popular divines of the present day. So long as they can pass off a mass of glittering generalities and paltry platitudes, that touch nobody and interest nobody, that relieve nobody's difficulties and comfort nobody's sorrows, they are happy. But just as soon as a question is presented, even by request, in which somebody is interested, then they are troubled, and repeated requests must be made before they can be persuaded to touch it, because it is a question "of considerable moment" and they don't "care to invade it;" and when at last they do muster up sufficient courage to "invade" it, the invasion only ends in defeat, as did this of Mr. Barrows.

After talking awhile about skepticism, he stated fairly enough that "Christ's mission to earth was to prepare an effective method of repentance by extending to man, through his own sacrifice, an atonement in which to have faith. Absolute

and unwavering faith in this fact and in the virtue of the atonement is a prerequisite to salvation. The futurity of all hangs in the balance of faith in, or discredit of, the truth that Christ died to save sinners." And then as if to make perfectly sure that no one who heard him should get any good from even this much truth, the report says:—

"In urging that Jesus fairly offered this opportunity to all, the speaker advanced the old but ever novel theory that after his mission to men, Christ went to the land of shades, and there through the crowded hosts that had lived on earth since the origin of man and to the rebellious spirits cast out of Heaven, he preached his gospel. The best biblical commentators, Mr. Barrows claimed, upheld that construction of the word which signifies that after his death, resurrection, and ascension, Christ went to the place of detention for departed spirits to announce the scheme of redemption and preach his plan of salvation."

It may be impertinent in us, but we would inquire, Who are these "best biblical commentators"? We suppose, however, that it is with him as it is with the most of the "advanced" theologians—the best biblical commentators are those who agree with his views. But whatever the best biblical commentators may say, it is certain that the word of God teaches no such doctrine. The Saviour did not die for devils, nor does he preach the gospel to either devils or dead men. The living it is who have hope for the truth of God, "they that go down to the pit cannot hope for thy truth" (Isa. 37:18); because "the dead know not anything." Eccl. 9:5. Then:—

"Dr. Barrows, in closing, addressed the congregation with a warm invocation to seek their future reward through the prescriptions of the Holy Text, and to avoid chimerical wanderings in the realms of alleged philosophy."

Amen! Such an "invocation" was sadly needed, and was most decidedly appropriate, after such a sermon as that. And yet the question remains, Did the Doctor *invade* the question or did he evade it?

The same evening, Rev. John Gray, rector of the Church of the Advent, of "paper carnival" fame, invaded a subject which, no doubt, was to him of "considerable moment"—he took for his text *the title of the prayer-book!*

J.

February 17, 1888

"Some Questions and Answers" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 7 , p. 104.

A CERTAIN clergyman in California, "actuated by a desire to be of service to the young men of our country," has sent a series of questions to a number of persons in the State, requesting answers to them. He did not send us the questions, but we feel disposed to answer them anyhow, as they are questions which involve considerations that are of much importance to society in general.

His first question is as follows:—

"1. Do you think the average young man in our country as sturdy and well qualified to be useful to self and country as were those of fifty years ago?"

No. The average young man is not as sturdy in any sense, neither morally, mentally, nor physically; therefore in the very nature of the case he is *not* as well qualified to be useful to self and country as were those of fifty years ago.

"2. If not, why not?"

Because the average young man of eighteen of to-day is acquainted with more kinds of immorality, and more of a kind, than the man of forty was fifty years ago. And there is in the young man of to-day more of an inclination to practice many kinds of immorality, than there was in those of fifty years ago for the reason that all kinds of immorality are much more popular than they were fifty years ago. There is no need to particularize on this point, nor it is necessary for anyone to have lived fifty years to know full well that it is true

Physically the young men of to-day are not as sturdy as they were fifty years ago, because they are much more intemperate, and at a much earlier age, than were those of fifty years ago. To prove this we need not go beyond the consideration of the one item of tobacco-using. A good deal less than fifty years ago the young man who used tobacco before he was eighteen, was rather an exception; but now the boy who does *not* use it before he is *ten* is rather an exception. He uses it in its very worst form too, that is, in the shape of cigarettes. There is no disputing the fact at all that cigarette-smoking has the very worst effect upon the heart, the brain, and the nervous system. Nor is that all. The boy buys his package of cigarettes, and finds in it lewd pictures, and the cigarettes themselves are so "doctored" as to excite the animal propensities in the direction suggested by the lascivious picture. And thus not only the physical but the moral powers are weakened, and the very soul is defiled.

But even though they do not use tobacco in the shape of cigarettes, though they use it in the form of "the best Havana's," or in the form of "the best plug," the case is little, if any, better, as all of it, whether in cigars, fine-cut, or plug, is so saturated with opium, laudanum, rum, gin, cognac, champagne, Piper Heidsieck, cascarilla, valerian, etc., etc., that it is only an excitant to strong drink. Here is a test which it would be perfectly safe to apply, with the assurance that the result would be against the young men of to-day. In proportion to population, there are more young men and boys using tobacco to-day than there were fifty years ago. But take the young men to to-day who use tobacco, and compare them with those who used tobacco fifty-years ago, and it will be found that these are not as sturdy as were those. This is *proved* by the fact that within a few years the authorities of the military and naval academies of the United States, have been compelled to prohibit the use of tobacco in those institutions, because those who used it could not pass the course of studies and come out such men as the Government wants. No such thing was necessary fifty years ago.

These are some of the reasons why the young men of to-day are not as sturdy as they were fifty years ago, and therefore they are *not* as well qualified to be useful to self or country as were those of fifty years ago.

"3. Do you think our educational system that best calculated to prepare our young men for success in life?"

As a system of education which is within the province of the State, when manual training shall have been generally added to it, as it is now in some States, we know not how it could be made better. But this we say of our national educational system in itself, and not of the manner of the *working* of the system. For the way in which this system has been run of late years, it is growing less efficient every day. There is too much *system* and too little *education*; there is too much machinery and too little work; too much cramming and too little training. Children are put through the school system from the lowest to the highest grade, about as a grist of wheat is put through a mill, and when they come out it is much as a mass of flour that has all the life ground out of it—it appears all well enough, but it is hard to make anything of it. They can, perhaps, give correctly every rule in what is called English grammar, and very likely can answer the most of the questions under each rule, and *violate the rule in answering the questions*. They can perhaps talk admiringly of the beauties of Longfellow, or the, supposed, elegance of Tennyson, while at the same time they cannot spell many common words of every-day usage. They have probably been graduated from the High School, and may have passed through the State Normal, and yet are unable to write correctly twenty connected lines. This is not conjecture, it is fact, as anyone may see who will observe.

Here again we may refer to the national military academy, as furnishing a decisive test of the question. It is shown by the records of the West Point examinations for admission, that the standard of education of those who apply is lower than it was thirty years ago. Our educational *system* is good, but the principal result of its machine-working of late years has been, more than anything else, the development of intellectual pride and practical inefficiency. The three most interesting and important questions we must defer till another time.

J.

February 24, 1888

"Some Questions and Answers. No. 2" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 8 , pp. 119, 120.

THE fourth question in order in the list referred to last week is as follows:—

"4. What do you regard as the chief danger to which our young men are exposed, as regards (1) their morals, (2) their religion, (3) their professional or business success?"

The chief danger to which our young men are exposed as regards their morals, is the guilt of sin, and the love of it. The chief danger to which they are exposed as regards their rebellion, is unbelief. The chief danger to their professional or business success, is in their haste to be rich; and is well stated in the following words of the San Francisco *Chronicle*:—

"As to the principal danger in the way of professional or business success, it may be summed up in one sentence, as it was many centuries ago—making haste to grow rich. The present generation imagines that it has made a new discovery in the science of finance and political economy, and has invented a process by which the forces of nature in the business world may be hurried and the pace accelerated. They are not content to adhere to ordinary business rules and business principles, but as in a continual state of feverish eagerness and intense longing to find some short cut to affluence, heedless of the fact, which they could learn if they would, that what seems to be a cut-off usually ends in a morass, or on the edge of a precipice, whence all that is left is to retrace their steps, often with pain and difficulty. The trouble is that our young men will not understand that two and two will make only four, no mat-

120

ter how the figures may be turned or twisted or juggled, and that in business matters speculation is the sworn foe of ultimate success."

"5. Does respect for woman occupy as high a place in the minds of young men of to-day as it did among those of two generations ago?"

It does not. The following words from the *Chronicle* are also to the point:—

"This is precisely the equivalent of asking if the young women of to-day are as deserving of respect as were their mothers or grandmothers; for it may be set down as an axiom that in any free country woman will receive every white of respect to which she is entitled. So long as young women respect themselves they need have no fear but that they will be respected; if they surrender their self-respect, they forfeit their right to expect or receive the respect of others."

We believe that this states the truth of the matter. And yet it is true that respect for women does not occupy as high a place in the minds of young men as it did among those of two generations ago. But this is only to say that the young women of to-day do not respect themselves as highly as did those of two generations ago; and this is a fact. Wherefore then the fact? Why is it that the young women of to-day do not respect themselves as highly as they ought to? The principal cause, that which takes precedence of all others, and which is more far-reaching in its consequences than any other, is the wickedness that is practiced in the church fairs. In the practices of the church fairs, there are demands made upon womanly modesty and self-respect that cannot be borne by those who are subjected to them.

We ourselves personally know of a church fair held in a certain city in Oregon, in which the young ladies were put up and sold at auction to the highest bidder. The public auctioneer of the city was called in and paid to conduct the sale. The effect of the sale was that the highest bidder should have the company of the young lady for the evening; and she was obliged to go with him whoever he

might be. And the inventors and chief managers of this scheme were the pastor's wife and a San Francisco drummer. Only shortly afterwards we read an authentic account of a similar occurrence in Pennsylvania, with this difference however that in Pennsylvania they had yet enough sense of decency to cover the young ladies' faces with shawls, whereas in Oregon they did it with open face before the gaze of the whole crowd.

It has been a common practice in church fairs to put up the young women to be voted upon by the young men, at so much a vote, as to which was the handsomest. And the managers of those fairs have even gone so far as to sell the kisses of the handsomest lady at so much apiece. Among country church-members who cannot have a church fair, it has been the practice for years to have "play parties," otherwise called "kissing-bees."

Now no young woman can be subjected to these immodest and indecent practices and yet retain her self-respect. No young woman can allow herself to be subjected to the immodest procedure of an auction sale of her company, and yet retain her modesty. No young woman can allow her charms of face or figure to be made the subject of public contest, and yet retain her self-respect. And no young woman can either sell her kisses or give them away, in public, and yet retain either her own self-respect, or the respect of those who buy them. If young women will not respect themselves, they cannot expect to be respected.

And yet mothers, and ministers' wives at that, will put forward their daughters in these wicked ways, and thus break down in them that native womanly modesty which in itself is the strongest safeguard of womanly purity. So long as a woman retains that womanly modesty and self-respect which the Scripture defines by the term "shamefacedness," men will have to lose every element of manliness before they will cease to respect her as she ought to be respected. But when this is ruthlessly broken down and swept away she has lost the casket that safely holds that precious jewel which is more than life to her. And to systematically break it down and sweep it away, is the certain effect of these loose and immodest practices of the churches. And so far as the churches practice these things they show themselves to be but panderers to the baser passions of men and women. Let the young ladies always respect themselves as they ought to, and they will ever be respected by the young men, as they ought to be.

The last question is this:—

"6. In what sense and to what extent is business and professional success dependent upon the moral and religious life?"

Well, this is hard to tell. It almost appears as though it were not dependent upon it in any sense, nor to any extent. Business and professional success is now attained to, in defiance of all moral or religious considerations, much more readily than it is by honest dealing and godly living. And it is so common nowadays for men to cover with a cloak of religion, the rascality by which they attain to business and professional success, that it is exceedingly difficult to tell, before a man's accounts are settled whether his success has been in any way dependent upon a genuinely moral and religious life, or not.

The general effect of this list of questions is of course to develop the one question, as to whether the world is growing worse or better. No man can

successfully deny that we have answered them fairly, and strictly in accordance with the actual condition and course of things as they are to-day, and therefore the general question that springs from all must be answered by the statement that the world is growing worse. And that is only what Inspiration said long ago. For "this know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof; from such turn away. For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts, ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution. But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived." 2 Tim. 3:1-7, 12, 13.

J.

March 2, 1888

"Historical Necessity of the Third Angel's Message" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 9 , pp. 135, 136.

WE have lately given in these columns, some proofs from Scripture and from current events, showing that the Third Angel's Message of Revelation 14 is now "the present truth" to the world, and that it is the most important question that the people of this world can consider. We have shown that *now* is the time of the Third Angel's Message, and that *now* the truths made prominent by it must be considered by the world. This message is just as much a part of the Reformation, as is any other step that has been taken since Luther nailed his theses to the church-door in Wittemberg. This we now propose to show, in a short series of articles in which we shall sketch the course of controversy from the Reformation onward; tracing the successive steps of Truth in her progress from the deep obscurity into which she had been plunged by the Papal supremacy, to the clear shining of this period of the nineteenth century. By this we shall prove that there is actually a historical, a logical, and a theological, necessity for the Third Angel's Message to complete the work of the Reformation.

Although the Reformation was actually begun in France by Farel, and in Switzerland by Zwingli, before Luther began his great work, yet as Luther's work was more positively aggressive than any other, and as he was singled out by the Papacy as the one object of its direct attack, any view of the Reformation, to be just, must be taken from the point of Luther's appearance upon the scene. Besides, any attempt to strike a balance, or draw a comparison, between the degrees of merit attaching to these great men, would be unjust. D'Aubigne has well expressed the truth on this point, in these words: "The Reformation existed not in Luther only; it was the offspring of his age."—*Hist. Ref.*, book 3, chap. 4.

And as it was the offspring of the age, so it existed in no man; and any attempt to institute a comparison between men is to detract from the dignity of the work, and to imply that it was the work of men instead of the work of God. At the same time we would not, in the slightest measure, attempt to rob any of these men of the tribute that is justly their due. Noble heroes they were, and all honor to them as such; yet the Reformation was the work of God, and these men were only his instruments.

As the Reformation was "the offspring of the age," so the leading doctrine of the Reformation, *i.e.*, justification by faith, was the logical deduction from the premises laid down by the age. And in view of the times and the events, it is difficult to conceive of any other doctrine that might properly have been the leading one.

At the date of the Reformation, the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Papacy had, from Gregory the Great, through Zacharias and Stephen III., Hildebrand and Innocent III., Alexander VI. and Leo X., reached that pinnacle of abusive power where she held the sway over this world and the world to come, and over the eternal destinies of the human race; and where she could traffic in immortal bliss, selling it for money,—where, in the energetic words of another, "The church was omnipotent, and Leo was the church."

In the exercise of that omnipotency, Leo proceeded to the sale of indulgences, covering both worlds for the past, present, and future. And now began the Reformation. Luther resisted the sale of indulgences, and the claims upon which they were sold. It is plain that if both sides stood firmly to their principles, nothing else could have come out of it but renunciation of the church of Rome, on the part of Luther, the adoption of Christ, instead of the Pope, as the head of the church, and justification by faith, instead of by *money* in the purchase of indulgences. For (1) if the Pope cannot grant remission of sin by an indulgence, can he grant remission at all? (2) If he cannot grant remission at all, can he bestow upon another the power to remit sin? (3) If he has not the authority, and those who receive authority from him have it not, then is such authority possessed by any one on earth? (4) If it stand thus with the Pope, is he head of the church? (4) If he be not the head of the church, is not Christ *alone* the head of the church, on earth as well as in Heaven? (6) If Christ alone be the head of the church, and the one alone through whose intercession and merits forgiveness of sin can be obtained, and if this forgiveness is to be obtained from God alone, through Christ alone, without the intervention of priest, bishop, or Pope, must not every one go to Christ himself, for himself, for justification? And therefore the logical consequence is justification by faith.

And such was the course through which Luther was led. Not that Luther saw or realized it all when he began. Not at all. Had he realized even the half of it, doubtless he would have stood aghast. When he opposed the indulgences, he saw only the wickedness of the indulgences as ministered by their venders, and of the manner in which Tetzel conducted the traffic. And as the Pope, persisted in this course and Luther persisted in his opposition, this first step carried him logically to the second, and, as events shaped the course, finally to the logical consequence of all, justification by faith, and *therefore* the Reformation.

It was a natural and an easy step to the next point, the Lord's Supper instead of the Papal mass. And here opened a new scene of controversy. Opposition was not confined between the reformers and the Papacy; on this subject it opened among the reformers

136

themselves. And the zeal that ought to have been exerted unitedly in maintaining a solid front in attacking the Papacy, was in a great measure spent in opposing one another. The contending parties on this subject were Luther on one side, and Carlstadt and Zwingle on the other. The Papal doctrine of the mass is, that the bread and the wine in the sacrament are veritably the actual *flesh and blood* of the Lord; and that either is as much so as both together; and that therefore it is superfluous to administer both to the laity; and so the bread *alone* is given instead of bread and wine. This is *Trans*-substantiation; *i.e.*, *change* of substance. Luther renounced this, and held that although the bread and wine are not the *real* body and blood of the Lord, yet Christ is really present *with* the bread and wine. This is *Con*-substantiation; *i.e.*, *with* the substance. Carlstadt and Zwingle denied both, and held, as is now held by Protestants almost everywhere, that the bread and wine are only *memorials* of the broken body and shed blood of the Lord Christ. But Carlstadt was impetuous, and while Luther was a captive in the Wartburg, Carlstadt, being deprived of his counsels, went too far for that *present* time, and in a measure endangered the Reformation.

In every great religious movement, when the minds of men are unusually stirred, fanaticism is ever ready to break forth and bring reproach upon the truth. It was so in the first days of the Reformation, and there has been no exception from that time to the present. And in this way the Reformation was endangered by these premature movements under the leadership of Carlstadt. At that very time fanaticism was showing itself in Wittemberg; and when the Reformers spoke against images, with other errors of the Romish Church, the slightest spark was soon blown by the fanatics into a most vehement flame; they rushed into the churches, tore down the images and crucifixes, broke them to pieces, and burned them. One excess led to another; the fanatics pretended to be illumined by the Spirit; despised the Supper, and held internal communion instead; claimed to have no need of the Bible, nor of human learning; began to prophesy the destruction of all but the saints; and that when that should be accomplished, the kingdom of God would be established upon the earth, the chief fanatic would be put in supreme authority, and *he* would commit the government to the saints.

Carlstadt was to a certain extent influenced for awhile by these enthusiasts; but only for a while, and then only so far as to despise learning, and advise his students at the college to return to their homes. Luther was informed of the state of affairs, and left his retreat, and returned to Wittemberg; and it fell upon him to quench this flame of enthusiasm, to put down the rule of fanaticism.

In these events lies the secret of the difference of opinion between the Reformers on the Lord's Supper. In the beginning Luther had inclined to the symbolical explanation of the Supper, and even at this time was not decidedly against it. But now that Carlstadt preached it, and the fanatics pushed the symbolism to the length of despising the Supper entirely; and Carlstadt being in a

measure, however slight, mixed up with them—Luther having to meet all this, rejected all idea of any symbolical meaning in the words, "This is my body," and adopted that view from which, to use his own words, he would not be moved by "reason, common sense, carnal arguments," nor "mathematical proofs."

In the way in which the subject was brought prominently before Luther it appeared to him that to hold the view that the bread and wine are symbols was akin to fanaticism, if not fanaticism itself. And when Carlstadt, after being banished from Saxony, went to Switzerland, and was admitted as pastor and professor of divinity at Basel; and when before this Zwingli's writings, maintaining the same views, had reached Luther, the whole company was held by Luther to be opponents of the truth; and he being as strenuous against this as anything else that he deemed to be error, and his opponents in this matter holding the truth, and necessarily defending it, it could not but be that the result must be division.

It is true that in this controversy Luther was stubborn; but in view of all the circumstances amidst which it arose, surely our charity will not be unduly taxed in excusing it. If he had been less strenuous in defending what he held to be true, the world would not have had the Reformation then. But however worthily our charity be bestowed in this instance, it fails to be so, when the scenes and the actors have all passed from the stage, when the Reformation has escaped the breakers and rides securely, and his successors stubbornly resist the truth for no other reason than that "Luther believed thus, and so do we;" and so cease to be *reformers*, and become rigid *Lutherans*. J.

(To be continued.)

March 9, 1888

"Historical Necessity of the Third Angel's Message. No. 2" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 10, pp. 151, 152.

THE death of Luther (February 18, 1546) left Melancthon at the head of the Reformation in Germany; and his views on the Supper were almost, if not entirely, identical with those of the Reformed; *i.e.*, the Swiss reformers as distinguished from *Lutherans*. His love of peace and his respect for Luther had caused him to hold his views in abeyance while Luther lived; but after Luther's death, this very love of peace led him into a war that lasted as long as he lived. For, holding views so favorable to those of the opposition, and believing, besides, that even in the widest difference of opinion on this subject, there was nothing that justified any division, much less such bitter contention, between the friends of the Reformation, his desire for peace induced him to propose a union of Lutherans and Zwinglinas. This immediately caused a division among the Lutherans, and developed what Mosheim calls the "*rigid* Lutherans" and the "*moderate* Lutherans,"—the moderate Lutherans favoring union, and the rigid Lutherans attacking with renewed vigor all together, and Melancthon in particular.

Just here also another element of contention for the rigid Lutherans was introduced. Calvin appeared as a kind of mediator between the Lutherans and Zwinglians; and he proposed by modifying the opinions of both parties to effect a more perfect union; but instead of his efforts being acceptable, the rigid Lutherans accused all who in the least degree favored the union of being Crypto-Calvinists,

152

i.e., secret Calvinists. By thus adding an epithet, the prejudice was increased against any effort toward conciliation; and besides, a bitter controversy was opened between the Lutherans and the Calvinists.

The bitterness of the opponents of Melancthon was increased by his connection with the "Interim," which was this: In 1547 a Diet was held at Augsburg, and Charles V. required of the Protestants that they should submit the decision of religious contests to the Council of Trent. The greater part of the members of the Diet consented. But under the pretext of a plague raging in Trent, the Pope issued a bull transferring the council to Bologna. The legates and all the rest of the Papal party obeyed the Pope, but the emperor ordered all of the German bishops to remain at Trent. This virtually dissolved the council; and as the Pope refused to re-assemble the council at Trent, and the Emperor refused to allow his bishops to go to Bologna, plainly there could be no council to decide the religious contests, and the action of the Diet was nullified. Now, to keep the matter under control until the difference between the Pope and the emperor could be settled, and the council re-assembled, Charles ordered Julius Pflugius, bishop of Nuremberg, Michael Sidonius, a creature of the Pope, and John Agricola, of Eisleben, to draw up a formulary which might serve as a rule of faith and worship for both Protestants and Catholics, until the council should be ready to act upon the question. This formulary, from its purpose of being only to cover the interval that should elapse till the council should act, was called the "Interim." But instead of pacifying the contestants, it only led to new difficulties, and involved the whole empire in violence and bloodshed.

Maurice, elector of Saxony, affected to remain neutral in regard to the "Interim," neither accepting nor rejecting it; but finally in 1518 he assembled the Saxony nobility and clergy in several conferences, to take counsel about what should be done. In all these conferences, Melancthon was accorded the chief place; and he finally gave it as his opinion "that the whole of the book of 'Interim' could not by any means be adopted by the friends of the Reformation; but declared at the same time that he saw no reason why it might not be adopted as authority *in things that did not relate to the essential parts of religion*, or in things which might be considered *indifferent*." This decision set his enemies all aflame again, and with Flacius at their head, the defenders of Lutheranism attacked Melancthon and the doctors of Wittemberg, and Leipsic "with incredible bitterness and fury, and accused them of apostasy from the true religion."—*Mosheim*.

Melancthon and his friends, however, were able to defend themselves; and a warm debate followed upon these two points: "1. Whether the points that seemed indifferent to Melancthon were so in reality. 2. Whether in things of an indifferent

nature, and in which the interests of religion are not essentially concerned, it be lawful to yield to the enemies of the truth." And right here we are brought to the contemplation of the greatest hindrance that ever affected the Reformation—that is, *scholasticism*.

Luther and all the other reformers stood upon the platform of "*The word of God, the whole word of God, and nothing but the word of God.*" They abandoned the sophistries of the schools, and rested solely upon this declaration, which must be the basis of every true reform in all ages. And just so far as that principle is abandoned, so much will the work be retarded. While this principle was adhered to, the Reformation succeeded gloriously; when the principle was abandoned, the Reformation suffered accordingly. In the *word* of God, lies the strength of the *work* of God. In this position there was another great advantage that the reformers held over their Papal antagonists. As long as they stood by the word of God alone, they occupied a field with which the Papists were wholly unacquainted; and the more the reformers studied and applied the word of God, the more easily they could defeat their adversaries. Their adversaries knew it, and therefore they employed every artifice to draw the reformers into the scholastic field; for there the Papists had every advantage which the Protestants had in the other. While the leaders of the Reformation lived, the Papists were unsuccessful in every attempt in this direction, and so the Reformation was successful everywhere; but when these leaders were removed from the world, and their faith and zeal were not inherited by their successors, and when to the craftiness of the Papists were added the zeal and artfulness of Loyola and his order, the Protestants were finally corrupted by the arts and stratagems of their opponents and induced to revive the subtleties of the schools in defending and illustrating religious truth. So it may be said with truth that, while the Protestants imbibed *scholasticism* from the Catholics, they allowed the Catholics to steal from them their *zeal*. All that will be needed to prove and illustrate it, will be simply to mention the subjects of controversy that engaged the Protestant disputants for more than a hundred years.

Out of the debate about things *indifferent* grew several others, from which arose yet others, and so on indefinitely. While Melancthon and his colleagues were at Leipsic discussing the "Interim," among other things they had said, "The necessity of good works in order to the attainment of eternal salvation, might be held and taught, conformably to the truth of the gospel." This declaration was severely censured by the rigid Lutherans, as being contrary to the doctrine and sentiments of Luther. George Major maintained the doctrine of good works, and Amsdorf the contrary. In this dispute Amsdorf was so far carried away by his zeal for the doctrine of Luther, as to maintain that good works are an *impediment* to salvation. This added new fuel to the flame, and on it raged.

Out of this debate grew the one known as the "Synergistical" controversy, from a Greek word signifying *co-operation*. The disciples of Melancthon, let by Strigelius, held from him that man *co-operates* with divine grace in the work of conversion. The Lutherans, led by Flacius, head of the university of Saxe-Weimar, held that God is the *only* agent in the conversion of man. The dispute led to yet another, concerning the natural powers of the human mind. On this

subject a public debate was held at Weimar in 1560, between Flacius and Strigelius. Flacius maintained that "the fall of man extinguished in the human mind every virtuous tendency, every noble faculty, and left nothing but universal darkness and corruption." Strigelius held that this degradation of the powers of the mind was by no means universal. And, hoping to defeat his opponent by puzzling him, put this question: "Should original sin, or the corrupt habit which the human soul contracted by the fall, be classed with *substances* or *accidents*?" Flacius replied that "original sin is the very substance of human nature." This bold assertion opened another controversy on the nature and extent of original sin.

J.

(*To be continued.*)

March 16, 1888

"Historical Necessity of the Third Angel's Message. No. 3" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 11, pp. 167, 168.

IN 1560 Melancthon died, glad, as he said on his death-bed, to be freed from the contentions of theologians. After his death, many who wished to see these divisions and animosities healed, hoped to bring the contests to an end. After many vain attempts, in 1568 the elector of Saxony and the duke of Saxe-Weimar summoned the most eminent men of each party to meet at Altenburg, and there, in an amicable spirit, sought to reconcile their differences. But this effort came to naught. Then the dukes of Wirtemberg and Brunswick joined in the scheme, and James Andreas, professor at Tübingen, under their patronage traveled through all parts of Germany working in the interests of concord. At last, they were so far successful as to gather, after several conferences, a company of leading divines at Torgau in 1576, where a treatise, composed by Andreas, was examined, discussed, and corrected; and finally proposed to the deliberations of a select number, who met at Berg, near Magdeburg. There all points were fully and carefully weighed, and discussed anew; and as the result of all there was adopted the "Form of Concord." And now that the "Form of *Concord*" was adopted, *discord* was fully assured; for it was only a source of new tumults, and furnished matter for dissensions and contests as violent as any that had gone before. Besides this, the field was now widened, so that the Calvinists and Zwinglians were all included in the whirl of controversy.

When Calvin appeared upon the scene, the field was not only enlarged, but new material was supplied; for he differed from both Lutherans and Zwinglians, not only on the Lord's Supper, but his essential tenet of the *absolute decrees of God*, in the salvation of men, differed from these churches. This was also an entirely new element in the strife; and in the very nature of the case it propagated a multitude of new disputes. It is not necessary to enlarge upon these, nor to draw them out in their full numbers. It will be sufficient to merely name the *leading* subjects. Differing from both Lutherans and Zwinglians on the presence of Christ in the Supper, of course the controversy on that subject was reopened,

and again canvassed through all its forms: 1. What is the nature of the institutions called sacraments? 2. What are the fruits of the same? 3. How great is the majesty and glory of Christ's human nature? 4. How are the divine perfections communicated to the human nature of Christ? 5. What is the inward frame of spirit that is required in the worship addressed to the Saviour?

Calvin's doctrine of the divine decrees was this:—

"We assert that by an eternal immutable counsel, God hath once for all determined both whom he would admit to salvation, and whom he would condemn to destruction. We affirm that this counsel, as far as concerns the elect, is founded on his gratuitous mercy, totally irrespective of human merit; but that to those whom he devotes to condemnation, the gate of life is closed by a just and irreprehensible, but incomprehensible, judgment."

On this subject the controversy ran through the following scale:—

1. What is the nature of the divine attributes? 2. Particularly those of justice and goodness. 3. Fate and necessity. 4. What is the connection between human liberty and divine prescience? 5. What is the extent of God's love to mankind? 6. What are the benefits that arise from the merits of Christ as mediator? 7. What are the operations of the divine Spirit, in rectifying the will, and sanctifying the affections of men? 8. The final perseverance of the elect.

Other subjects of controversy were as follows:—

Other subjects of controversy were as follows: 1. What is the extent of external ceremonies in religious worship." 2. What are the special characteristics of things *indifferent*? 3. How far is it lawful to comply with the demands of an adversary in discussing things indifferent? 4. What is the extent of Christian liberty? 5. Is it lawful to retain, out of respect to the prejudices of the people, ancient rites and ceremonies which have a superstitious aspect, yet may be susceptible of a favorable and rational interpretation?

Bear in mind that these are only the leading subjects that lay between Calvinism on the one hand, and Lutheranism, and the Zwinglians on the other. Calvin had yet other controversies to conduct on his own account. Among these were: (1) The Immortality of the Soul; (2) the Trinity; (3) Predestination (against his opponents in Geneva); and above all, (4) in acquiring and maintaining his own absolute supremacy in Geneva.

It will be seen at the first glance that this last list is almost nothing in comparison with that which agitated the Lutheran Church, or with that which lay between the Calvinists and Lutherans. But there is an excellent reason for this; and that is, none but the most intrepid dared to question the doctrines of Calvin in Geneva. All opposers of Calvin there had to fairly take their lives in their hands. And some did not escape even that way. To give a proper view of affairs in Geneva, we quote a passage of the highest authority ("Encyclopedia Britannica," ninth edition, art. "Calvin"), written by W. L. Alexander, D.D., one of the Bible revisers, and which is *prima facie* favorable to him:—

"His system of church polity was essentially theocratic; it assumed that *every member of the State* was also under the discipline of the church; and he asserted that the right of exercising this discipline was vested *exclusively* in the consistory, or body of

preachers and elders. His attempts to carry out these views brought him into collision both with the authorities and with the populace,—the latter being enraged at the restraints imposed upon the disorderly by the exercise of church discipline, and the former being inclined to retain in their own hands a portion of that power in things spiritual which Calvin was bent on placing *exclusively* in the hands of the church rulers. His dauntless courage, his perseverance, and his earnestness at length prevailed. . . . His work, as has been justly said, 'embraced everything;' he was consulted on every affair, *great and small*, that came before the council."

It is plain, therefore, that where "every member of the State" "was subject to the discipline of the church," and where this discipline was exercised

168

"*exclusively* by the body of preachers and elders," with Calvin the head of that body, his power was practically unlimited. It is equally plain that opposition to his doctrines could have no chance at all to spread, if he should choose to exert his power; and that he did choose to exert it, needs no argument. I proceed to the controversies that arose in Geneva.

One of the first of his opponents was Gruet, who attacked him vigorously on his supremacy, and called him "bishop of Asculum," and "the new Pope." Amongst a good many other things he denied the immortality of the soul. He may have been an infidel; but at any rate he was brought before the council, and punished with death. Another opponent was Castalio, master of the public schools of Geneva, who attacked the doctrine of unconditional predestination. He was deposed from his office, and banished. Another was Jerome Bolsec, a monk who had been converted to Protestantism. He, too, attacked the doctrine of absolute decrees. He was thrown into prison, and after a two days' debate with Calvin before the council, was banished.

Out of this grew still another. Jacques de Bourgogne, a lineal descendant of the dukes of Burgundy and an intimate friend and patron of Calvin, had settled at Geneva solely to have the pleasure of his company. Bourgogne had employed Bolsec as his physician, and when Bolsec became involved in his difficulty with Calvin, Bourgogne came to his support, and tried to prevent his ruin. This so incensed Calvin that he turned his force against the nobleman (a noble man, too), who was obliged to leave Geneva, lest a worse thing should befall him.

Another, and the most notable opponent, was Servetus, who had opposed the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, and also infant baptism; and had published a book entitled "Christianity Restored," in which he declared his sentiments. He had been condemned to death by the Catholics for heresy, but he escaped from their prison in DauphinÈ, in France, and in making his way to Italy, passed through Geneva, and there remained a few days. He was just about to start for Zurich, when at the instigation of Calvin he was seized, and out of the book before mentioned, was accused of blasphemy. The result, as everybody knows, was that he was burned to death. Dr. Alexander says further: "The heresy of Servetus was not extirpated by his death; but none of his followers were visited with severer penalties than banishment from Geneva. The trials of several of these,

with the conferences and controversies connected with them, occupied much of Calvin's time for several years."

From the foregoing it is very easy to see why the Calvinistical body was so much more exempt from divisions and tumults than was the Lutheran.

J.

(To be continued.)

March 23, 1888

"Historical Necessity of the Third Angel's Message. No. 4" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 12 , pp. 183, 184.

BUT however bitter the opposition between Lutherans and Calvinists, and amongst the Lutherans themselves, and again, between all of these on one hand and the Catholics on the other, they could call a truce upon all their differences, and unite all, Catholics, Lutherans, Zwinglians, and Calvinists, in one common onset against Anabaptists.

The name "Anabaptist" signifies *re*-baptisers, and was applied indiscriminately to all who denied the validity of sprinkling for baptism, and especially of infant baptism, or sprinkling rather. Before the period of the Reformation there were scattered throughout almost all the countries of Europe, and persecuted everywhere, lineal descendants, in point of doctrine, of the Albigenes and Waldenses, who did not practice infant baptism (sprinkling) but held to the genuine doctrines of baptism, the sleep of the dead, and some to the true Sabbath. Of course these doctrines caused them to be considered then abominable heretics; but when, unfortunately, in the early days of the Reformation, some of the name ran into the most fearful fanaticism, all of the name were classed together in it, and the severest of penal laws of those severe times were enacted against all who could be classed as Anabaptists.

"In almost all the countries of Europe, an unspeakable number, . . . preferred death in its worst forms to a retraction. . . . Neither the view of the flames that were kindled to consume them nor the ignominy of the gibbet, nor the terrors of the sword, could shake their invincible . . . constancy, or make them abandon tenets that appeared dearer to them than life and all its enjoyments. . . . And it is much to be lamented that so little distinction was made between the members of this sect, when the sword was unsheathed against them. Why were the innocent and the guilty involved in the same fate? Why were doctrines purely theological . . . punished with the same rigor that was shown to crimes inconsistent with the peace and welfare of civil society? Those who had no other marks of peculiarity than their administering baptism to *adult persons* only, and their excluding the unrighteous from the external communion of the church, ought undoubtedly to have met with milder treatment than that which was

given to those seditious incendiaries, who were for unhinging all government and destroying all civil authority. . . . It is true that many Anabaptists suffered death, *not* on account of their being considered rebellious subjects, but merely because they were judged to be incorrigible heretics; for in this century the error of limiting the administration of baptism to adult persons only, and the practice of *re-baptizing* such as had received that sacrament in infancy, were looked upon as the most flagitious and intolerable of heretics."—*Mosheim, Church History, Cent. 16, sec. 3, part 2, par. 6.*

As before remarked, the Anabaptists became the one object of the attack of all parties, civil and religious. Their opposition to infant baptism was what disconcerted Melancthon in the presence of the fanatics at Wittemberg. He owned that they had hit upon a "*weak point*;" and his doubts on this point led him to make the familiar statement, "Luther alone can decide" the question of their *inspiration*. It was the fear of being landed in Anabaptism that was the reason that "Luther did not face this question thoroughly." The Protestant Council of Zurich ordered "that anyone who administered anabaptism should be *drowned*;" and the order was actually executed upon Felix Mantz, "who had formerly been associated with Zwingli at the commencement of the Reformation."

One of the very earliest of Calvin's theological efforts was the composition of a book entitled, "*Psychopannychia*," on the immortality of the soul, in opposition to the Anabaptists in France. And the claim of the true Sabbath was not the least of the causes of Luther's bitterness against Carlstadt. (For a full and fair discussion of this point, see "Andrews' History of the Sabbath," chap. 23.)

England was not entirely exempt from these scenes; yet while exempt from some she was subject to others from which the continental nations were free. To escape the persecutions of "Bloody Mary," many of the English Protestants fled to Germany. Worship while in exile was conducted by some with the rites of the Church of England as established under Edward VI., while others preferred the Swiss or Calvinistic form of worship. This caused a division, and the former were called *Conformists*, the latter *Non-Conformists* or *Puritans*; and thus the Puritans appear upon the scene. After the death of Mary, at the accession of Elizabeth, these exiles returned to England, and carried their controversies with them; and England not only supplied a better field for their propagation, but there the Scotch Presbyterians, who had spread to a considerable extent in England, allied themselves with the Puritans. These controversies turned, as stated above, upon the *forms of worship*; whether the clergy should wear vestments; whether the church should be governed by bishops; about cathedral churches, and the archdeacons, deans, canons, and other officials of the same; about festivals and holy days; the sign of the cross; about godfathers and godmothers, etc., etc.

There were, again, branch controversies from some of these. For instance: on the office of bishops, the question at first was whether bishops are allowable as they stand in the Church of England. But Bancroft, afterward archbishop of Canterbury, asserted that bishops are superior to all other officers in the church, by *divine right* of the appointment of God himself. To sustain this claim, they were compelled to hold, *not* the Bible alone as authority, but the Bible *and* the church

of the first five centuries, especially as illustrated in the forms of church government.

The Puritans and Presbyterians, in denying this, and asserting the sufficiency of the Bible alone, and charging all these other things to the account of Rome, as being "vain, superstitious, idolatrous, and diametrically opposite to the injunctions of the gospel," were involved in a serious dilemma. When they inveighed so heavily against the rites, ceremonies, and festival days of the Conformists, as being of Rome, and "superstitious, idolatrous," etc., the Episcopalians retorted upon them, that the *observance of Sunday was only an ordinance of the church*, and that therefore if they renounced the authority of the church, and held "the Bible and the Bible alone," they must give up the observance of Sunday.

But the Non-Conformists, instead of facing this question boldly, and instituting an honest inquiry at the oracles of God, "What day is the Sabbath?" determined that they would keep Sunday anyhow, and if anything must yield, it should be the Scripture. And so Mr. Nicholas Bound, D.D., invented the, to them, very pleasing doctrine, which is yet perpetuated by many who will not obey the commandment of God, that the fourth commandment requires only *one day in seven*. And such is the origin of the seventh-part-of-time, one-day-in-seven fraud. This was adopted by all the Puritans and Presbyterians with wonderful celerity. And so a *second* time the Sabbath of the Lord pleaded for release from condemnation at the hands of men, and was denied, as was its Lord, "Not this man, but Barabbas."

Another subject that grew out of the differences between the Conformists and Non-Conformists was sprung by Thomas Cartwright, in an attempt to establish Calvin's system of church government in England, and which also effectually frustrated all hopes of any compromise. We shall give this in the words of Mr. Green:—

"So difficult, however, was her [Elizabeth's] position that a change might have been forced upon her had she not been aided at this moment by a group of clerical bigots, who gathered under the banner of Presbyterianism. Of these, Thomas Cartwright was

184

the chief. He had studied at Geneva; he returned with a fanatical faith in Calvinism, and in the system of church government which Calvin had devised; and as Margaret professor of divinity at Cambridge, he used to the full the opportunities which his chair gave him of propagating his opinions. No leader of a religious party ever deserved less of after sympathy. Cartwright was unquestionably learned and devout, but his bigotry was that of a medieval inquisition. The relics of the old ritual, the cross in baptism, the surplice, the giving of a ring in marriage, were to him not merely distasteful, as they were to the Puritans at large, they were idolatrous, and the mark of the beast. His declamation against ceremonies and superstition, however, had little weight with Elizabeth or her primates; what scared them was his reckless advocacy of a scheme of ecclesiastical government which placed

the State beneath the feet of the church. The absolute rule of bishops, indeed, Cartwright denounced as begotten of the devil; but the absolute rule of presbyters he held to be established by the word of God. For the church modeled after the fashion of Geneva he claimed an authority which surpassed the wildest dreams of the masters of the Vatican. All spiritual authority and jurisdiction, the decreeing of doctrine, the ordering of ceremonies, lay wholly in the hands of the ministers of the church. To them belonged the supervision of public morals. In an ordered arrangement of classes and synods, these presbyters were to govern their flocks to regulate their own order, to decide in matters of faith, to administer 'discipline.' Their weapon was excommunication, and they were responsible for its use to none but Christ.

"The province of the civil ruler in such a system of religion as this, was simply to carry out the decisions of the presbyters, 'to see their decrees executed, and to punish the contemners of them.' Nor was this work of the civil power likely to be a light work. The spirit of Calvinistic Presbyterianism excluded all toleration of practice or belief. Not only was the rule of ministers to be established as the one legal form of church government, but all other forms, Episcopalian and separatist, were to be ruthlessly put down. Never had the doctrine of persecution been urged with such a blind and reckless ferocity. 'I deny,' wrote Cartwright, 'that upon repentance there ought to follow any pardon of death. . . . Heretics ought to be put to death now. If this be bloody and extreme, I am content to be so counted with the Holy Ghost.'

"The violence of language such as this was as unlikely as the dogmatism of his theological teaching to commend Cartwright's opinions to the mass of Englishmen. Popular as the Presbyterian system became in Scotland, it never took any popular hold on England. It remained to the last a clerical rather than a national creed, and even in the moment of its seeming triumph under the commonwealth it was rejected by every part of England save London and Lancashire. But the bold challenge which Cartwright's party delivered to the Government in 1572, in an 'admonition to the parliament,' which denounced the government of bishops as contrary to the word of God, and demanded the establishment in its place of government by presbyters, raised a panic among English statesmen and prelates, which cut off all hopes of a quiet treatment of the merely ceremonial questions which really troubled the consciences of the more advanced Protestants. The natural progress of opinion abruptly ceased, and the moderate thinkers who had pressed for a change in ritual which would have satisfied the zeal of the reformers, withdrew from union with a party which revived the worst pretensions of the Papacy."—*Larger History of English People*, book 6, chap. 5, paragraph 31.

Shortly after this, in 1581, there occurred a division among the Puritans, which was followed by very notable results. Robert Brown drew off in a revolt from the government of synods and presbyteries, as well as from the government of bishops; and held that each church or assembly of worshipers was entirely *independent* of all others, and *self-governing*, and all points of doctrine or discipline were to be submitted to the congregation for discussion and final decision; that each congregation should elect its own pastor, etc. The sect that thus arose were called *Independents*, or Congregationalists. To escape the persecution that arose against them as a matter of course, they fled to Holland, and founded churches in Middleburg, Amsterdam, and Leyden. Shortly after going to Holland, Brown deserted his followers, returned to England, and took a benefice in the English church. This left John Robinson in charge, who remodeled the whole society, and in 1620 sent a company to America, who were the Pilgrims that landed at Plymouth Rock, and the first settlers of New England. J.

(*To be continued.*)

March 30, 1888

"Historical Necessity of the Third Angel's Message. No. 5" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 13 , pp. 199, 200.

IN entering the seventeenth century we find a new element upon the sea of controversy. Philosophy of the different schools was in each one striving for ascendancy; and if not a direct cause of many of the disputes of this century, it gave a coloring to them. At this time philosophy was represented in the two classes of *Peripatetics* (followers of Aristotle) and *Fire-Philosophers*, from their proposition that "the dissolution of bodies by the power of *fire* is the only way in which the first principles of things can be discerned." The Peripatetics held the professorships in almost all of the places of learning; and held all who questioned Aristotle, as little less criminal than downright heretics; and so, there was a lively contest kept up between them and the Fire-Philosophers, or *chemists*. But there was a union of the interests of these two, when, about 1640, the Cartesian gauntlet, "*Cogito, ergo sum*" (*i.e.*, I think, therefore I am), was thrown into the arena; and they both turned with all their energy against the new philosophy; "not," says Mosheim, "so much for their philosophical system as for the honors, advantages, and profits they derived from it." And, "seconded by the clergy who apprehended that the cause of religion was aimed at and endangered by these philosophical innovations, they made a prodigious noise and left no means unemployed to prevent the downfall of their old system. . . . They not only accused Descartes of the most dangerous and pernicious errors, but went so far, in the extravagance of their malignity, as to bring a charge of *atheism* against him." In opposition to Descartes, Gassendi also entered the lists, and this gave rise to yet another school of philosophy, the *Mathematical*. That of Descartes was called the *Metaphysical*, or Cartesian, philosophy. As the Peripatetic was the only

philosophy taught in the Lutheran schools, the rise of the new philosophy was a new subject for discussion and opposition there, and gave more ample scope for the exercise of their propensities.

Another thing that greatly troubled the Lutherans was, that in 1614 John Sigismund, elector of Brandenburg, entered the communion of the Calvinists, and granted to all his subjects entire liberty in religious matters, and left to the free choice of all whether they would embrace one religion or another, or any at all. But the Lutherans "deemed it intolerable that the Calvinists should enjoy the same privileges as themselves." And this was carried to such a length that the people of Brandenburg were prohibited from studying at the University of Wittenberg.

But that which gave the Lutherans the most trouble in this century was the efforts of a succession of persons to bring about a state of harmony between them and the Calvinists. James I. of England tried it, and failed. In 1631, in a synod of the Calvinists at Charenton, an act was passed, which granted that the Lutheran religion "was conformable to a spirit of true piety, and free from pernicious and fundamental errors," but the overture was not accepted. In the same year, a conference was held at Leipsic, between several of the most eminent doctors of both communions, in Saxony and Brandenburg. And although the Calvinists showed all possible fairness, and made concessions that the Lutherans themselves could scarcely expect, yet all their efforts were looked upon and regarded with suspicion, as being only schemes to ensnare them, and the conference broke up with nothing done.

In 1645, Vladislaus IV., king of Poland, called a conference at Thorn, but it only increased the party zeal. In 1661, William VI., landgrave of Hesse, called a conference at Cassel, in which the doctors there assembled came to an agreement, embraced one another, and declared that there was nothing between them of sufficient importance to prevent union and concord. This was no sooner learned by the Lutheran brethren, than they turned at their fury against their delegates, and loaded them with reproaches of apostasy, Calvinism, etc.

Besides these public efforts, there were others of a private character. John Dureau, a Calvinist, a native of Scotland, says Mosheim, "during a period of *forty-three years*, suffered vexations, and underwent labors which required the firmest resolution, and the most inexhaustible patience; wrote, exhorted, admonished, entreated, and disputed; in a word, tried every method that human wisdom could suggest, to put an end to the dissensions and animosities that reigned among the Protestant churches. . . . He traveled through all the countries in Europe where the Protestant religion had gained a footing; he formed connections with the doctors of both parties; he addressed himself to kings, princes, magistrates, and ministers. . . . But his views were disappointed. . . . Some, suspecting that his fervent and extraordinary zeal arose from mysterious and sinister motives, and apprehending that he had secretly formed a design of drawing the Lutherans into a snare, even attacked him in their writings with animosity and bitterness, and loaded him with the sharpest invectives and reproaches; so that this well-meaning man, neglected at length by *his own communion*, . . . spent the

remainder of his days in repose and obscurity at Cassel."—*Church History, 17th cent., sec. 4, part 4, chap. 1, paragraph 6.*

That which he proposed as the foundation upon which they might unite was the Apostles' Creed, the *ten commandments*, and the Lord's prayer.

Another of the most zealous of the peacemakers was John Matthias, a Swedish bishop, who with George Calixtus, attempted to carry on the work of Dureus. But the opposition was so bitter that Matthias was obliged to resign his bishopric; and Calixtus was accused of syncretism, and to his "charge many other things were laid, besides the *crime* of endeavoring to unite the disciples of the same Master in the amiable bonds of charity, concord, and mutual forbearance."—*Id., par. 7.* (*Italics his.*) This crime was called *syncretism*.

The *Pietistical* controversy was another, that engaged the attention of the Lutherans during this century. This was set on foot by Philip James Spener, of Frankfort, who had in view the promotion of *cital religion*, rousing the lukewarm and indifferent, stemming the torrent of vice and corruption, and reforming the licentious manners of both the clergy and people. See paragraph 26. The better to accomplish this, Spener and his adherents proposed that, besides the stated times for *public* worship, private assemblies for prayer and other religious exercises should be held. For these laudable and most necessary aims they were nicknamed *Pietists*, and the opposition was as strong as against any of the others.

This subject was carried further by some of the professors of Leipsic, who for the purpose of instructing the candidates for the ministry in something better than how to perpetrate broils, "undertook to explain in their colleges certain books of Scripture, in order to render these genuine sources of religious

200

knowledge better understood, and to promote a spirit of practical piety and vital religion in the minds of their hearers. . . . Accordingly these lectures were much frequented, and their efforts were visible in the lives and conversation of several persons, whom they seemed to inspire with a deep sense of the importance of religion and virtue." But immediately the cry arose that this was "*contrary to custom*." "Hence rumors were spread, tumults excited, animosity kindled, and the matter at length brought to a public trial in which these pious and learned men were indeed declared free from the errors and heresies laid to their charge, but were at the same time *prohibited* from carrying on that plan of religious instruction which they had undertaken with so much zeal."—*Id. par. 37.*

But this did not put down the good work thus begun; for the contest spread rapidly through all the Lutheran Churches in Europe. Therefore the doctors and pastors of Wittenburg thought themselves obliged to proceed publicly, first against Spener in 1695, and afterwards against his disciples, which gave rise to new debates. The Pietists held: 1. That none should be admitted to the ministry but such as had been properly educated, and who were distinguished by wisdom and sanctity of manners, and who had their hearts filled with divine love. 2. That the scholastical theology should be abolished. 3. That polemical divinity, that is, the controversies between Christians, should be less eagerly taught. 4. That all mixture of philosophy and human learning with the Holy Scriptures should be

abandoned. 5. That no person who was not himself a model of piety, was qualified to be a public teacher of piety, or a guide to others in the way of salvation.

Out of these sprung other debates as follows: 1. "Can the religious knowledge acquired by a wicked man be termed theology?" 2. "How far can the office and ministry of an impious ecclesiastic be pronounced salutary and efficacious?" 3. "Can an ungodly and licentious man be susceptible of illumination?" The Pietists further demanded the suppression of certain propositions that it was customary to deliver from the pulpit publicly, that, unqualified, were capable certainly of being interpreted as granting indulgence. Such were these: "No man is able to attain that perfection which the divine law requires. Good works are not necessary to salvation; in the fact of justification on the part of man, faith alone is concerned without good works." Also the Pietists prohibited dancing, pantomimes, theatrical plays, etc., among their members; and this again gave an opportunity for the scholastics to display their ingenuity. They raised the question, first, whether these actions were of an indifferent nature, and then from that whether any human actions are truly [*sic.*] indifferent; *i.e.*, equally removed from moral good on one hand, and from moral evil on the other.

In the Calvinist Church, after the death of its founder, the controversy over the "divine decrees" continued through the seventeenth century. From the college at Geneva the doctrine of Calvin spread to all parts of Protestant Europe, and into the schools of learning. But there arose a difference of opinion not about the "decrees," but about the *nature* of the decrees. The majority held that God simply *permitted* the first man to fall into transgression; while a considerable minority maintained with all their might, that "to exercise and display his awful justice and his free mercy" God had decreed from all eternity that Adam *should* sin, and had "so ordered the course of events that our first parents could not possibly avoid their unhappy fall."—*Id.*, chap. 2, par. 10.

These last were called *Supralapsarians*, while their opponents were called *Sublapsarians*.

J.

(To be continued.)

April 6, 1888

"Historical Necessity of the Third Angel's Message. No. 6" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 14 , pp. 216, 217.

HOWEVER sharp the contention was at any time between those who would have it that God *decreed* that man should sin, and those who held that he only permitted it, their differences were all laid aside whenever and wherever there appeared those who "thought it their duty to represent the Deity as extending his goodness and mercy to all mankind." For both the *Supralapsarians* and *Sublapsarians* held alike to the decrees of unconditional election and reprobation.

This new controversy arose in the early part of the seventeenth century, and is known as the Arminian controversy, from James Arminius, professor of divinity in the University of Leyden, who was the originator of it. Arminius had been educated a Calvinist, at the College of Geneva, and because of his merit, had been chosen to the University of Leyden. After leaving Geneva, and as he grew older, his mind more and more revolted from the doctrine of Calvin on predestination, and he embraced the scriptural doctrine that the grace of God is free to all, and brings salvation to all men, and that none are prohibited, by any decree, from its benefits, nor are any elected thereto, independent of their own actions, but that Christ brought salvation to the world, and every man is free to accept or reject his offer as he chooses. But as Calvinism was at that time flourishing in Holland, the teaching of Arminius drew upon him the severest opposition.

Arminius died in 1609, and Simon Episcopius, one of his disciples, carried the work forward with unabated vigor, and in a little while the controversy spread through all Europe, and created as much tumult in the Calvinist Church as Calvinism had formerly caused in the Lutheran. And the stubbornness of the Lutherans was repeated on the part of the Calvinists. With these, also, some sought to bring the contending parties to an accommodation, but with no success. At last, in 1618, by the authority of the States General, the national synod was convened at Dort, to discuss the points of difference and come to an agreement.

Deputies assembled from Holland, England, Hesse, Bremen, Switzerland, and the Palatinate; and the leading men of the Arminians came also. Episcopius addressed the assembly in a discourse, says Mosheim, "full of moderation, gravity, and elocution." But his address was no sooner finished than difficulties arose, and the Arminians found that instead of their being called there to present their views for examination and discussion, it was that they were to be tried as heretics; and when they refused to submit to the manner of proceeding proposed by the synod, they were excluded from the assembly, and the famous synod of Dort tried them in their absence, and, as a natural consequence, they were pronounced "guilty of pestilential errors," and condemned as "corrupters of the true religion;" and all this after the solemn promise made to the Arminians that they should be allowed full liberty to explain and defend their opinions, as far as they thought necessary to their justification.

After this the doctrine of "absolute decrees" lost ground from day to day; and the way in which the synod had treated the Arminians only increased their determination, and besides drew to them the sympathy of many, so much so indeed that the whole provinces of Friesland, Zealand, Utrecht, Guelderland, and Groningen, never would accept the decisions of that assembly.

Immediately after this, too, the controversy over the Cartesian philosophy entered the Calvinist Church, and set it all awlirl again, and kept it so.

James I. came to the English throne in 1603. He had been raised a Puritan, and therefore that party supposed they would be greatly favored by him as king. Accordingly, before he reached London, they presented to him a petition signed by eight hundred and twenty-five ministers from various countries, desiring a

redress of ecclesiastical "abuses," and asking for a conference. On January 14, 15 and 16, 1604, the king summoned to Hampton Court, the Archbishop of Canterbury, eight bishops, five deans, and two doctors, of the Church of England, "who were to oppose all innovation." To meet these he called four members of the Puritan party.

James, to avenge himself for the humiliations that had been put upon him by the Puritans in Scotland when he was a boy, sided with the Episcopalians, and became the chief talker in the conferences of the three days. This so pleased the bishops that one of them (Bancroft, of the divine right contest before mentioned) fell upon his knees with his eyes raised to James, and cried out, "I protest, my heart melteth for joy that Almighty God, of his singular mercy, has given us such a king as since Christ's time hath not been." And the archbishop (Whitgift) was so transported with joy as to declare that "undoubtedly his majesty spoke by the special assistance of God's Spirit."

Whether these men were exactly in the right in speaking thus may safely be questioned; but there was one grand result of this Conference: James ordered a new translation of the Scriptures, by which we have our present "King James's" version. When his delegates returned from Dort, and reported what had been done, James gave the Puritans another snub, by expressing in strong terms his dislike, and declared that the position of Arminius on the divine decrees was preferable to that of Calvin.

After James came Charles I., a rigid Episcopalian, and therefore a bitter opponent of all dissenters, Puritans as well as others, and through Laud carried things with a high hand. He finally pushed civil matters so far, that he brought upon his kingdom the civil war, and by that, through Cromwell, the complete ascendancy of the Puritans. When affairs had grown somewhat quiet after the close of the civil war, there were peace-loving men in England who wished to heal the divisions between the Episcopalians and the Puritans; but about all the recognition they received was to be called atheists, Deists, Socinians, and to cap the climax, a new epithet was invented, *Latitudinarians*.

After the Commonwealth, came Charles II., who reduced everything again to the jurisdiction of bishops. After him came James II., who tried to bring the kingdom under the papal rule. This danger, of course, led all to make common cause against it, till finally, to save the kingdom to Protestantism, William of Orange, with his wife Mary, daughter of James II., was invited to come over from Holland and take the kingdom and reign. In 1688 they came; James ran away to France, and the kingdom was settled upon William and Mary jointly, and pledged to a Protestant succession forever. But as soon as James was out of the kingdom, and the bishops were required to take the oath of allegiance to the new king, many of them discovered all at once that James was king by "divine right," and that it was treason to swear allegiance to any other while he lived. It mattered not though he had, like the coward that he was, basely run away in disguise; no matter though he in his flight had thrown the great seal of the kingdom into the Thames, and by thus throwing away "that mystic symbol of legal government" had left the realm a prey to every unlawful element;—no matter for all this and more, they refused to take the oath of allegiance to one of the best

rulers that England once saw. This caused a division and endless discussion within the Episcopalian Church. Those who refused to take the oath were denominated *Nonchurch* and *High Church*, those who took the oath were called *Low Church*. This controversy lasted through the century, till James, William, and Mary all were dead, and Anne succeeded.

In 1650, another tumult arose in England. The Quakers began their preaching, and excited great commotion and fearful persecution, till in 1680, William Penn obtained a grant of a portion of land in America, to which his brethren might go and be secure.

In the eighteenth century, both in England and on the continent, infidelity caused the principal portion of controversy. Under the leadership of Voltaire, and the patronage of Frederick the Great, it grew stronger and stronger, until it finally culminated in the barbarities of the French Revolution that so shocked the world. In England, however, there were some notable controversies on other subjects. In the early part of the century, William Whiston (the translator of Josephus) revived the Trinitarian controversy, by boldly announcing himself as an Arian. He was followed soon by Samuel Clark, a prelate of the English Church. But that which caused the greatest commotion of the whole century in religious circles, was started in 1738, by John Wesley's preaching of conversion, and a "present, free, and full salvation" by the "witness of the Holy Spirit." Wesley was a member of the Established Church of England, and his "doctrines offended the clergy." "The churches were shut against him," and he had to preach in the open air. But "immense crowds" flocked to hear him. In 1740, the clergy, not content with excluding the preachers of these doctrines from their pulpits, "repelled them and their converts from the Lord's Supper." Being thus cut off from all fellowship or recognition by the orthodox, there was no course open but to establish communion amongst themselves, to have their own meeting-houses, and for the preachers to administer the sacrament themselves. The trials, perplexities, and persecutions of the early Methodists are too well known to require any further mention in this place; though it might not be out of place for us to express the wish that the Methodists *now* would call to mind the former day, whenever unpopular doctrine is brought to their notice.

In 1747 the Baptists, or Anabaptists, as they were also called, were brought into particular notice again by Mr. Whiston's openly joining their communion. The controversy on the immortality of the soul was again revived by Dr. Priestly's asserting the unconciousness of the dead.

In the nineteenth century, the first prominent movement was in relation to the second coming of Christ. In 1827 it began in England, and in 1833 of Christ. In 1827 it began in England, and in 1833 in this country by William Miller. This, however, was not so much a controversy as a *warning voice*, and it soon spread to all nations.

We ask our readers to look over again the subjects that have formed this course of controversy for in our next we shall present the point which is the object of these articles, that is, the necessity for

the Third Angel's Message to bring into prominence the commandments of God. And by reviewing what we have now given, the truth which we shall present in the next will be more plainly seen. J.

(Concluded next week.)

April 13, 1888

"Historical Necessity of the Third Angel's Message. No. 7" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 15, pp. 230, 231.

ANYONE who has carefully read the preceding articles in this series, can very readily see that the following statements of Mosheim are the exact truth:—

"None of the famous Lutheran doctors attempted to give a regular system of *morality*."—*Church History, cent. 16, sec. 3, part 2, chap. 1, par. 17.*

Again:—

"The *science of morals* . . . was for a long time neglected among the Lutherans. . . . Hence it happened that those who applied themselves to the business of resolving what are called cases of conscience, were holden in high esteem, and their tribunals were much frequented."—*Id., cent. 17, sec. 12, part 2, chap. 1, par. 19.*

He also gives an excellent reason for this. He says:—

"Had not the number of adversaries with whom the Lutheran doctors had to contend given them perpetual employment in the field of controversy, and robbed them of that precious leisure which they might have consecrated to the advancement of real piety and virtue, they would certainly have been the divines of this century [the sixteenth] were educated in the school of controversy, and so trained up to spiritual war that an eminent theologian and a bold and vehement disputant were considered as synonymous terms. It could scarcely indeed be otherwise, in an age when foreign quarrels and intestine divisions of a religious nature threw all the countries of Europe into a state of agitation, and

231

besieged the doctors of the contending churches to be perpetually in action, or at least in a posture of defense."—*Id.*

What was true of the Lutherans was also true of the Calvinists in this respect, as well as in others. The same writer says of these:—

"The progress of morality among the Reformed [Calvinists] was obstructed by the very same means that retarded its improvement among the Lutherans. It was neglected amidst the tumult of controversy; and while every pen was drawn to maintain certain items of doctrine, few were employed in cultivating virtue, life, and manners for its objects."—*Id., cent. 16, sec. 2, part 2, chap. 2, par. 37.*

This same course continued through the seventeenth century also. Says Mosheim, further:—

"It must be acknowledged that, during the greater part of this century [the seventeenth], neither the discourses of the pulpit nor the instructions of the schools were adapted to promote among the people . . . ideas of religion, or to give them a competent knowledge of the doctrines and precepts of the gospel. The eloquence of the pulpit, as some ludicrously and too justly represent it, was reduced in many places to the noisy art of bawling (during a certain space of time measured by a sand-glass) upon religious points of theology, which the orators understood very imperfectly, and which the people did not understand at all. . . . The ministers of the gospel had their heads full of sonorous and empty shards of trivial distinctions and metaphysical subtleties, and very illy furnished with that kind of knowledge which is adapted to touch the heart, and to reform the life."—*Id.*, cent. 17, sec. 2, part 2, chap. 1, par. 13.

The point in these quotations is illustrated in the necessity for the work of the Pietists, and is emphasized in the prohibition that was pronounced against that work.

There is another reason for the lack of the development of the genuine principles of morality. As shown above, in the very nature of the case, every leader in any reform was compelled to devote his sole attention to the discussion of the points which he was advancing. But the next great trouble was that when the leader died, *the followers utterly refused to take a single advance step*. On this Mosheim says:—

"The doctrine of the Lutheran Church remained secure during this [the seventeenth] century; its fundamental principles received no alteration, nor *had any doctor* of that church, who should have assumed to renounce or *invalidate* any of those theological points which are contained in the symbolical books of the Lutherans, *have met with toleration and indulgence*."—*Id.*, cent. 17, sec. 2, part 2, chap. 1, par. 16.

And of the Calvinists, he says:—

"The method . . . observed by Calvin . . . was followed, out of respect for his example, by almost all the divines of his communion, who looked upon him as their model and their guide."—*Id.*, cent. 17, sec. 3, part 2, chap. 4, par. 37.

This has been true in almost every instance. Therefore, as there has been in the course of the reformation no definite reform on the principles of morality, we lay down the proposition that if ever there is to be a clearly defined reformation upon the true principles of morality, *those principles* must be the one leading subject, above all others, set forth in that reform. Will anyone deny that the necessity of such a reform is as great as for any one of the ones that have been taken from the days of Luther to this day?

We do not say that absolutely none of the principles of morality have been believed in, nor practiced; for with the wide dissemination of the Scriptures

consequent upon the Reformation, it were impossible but that some rays of light should be discernible in that direction. But we do say that, until the present time, morality as a *system* has never had a place in the Reformation. What, then, must be the characteristic of such a reform when it shall come? We answer, As the ten commandments presuppose the moral law; as they are the sum of all duty toward God or man (Eccl. 12:13); as they are the sum of all morality; when such reform shall be presented itself to the world, it must bear high and prominent upon its crest those same ten commandments, demanding obedience thereto as the sum and effort of moral obligation. Now the Third Angel's Message does just that thing; for that message proclaims with a loud voice to every nation and kindred and tongue and people, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." Therefore, by thus tracing the reformation through its course of controversy, we have proved to a demonstration, the HISTORICAL NECESSITY OF THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE.

Moreover, the truth of God is as much an exact science as any of those that are called the exact sciences, therefore no true reform can deny, or be made independent of, any principle of true reform that may have gone before. Consequently, when this reform upon the principles of morality shall have come, it will deny the truth and efficacy of no single step in the progress of the Reformation. With Luther, it will hold the Lord's Supper as a memorial of "the Lord's death, till he come;" with the genuine Anabaptist, it will hold the unconsciousness, the sleep, of the dead, and that we are buried by baptism into the Lord's death; with Arminius, it will hold that the grace of God is free to all men; with Wesley, it will hold the genuine conversion of the soul, and the witness of the Holy Spirit; with the Puritan, it will hold simplicity of worship; with William Miller, it will hold, "Behold, I come quickly," saith the Lord; with the grand result of the Reformation as a whole, it will hold the most perfect toleration of religious belief, and the inestimable boon of freedom of thought and liberty of discussion.

Now, in holding all these truths, they may be summed up in the one expression, that it will hold "the faith of Jesus." So when this Reformation shall have presented itself to the world, equally with the ten commandments, it must bear just as high and just as prominent "the faith of Jesus;" and combined, its insignia will read, "The commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." Now the Third Angel's Message does just that thing. Therefore, by this course of controversy, we also demonstrate the *logical* necessity of the Third Angel's Message.

Again; the very aim of the principles of the Reformation is the law of God. Take justification by faith: what is the aim of that but "that the *righteousness of the law* might be fulfilled in us"? Rom. 8:3, 4. Take sanctification by the Holy Spirit: what is the aim of that but "unto obedience"? 1 Pet. 1:2; Rom. 8:7-9. Sooner or later, then, these aims must be met, and the principle of obedience to the law of God must be inculcated, which of necessity must be a reform in morality. So, then, it would appear that there is also a *theo*-logical necessity for the Third Angel's Message.

The work of Christ also demands that the law of God be held up before all people, by which they must compare their lives; for the place and work of Christ

in Heaven are in the most holy place, blotting out the sins of his people, from Abel onward. And that requires a comparison of their lives with the law of God. Now, if that be the work of Christ in Heaven, what can his work logically be on earth but, through his ambassadors, comparing the lives of the people of earth with the law of God? So, therefore, the Third Angel's Message supplies this demand when, following the angel who had gone before, crying, "*The hour of His Judgment is come*" (Rev. 14:7), he says with a loud voice, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:12.

Several times in the course of controversy, the Sabbath of the Lord, as the basis of the acknowledgment of the sovereign rights of God and the claims of his holy law, has presented itself for recognition; but it was beaten back,—beaten back, yet not to stay. No; these appearances of the Sabbath on the sea of controversy should rather be considered (to borrow De Quincey's splendid figure), as "one of those ambitious billows which sometimes run far ahead of their fellows in a tide steadily gaining ground, but which inevitably recede in the next moment, marking only the strength of that tendency which sooner or later is destined to fill the whole capacity of the shore."

And now once more the glorious Sabbath of the Lord has appeared, not to be beaten back, not to recede even to gather greater strength, but rolling in with all the impulse of a mighty tide,—irresistible, soon "to fill the whole capacity of the shore" indeed. And those who see it, or hear it, should realize, *must* realize, that it is the one only tide in their affairs, which, taken at the flood, will lead on, not to fortune, but to EVERLASTING LIFE AND ETERNAL GLORY.

J.

April 20, 1888

**"The Elgin Sunday-law Convention" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 16 ,
pp. 247, 248.**

THE Elgin Sunday-law Convention held last November in Elgin, Illinois, was "called by the members of the Elgin Association of Congregational Ministers and Churches, to consider the prevalent desecration of the Sabbath, and its remedy," and passed the following resolutions:—

"*Resolved*, That we recognize the Sabbath as an institution of God, revealed in nature and the Bible, and of perpetual obligation on all men; and also as a civil and American institution, bound up in vital and historical connection with the origin and foundation of our Government, the growth of our polity, and necessary to be maintained in order for the preservation and integrity of our national system, and therefore as having a sacred claim on all patriotic American citizens.

"*Resolved*, That we look with shame and sorrow on the non-observance of the Sabbath by many Christian people, in that the custom prevails with them of purchasing Sabbath newspapers,

engaging in and patronizing Sabbath business and travel, and in many instances giving themselves to pleasure and self-indulgence, setting aside by neglect and indifference the great duties and privileges which God's day brings them.

"2. That we give our votes and support to those candidates or political officers who will pledge themselves to vote for the enactment and enforcing of statutes in favor of the civil Sabbath.

"3. That we give our patronage to such business men, manufacturers, and laborers as observe the Sabbath.

"4. That we favor a permanent Sabbath organization for the State of Illinois; the object of which shall be the creation of public sentiment and to secure the enactment of enforcement of necessary laws for the protection of the Sabbath.

"5. That we favor the organization of auxiliary societies to accomplish the above object.

"6. That four committees be appointed by this convention, consisting of two persons each, a minister and layman; one committee to carefully and accurately investigate and report to the next convention all the facts obtainable concerning Sunday business; one to investigate and report similarly concerning Sunday newspapers; one concerning Sunday pleasuring; one concerning Sunday transportation and travel.

"*Resolved*, That this association authorizes the Executive Committee to request railway corporations and newspapers to discontinue the running of Sunday trains and the publication of Sunday editions of their papers."

Notice, the Sabbath is here set forth as an institution of God, and *also* as a "*civil* institution." It is for "candidates or political officers who will pledge themselves to vote for the enactment and enforcing of statutes in favor of the *civil* Sabbath," that they will vote.

Now we shall present some of the arguments upon which they base this demand for laws in favor of the "*civil* Sabbath," and also showing what they want these laws enforced for.

Rev. Henry Wilson, a prominent member of the convention, said:—

"The industries of the world should be silent one day in seven, that the toiler may hear the invitation of the Master, 'Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest,' and that the spiritual temple of God may be built without the noise of the hammer."

Exactly. The Sates must compel everybody to keep Sunday "*that* the spiritual temple of God may be built." And then they will call that a *civil* statute! If such a statute as that would be a *civil* one, then what would be required to make a religious statute? But suppose the toiler should then refuse to go to hear that invitation; what then? Will the State compel him to go? If not, why not? The State compels him to keep Sunday *that* he may hear the invitation; now is the State to allow its good offices to be set at naught, and its purposes frustrated by the

toiler's refusing to hear the invitation? And the church having gained the recognition of the State to that extent, is she going to stop short of her object? Other quotations will answer these questions.

Dr. W. W. Everts, of Chicago, said:—

"This day is set apart for divine worship and preparation for another life. It is the test of all religion. The people who do not keep the Sabbath have no religion."

Is it then the province of the State to pass and enforce statutes in the interests of divine worship? Is it in the nature of a *civil* statute to prepare men for another life? "It is the test of all religion," says the Doctor. Then what is the enforcement of the Sabbath but the enforcement of a religious test? And what is the application of it to "candidates and political officers" but the *application of a religious test*? And what is that but an open violation of the Constitution of the United States, which says, "No religious test shall be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States"? It is true that, under the decisions of the United States Supreme Court, this provision of the Constitution does not prohibit the application of any religious test as a qualification to any officer under any *State*. And if there be no such provision as this in the State Constitution, these preachers of Illinois, and of all the other States, can go ahead unrestrained in the application of their religious test to all the candidates for *State* offices. But there is one thing certain, and that is, Sunday being "the test of all religion," *no Sunday-law test can ever be applied to any candidate* for the House of Representatives, for the Senate, or for any other office or public trust under the United States, without a direct violation of the Constitution of the United States as it is.

Further, says the Doctor, "The people who do not keep the Sabbath have no religion." The antithesis of this is likewise true. The people who *do* keep the Sabbath *have* religion. Therefore this demand for laws to compel people to keep the Sabbath, is a demand for laws to compel people to be *religious*. And yet they have the face to call it "the civil Sabbath."

Again Doctor Everts says:—

"He who does not keep the Sabbath does not worship God, and he who does not worship God is lost."

Perfectly true, Doctor. The antithesis of this also is true, He who *does* keep the Sabbath, *does* worship God. Therefore your demand for laws to compel men to keep the Sabbath, is a demand for laws to compel them to worship God. And that is only to introduce the system of the Papacy and of the Inquisition. There is no use for you to deny that you want laws to compel the observance of the Sabbath, and that, too, with the idea of worship, because in the very next sentence you say,—

"The laboring class are apt to rise late on Sunday mornings, read the Sunday papers, and allow the *hour of worship* to go by unheeded."

Here are the steps plainly to be taken, as surely as these ambitious clerics ever get the slightest recognition of their Sunday-law demands. First, a law compelling all labor to cease on Sunday. Then the laboring class will read the

Sunday papers, and so allow the hour of worship to go unheeded; consequently there must be, secondly, a law abolishing all Sunday papers. But suppose then these people take to reading *books*, and let the hour of worship go by unheeded, then, logically, there must be, thirdly, a law abolishing all reading of books on Sunday. But suppose they let the hour of worship go by unheeded anyhow, then, logically, there must be, fourthly, a law compelling them not to let the hour of worship go by unheeded. Having secured themselves in the first two of these steps, what is to hinder these divines from taking the other two, which just as logically follow, as the second follows the first? There is just nothing at all to hinder them. Well, then, having taken the first two, will they not take the other two? Anybody who thinks they will not, has studied human nature, and read history, to very little purpose. And anybody who thinks that they do not *intend* to take the other steps has read the Sunday-law propositions to very little purpose. Prof. Samuel Ives Curtis said in this convention: "We are not commanded to remember the Sabbath as a day of rest and recreation, but to 'keep it holy.'" And last spring in the Boston Monday Lectureship, Joseph Cook said:—

"The experience of centuries shows that you will in vain endeavor to preserve Sunday as a day of rest, *unless you preserve it as a DAY OF WORSHIP.*"

There, that ought to be plain enough to make anybody understand what is the purpose of the demand

248

for "civil" Sunday laws. The only safety is in never allowing them to secure themselves in the first step—that is, in never allowing them to secure any sort of a Sunday law. For just as soon as the so-called Protestant churches in this land become possessed of power to wield the civil power in the interests of religion, we shall have the Papacy over again.

But Doctor Everts continues: it is not enough that Sunday papers must be stopped in behalf of the churches, but Sunday trains must also be stopped, and for the same reason. He says:—

"The Sunday train is another great evil. They cannot afford to run a train unless they get a great many passengers, and *so break up a great many congregations.* The Sunday railroad trains are hurrying their passengers fast on to perdition. What an outrage that the railroad, that great civilizer, should destroy the Christian Sabbath!"

Oh, yes! The church-members, and the church-goers, will go on Sunday trains and Sunday excursions, etc. Therefore the *trains* are responsible and are hurrying their passengers on to perdition. Therefore by all means stop the Sunday trains, so as to keep the excellent church-members out of perdition, for if they have any chance they will go. Shut up the way to perdition, and then they will go to Heaven. They haven't enough religion, nor love of right, to do right, therefore they must have the State to take away all opportunity to do wrong. And these people will boast themselves of their religion, and their being Christians! It is difficult to see how a Sunday train can hurry anybody to perdition who does not ride on it. And if these church-members are hurried to perdition by Sunday trains,

who is to blame? Right here lies the secret of the whole evil—they blame everybody and everything else, even to inanimate things, for the irreligion, the infidelity, and the sin that lies in their own hearts.

The following statements made by Dr. Mandeville, in the convention, are literally true, in a good deal deeper sense than he intended:—

1. "There has been an alliance formed between the church and the world."

That is a fact, and it is going to ruin both.

2. "Let us not deny it."

Amen. We earnestly hope you will not. There is no use in trying to deny it. But instead of going about in the right way to remedy the evil, you set on foot a scheme to compel the world to act as though it were religious, and so to bind closer the alliance, and increase the evil.

3. "Influential men fasten themselves upon the church; a sort of political Christians."

Most decidedly true. And the most "influential" of these "political Christians," and the most of them are found in the pulpit; and they organize conventions and pass resolutions to give their "votes and support to those candidates or *political* officers who will pledge themselves *to vote* for the enactment and enforcing of statutes in favor of the *civil* Sabbath," "as a day of *worship*."

4. "Too many men are in the church for self-profit."

Indeed there are, a vast number too many.

5. "We pastors are to blame for allowing them to rule."

Yes; you are. You are especially to blame for those influential political Christians fastening themselves upon the church and ruling it, and trading off its votes through Sunday-law conventions. The churches themselves, however, are not clear of blame in this. They ought to rise up and turn out the whole company of these political Christians, and fill their pulpits with such Christians as care more for the love of Christ and the power of the Holy Spirit than they do for votes and the power of civil government!

But the following statements by the same gentleman, we do not suppose have any deeper meaning than he intends:—

1. "The subject has two sides. We must not look alone at the religious side. The interests of the Church and State are united."

And yet you are all opposed to a union of Church and State, aren't you?

2. "The merchants of Tyre insisted upon selling goods near the temple on the Sabbath, and Nehemiah compelled the officers of the law to do their duty and stop it. So we can compel the officers of the law to do their duty. . . . When the church of God awakes and does its duty on one side, and the State on the other, we shall have no further trouble in this matter."

Yes, we remember how it was before. The gentle Albigenses in the south of France greatly disturbed the church. They refused to obey its commands. But the church was wide awake, for Innocent III. was Pope; and he awoke the State with the call, "Up, most Christian king, up, and aid us in our work of vengeance!" And thus with the church awake to its duty (?) on one side, and the State on the other,

the Albigenses were swept from the earth, and there was no further trouble in that matter. Woe, worth the day, and thrice woe to the people, when the religious power can compel the civil. And that is precisely what this Elgin Sunday-law Convention proposes to do.

It would seem from Dr. Mandeville's citation of the example of Nehemiah that they intend to set up a theocracy here. If not, there is no force in his argument, from that instance. But from the following it is quite certain that that is what they have in view. Prof. C. A. Blanchard said:—

"In this work we are undertaking for the Sabbath, we are representatives of the Lord God."

Therefore it follows that when they vote to support those candidates and political officers who will pledge themselves, etc., they will vote as the representatives of God. And if any of themselves should secure votes enough to send them to the Legislature or to Congress, they would go there and legislate as representatives of God. And when they get into their hands the power to enforce the law, and to compel the civil power to do their bidding, they will do it all as the representatives of God. And thus again it is demonstrated that if these influential "political Christians" once get the Sunday law for which they are so diligently working, we shall have in this nation a living image of the Papacy. And again we say the only safety is in not letting them secure the enactment of any sort of a Sunday law, nor anything else through which they may dominate the civil power.

NOTE.—We have not selected all these quotations about the *religious* Sabbath, and left out what was said about the civil Sabbath. We have carefully read the whole report, and we state it as the literal truth that outside of the resolutions, there is not in all the report a single sentence about a *civil* Sabbath. It is all religious and that only. And yet, just like the California Sunday-law Convention, when it came to putting the thing in form to get votes and legislation they deftly inserted the word "civil." All this goes to show what we have often stated, that there is no such thing as a civil Sabbath; and it shows that these men do not really intend to secure, nor to enforce, a "civil" Sunday law, but a religious one wholly.

J.

May 4, 1888

"The Presbyterian Cardinal" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 17 , pp. 264, 265.

HENRY M. FIELD, D. D., is one of the foremost men of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and a man of much more than national reputation. He is editor of the New York *Evangelist*, which appears to be the official organ of the Presbyterian Church in the East. He is, we believe the only Protestant ecclesiastic who has entered upon a set discussion with the representative of infidelity—Colonel Ingersoll. He is quite an extensive traveler, and has written books about his travels which have a wide circulation. Last summer he traveled

in Spain, and wrote a book entitled "Old Spain and New Spain," in which he pays flattering tribute to the Catholic Church, and its influence in Spain, as being in harmony with the institutions of the country. Of this book the *New York Observer* says:—

"From a Protestant point of view, such an extensive charity towards a system which in all times and lands has been hostile to liberty, and oppressive in the last degree, we can neither understand nor sympathize with. There are doubtless many devout persons who are Romanists, but the Roman Church is corrupt and cruel; under its present rulers it seeks not so much salvation of souls as the political control of States and nations, and its supremacy in any country is the signal for decline in piety, morality, and prosperity. We therefore regret that so interesting and attractive a book should be pervaded by a spirit so favorable to the chief enemy of Protestantism."

265

Doctor Field, very properly, as will be seen further on, sent a copy of this book to Cardinal Gibbons.

Early in February Doctor Field was in Washington City, and attended a reception given in honor of Cardinal Gibbons, to whom he personally paid his respects. At this, somebody in Washington addressed Doctor Field, expressing surprise and pain that any Protestant minister, and much more such a prominent and influential one, should so far forget his profession and compromise his dignity. It is true the writer of the letter did not sign his name, in which he showed a trait which was unbecoming if not cowardly. Doctor Field printed the letter in the *Evangelist*, and in reply administered a strong rebuke, not only to the writer of the letter, but also to all who concur in the sentiments expressed in the letter. He calls it "a piece of gross impertinence;" says that he prints it "as a specimen of the narrowness which exists in the minds of some well-meaning, but very simple (not to say silly) people;" and further says:—

"It is not that we take any personal offense at his communication, that we notice it; but because it is the manifestation of a spirit which itself needs to be rebuked—a disposition to stand entirely aloof from Roman Catholics, which we believe is most mischievous to the church and to the country."

Somebody sent to Cardinal Gibbons a copy of the *Evangelist* which contained this letter and the reply to it. This, with the present of Mr. Field's book, drew from the Cardinal a very gracious letter, which in its turn so pleased the editor of the *Evangelist* that he gushed clear over. We insert the matter just as it stands in the *Evangelist* of March 29, 1888:—

"Private correspondence is commonly of interest only to the parties, and of no concern whatever to the public. But a man in high position is a public character, in whose personality all may feel a legitimate interest. And if it discloses itself in a letter written with the freedom of private correspondence, it may, with his consent, be seen by the eyes of others. Certainly few men in Church or State

hold so high a dignity as our only Cardinal, the head of the Roman Catholic Church in America. His letter drew out of a slight incident—our attendance at a reception given him in Washington, for which some unknown person in that city wrote us a very sharp letter, which, instead of throwing into the fire, we published, and answered as we thought it deserved. It is correspondence someone sent to the Cardinal, which called forth the following, that we now have his full consent to give to the public:—

"CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE, 408 N. Charles Street,
Baltimore, March 6, 1888,

REV. DEAR SIR: I beg to thank you very cordially for the copy of your work, "Old Spain and New Spain," which you kindly sent me through Mrs. Callan. From the praise which she bestows on it, I am sure I will read it with interest and pleasure. In a postscript he adds: "Since writing the foregoing, I have read with great satisfaction and edification your beautiful tribute to the good Archbishop Granada. Had you lived in the days of Ignatius Loyola, I am sure you would have revered and cherish the man on account of his burning love for Christ."]

"I avail myself of this occasion by tendering to you my sincere expression of gratitude for your manly and well-merited rebuke to the writer who had the hardihood to expostulate with you for attending the reception given to me at Mrs. Admiral Milgram's. I was delighted to meet yourself and your honored brothers on that occasion, but you are risen still higher in my estimation by your noble reply to the writer in question. Such men as that writer exhibit very little of Christian charity and do much to make the enemies of Christianity . . .

"Your words, on the contrary, serve to remind all that if we cannot agree in matters of faith, I should never be wanting in the courtesy and urbanity which Christians of all denominations owe to one another.

"I am with great regard, yours faithfully in Christ, JAMES CARD,
GIBBONS, *Abp. Baltimore*,
'REV. H. M. FIELD, D.D.'

Could anything be more gentle than this? Can anyone detect in it the slightest tone of arrogance? The writer does not assume that the Roman Catholic Church is the only Christian body on earth; on the contrary, he distinctly recognizes 'Christians of all denominations,' and asks only for the 'courtesy and urbanity' which all Christians 'owe to one another.' The gentleness of the letter is the best answer to the . . . intolerance which will not recognize a Christian faith or Christian life anywhere but within the narrow bounds of its own sect. Comparing it with . . . one in which a correspondent (who did not dare even to sign his name to his own letter) undertook to call us to account, we think our readers will

agree that the Cardinal may well say that 'such men as that writer exhibit very little of Christian charity, and do much to make the enemies of Christianity rejoice.' Are we to refuse the outstretched hand of one who signs himself, 'Yours faithfully IN CHRIST—that blessed name which is the bond that holds the world together?'"

This is a good specimen of the mawkishness that now passes for the best Protestantism; with the exception, however, that this is the first instance in which we have seen Mr. Gibbons acknowledged as a Cardinal outside of the Catholic Church. We do not know exactly in what sense it is that Doctor Field uses the word "our" in calling Mr. Gibbons "*our* only Cardinal." We do not know whether he uses it as a representative Presbyterian, or whether he presumes to speak for the whole nation. If he speaks as a representative Presbyterian, and thus acknowledges Mr. Gibbons as the Presbyterian Cardinal, as well as a Catholic Cardinal, then we have nothing to say, it is their right to do so if they choose. Nevertheless we shall watch with considerable interest to see whether there are any Protestants in the Presbyterian Church, or whether they have gone bodily over to allegiance to their "only Cardinal, the head of the Roman Catholic Church in America."

If Mr. Field has in this taken it upon himself to speak for the whole nation, and for the nation to acknowledge Mr. Gibbons as our only Cardinal, then, as American citizens, we do most decidedly protest. He is not our Cardinal in any sense. The United States knows no Cardinal, it recognizes no such dignity as a Cardinalate. And as for Doctor Field's saying that "certainly few men in Church or State hold so high a dignity as our only Cardinal," it is utterly false. So far as the church is concerned, the humblest Christian in it holds an infinitely higher dignity than does Doctor Field's "only Cardinal." And as for the State, there is not an American citizen in this Union, who appreciates what American citizenship is, who does not hold a dignity vastly greater than that of Doctor Field's only Cardinal, who is bound in a contemptible vassalage to a foreign and despotic lord.

But the strangest thing in this whole connection is to see how unquestioningly Doctor Field accepts the dignity of a disciple of Loyola, conferred upon him by his Cardinal in the words: "Had you lived in the days of Ignatius Loyola, I am sure you would have revered and cherished the man on account of his burning love for Christ." Not only does the Doctor unquestioningly accept this high honor, but he shows his high appreciation of it by acknowledging the donor as "our only Cardinal."

We believe that Cardinal Gibbons is entirely correct in his estimate. We do not doubt at all that had Henry M. Field, D. D., "lived in the days of Ignatius Loyola, he would have revered and cherished the man in his burning" fanaticism—"burning" in more senses of the word than one, as is abundantly proved by the dreadful history of the Jesuits in every nation. We do not doubt at all that had Doctor Field lived in the days of Ignatius Loyola, he would have stood with him and his Jesuitism against Luther and Protestantism. Doctor Field accepts the discipleship of Loyola which his "only Cardinal" gives him. Loyola was the founder of the Society of the Jesuits. He was a Spaniard. Spain has

seen more of Jesuitism than has any other nation. Jesuitism may fairly be said to be a Spanish institution. Doctor Field spent part of a summer there, and flatters the influence of the Catholic Church there as being in harmony with the institutions of the country. Now let us have an estimate of Jesuitism and its influence, recorded by a native Spaniard who has spent his life in that country and knows its history as he knows its language. SeÒor Castelar says of Jesuitism:—

"Never was there founded an institution so openly at war with the spirit of its time. The sixteenth century was the century of renovation; Jesuitism a sect of relapse. The sixteenth century founded the liberty of thought; Jesuitism founded intellectual slavery. The one tended to religious reform, the other to religious reaction; the one celebrated the emancipation of the conscience, the other adored the person of the Pope; the one heard the divine voice, the Holy Spirit, in the idea of every man, the other saw God only in traditional and ecclesiastical authority; the one wrenched the conscience away from Rome, the other returned to Rome the absolute dominion over time and eternity. Never in human memory has there existed a religious association, regular and secular at once, equally at home in palaces and in deserts, lying in wait for the courtier, the minister, and the monarch, as well as for the savage lost in the pampas of America or the forests of Asia; never, I repeat, was there a religious association like this, founded upon absolute authority and obedience, which with such sovereign command exacted the subjugation of man and his living spirit, his indomitable liberty, his unconquerable inclinations to the cold apathy of a corpse."—*Harper's Monthly Magazine*, October, 1878.

Another writer speaking of the wounds which turned Loyola from a soldier into a fanatic, says:—

"They were the cause of many an *auto-dasft* in Italy, and of a persecution worse than that of Diocletion in Spain. . . . They led to the massacre of St. Bartholomew's, the death of Mary Queen of Scots, the Spanish Armada, the Gunpowder Plot. They disturbed the New World, gave rise to many deeds of self-denial and piety, and many horrible crimes and woes. They were felt in distant Russia. They aroused the Poles against the Russians, and excited a fierce war in which Poland inflicted injuries upon its feeble neighbors that have scarcely yet been expiated in seas of blood. They spread their fatal influence over China, and stirred that vast empire with a violent impulse. They were felt in Ethiopia and Hindostan, in Canada and Brazil; they gave rise, in fact, to the company of the Jesuits.—*Eugene Lawrence, Historical Studies*, p. 99.

Loyola himself procured the erection of the inquisition in Portugal, in 1545-46. And yet to be commended by a Papal Cardinal, as one who "would have revered and cherished" such a man as this, the international founder of such a system as

this, is considered by Doctor Field as of sufficient honor to deserve in return the grateful platitude that "certainly few men in Church or State hold so high a dignity as *our only Cardinal*"!! We do not wonder at all that the Cardinal gave his "full consent" that the letter should be published in the editorial columns of the *Evangelist*. Nothing pleases "our only Cardinal" better than to see the Presbyterians recognizing in him "so high a dignity," and acknowledging as their "only Cardinal the head of the Roman Catholic Church in America." Protestants there are yet some, but Protestantism is dead.

J.

May 11, 1888

"Not an 'Enduring Morality'" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 18 , pp. 278, 279.

SOMETHING over two years ago the Presbyterian Synod of New York appointed a committee on Religion and Public Education to consider and report upon the following resolution:—

"*Resolved*, That the Presbyterian Synod of the State of New York, believing that the lessons of history and the traditions of American liberty forbid the union of Church and State, *discriminates between sectarianism and religion*, and affirms that so far as public education is concerned, an enduring morality must derive its sanctions, not from policy, nor from social customs, nor from public opinion, but from those fundamental religious truths which are common to all sects, and distinctive of none,

"It therefore urges upon its members the imperative necessity of opposing the attitude of indifference to religion, which appears both in public-school manuals, and in the educational systems of reformatories, and, at the same time, of using every proper influence to secure the incorporation with the course of State and national instruction, of the following religious truths as a groundwork of national morality, viz.:—

"1. The existence of a personal God.

"2. The responsibility of every human being to God.

"3. The deathlessness of the human soul as made in the image of God, after the power of an endless life.

"4. The reality of a future spiritual state beyond the grave in which every soul shall give account of itself before God, and shall reap that which it has sown."

That is a queer sort of a resolution on religion to be passed by a body of men who pretend to know anything about the religion of Christ. In the four "religious truths" which they set forth as "a groundwork of national morality," they certainly have made a success of getting those "which are common to all sects and

distinctive of none;" for there is not one point in the four that is not accepted by nine-tenths of the people on earth.

The Unitarian, the Trinitarian, the Jew, the Mohammedan, and the heathen can all accept every point named. As to "the existence of a personal God," whether it be Buddha, or Joss, or Allah, or Jehovah, it is all right: all that is necessary is to assent to the *existence* of a *personal* God. And there is nobody that believes in any sort of a god at all who does not believe in man's personal responsibility to him. "The deathlessness of the human soul" has been believed by the great majority of the race, almost ever since Satan told Eve that she should not die. And if a person believes that the soul is *deathless*, it is not likely to be very hard for him to believe that it is made after the power of an "*endless life*." The fourth point is already contained in the second and third, and it is difficult to see what they want to gain by repeating it.

But the worst thing about it is that there is not in the whole statement a word or a hint about Christ, no more than if there were no such person in existence. And yet it is proposed by a body of professed Christians, as a statement of "religious truths." More than this, they make the whole thing but a piece of infidelity by resolving that "an enduring morality must derive its sanctions . . . from those

279

fundamental religious [*sic*] truths which are common to all sects and distinctive of none." The truth is, a person may believe all four of the points named and yet not have a particle of morality in him. All men have made themselves immoral by transgression of the moral law. And no man can attain to morality except by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. "An enduring morality" can only be secured by an abiding faith in Jesus Christ. And when these men make "an enduring morality" to derive its sanctions from these fundamental religious truths "which are common to all sects, and distinctive of none," they in that set Christ aside and present to men the hope of an enduring morality without him. But such a hope is a spider's web instead of an anchor of the soul. God forbid that such morality shall ever become national.

As was to be expected, the report says:—

"The earliest efforts of your committee were directed towards ascertaining the attitude of the Roman Catholics. Archbishop Corrigan, of New York, and Vicar-Generals Quinn and Preston, besides many leading priests and writers of the Roman Catholic persuasion, were interviewed, with the most satisfactory results."

Now just see what that committee counts as "a most satisfactory result." A member of this committee wrote a letter to Archbishop Corrigan, "requesting for publication a distinct statement of the position which the Roman Catholics would be likely to assume." Vicar-General Preston answered the letter as follows:—

"The Most Rev. Archbishop desires me in his name to say in response to your letter that the Catholic Church has always insisted, and must always insist, upon the teaching of religion with education. For this reason we cannot patronize the public schools, and are forced to establish our own parochial schools. The question, where there are many different denominations, each with

its own creed, is a difficult one to settle. We could be satisfied with nothing less than the teaching of our *whole faith*. Protestant denominations, if they value their own creeds, ought to feel as we do.

"*Denominational schools* are, to our mind, the only solution of the question. This plan should satisfy everyone, and would save the State a vast outlay of expense.

"The *points* you propose, while better than none, would never satisfy us, and we think they ought not to satisfy many of the Protestant churches; while the infidels, who are now very numerous, would certainly reject them.

"We believe that the country will yet see the ruinous effects of an education from which religion has been excluded. With sincere respects on the part of the Archbishop and myself.

"Yours very truthly,

T. S. PRESTON, V. G.

"Rev. GEO. SHIPMAN PAYSON."

Then says the committee:—

"The position of the Roman Catholics upon the question, therefore, is well defined."

Indeed it is, a good deal better defined than is this Presbyterian spider's web. That is not a position at all, it is only a floating scheme trying to catch whatever element it can. What an edifying spectacle it is, indeed, to see a committee from the Presbyterian Synod of New York, soliciting the alliance of the Catholic Church, and that not only to meet with a rebuff, but to be snubbed with the reminder that Protestant denominations don't value their own creeds, and that the "points" proposed "ought not to satisfy many of the Protestant churches!" And then, more than all, to find the committee reporting this as a "most satisfactory" result! Well, well, what will the committee do next? We have not the least doubt, however, that they will do as was suggested by the National Reformers seven years ago—they will "make repeated advances," and allow themselves to be subjected to repeated "rebuffs," to get Rome's "co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it." Because, "it is one of the *necessities* of the situation."

J.

"Connecting Links Between Church and State" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 19 , p. 296.

IN the *Homiletic Review* for December, 1887, Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D., has an article on "The Connecting Links between Church and State," and says that there are three of these links, namely, Marriage, Sunday, and the Public School. That is, these are the three links which form the union of Church and State in the United States. From the adoption of the Constitution until lately, it has ever been the just pride of this Nation, that in its form of government, Church and State were wholly separate; and that with religion the State had nothing to do, but left

that matter just where it rightly belongs, as solely pertaining to the individual's personal relations between himself and God. Within the last few years, however, there has been a notable change of view in regard to this subject, in both its phases, especially on the part of prominent theologians and would be church leaders.

One class of these insist that the propagation of religious opinions is an essential prerogative of civil government, and therefore they wit "undying enthusiasm" are determined to have the National Constitution and laws so altered as to make their views effective. Of this class the leaders of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the National Reform Association are the representatives. The other class insist that in this Government there is already a union of Church and State. Of these Dr. Schaff is the principal one, and this article in the *Homiletic Review* is his statement of the case. It would be an easy task to show the causes of this change of base on the part of the Church and State religionists, but we shall not enter upon that at this time. We want to notice Dr. Schaff's "Links."

He starts out with this proposition:—

"A total separation of Church and State is an impossibility, unless we cease to be a Christian people."

He offers not a particle of proof in support of this statement, while proof is the very thing that is most needed. He assumes that the people of the United States are Christians, while not one in ten of them are Christians. The Doctor ought to have offered some proof; assumptions are *not* proof. But, granting his assumption that this is a Christian people, and this a Christian Nation, his proposition is yet defective, because he says that, that being so, "a total separation of Church and State is an impossibility." However, to call this defective is not enough—it is totally wrong. For the precept of Christ *does* make a total separation of Church and State. The word of Christ is, "Render unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." There is no question at all that by the term "Cesar" the Saviour means the State—the civil government. Here duty lies in two directions—to God and to the State. To each is to be rendered that which is his—to God that which is God's, to the State that which is the State's. Now the church of Christ is God's; that which is rendered to the church is rendered to God, because it is "the church of the living God." The church is not Cesar's, it is God's. That which pertains to the church does not and cannot pertain to the State; that which is to be rendered to the church is not to be, and cannot be, rendered to the State; because the church is God's, and that which is God's must be rendered to him and not to the State. Therefore it is demonstrated that in these words the Lord Jesus has totally, and forever, separated the church from the State. And therefore Doctor Schaff's proposition is contrary to the word of Christ.

Dr. Schaff counts marriage as one of the connecting links that unite Church and State. But this is impossible without making marriage a *sacrament of the church* and confining it to that, as the Papacy has assumed the power to do, and so to count all marriages as only concubinage which are not solemnized by the church. But this it is impossible to do, because marriage *belongs to the race*. It

no more belongs to Christians than to pagans. It is an original institution, and knows no distinctions. It be- [sic.] belongs equally to atheists, infidels, Jews, heathen, and Christians—all alike, and to one class no more than to another. And as the institution belongs to all classes that can be found in civil government; and *as it relates to man in his relations to his fellow-men*; its regulation is properly within the province of civil government. As a matter of fact, marriage is no more a "connecting link" between Church and State, than is life, or property, or character.

But when the Doctor comes to the discussion of his second "connecting link," the Sunday, he makes a good deal worse mixture than he does with his first. We quote the whole paragraph:—

"The Christian Sabbath, or weekly day of rest, is likewise protected by legislation, and justly so, because it has a civil as well as a religious side; it is necessary and profitable for the body as well as for the soul; it is of special benefit to the laboring classes, and guards them against the tyranny of capital. The Sabbath antedates the Mosaic legislation, and is, like the family, founded in the original constitution of man, for whose temporal and spiritual benefit it was institute by the God of creation."

This paragraph is as full of error as an egg is full of meat. We have not space to fully set forth all the errors that it contains, but we shall call attention to some. The most prominent token of error that it bears is, that it contradicts itself. He first calls it "the Christian Sabbath," and then says that it is "founded in the original constitution of man." But Christianity is not an original institution. How, then, can the Sabbath be "founded in the original constitution of man," and be at the same time the "*Christian* Sabbath"? It cannot be; it is a moral impossibility. Christian institutions are peculiar to the system of redemption through Christ; but the Sabbath antedates the system of redemption. The Sabbath was instituted before man had sinned, before he needed to be redeemed. It would have been kept by man had he never sinned; but had he never sinned, there never would have been any Christianity, nor any Christian institutions. Consequently it is impossible for the Sabbath to be the "*Christian*" Sabbath. It is utterly a misnomer to call it the Christian Sabbath. The only names the Author of the Sabbath has ever given it are "the Sabbath of the Lord," and, "the Lord's day."

Let these titles, which alone the Author of the Sabbath has given to that institution, be put alongside of his own words in relation to what men owe to civil government, and see how the matters stands. He calls it "the Sabbath of the Lord," and, "the Lord's day." He says, "Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and *unto God the things that are God's*." The Sabbath is *the Lord's*. It is *the Lord's* day. Therefore it is to be rendered to the Lord. The Sabbath pertains not to Cesar. It is not Cesar's in any sense. It is the Lord's. Therefore, the Sabbath being the Lord's and not Cesar's, it is proved by the words of Christ that the civil government has nothing at all to do with it. This annihilates at once the Doctor's idea that the Sabbath "has a civil as well as a religious side." The word of God says that the Sabbath is the Lord's, and Christ distinctly separates that which is the Lord's from that which is Cesar's; therefore, when Dr. Schaff or anybody else attempts [sic.] to pass off the Sabbath as both civil and religious [sic.], as pertaining both to God and to Cesar, he confounds that

which Christ has clearly distinguished, and virtually charges Christ with loose thinking.

The commandment of God does not say, Remember the Sabbath day to keep it *civilly*; it does say, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it *holy*." The Sabbath is wholly a religious institution; man's observance of it pertains wholly to the Lord. Therefore when the State undertakes to enforce the observance of the Sabbath, it thereby demands that to Cesar shall be rendered that which is God's; and in that it usurps the place of God. That which is the Lord's we are to render to him direct, without any meddling mediumship of Cesar. When we have rendered to Cesar that which is his, we have rendered to him all his due, and when he has so received his due, he has no right to demand any more. And it is none of his business how men render to God that which is God's, or whether they render it at all or not.

All this is written in regard to the State and the Sabbath of the Lord. It is Sunday, however, that Dr. Schaff presents as the second connecting link which forms the union of Church and State in our country. And, indeed, this must of his article is true. Sunday *is* the link which connects Church and State, whenever the State has anything to do with it in the way of legislation. But whereas the Sabbath of the Lord belongs to God, though not to Cesar, the Sunday sabbath belongs neither to God nor to Cesar. There is no command of God for it. It is wholly an institution of the Church. The church instituted the practice of Sunday observance; the first Sunday law that ever was issued—that by Constantine—was at the request of the church, and was expressly to favor the church; and that has been the only purpose of Sunday legislation from that time to this. And *that* is why it is that Sunday is in truth the "connecting link" that forms the union between the *Church* and the State. But the more permanently that link is severed amongst all people, the better it is for both Church and State. There has never yet been a union of Church and State that has not tended only the more to corrupt both. And it never can be otherwise. The church of Christ is espoused "as a chaste virgin to Christ," and she cannot join herself to any other, without forsaking her Lord and making herself an adulteress.

Let no one blame us for saying that there is no command of God for keeping Sunday, and that it is an institution of the church. We make the statements just as we find them, and we find them made by what is certainly high authority. The American Tract Society issues a \$500 prize-essay on the subject, which says of the "Christian Sabbath," that there is "complete silence of the New Testament so far as any explicit command" "or definite rules for its observance are concerned." And the American Sunday-school Union issues a \$1,000 prize-essay on the same subject, which says: "Up to the time of Christ's death there had been no change in the day." And "so far as the record shows, they [the apostles] did not give any explicit command enjoining the abandonment of the seventh-day Sabbath, and its observance on the first day of the week." And this \$500 essay also fixes upon Sunday as a sacred day only by "a *consensus* of the Christian church." Now, according to the word of Christ, which we are here discussing, men owe duty in but two directions—to God and to Cesar. But Sunday observance belongs to neither of these, but to "the church." Therefore as Sunday

observance belongs neither to God nor to civil government, there is no power in existence that can of right command it; and there is no obligation resting upon any soul to observe it.

Dr. Schaff's third "connecting link," the public school, we must defer till next week.

J.

May 25, 1888

"Doctor Schaff and the Public School" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 20 , pp. 311, 312.

THE third of Doctor Schaff's "links" between Church and State, is, "The Public School." He confesses that,—

"Positive religious instruction is the duty of the family and the church, which has the commission to teach all nations the way of life. The State cannot be safely intrusted with this duty."

That is all true. The State cannot teach Christian religion, or Christian morality, because, as we showed in last week's SIGNS, it has not the credentials for it. That work is committed to the church alone. It is the church which is "the pillar and ground of the truth." It was the church which was commissioned to go "into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." It is with the church that Christ promised to be till the end of the world. Without the presence and help of the Holy Spirit, no religious teaching can ever be effectual. But it is the church, which is "an habitation of God through the Spirit." None of these things are spoken to the State or of the State. None of these things pertain to the State. But without these things no effectual religious instruction can ever be possible. Therefore it is perfectly certain that the State never can, with any propriety whatever, take it upon itself to give religious instruction. It is indeed true that "the State cannot be safely intrusted with this duty."

But, as in this we perfectly agree with Doctor Schaff's statements, the reader may query wherein we sufficiently disagree with him to justify the writing of an article on the subject? It is in this: Although the Doctor grants that to the church and not to the State belongs the work of imparting religious instruction, yet he insists that religious instruction shall be given in public schools at the public expense. Now, as this work belongs to the church, and cannot be intrusted to the State, and as this work must be done in the public school, at the public expense, it therefore follows that Doctor Schaff proposes that the church shall use the machinery of the State with which to do her own work. In this way he makes the public school a "link" between Church and State. But we deny the right of the church to use the State for any such purpose. We protest that the church shall do her work herself, with the means which God has appointed her, and with no other; for whatsoever is more than this is sin. If the church cannot do her own appointed work with the means which God has appointed her, she cannot do it at all. If the church cannot do her own appointed work with the

means which God has appointed her, she cannot do it at all. If the church cannot impart religious instruction without the help of the State, she cannot impart it *with* the help of the State. If the church possesses enough of the presence and power of the Spirit of God, to make her instruction effectual, she will not need the help of the State; and if she lacks that power her instruction will not be effectual even though the doors of every public school building in the nation be opened to her.

It is particularly interesting to notice the Doctor's plans for imparting religious instruction in the public schools. He says:—

"The Catholics certainly have a right to demand

312

the Douay version as a substitute for that of King James, and both might be read, the one to the Catholic the other to the Protestant pupils."

There are some questions that we should like to have answered on this proposition: 1. Is the same teacher to give instruction from the Douay version to the Catholics, and from King James's to the Protestants? or shall there be two teachers—a Catholic and a Protestant—in every school? 2. If the Catholics have "*a right to demand* the Douay version," and the Protestants have a right to demand King James's version, then why is it that those who are neither Catholics nor "orthodox" Protestants, have not "*a right*" to demand that there shall be no version at all used in the public schools? or is it true that all rights belong along to Catholics and "Protestants"? 3. Is it so wholly essential to the welfare of the nation that the Catholic "demands" shall be satisfied more than those of any other people in the nation?

The reason which Doctor Schaff gives why the State cannot be safely intrusted with this duty, is that,—

"It might teach Rationalism, as is actually done in a great many public schools and universities of Germany, Holland, and Switzerland."

Therefore to make it certain that there shall be just the proper kind of teaching in the public schools of our country, he offers this plan:—

"The State may, if necessary, allow the different denominations to monopolize certain school hours in the school building for religious instruction."

Let us look at this a moment. The school day consists of about *six* hours, and the State is to allow the different denominations to monopolize certain of these hours in the school-room. Of the "different denominations" there are the Catholic, Episcopalian, five of the Methodist, eight of the Baptist, ten of the Presbyterian, Unitarian, Universalist, and two Adventist—this makes at least *thirty-two* "different denominations" who are to monopolize certain of the *six* school hours in the school building. Now will the Doctor have the State distribute the six hours of the school day equally among these thirty-two denominations? If so where is the State to get in any other instruction? Or will Dr. Schaff have each of the "different denominations" monopolize one hour a day in its turn? If that be it, then let us see—there are twenty school days in a month, and there are thirty-two different denominations. As it would take more than six weeks to go round once, there would be given to the different pupils but one hour of religious instruction in about

six weeks. Then the same question again arises, During this round of "religious instruction" how are the regular teachers to get anything else into the minds of the pupils to any purpose? Or would the doctor have all thirty-two of the "different denominations" go to "the school building" and monopolize an hour each day all together?!! That would be Babel risen again indeed.

And, says the Doctor:—

"In this way the problem of united secular, and separate religious, instruction could be solved, at least to the reasonable satisfaction of the great majority."

It is perfectly safe to say that in this way the problem could *not* be solved to the reasonable satisfaction of any reasoning person in the nation. The "different denominations" themselves would not be satisfied with it; those who belong to none of the different denominations could not be satisfied with it; nor could the school authorities be satisfied with it. The truth of the matter is, that an attempt to carry into effect any such scheme would be the utter destruction of the whole public-school system. From another sentence in the same paragraph the Doctor seems to imply that the regular teachers of the schools are to do the work of the religious, as well as the secular, instruction. He says:—

"In communities which are sufficiently homogeneous one teacher would answer; in others two or more might be chosen, and the children divided into classes according to the will of the parents or guardians."

A community sufficiently homogeneous to require but one teacher, would consist of but one denomination. But how many such school districts can be found in the United States? The places where two or more teachers would be required, would be of course where there are two or more "different denominations," and there would necessarily have to be as many teachers as there might be different denominations. Or does Doctor Schaff intend that the teachers in the schools shall all be so polemically versatile that any one of them shall be able to give religious instruction in harmony with the religious views of any one or all of the different denominations? Then, again, who is to examine the teachers, and pass upon their qualifications to impart the requisite amount and the quality of such religious instruction? Oh! that important office would fall to the church, of course. And thus we are brought round again to the point which we made at the first, that Dr. Schaff's proposition, and that of everybody else who proposes to put religious instruction into the public schools, is only a scheme to secure to the church the help of the State in furthering her own aims, and so the "connecting link between Church and State" is to be formed.

How it would be possible to frame a scheme of public instruction more utterly absurd than is set forth in this essay by Dr. Schaff it would be difficult to conceive. And how any man of the standing of Dr. Schaff could get off such a perfect medley of nonsense, would be surprising were it not patent on the very face of public affairs that the emasculated Protestantism of to-day has set itself to secure control of the power of the State to wield it in its own interests, and it is willing to countenance any absurd scheme, and propose any sort of a compromise, to gain

the support of the Roman Church, because its managers know that they cannot win without this. This is shown by another statement from the Doctor:—

"Possibly the more liberal portion of our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens might agree to such a compromise" (as is proposed in the statements which we have quoted).

There is a good deal being said about the danger to our institutions, from Romanism. There is such danger, but it lies not in Romanism direct, but in this degenerate Protestantism, ambitious of civil power, and willing to compromise with Rome to obtain it. This it is that needs to be constantly and carefully watched.

J.

June 1, 1888

"Misdirected 'Enthusiasm'" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 21 , pp. 326, 327.

THE annual address of the president of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, published some time since, is an important document. Not for any particular views of temperance or temperance methods, but because of its views of religion and politics, and of religio-political methods. We shall here note some of them. We could not attempt to notice the address in detail, for it occupies more than seven solid pages of the *Union Signal*. We shall quote the most striking passages. Addressing her beloved comrades, the president said:—

"The marshaling hosts of which you are the vanguard, represent the downfall of sectarianism in religion, and the death of sectionalism in politics. The bugle of your advance strikes the key-note of the church universal. . . . The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, local, State, national, and world-wide, has one vital, organic thought, one all-absorbing purpose, one undying enthusiasm, and that is that *Christ shall be this world's king*. Yea, verily, **THIS WORLD'S** king in its realm of cause and effect; king of its courts, its camps, its commerce; king of its colleges and cloisters; king of its customs and its constitutions."

The "undying enthusiasm" of these enthusiastic ladies will be dead more than a thousand and one years before ever they see any such thing as that. For it is "THIS WORLD," mark it, not the world to come, of which they have so enthusiastically set themselves to make Him the king—king of its courts, camps, cloisters, commerce, etc., etc.—and no such thing as that will ever be. The word of God says that when Christ comes to "THIS WORLD" as King of kings, and Lord of lords, "Out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. . . . And I saw the beast, and *the kings of the earth*, AND THEIR ARMIES, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken,

and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshiped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth; and all the fowls were filled with their flesh." See Rev. 19:11-21.

Again:—

"The kingdom of Christ 'must enter the realm of law through the gateway of politics.' . . . There are enough temperance men in both [the Democratic and Republican parties] to take possession of the Government and give us national prohibition in the party of the near future, which is to be the party of God. . . . We pray Heaven to give them no rest . . . until they shall . . . swear an oath of allegiance to Christ in politics, and march in one great army 'up to the polls to worship God.' . . . I firmly believe that the patient, steadfast work of Christian women will so react upon politics within the next generation that the party of God will be at the front."

And this maps out the result:—

"Concerning the platform of our next National Prohibition Convention, I am content to leave it substantially where it is, save that it should declare Christ and his law to be the true basis of government, and the supreme authority in national as in individual life. I greatly desire and hope that we may use our influence to secure this end. Such a declaration must be clearly divested of anything that looks toward a union of Church and State, to which all enlightened Christians are thoroughly opposed, but must as explicitly recognize Christ as the great world-force for righteousness and purity, and enthrone him King of nations in faith, as he will one day be in fact, through Christian politics and laws, no less than Christian living."

But how such a declaration as that is to be clearly divested of anything that looks toward a union of Church and State, is what we should like to know.

327

We wish the worthy president of the National W.C.T.U. had given some instruction, or at least some hint, as to how it is to be done. Notice, "It should declare Christ and his law to be the true basis of government, and the supreme authority in national as in individual life;" it must explicitly recognize Christ, "and enthrone him King of nations in faith." Now Christ is the head of the church, and the church is his body. Col. 1:18. Therefore if Christ be enthroned in national affairs, it is only the enthronement of the church in national affairs; if Christ be enthroned in the State, the church is thereby enthroned in the State, for the church is his body. To declare Christ and his law to be the supreme authority in national life, is inevitably to declare the *church* and its law to be the supreme authority in national life; and that is the most perfect union of Church and State; because the church is Christ's body, and you can't enthrone him without enthroning his body. This is the Scripture truth of the matter, and when the

Woman's Christian Temperance Union proposes to do what they here announce, and then at the same time proposes to divest it of anything that looks toward a union of Church and State, they are simply proposing to *divest Christ's body of his head*.

But that they can't do. And, in truth, they do not intend to try to do it. They fully propose to enthrone the church with their enthronement of its Head. It is impossible to do otherwise. And the veil of their being "thoroughly opposed" to a union of Church and State, under which they, and the National Reformers, altogether, endeavor to hide it, is exceedingly thin. It is said of Augustus that he "was sensible that mankind is governed by names; nor was he deceived in his expectation, that the Senate and people would submit to slavery, provided they were respectfully assured that they still enjoy their ancient freedom." These workers for political power in religious things, seem not to have forgotten the opinion nor the tactics of Augustus. They too seem to be fully sensible that mankind is governed by names; and their expectation seems to be that the people of this nation will submit to the slavery of a union of Church and State, provided that they are repeatedly told that there is no union of Church and State, and that "all enlightened Christians are thoroughly opposed" to it. The danger is that these aspirants to such illegitimate power will not be deceived in *their* expectations, any more than was Augustus in his.

Again we read:—

"To meet the new creation, how grandly men themselves are growing; how considerate and brotherly, how pure in word and deed."

Yes indeed! And if you want to see the proof of it, just read the dispatches in any principal daily, any day, in any part of the land.

This also we read in the address:—

"The W.C.T.U. and Prohibition party must join forces to stand for nationalism as against sectionalism; the future in politics as against the past; . . . and the everlasting prohibition of sin as against any alliance between sin and the Government."

Let "the W.C.T.U. and Prohibition party" be told that no political power now any civil government can ever of right have anything whatever to do with the prohibition of sin.

In Miss Willard's suggestions for 1888, under the heading of "Legal," is this:—

"Respectfully to request our brothers of the Prohibition party, when the time shall come to consider names for the greater political movement into which that party is to merge itself, to consider carefully the merits of the name 'Home Protection party,' as embodying its purpose and as educational to the people; also request them to continue to stand firm for the American Christian Sabbath; the Bible in our public schools; the enfranchisement of women as a means to prohibition; and make an open declaration that Christ and his law are the supreme authority in such government as they seek to establish in this republic.

"Designate a commission representative of the whole country, which shall bear these requests to our friends and allies, the men of the Prohibition party."

"To stand firm for the American Christian Sabbath," as she says in another place, "as a sacred institution." What is the American Christian Sabbath? and how did it become so? If it is Christian, how can it be American? And if it is American, what made it sacred? The Bible tells about the Sabbath of the Lord, but it nowhere speaks of any such things as a "Christian" Sabbath, much less does it say anything about an "American Christian" Sabbath. That must be an institution that is found outside of the Bible; and the question again arises, How did it become sacred?

"Stand firm for the Bible in our public schools." Which Bible? the Protestant Bible, or the Catholic Bible? which? Your "brothers" of the National Reform party propose to put the Catholic Bible into our public schools, even into the hands of the children of Protestants, wherever the Catholics are in the majority—that is, in New York, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Minnesota, California, and a number of other States. Ladies, please define your position.

Of all this and a good deal more after the same sort, "the audience manifested its appreciation by universal hand-clapping and waving of handkerchiefs." And "upon motion, it was accepted by almost unanimous vote as expressing the principles of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union." And by the same token it is abundantly shown that the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union is pledged to carry civil government into the realms of conscience in this nation.

J.

June 8, 1888

"The Plea for National Sunday Legislation" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 22 , pp. 343, 344.

APRIL 8, the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Senator Blair chairman, gave a hearing to arguments in support of the petitions of the W.C.T.U., for National Sunday Legislation. Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, D.D., delivered what seems to have been the principal production on the question. He has since presented the same argument in the Philadelphia National Reform Convention. The paper is entitled, "National Sabbath Reform." We propose to reproduce here some of his arguments, not only that we may examine them for their own sake, but also that they may be examined by our readers in the light of the principles stated in the report of the United States Senate, given on another page.

The petitions in support of which the argument was made, ask Congress to prohibit Sunday railroad trains, Sunday mails, and Sunday parades in the army and navy. The Doctor instances the railroad strikes, riots, and wrecks, as proof that the Sunday train is a national evil, and says:—

"There is abundance of evidence in the testimony of railroad men themselves of the fact that their Sabbath-breaking is closely related to their train-wrecking. They feel that, having broken one

commandment of God, they might as well go through the whole list. . . . It is a perilous thing to allow men to be started in law-breaking."

So, then, Dr. Crafts and his fellow-petitioners want Congress to set itself up as the guardian of the law of God, to define what is the law of God and what is its transgression—to define and to punish *sin*—for Mr. Crafts said also in this very connection that "most of the railroad work" "is a sin against God's law."

He demands that railroad trains shall be compelled to stop over Sunday wherever they may be when Sunday overtakes them, and then inquires:—

"Why may not a few railway passengers be detained for one day, even at some slight inconvenience or loss, on the same ground that steamboat passengers are detained in quarantine for a fortnight, namely, to protect the public health?"!!

Does the Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, D. D., mean seriously to assert that all steamboat passengers are detained in quarantine for a fortnight? He knows better. He knows that it is only the passengers of steamboats infected with cholera, or yellow fever, or small-pox, or some such deadly disease, that are detained in quarantine at all. Well, then, does he mean seriously to assert that a railroad train running on Sunday is as dangerous to the public health as is a cholera-infected steamboat? and that the train must therefore be quarantined on Sunday "to protect the public health"? If he does *not* mean this, then his argument is an utter *non sequiter*. And if he *does* mean this, then to what absurd lengths will men not run in their wild endeavors to find a basis for Sunday legislation? The lightning express on Sunday is as a streak of cholera, says the Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, D.D.; so it must be quarantined.

His next proposition is of the same piece. Here it is:—

"An inter-State commerce bill to protect the health of cattle is now before the Senate. Why not add another to protect the health of railroad men?"

Well, dear Doctor, there are several reasons for this. As you seem not to have discovered any, let us endeavor to enlighten you. There are several points of distinction between railroad men and cattle. You seem not to have discovered this. Allow us to point then out.

First, there has always been recognized, by everybody, unless, perhaps, certain Doctors of Divinity, a distinction between railroad men and cattle in this, that railroad men have more sense than cattle have; that they are capable of taking care of their own health, and that they have all the facilities for it.

Secondly, a distinction between railroad men and cattle appears in this, that railroad men are not bought and sold, nor are they crowded into cars and shipped, as cattle are.

Thirdly, an important distinction between railroad men and cattle appears in this, Doctor, that railroad men are not killed and eaten as cattle are. You see, Doctor, cattle are eaten by the public. Therefore you will see, perhaps, that if the cattle be diseased, the public will be eating disease, and the public health will be endangered. Therefore an inter-State commerce bill to protect the health of cattle is a necessity to protect the public health. Now, Doctor, if the American public was killing and eating railroad men as it is cattle, then it would be the most proper

thing to "add another" inter-State commerce bill to protect the health of railroad men. But, Doctor, we are happy to inform you that the American public does not do that thing yet. Therefore there is no necessity whatever for any inter-State commerce bill to protect the health of railroad men—by declaring a quarantine on all Sunday trains.

Next the Doctor discusses Sunday mails, and it is in this that there appears the "true inwardness" of his whole Sunday-law argument, and, in fact, of the whole Sunday-law movement. He says:—

"The law allows the local postmaster, if he chooses (and some of them do choose), to open the mails at the very hour of church and to make the post-office the competitor of the churches."

There is the secret of the whole Sunday-law agitation. The churches cannot bear competition. They must have a monopoly. The Sunday trains must be stopped, because they are competitors of the churches. The Elgin Sunday-law Convention, which Dr. Crafts indorses, said so. The Sunday papers must be abolished, because they are competitors of the churches. The Elgin Sunday-law Convention said so. The post-offices must be closed on Sunday, because they are competitors of the churches. Dr. Crafts says so. Now by the side of these statements read this:—

"The Sunday train, the Sunday newspaper, and the Sunday mail are a combine against public health."

That is to say, the Sunday train is a competitor of the churches; therefore it must be quarantined—"to protect the public health." The Sunday newspaper is a competitor of the churches; therefore it must be abolished—"to protect the public health." The post-office open on Sunday is a competitor of the churches; therefore it must be shut—"to protect the public health." The nation must secure to the churches a complete monopoly of Sunday, and all "to protect the public health." How very considerate of the public health these dear Doctors of Divinity are, to be sure! No, they are not. The public health is not in all their thoughts. They don't care a continental for the public health more than does

344

anybody else. It is national power to enforce religious observances that they want. That is what they are determined to have. They know that if they should work in the name of that which they really want, they could get no hearing at all before any legislative body in this nation. Therefore they trump up the hypocritical plea of "protection of the public health," or "protection of the workingman from the oppression of monopolies," or anything else under which they can hide their real intentions.

This is further shown by the fact that although Dr. Crafts repeatedly stated that this Sunday legislation is to protect the public health, he declared that:—

"A National Sabbath Committee, *representing the religious organizations* of the nation, will be necessary to secure clear convictions on the subject among Christians, and also the enactment and enforcement of wholesome Sunday laws. . . . This National Sabbath Committee should be appointed by the churches."

Now if this legislation is in the interest of the public health, why is it that the National Committee must be appointed by the *churches* instead of by the *public*? And why should this National Committee represent the *religious organizations* instead of the *public*? If all this legislation is in the interests of the public health, then why must the National Committee be chosen by the churches from the religious organizations, instead of by the *public*, from the *Boards of Public Health* of the different States? Ah! the truth is that the interests of the public health do not enter into the question at all. The whole thing is in the interest of the churches, and in behalf of the religious organizations; and the public health is nothing but a hypocritical plea swung in to hide the real motive. But they can't hide it all.

Next Mr. Crafts tells what they want. In regard to closing the post-offices on Sunday during church hours, to stop this competition with the churches, he says:—

"A law forbidding the opening between ten and twelve would accomplish this and would be better than nothing; *but we want more.*"

Again:—

"Now forbidding any handling of Sunday mail at such hours as would interfere with church attendance on the part of employes would be better than nothing; *but we want more than this.*"

Again:—

"Local option in deciding whether a local post-office shall be open at all on Sunday, we should welcome as better than nothing,—a wholesome incentive to local agitation; *but we desire more than this.*"

And again:—

"A law forbidding all carrier delivery of mail on Sunday would be better than nothing; *but we want more than this.*"

Well, then, what do they want?

"What we ask is a law instructing the postmaster-general to make no further contracts which shall include the carriage of mails on the Sabbath, and to provide that hereafter no mail matter shall be collected or distributed on that day."

And THEY WANT MORE THAN THIS. This is sufficient for them to here. Just as soon as these men get what they here ask, and find by that that the religious power can influence the civil in its own behalf, then they will push that power to the utmost extent that their influence can carry it. If they get what they here ask, in the very words of Dr. Crafts, there will be no stopping-place short of the fullest claims of the Papacy. If they get what they here ask, the first thing to be done will be for the national power, by some tribunal, either the legislative or judicial, to declare what day is the Sabbath. To do this will demand the interpretation of Scripture, and the decision of a religious question. Therefore, by this one act, by this single step, the nation will be plunged at once into a whirl of religious controversy, of judicial interpretations of Scripture and judicial decisions of religious questions; and where shall the thing stop? This is precisely what the

National Reformers are trying to do—and Dr. Crafts is one of them. They intend, by their own words, that "the whole frame-work of Bible legislation" shall be "thoroughly canvassed by Congress and State Legislatures, by the Supreme Courts of the United States and of the several States, and by lawyers and citizens;" and then, again in their own words, "the churches and the pulpits [will] have much to do with shaping and forming opinions on all moral questions, and *with interpretations of Scripture* on moral and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical, points;" "and the *final decisions* will be developed there." And that will be the times of the Papacy over again. And the one single step that will plunge the nation into this maelstrom is this Sunday-law action which Congress is now petitioned to take, and in behalf of which the *Union Signal* has promised that Senator Blair is to frame and present a bill.

When this question came before the United States Senate before, the Senate replied: "Let the National Legislature once perform an act which involves the decision of a religious controversy, and it will have passed its legitimate bounds. The precedent will then be established, and the foundation laid, for that usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country which has been the desolating scourge to the fairest portions of the Old World." We are anxiously waiting to see what reply the United States Senate now will make upon the same question. We are anxious to see whether Senator Blair will indeed frame and present a bill, and thus show himself ready to carry the National Legislature beyond its legitimate bounds. And if he does that thing, then we are anxious to see whether the National Legislature will allow itself to be carried beyond its legitimate bounds. We are anxious to see whether the National Legislature will establish the precedent, and lay the foundation, for the usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country. We are intensely anxious to know whether the National Legislature is ready to inflict this desolating scourge upon this fair land.

Besides all this, we are really anxious to know whether or not the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Senator Blair chairman, is so blind as not to be able to see the fallacy, the sophistry, and the hypocrisy of the address of the Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, D.D. If it is so, then we must confess that our estimate of the degree of intelligence that ought to be found in a United States Senator is greatly lowered.

J.

June 15, 1888

"Service of Self" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 23 , pp. 359, 360.

IN Paul's catalogue of the sins that are characteristic of the last days, in the church as well as in the world, selfishness stands at the head. "Men shall be lovers of their own selves." 2 Tim. 3:2. From this root spring all the branches that the apostle has named, and if we kill the root the branches will die of themselves. Our eyes and our endeavors should ever be upon this; because it is so insidious, so deceitful, that many acts, even our own, which we think are acceptable

service to the Lord, are not so in fact, but are service of ourselves—selfishness. We need, therefore, constantly to examine ourselves (2 Cor. 13:5) by the strictest possible tests, that we may discover the real motive of our actions. There is not an act that we can commit, that may not spring from selfishness, whereas all ought to spring from benevolence; and we need to know as nearly as possible for ourselves, whether we are really serving the Lord or serving ourselves.

Here is one who gets up Sabbath morning, and someone asks him, Are you going to church to-day? No, I think I will not go to-day; there is not going to be any preaching. If there was to be preaching I would go. So when the preacher comes round he goes, and probably thinks he is serving the Lord. But he is serving himself; he is actuated by sheer selfishness. Is your wish to glorify God? is it to do your part in encouraging and edifying the church? You can do it as well on the Sabbath when there is no preaching at your church as when there is. It is your duty to go to the place of meeting on the Sabbath, and if your wish is to serve God, you will never ask yourself whether there is to be preaching or not.

Again, very often when the time comes to go to prayer and social meeting, perhaps we don't feel like going; we think over it awhile and decide not to go, but knowing it is our duty to go, and knowing that

360

we are expected to be there, we feel uneasy at home and finally decide to go; not because we want to, not because we are glad to, but to *relieve ourselves* of uneasiness, and it is selfishness. Then when we reach the place of meeting it is the same process over again; we don't feel like speaking or praying and so we wait, and wait, the meeting is almost over, the time is nearly expired, we have neither prayed nor spoken; we know we ought to do one or the other, we know we are expected to do so, we know we do not and shall not feel easy unless we do; so, to *relieve ourselves*, we get up and say, "I am glad to be here," etc., with a manner and in a tone in which there is no element of gladness, and all simply to relieve ourselves, and which is therefore selfishness.

Once more, there are those who will do no missionary work till near the close of the quarter, and there is only a short time till they will have to make a report, and they have done nothing which they can report, so they will take up a few tracts or papers, and rustle round and distribute them somewhere, not with any particular consideration of the precious truth which they are handling, not with any burden for souls for whom Christ died, but primarily, if not solely, to *have something to report*, to satisfy and relieve *themselves*, and which therefore is selfishness. And so we might, and in fact so we need to trace to its source every act of our lives, and see for ourselves whether we are serving God or serving ourselves. By so doing we shall develop and cultivate benevolence, cheerful well-doing, and willing service in the cause of our Master.

The Scripture sets before us the one single motive that must actuate all our service. That motive is, *love for Christ*. Any other motive, any other inducement, whatever it may be, is too low. We must keep ourselves reigned up to this supreme incentive. Christ himself set it before us in his own words. In his twice-repeated question to Peter, "Lovest thou me?" he gives us the supreme rule by which to detect the motive by which we are actuated. The true intent of this

passage (John 21:15-17) has been too often lost by passing it by as simply intended to recall to Peter's mind, in a delicate way, his triple denial of the Lord. We do not deny that such impression was conveyed to Peter, but we regard it as equally undeniable that there is in it a deeper meaning than that,—even this, that to Peter, and to all others, he asks [*sic.*] the searching question twice repeated, "Lovest thou me?" And when we can answer that question in the affirmative, as did Peter, then, and not till then, are we prepared to do anything in the name of Him "who hath loved us and hath washed us from our sins in His own blood."

Then when Sabbath comes the question will not be, Shall I go to church to-day? but it will be, "Lovest thou me?" and all will be decided at once. When the occasion of the prayer and social meeting comes, there will be no question about whether we shall go, or whether we shall take part when we do go, but "Lovest thou me?" will decide it all. In doing missionary work of whatever kind, "Lovest thou me?" will settle the matter of reporting, long before the end of the quarter. That all-important question repeated o'er and o'er, and answered o'er and o'er, will rid the heart and mind of all selfishness, and plant, and cause to grow, the beautiful tree of benevolence, bearing abundantly its sweet fruit,—joy, gladness, willingness, readymindedness, and cheerfulness, in all the service of the Lord,—and God will be glorified in his saints. "More love to thee, O Christ! more love to thee."

J.

June 22, 1888

**"The Upper Columbia Camp-meeting" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 24 ,
pp. 375, 376.**

THIS meeting was held at Dayton, Washington Territory, in a beautiful grove on the skirts of the town. The Touchet Creek flows along one side of the grounds, giving abundance of excellent water fresh from the mountains. There were two hundred and fifty-six campers within the grounds.

Prosperity has attended the labors put forth in this Conference the past year, nearly a hundred additions having been made to the membership. Four new churches were received into the Conference. The tithes for the year amounted to \$3,000. Three years ago the membership was one hundred and eighty, now it is three hundred and forty-nine, which shows an average increase of about ninety a year. Then the tithes were but \$1,100, now they are \$3,000, which shows an average increase of \$333 a year, though the past year the increase was about \$700. The growth of the Sabbath-school and the Tract and Missionary Society and their work have likewise been prosperous. Territorially this is one of the very largest Conferences in the United States, embracing all Eastern Oregon and Eastern Washington, Idaho, and Montana.

Considering the large territory and the widely distributed membership, the attendance at the camp-meeting was very good. But the attendance upon the meetings, of those who were in the camp, was of the very best. We never saw

before so general an attendance of all the campers, at all the meetings. There was no straggling. From the first meeting till the last it seemed that all on the grounds were in their places promptly at all the meetings, whether business meetings or devotional. With this oneness of mind in the work and the worship there came a spirit of devotion, which was richly blessed of the Lord.

In the preaching, the minds of the speakers were led out to dwell largely upon the great love of God to men, and that rest and freedom which the Saviour only can give, and the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ. And great grace was upon all. The Lord gave great freedom in the preaching of his word, and the impressions made by it were deep and lasting. Souls were set free from sin, and showed their gratitude in thanksgivings and praises aloud. The worn ones had their strength renewed; the discouraged were lifted up and strengthened in the faith; and sinners were converted. The meetings only grew in interest, and deepened in religious influence, from the beginning to the close. While we with the held of the Lord watered others we were watered ourselves, our own souls were greatly refreshed. We love to tell the story of Jesus and his love.

The attendance from the outside was excellent. Every evening the large tent was crowded full, while many stood around it, and the closest attention was paid by all to the word spoken. For the benefit of these the preaching was upon the Papacy and its fast-forming image. The truth was most favorably received, and those who heard openly expressed their wish that the meetings might continue longer—some wished they might continue a month. The Third Angel's Message is not a living issue, as never before, and there is nothing that can arouse the people like the plain preaching of it.

Brother E. M. Morrison was present from the Pacific Press, to work up the canvassing interests in the Conference, and succeeded in arousing an earnest purpose and a zeal in this important branch of work, which we are sure will be seen in a much wider circulation of our books in this part of the country.

The school has proved a success. The past year has been only the second of its existence. A new building 30x45 feet was erected last year, yet ad-

376

ditional room has to be provided to meet the necessities of the school the coming year. The school question was quite thoroughly canvassed, and the Conference cheerfully resolved to conform to the educational plans recommended by the General Conference. Elder Colcord started East immediately after the camp-meeting, and will attend the teachers' institute to be held in Battle Creek the latter part of June.

The brethren adopted the plan recommended by the General Conference for the support of foreign missions, and as the matter was quite fully set before them, and understandingly entered into, we believe that the plan of weekly donations will be faithfully carried into action.

Monday afternoon, June 4, eighteen persons were baptized in the beautiful stream that flows by the camp-ground. Tuesday, June 5, was the last day of the meeting, and its hours were largely employed in closing up the business of the difference organizations. At 3 P.M., after a short sermon, a praise meeting was

held. It was a most precious season. The Spirit of the Lord came in abundantly, and all rejoiced in the Lord. Dear Brother Decker, the president of the Conference, was greatly blessed.

With a sermon Tuesday night on the subject of the true relation which civil government bears to religion, or the worship of God, the meeting closed. Wednesday morning before daylight we left the grounds for the North Pacific camp-meeting, and many of the brethren departed for their homes. And thus closed what was unanimously declared to be the best camp-meeting ever held in the Upper Columbia Conference, and by most declared to be the best they ever attended anywhere.

Brother Decker and his corps of fellow-laborers all go to their work with hearts full of courage and good cheer in the Lord; and we are glad to believe that this good meeting is but a token of what God is willing to do, and will do, for the dear souls in the Upper Columbia Conference. There are three ordained ministers—Elders H. W. Decker, D. T. Fero, and J. W. Scoles—and four licentiates, engaged in active labors in the field, besides Elder G. W. Colcord, who is in charge of the Conference school.

J.

June 29, 1888

"North Pacific Camp-meeting" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 25 , pp. 391, 392.

THE annual camp-meeting of the North Pacific Conference was held at East Portland, Oregon, on a beautiful plat of ground, only about five blocks from the main part of the city. There were no shade trees on the grounds occupied, but as Oregon, true to herself, secured a copious down-pour of rain eleven out of the fourteen days of the meeting, the absence of shade trees was not counted a very serious thing. There were one hundred and five tents and about four hundred and fifty people in the encampment.

The past year has been a very prosperous one for this Conference. The membership has increased more than fifty per cent, there having been two hundred additions, making now five hundred and seventy members in the Conference. Four new churches were received into the Conference. The regular tithes amounted to about \$1,600 more than the previous year. More work was done in the canvassing field the past year than in the two preceding years. One brother visited six hundred families and sold four hundred copies of "Facts for the Times" in three months, besides taking a large number of short-term subscriptions for our periodicals.

The Conference school has also had marked success. A school building was put up 26x44 feet with a projection 28x18 feet, two stories in height, and finished to accommodate one hundred students, and can be made to accommodate one hundred more by finishing the upper story, which at this Conference it was determined to do the present season. The school opened with sixty-one

students, and the number increased to eighty-five, employing the time of three teachers, Brother T. H. Starbuck, principal. The building, finished as it was, cost about \$2,100, and it is estimated that to finish the upper story ready for school work will cost about \$500. The Conference voted unanimously to send Brother Starbuck East, to attend the teachers' institute in Battle Creek, and he started from Portland Monday, June 18.

Although the rain continued through almost the whole of the meeting, and was heavy, the attendance at the meetings throughout was very good, so good in fact that it could not be said that the rain made any material difference in the attendance, except in that from the outside, which was not so large as it doubtless would have been in fair weather. Those to whom fell the preaching of the word, endeavored to make it close and practical, and to get all to see their real standing in the light of the law of God, that the unsearchable riches of the salvation of Christ might be properly appreciated. The Lord blessed the effort made; the word was well received, and the response was hearty and general. We do not remember ever before to have seen a more general move of the whole congregation than was made on Sabbath afternoon, after a sermon on the words, "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled." It was impossible to call them forward, for almost all had risen at the call. Therefore the congregation was divided into sections, and a minister appointed to each section, who could carry forward the work there. As it was raining quite hard, the beating of the rain upon the large tent prevented any confusion of voices from a number of persons speaking at once, while those in the immediate vicinity of the speaker could hear distinctly enough. When the congregation had remained thus together as long as seemed profitable, it was dismissed, and the children went to the place where the children's meetings were held, and the youth went to another tent that was made ready for them, where more direct efforts were

392

made to help them than could be made in the general assembly. Of the adults those were invited to remain who had not yet found that desired "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost," which is promised to those who are citizens of the kingdom of God, for whom special effort was made so far as possible according as each one had need.

It was a blessed day altogether; and we know of no one thing that helped to bring about the good results more than the Sabbath-school lesson for the day. This was upon the love of God. All had studied the lesson with interest; the teachers entered heartily upon their work with the classes; the general review was full of life, and deeply impressive. Thus the deep and tender impressions made by the Spirit of God, as the wonders of his great love were portrayed anew by his holy word, in the good Sabbath-school lesson, became the very best preparation for the effective preaching of the word, and the special effort in behalf of the people on the Sabbath day.

Tuesday afternoon eighteen persons were baptized. The camp-meeting proper closed on Wednesday morning, but a workers' meeting was held for another week, to which about eighty remained till the following Monday morning,

when the most of them departed, but there were twenty-six at the very last session of the workers' meeting, which closed at noon Tuesday, June 19.

Sabbath afternoon, June 16, Brethren H. W. Reed and W. C. Ward were ordained to the gospel ministry. Sermon by Elder E. R. Jones, prayer by Elder Samuel Fulton, and charge by Elder A. T. Jones.

Elder Samuel Fulton was elected president of the Conference for the coming year. His health is rapidly improving; he has met with a warm reception by the brethren throughout the Conference; the field is white already to the harvest; we believe there enters with him upon the work "a band of men whose hearts God has touched;" and we look for the year to come to be a prosperous one in the North Pacific Conference.

Tuesday, June 19, at 4 P.M., we started from East Portland, and arrived at Oakland Thursday, June 21, at 7:15 A.M., glad to have had the privilege and the blessing of meeting with the brethren of Oregon and Washington in their annual camp-meetings; and grateful to God for his kind care, his tender mercy, and his wondrous love, "which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life."

J.

"The Commentary. The Third Angel's Message" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 25 , pp. 394, 395.

[CD-ROM Editor's Note: This article has no initial attached to it. Both EJW and ATJ were co-editors of the Signs for this issue. It is attributable to ATJ or EJW.]

THE TIME OF THE MESSAGE

(Lesson 1. Sabbath. July 7.)

1. TO what event, and date, were we brought in the previous lesson?
2. In this dealing with the Papacy what additional prophecies were fulfilled?

"And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death." "He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity; he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints." Rev. 13:3, first part, and verse 10.

3. How may we know that the prophecy relates to the same power as that in the previous lesson? Compare Dan. 7:4-8 with Rev. 13:1, 2; and Dan. 7:8, 25 with Rev. 13:5-7.

4. Was this captivity and deadly wound to put a total end to the Papacy?

"And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed; and all the world wondered after the beast." Rev. 13:3.

5. When was it that this captivity occurred?--A.D. 1798.

6. At that time what else did the prophet see?

"And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon." Rev. 13:11.

7. Is it for us to know what this means?

"The secret things belong unto the Lord our God, and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law." Deut. 29:29.

8. Is this a revelation?

"The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John." "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein; for the time is at hand." Rev. 1:1, 3.

9. What part of the world was represented by the symbol of the leopard?—*Grecia*. What by the bear?—*Media and Persia*. What by the lion?—*Babylonia*. What by the beast and the ten horns?—*Western Europe and North Africa*.

10. Then as the characteristics of all these are found in the first beast of Rev. 13, what parts of the world are covered by the description of this first beast?—*The principal parts of Europe, Asia, and Africa*.

11. Whence was this other beast seen coming up?—"Out of the earth." Rev. 13:11.

12. Whence had the first beast risen?

"And I stood upon the sand of the sea and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his head as the names of blasphemy." Rev. 13:1.

13. What is meant by "sea," when used as a symbol?

"And he saith unto me, The waters which thou sawest, where the whore sitteth our peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues." Rev. 17:15.

14. What then is represented by a power coming up out of the sea? See note.

15. What by power coming out of the earth? See note.

16. In 1798 how much of Europe, Asia, and Africa was occupied by peoples, multitudes, and established an organized nations?—*All the known parts of them*.

17. How long had it been so?—*For ages*.

18. Therefore, as the symbols which are directly connected with the beast, embrace the principle parts of Europe, Asia, and Africa; as all the rest of the known parts of the Eastern Continent had been for ages occupied by established nations; and as the other beast was to arise were this had not been so, were must this "other beast" arise!—*In the Western Continent*.

19. Did the dominion of the first beast or any of the ten kingdoms extend to any part of the Western Continent in 1798?—*It did. Spain, France, Portugal, and Britain then owned all except the possessions of what had been the thirteen British colonies, which then formed the United States America*.

20. What position then did the Government of the United States occupied 1798?—*It was the only independent nation then on the earth, which had arisen*

where there had not formerly been for ages, peoples, multitudes, and established nations.

21. What then is the inevitable conclusion?—*That the United States Government is the power signified in the prophecy of Rev. 13:11-17.*

22. What is to be said to the people of this Government?

"Saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live." Verse 14, last part.

23. When they shall have made an image to the beast, what will he do?

"And he exerciseth all the power of the first

395

beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed." "And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed." Verses 12, 15.

NOTE

QUESTIONS 14, 15.—In his vision of the seventeenth chapter, Daniel says: "The four winds of the heaven strove upon the great sea. And four great beasts came up from the sea." These four great beasts represented the four great kingdoms of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, and Rome. Each of these arose by overthrowing the one that had gone before it. And as a symbolic sea represents peoples, multitudes, nations, and tongues, it is easy to understand how these great powers came up from the sea. It is also plain that a power symbolized as coming up out of the *earth* would arise from a condition of things the opposite of that represented as the sea; that is, from a place where, before it, there had not been peoples, multitudes, nations, and tongues.

July 6, 1888

"Rome's Influence" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 26 , p. 407.

IF anybody fails to see that the Papacy is now fast moving into the place of the greatest influence of any earthly organization, not only in Europe, but in this nation as well, we can only wonder what he can be doing. In Europe, to say nothing of Catholic countries, which, as a matter of course, are subject to the Pope, Germany is subject to the dictation of the Pope; England is glad to obtain his help in her political affairs; and even the autocrat of all the Russias is willing to make overtures to the Pope.

In our own country Rome's influence is growing faster than any other one thing. Everybody knows that it was the word "Romanism" in an unfortunate alliteration that cost Blaine the presidency in 1884. The editor of the *Converted Catholic* says that more senators and representatives send their sons to the Jesuit College at Georgetown, than to all the other institutions of learning at

Washington. This proves, either that a large number of senators and representatives are Catholics, or that Rome has more influence with senators and representatives than have all the other educational institutions in Washington put together.

L. Q. C. Lamar was lately Secretary of the Interior. He was charged with giving to Catholics more positions in his department than to other denominations. His reply was, that "if the Roman Catholics have been recognized to a greater extent than other denominations, it is only because they have asked more largely;" and explains this by saying that the Romish Church has at Washington "an energetic and tireless director, who is active to seize opportunities for extending missionary and educational work among the Indians." The Government superintendent of Indian schools is a Catholic; and the *Christian Union* says that four-fifths of the Government Indian schools, under religious control, have been given to the Romish Church.

The assistant attorney-general of the United States—Mr. Zach. Montgomery—is a Roman Catholic, with all the Roman Catholic enmity to the public schools, and hesitates not to use his official influence to show it. Not only since, in an address at Carroll Institute, he openly denounced the public-school system as godless, anti-parental, and destructive of happiness. And the Senate knew his enmity to the public schools when it confirmed him as assistant attorney-general.

We would not have a word to say against Catholics being given public and official positions in any department of Government, were it not that the allegiance of every Catholic is paid to the Pope before it is to the United States; and must be so paid, or else he ceases to be a good Catholic; every soul of them enters politics, or into official positions, *as a Catholic*; and the Pope has commanded all Catholics to do all in their power to cause the legislation of States to be shaped upon the model of the "true church."

Next the secular press is captivated by the seductive influences of the Papacy. Not only is this true of that portion of the press which makes politics a trade, and which professedly follows, while it leads, public influence; it is equally true of the great magazines. In the *Century* for May, 1888, there was published a most flattering tribute to the Pope, with full-page portrait, under the title of "The Personality of Leo XIII." And in the *Forum* for April, 1888, Rome forms the subject of two long articles—one, "Civil Government and Papacy," the other, "Socialism and the Catholic Church."

In a letter to Hon. Warner Miller, delegate at large from the State of New York to the late National Republican Convention, the Hon. John Jay, late United States Minister to Austria, in referring to Lafayette's remark about the "*invisible* hand of the Jesuit" disturbing our liberties, says:—

"The hand is no longer invisible, and the voice once soft and alluring, is that of a conqueror so assured of his power—or so confident of increasing it by indulging in 'unlimited brag'—that they coolly discuss the disposition they will make of the United States, as a people already subject to the control of Canada, wrote to Lord Randolph Churchill (the *Churchman*, New York, April 2, 1887): 'The Irish vote is a great factor in America.' 'The power of their

organizations is increasing every day.' 'They hold *already* the balance of power in the presidential and other elections.' A further remark threw light upon the continual forcing into our politics of foreign questions of race and religion, and indicated the use that they are proposing to make of their power in America in case they shall find it convenient to involve the republic in war with England. 'Should a misunderstanding,' remarked his Grace, complacently, 'happen between England and the United States, Canada would, in a few days, be overrun with American troops. It would cost that republic very little, as Irish-American military organizations would very largely supply both men and money.'

"A similarly dictatorial tone is of late constantly heard at home. The announcement of Mr. Chamberlain's appointment as fishery commissioner was promptly followed by a reminder that he was not a *persona grata* to the Irish nation, and that no treaty he might make would stand a chance of ratification. The suggestion that Mr. Phelps, our Minister to England, might be nominated as chief justice, brought a quick announcement that the nomination would be defeated; and when the so-called 'Freedom of Worship' Bill for classifying children in religious classes, and subjecting them to Jesuit discipline, was pending in the New York Legislature the 'Catholic Union,' with a Jesuit as an adviser, reproduced in a tract intended for the Legislature of the State, a threat from the *Catholic Review* against all who should oppose the bill, of 'political damnation;' accompanied with the boast, 'We have already marred the political future of more than one political bigot, and we advise all others to note the fact.'

"The disposition to boast of their achievements in controlling at will our legislative bodies, is not confined to the State Legislature. It was recently stated in the United States Senate (February 16, 1888), in a debate on the bill for 'national aid in the establishment and temporary support of common schools'—the bill so honorably sustained by Mr. Blair against obstacles that might have dismayed a less resolute legislator, the bill which originated with Chief Justice Waite, Mr. Winthrop, Mr. Stuart, Mr. Evarts, Dr. Curry, and other trustees of the Peabody Fund, as essential to arrest illiteracy at the South and fit the freedmen for their duties as citizens—that a senator had showed to the speaker, who had read it with his own eyes, the original letter of a Jesuit priest. In this letter he begged a member of Congress to oppose the bill and kill it, saying that they had organized all over the country for its destruction, that they had succeeded in the Committee of the House, and that they would destroy the bill inevitably; and it is a fact that the bill, having three times passed the Senate in three different Congresses, each time with a larger vote in its favor, has been repeatedly smothered in the Committee of the House, by those who knew that there was a

majority in the House in favor of the bill; and for six years the legislation of Congress has been arrested."

Next after the political world and the secular press, there is the "Protestant" religious world and its press. And in hardly anything does this take second place after the others, in this truckling flattery to the Papacy. The *Evangelist*, the *Christian Union*, the *Christian at Work*, the *Independent*, and other papers of lesser note, all pay flattering tribute to Rome. The *Evangelist* acknowledges Cardinal Gibbons as its "only cardinal;" the *Independent* wishes the Pope "a long reign and Godspeed in his liberalizing policy;" the *Christian at Work* salutes him as "Holy Father," and in the name of "the whole Christian world" glorifies him as this "venerable man whose loyalty to God and zeal for the welfare of humanity are as conspicuous as his freedom from many of the errors and bigotries of his predecessors, is remarkable;" and the *Christian Union* acknowledges him as "a temporal prince" and "Supreme Pontiff." Nor are the "Protestant" doctors of divinity one whit behind these "Protestant" papers. Rev. Charles W. Shields, D.D., of Princeton College, writing of the reunion of Christendom, said of a certain position, that it would not do to take it because—

"You would exclude the Roman Catholic Church, the *mother of us all*; the church of scholars and saints, of Augustine, and Aquinas, and Bernard, and Fenelon; the church of all races, ranks, and classes, which already gives signs of being American as well as Roman, and the only church fitted, by its hold upon the working masses, to grapple with the labor problem before which our Protestant Christianity stands baffled to-day."—*New York Evangelist*, February 9, 1888.

Yes, the Catholic Church *does* give signs of becoming American as well as Roman, and the surest sign of this is the readiness with which Americans and professed Protestants surrender to her all their dearest interests of man in order to secure her influence.

J.

"The Third Angel's Message. The Time of the Message" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 26 , pp. 410, 411.

THE TIME OF THE MESSAGE

(Lesson 3, Sabbath, July 21.)

1. WHAT warning does God give, against the worship of the beast and his image?

"And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the

Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." Rev. 14:9-11.

2. This text says, "The third angel followed *them*;" followed whom?

"And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people." "And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." Verses 6, 8.

3. The sixth verse says, "I saw *another* angel fly in the midst of heaven;" to what does this seem to direct us?—*To another one that had been seen somewhere.*

4. Where is the record of John's seeing another angel flying thus?

"And I beheld, and heard an angel flying through the midst of heaven, saying with a loud voice, Woe, woe, woe, to the inhabitants of the earth by reason of the other voices of the trumpet of the three angels, which are yet to sound!" Rev. 8:13.

5. What is the burden of this angel's cry?

6. How many woes?

7. By reason of what?

8. Then with what are these three woes connected?

9. To what does the fifth trumpet—the first woe—refer?—*To the rise and spread of Mohammedanism. "With surprising unanimity, commentators have agreed in regard to this as referring to the empire of the Saracens, or to the rise and progress of the religion and the empire of Mohammed."*—Albert Barnes.

10. What did the prophet say should be commanded them?

"And it was commanded them that they should not hurt the grass of the earth, neither any green thing, neither any tree; but only those men which have not the seal of God in their foreheads." Rev. 9:4.

11. What was commanded them? See note.

12. For what specific length of time were they to torment men?

"And to them it was given that they should not kill them, but that they should be tormented five months; and their torment was as the torment of a scorpion, when he striketh a man." "And they had tails like unto scorpions, and there were stings in their tails; and their power [was] to hurt men five months." Rev. 9:5, 10.

13. When did this period being?—*"It was on the twenty-seventh day of July, in the year twelve hundred and ninety-nine of the Christian era, that Othman first invaded the territory of Nicomedia."*—Gibbon, chap. 64, par. 13.

14. Then at what time did the first woe end?—*July 27, 1449.*

15. What followed?

"And the sixth angel sounded, and I heard a voice from the four horns of the golden altar which is before God." Rev. 9:13.

16. How long was the sixth trumpet—the second woe—to continue?

"And the four angels were loosed, which were prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year, for to slay the third part of men." Verse 15.

17. Literally what length of time is this?—*391 years and 15 days.*

18. When did it end?—*August 11, 1840.*

19. What historical event marks the ending of this time at that date?—*On that day the four great powers of Europe,—England, Austria, Prussia, and Russia,—assumed control of all the foreign affairs of the Government of Turkey, and have held it ever since. See "Thoughts on the Revelation," 9:18, 19.*

NOTES

QUESTION 11. "Remember that you are always in the presence of God; on the verge of death, in the assurance of judgment, and the hope of paradise. Avoid injustice and oppression; consult with your brethren, and study to preserve the love and confidence of your troops. When you fight the battles of the Lord, acquit yourselves like men, without turning your backs; but let not your victory be stained with the blood of women or children. *Destroy no palm-trees, nor burn any fields of corn. Cut down no fruit trees*, nor do any mischief to cattle, only such as you kill to eat. When you make any covenant or article, stand to it, and be as good as your word. As you go on, you will find some religious persons who live retired in monasteries, and propose to themselves to serve God that way: let them alone, and neither kill them nor destroy their monasteries. And you will find another sort of people, that belong to the synagogue of Satan, who have shaven crowns; be sure you cleave their skulls, and give them no quarter till they either turn Mahometans or pay tribute."—*Gibbon, chap. 51, par. 10.*

IN Rev. 14:9 we read: "The third angel followed them." Followed whom? Why, certain angels that had gone before. The eighth verse says, "There followed another angel." As this angel likewise "followed" someone, we must go yet farther back. So in the sixth verse we read, "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, Saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." We must know

411

then, the time of the angel of the sixth verse, before we can know the time of the angel of the eighth, or of the ninth verse; for the angel of verse 8 *follows* the angel of verse 6, and the third angel, of verse 9, follows both these. Therefore the time of the angel of verse 6 must be known, to know the time of the third angel, verse 9.

NOTICE again verse 6. It does not read, And I saw an angel, but it reads, "And I saw *another* angel." By this word "another," there is direct reference made to some angel or angels that the prophet had seen before. Tracing backward in the book to find what will answer to this we find none until we come to chapter 10:1, where we read, "And I saw another mighty angel." But this text also uses the word "another," and therefore we must go further back. So we go on backward till we come to chapter 8:13, where we read, "And I beheld, and heard an angel flying through the midst of heaven." Here the word "another" is not used, but simply, "I beheld, and heard *an angel*." This, then, is the first of certain

angels which the prophet saw which the language used will connect directly with the angel of chapter 14:6, thus: "I beheld, and heard an angel" (chap. 8:13), "And I saw *another* mighty angel" (10:1), "And I saw *another* angel" (14:16).

NOTICE further that these angels appear upon the scene in the midst of the events that accompany the last three of the seven trumpet angels. In chapter 8:2 John saw seven angels to whom were given seven trumpets; and in verse 6 he says, "And the seven angels which had the seven trumpets prepared themselves to sound." Then after the first four had sounded, this angel of chapter 8:13 appears, when the prophet says, "And I beheld, and heard an angel flying through the midst of heaven, saying with a loud voice, Woe, woe, woe, to the inhabitants of the earth by reason of the other voices of the trumpet of the three angels, which are yet to sound!" Now as this angel is connected, by the expressions used, with the angel of chapter 14:6, and as this angel appears just before the sounding of the fifth trumpet is a proper starting-point to find the time of the message of chapter 14:6. If we can find the time of the first trumpet, we can find the time of the angel of chapter 14:6.

IN chapter 9:1-11 is the prophecy of the events of the fifth trumpet, of which says Albert Barnes, "With surprising unanimity, commentators have agreed in regarding this as referring to the empire of the Saracens, or to the rise and progress of the religion and the empire set up by Mohammed." We cannot see how anyone who will read the prophecy, and Gibbon's history of Mohammed and his successors in the light of it, can disagree with the application of the prophecy to the Mohammedans. We cannot here go into a detailed explanation and application of the prophecy to the Mohammedans. We cannot here go into a detailed explanation and application of the different points of the prophecy—for that see the work, "Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation," or "The Seven Trumpets," both published at this office—we can here only notice *the time* referred to in the prophecy. The rise of Mohammedanism is shown under the symbol of a cloud of locusts, but in verses 7-9 the symbol is explained by the words, "The shapes of the locusts were like unto horses prepared unto battle; . . . and their faces were as the faces of man; . . . and the sound of their wings was as the sound of chariots of many horses running to battle." And says the Scripture, "Their power was to hurt men five months." Five months are one hundred and fifty days; this being prophetic time,—a day for a year,—equals one hundred and fifty years, during which they were to hurt men.

THIS one hundred and fifty years is to be counted from the time that they had a king over them, as says verse 11: "They had a king over them . . . whose name in the Hebrew tongue is Abaddon, but in the Greek tongue hath his name Apollyon [margin "a destroyer"]." For more than six hundred years the Mohammedans had no regularly organized Government, and recognized no such dignitary as that which answers to the title of king. Each tribe, under its own chief, was independent of all the others, and came and went as it pleased. While this was the case it is evident, and it is the fact, too, that their character as "a destroyer" was not, and could not be, such as it was after they were solidly united in one Government under the sway of a ruler recognized by all. This is made more apparent when it is seen what was to be destroyed by this "destroyer." The

first four trumpets show the ruin of the Western Empire of Rome, and the fifth relates to the destruction of the Eastern Empire. And it is in the character of the final destroyer of the last remains of the Roman Empire that this power acts. It was not as a destroyer of men as such, for of them it is said "that they should not kill them, but that they should be tormented five months," "and their power was to hurt men five months." It is evident then that his character and work as "a destroyer" relate to the final destruction of the Roman Empire, which was then represented in the Eastern Empire with the capital at New Rome—Constantinople.

OTHMAN was the caliph who established the organized Government of the Mohammedans, and from him is descended the name and title of the *Ottoman Empire*. It was under the organized power of Othman that the work of the destroyer began. In closing his account of the devastating rage of the Moguls and Tartars under Zingis Khan and his generals, Gibbon says:—

"In this shipwreck of nations [A.D. 1240-1304] some surprise may be excited by the escape of the Roman Empire, whose relics, at the time of the Mogul invasion, were dismembered by the Greeks and Latins."—*Decline and Fall*, chap. 64, par. 13.

BUT when the decline of the Moguls gave free scope to the rise of the Moslems, under Othman, of him he says:—

"He was situate on the verge of the Greek Empire; the Koran sanctified his *gazi*, or holy war, against the infidels; and their political errors unlocked the passes of Mount Olympus, and invited him to descend unto the plains of Bithynia. . . . It was on July 27, A.D. 1299, that Othman first invaded the territory of Nicomedia; and the singular accuracy of the date seems to disclose some foresight of the rapid and destructive growth of the monster."—*Id.*, par. 14.

THE work of destruction, then, which was to subvert the last remains of the Roman Empire, began July 27, 1299, and never ceased till the imperial power passed into the hands of Amurath, July 27, 1499. Then the first woe was passed, verse 12, and the sixth angel sounded, and the four angels of the Euphrates were loosed "which were prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year." This also being prophetic time, each day represents a year. A year=360 years, a month 30 years, a day 1 year, an hour, the twenty-fourth part of 360=15 days, altogether=360+30+1=391 years and 15 days. This, from July 27, 1449, onward, gives us August 11, 1840, when the imperial power passed out of the hands of the Ottoman Emperor into the hands of the Great Powers of Europe, just as it passed into his hands 491 years and 15 days before. Then it was that the second woe passed, and behold the third woe was to come *quickly*. Chap. 11:14.

THEN it is between the second and third woes, in the space marked by the word "quickly," that Rev. 10:1 applies: "And I saw *another* mighty angel come down from Heaven, clothed with a cloud; . . . and he set his right foot upon the sea, and his left foot upon the earth. . . . And the angel which I saw stand upon the sea and upon the earth lifted up his hand to heaven, and sware by him that liveth for ever and ever, who created heaven, and the things that therein are, and the earth, and the things that therein are, and the sea, and the things which are

therein, that there should be time no longer; but in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets." Notice that this angel refers to the sounding of the seventh trumpet as then future—"the seventh angel, *when he shall begin to sound*." Of that sounding we read in chapter 11:15: "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever."

THE kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ at the second coming of Christ. Says Paul: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at *his appearing and his kingdom*, Preach the word." 2 Tim. 4:1. When he comes, "he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords." Now mark, the sixth trumpet and the second woe ended August 11, A.D. 1840. Then saith the word of God, the third woe and the seventh trumpet comes quickly; and when that comes, the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. This is at the coming of Christ, and the coming of Christ is the end of the world. The first four trumpets mark the downfall of the Western Empire of Rome; the fifth marks the destruction of the Eastern Empire of Rome; and the seventh trumpet marks the downfall of all empires, all kingdoms, and all nations; for when the God of Heaven sets up his kingdom, "it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms." Dan. 2:44. The woe of the fifth trumpet was called by Gibbon the "shipwreck of nations;" but the woe of the seventh trumpet will be not only the shipwreck of nations, but of the great globe itself; for in Rev. 11:19, among the events of the seventh trumpet—the third woe—are that earthquake by which every mountain and island are moved out of their places, and that great hail, both of which come in the seventh plague, when God "ariseth to shake terribly the earth," and the great voice is heard out of the temple of Heaven from the throne, saying, It is done. Rev. 16:17-21. J.

July 13, 1888

"The 'Reunion of Christendom'" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 27 , pp. 423, 424.

CHURCH union is fast becoming a question of leading importance among the large denominations. Just now it appears to be the principal theme in the Presbyterian Church as related to the Episcopalian, particularly in the East. The question was fully opened nearly two years ago, by the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, in general convention assembled. These bishops proposed four terms which they set forth as "essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom." These are, the Holy Scriptures, the Nicene creed, the two Sacraments, and the Historic Episcopate. As between the Episcopalians and the Presbyterians, the "Historic Episcopate" is the only one of the four "terms" upon which any question is raised;

and the Presbyterian writers are making strong efforts to reach any accommodation upon this point.

Professor Briggs, of Union Theological Seminary, proposes that the office of moderator of each presbytery shall be made permanent, and then as "such a moderator would have the duties of a diocesan bishop, why not give him the historic name"? Then and thus the "Historic Episcopate" would be established in the Presbyterian Church, and nothing would remain to hinder the organic unity of the two churches—*provided* the Episcopalians shall not insist upon reordaining all the Presbyterian preachers, moderator-bishops, and all, according to the "Apostolic Succession." But the Presbyterians propose that the Episcopalians shall waive the Apostolic Succession part of the program and recognize the validity, if not the regularity, of the Presbyterian ordinations up to the time of the union. And as now, according to "the Presbyterian polity," a minister is ordained by the laying on of the hands of the *moderator* and the presbyters, and according to "the Episcopalian polity" he is ordained by the laying on of the hands of the *bishop* and presbyters, when the *moderator* shall have been made a permanent officer and given the "historic name" of *bishop*, the ordinations in both bodies will be alike, the great work will be accomplished, and the two churches will be one!

Rev. Charles W. Shields, D.D., of Princeton College, proposes that in the direction of this Episcopal-Presbyterian ordination, the ice shall be broken by the two bodies sending out jointly foreign missionaries, who shall be jointly ordained, either by a bishop and Episcopal presbyters who had formerly received Presbyterian ordination, or by a bishop and Presbyterian presbyters who had formerly received Episcopal ordination. Then "a missionary thus ordained would go forth with double authority into a wider field, for a fuller service, and everywhere represent a united church, *at least to heathenism abroad* if not to infidelity at home"! For let it be distinctly understood, and, says Dr. Shields, "let it be emphasized, that there is no thought of one communion absorbing another. Surely nobody is foolish enough to dream of any immediate fusion of Christian denominations." It is not any real or vital unity that is wanted, nor that is intended. It is only a make-believe unity that they can pass off as genuine upon the heathen abroad or the unthinking at home, and which they can wield for selfishly ambitious ends in the establishment of despotic power after the image of the Papacy.

This is further shown in the fact that although the Episcopalian Church stands on the Apostolic Succession in the Historic Episcopate, yet both Dr. Briggs and Dr. Shields, on behalf of the Presbyterian Church, are willing to accept the Historic Episcopate, with the Apostolic Succession *neither enjoined nor forbidden*. That is to say, the Historic Episcopate is to be the bond of union, but it must be so expressed that to the Episcopalians it shall mean the Historic Episcopate *with* the Apostolic Succession, while to the Presbyterians it may mean the Historic Episcopate *without* the Apostolic Succession. In other words, the bond of union is to be the Historic Episcopate, but it must be so expressed that to each denomination it shall mean just what that denomination wants it to mean.

This is clearly proved by Doctor Shield's argument. He says that "it would only be hurtful [for the Episcopalians] to *enjoin* a doctrine of Apostolic Succession," because that would not only "assail the liberal and evangelical portion" of her own communion, but would "repel the Evangelical Lutheran Church, that bulwark of the Reformation;" "would repel the Presbyterian Church, that backbone of American orthodoxy;" "would repel the Methodist Episcopal Church, that pioneer of American Christianity;" "in a word, would repel nine-tenths of our ecclesiastical Protestantism, and be left with a mere nominal Catholicity." On the other hand he says, "It would be as hurtful if not more hurtful [for the Presbyterians or others] to *forbid* a doctrine of Apostolic Succession," because then—

"You would exclude the Roman Catholic Church, the mother of us all, the church of scholars and saints, such as Augustine and Aquinas, and Bernard and Fenelon; the church of all races, ranks, and classes, which already gives signs of becoming American as well as Roman, and the only church fitted, by its hold upon the working masses, to grapple with that labor problem before which our Protestant Christianity stands baffled to-day. You would exclude also the Protestant Episcopal Church, the beautiful daughter of a beautiful mother, claiming a lineage of apostles, saints, and martyrs; the church which still hails from the home of our Anglo-Saxon Christianity, from altars at which Knox and Bucer ministered, from cloisters in which our Westminster Standards were born, and from colleges out of which came our Whitfield and Wesley with tongues of flame; the church which daily offers in its liturgy Lutheran, Reformed, and Presbyterian prayers, and the one church which now seeks to win back the wrangling sisterhood of churches home again. In a word, you would exclude five-sixths of Christendom, and be left with a mere sectarian Protestantism."

Therefore the case stand just thus: The Apostolic Succession is essential to the Historic Episcopate, and the Historic Episcopate is essential to the reunion of Christendom. But as to *enjoin* a doctrine of Apostolic Succession would repel nine-tenths of ecclesiastical Protestantism, and as to *forbid* such a doctrine would repel five-sixths of Christendom—composed of "the mother of us all" and "the beautiful daughter of a beautiful mother"—it is essential to the cause of church unity, and will "greatly help that cause and harm no one to leave the whole question open;" because the "the Catholic Episcopalian could still find in it what he finds in it now," and "the Catholic Presbyterian could again find in it what he found in it once," and only what he wants to find in it now. And thus the unit of the church will be absolutely assured; and the firm reunion of Christendom will be accomplished.

No one who has studied the history of the fourth century in the framing of the Papacy, can read the discussion of this scheme of church unity, and fail to see the perfect likeness of this to that. There the worldly-minded bishops, ambitious of political power, palmed off upon Constantine just such a hocus-pocus unity, and argued to him that the support of this united Christendom was the surest safeguard of the imperial power in the fearfully disturbed condition of the times.

But when Constantine discovered the fraud and found that the pretended unity was a hoax, he was fully equal to the occasion, and determined that the pretended unity should be a fact. He therefore convened the Council of Nice, established the national creed, compelled its unanimous subscription, and enforced its provisions, under imperial penalties. And the whole violent history of the two following centuries is but a dismal and bloody record of the contentions of the rival denominations in the "united Christendom."

Just so it will be here: the churches will form a union that has not in it a single element of true unity, but is wholly to be used in controlling the civil power in the interests of the church. And when they, as a "united" body, shall have secured the recognition and support of the civil power, then there will be as many divisions as there are denominations, and it will be again as it was before. Those who preside over the churches will endeavor to anticipate each other in the hope of influencing the

424

administration in favor of their own tenets; and the heads of each party will assiduously pay their court to the administration, with a view of obtaining, not only protection for themselves, but also power against their opponents. See "Socrates," book 3, chapters 24, and 25.

Against a union of the churches we would have not a word to say, but would only rejoice in it, if it were a genuine union, a union formed by a real, abiding love for the word of God. But when it is only a patched-up, compromising, hypocritical union, as is now proposed and is fast becoming popular among the American churches, such a union is only fraught with danger to every principle of liberty, civil or religious. The sole purpose of it is to control the civil power; and as was declared by the United States Senate in 1829, "Extensive religious combinations to effect a political object are always dangerous." In view of this principle, and in the light of the history of the fourth century and the Papacy, the so-called reunion of American Christendom is worthy the careful consideration of every American citizen, and every lover of truth and equity.

J.

"The Church the House of God" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 27 , p.

424.

IN one of the views which the Scripture gives of the Church of Christ it is called "the house of God." Said Paul to Timothy: "These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly; but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." 1 Tim. 3:14, 15. And again, in the letter to the Hebrews, we read: "And Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after; but Christ as a son over his own house; *whose house are we*, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end." Heb. 3:5, 6. Peter also adopts the same figure, and, speaking of the Lord, says, "To whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and

precious, ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house." 1 Peter 5:4, 5. [sic.]

Christ is the "living Stone," and they who believe on him become "lively" stones because they live by him who is life; for it is written: "Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner-stone, elect, precious; and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded." These persons therefore who by believing on the living Stone become lively, or living, stones, are built up a spiritual house, and this house is the church of the living God. Paul further speaks of it as God's *building*. Speaking of himself and Apollos as ministers by whom the brethren had believed on Christ, he says: "For we are laborers together with God: ye are God's husbandry, ye are God's building." 1 Cor. 3:9. That is to say, By their labors in preaching the gospel of Christ, these brethren had been brought to believe on Christ, the living Stone, and, by believing on him, had become imbued with life from him, and had thus become in the figure living stones. These then built up that spiritual house, became God's building. Now Paul carries the thought further: "According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise master-builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. 3:10, 11.

Christ is the foundation and chief corner-stone, the very foundation of the foundation, and in the letter to the Ephesians, Paul carries the thought yet further and completes this conception of the church as the house or building of God. Of Christ he says: "For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father. Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit." Eph. 2:18-22.

Here, then, is the Lord's view of the church as the house or building of God: Christ, and the apostles and prophets are the foundation, and the membership at large is the superstructure. But Christ himself is the chief corner-stone, the foundation of the whole structure, the foundation of the foundation itself. Because it is only in Christ that either the apostles or prophets were ever what they were, or that any member is what he is. Christ is the living Stone, to whom the apostles and prophets and all others must come that they might be made lively stones, fit for the building of God. In Jesus Christ, and upon Jesus Christ, the church of Christ, the church of the living God, is built. And the purpose of this building is "for an habitation [a dwelling place] of God through the Spirit." "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you," and "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Rom. 8:9. And said Jesus, "If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." John 14:23. Thus it is, and of these "God hath said, I will dwell in them; and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." 2 Cor. 6:16. As he saith also in another place, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in

you?" 1 Cor. 3:16. "For ye are the temple of the living God." When these in whom the Spirit of God dwells are "fitly framed together," and built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, and Jesus Christ, they grow unto an holy temple, in the Lord, and are "an habitation of God through the Spirit." And that is the house of God, the church of the living God.

Peter said, as before quoted, "To whom coming as unto a living stone, ye also as lively stones are built up a spiritual house." Now it is a characteristic of a living stone that it can be polished to such a height that it will reflect the image of the one looking upon it. Thus Christ is the living stone, to whom we come, and upon whom we look, and to whom we come, and upon whom we look, and as we look we see ourselves. And there "we all, with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, *are changed into the same image* from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." 2 Cor. 3:18. And thus, being changed into the same image, we also become lively stones, reflecting in turn the image of Christ as he looks upon us; for then God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, shines into our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. 2 Cor. 4:6. Then the church is indeed the light of the world, a city set on a hill which cannot be hid. It is written of the city of God, the New Jerusalem, that it has twelve foundations "garnished with all manner of precious stones." The first foundation is jasper, clear as crystal; the second, a sapphire; the third, a chalcedony; the fourth, an emerald; the fifth, a sardonyx; the sixth, a sardius; the seventh, a chrysolite; the eighth, a beryl; the ninth, a topaz; the tenth, a chrysoprasus; the eleventh, a jacinth; the twelfth, an amethyst; and are surmounted by a wall great and high, "and the building of the wall of it was of jasper; and the city was pure gold, like unto clear glass." And the glory of God does lighten the city, and the Lamb is the light thereof; and her light is like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal. Rev. 21:10-23. Eye has never seen except in holy vision such a scene of glory and beauty as is here pictured of the city of the living God, and the home of the redeemed.

Now the New Jerusalem is not the church. It is *not* the house, the building, the habitation, the church, of God, referred to in the texts which we have quoted in this article. But from this description of the glorious city of God, we may gather from this image of the church as a house, a building, and an habitation of God, an idea of what the Lord desires that the glorious church of God shall be. Christ is a living stone, the chief corner-stone, most precious. He is the first, the chief foundation of the church. Upon him as part of the foundation also, rest the apostles and prophets, made from him lively stones. Then upon this foundation are built all the saints, as gold, silver, and precious stones. 1 Cor. 3:12. Then the light of the knowledge of the glory of God as it shines in the face of Jesus Christ, shining through and reflected from all these, makes the church indeed the light of the world, giving to men the knowledge of the glory of God as he has revealed himself in Jesus Christ. Oh, that each one who professes to be a member of the church of Christ were really so! Oh, that everyone who is professedly joined to the church, were really joined to Christ! that each one were indeed a lively stone reflecting the precious image of the dear Redeemer, and thus conveying to them that are in darkness the light of the knowledge of the glory of God as it is

manifested in Jesus Christ our Lord. Then indeed would the world believe that God did send Jesus Christ.
J.

"The Third Angel's Message. The Time of the Message" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 27 , pp. 425, 426.

THE TIME OF THE MESSAGE

(Lesson 4. Sabbath, July 28.)

1. TO what date were we brought in the first two lessons?
2. To what date were we brought in our last lesson?
3. What prophetic period then closed?—*The second woe, the sounding of the sixth trumpet.*"

4. After that what was to come quickly?

"The second woe is past; and, behold, the third woe cometh quickly." Rev. 11:14.

5. How many woes were there to be?

"And I beheld, and heard an angel flying through the midst of heaven, saying with a loud voice, Woe, woe, woe, to the inhabitants of the earth by reason of the other voices of the trumpet of the three angels, which are yet to sound!" Rev. 8:13.

6. With what are these three woes connected?

7. Then with what is the third woe connected?

8. Then when the third woe does begin, what begins at the same time with it?—*The sounding of the seventh trumpet.*

426

9. When the seventh angel sounded, what were heard?

"And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever." Rev. 11:15.

10. What other notable events are mentioned in connection with the seventh trumpet?

"And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them which destroy the earth. And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament: and there were lightnings, and voices, and thunderings, and an earthquake, and great hail." Verses 18, 19.

11. What is meant by the wrath of God?

"And I saw another sign in heaven, great and marvellous, seven angels having the seven last plagues; for in them is filled up the wrath of God." Rev. 15:1.

12. When this time of the dead comes that they should be judged, what is also said to the living?

"And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come; and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." Rev. 14:6, 7.

13. When is it that reward is given to saints and prophets, and them that fear the name of the Lord?

"And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be." Rev. 22:12.

"For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." Matt. 16:27.

14. When is it that there come these lightnings, and voices, and thunderings, and the earthquake, and great hail?

"And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, It is done. And there were voices, and thunders, and lightnings; and there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake, and so great." "And every island fled away, and the mountains were not found. And there fell upon men a great hail out of heaven, every stone about the weight of a talent; and men blasphemed God because of the plague of the hail; for the plague thereof was exceeding great." Rev. 16:17, 18, 20, 21.

15. In what length of time, comparatively, was this woe—the seventh trumpet—to come, after the second woe was past?

"The second woe is past; and, behold, the third woe cometh quickly." Rev. 11:14.

16. When did the second woe end?—*August 11, 1840.*

17. Yet what was to come before the seventh trumpet?

"And I saw another mighty angel come down from heaven, clothed with a cloud: and a rainbow was upon his head, and his face was as it were the sun, and his feet as pillars of fire: and he had in his hand a little book open: and he set his right foot upon the sea, and his left foot on the earth." "And the angel which I saw stand upon the sea and upon the earth lifted up his hand to heaven." "But in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets." Rev. 10:1, 2, 5, 7.

18. What is it especially that this angel says shall be done in the time of the seventh trumpet angel?

19. What time in his sounding is this to be done?—"*In the days [the years] . . . when he shall begin to sound.*"

20. What is the mystery of God?

"Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting

God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." Rom. 16:25, 26; Eph. 3:3, 5-9; Gal. 1:12; Eph. 6:18, 19.

21. What is the gospel?

"For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." Rom. 1:16.

22. Then in effect what is said by the angel in Rev. 10:7?—*That in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the power of God for the salvation of sinners will cease to be exercised.*

23. As all these things are to follow in quick succession when the seventh angel sounds, is it not, therefore, of immense importance to the world to know when the seventh trumpet angel begins to sound?

NOTES

SAID the angel, "In the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets." Rev. 10:7. This refers to the last of the seven trumpet angels, and the third woe, and, as shown last week, was to come "quickly" after the ending of the sixth trumpet, and the second woe. Rev. 11:14. These being prophetic days—each day for a year—the expression means, In the years of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound. The seventh trumpet, the third woe, covers all the woe that will ever be on this earth from the time when this trumpet begins to sound. But the mystery of God is to be finished in the years *when it begins*—not at the latter part, nor at the end, but in the beginning. Whenever, therefore, the seventh angel begins to sound, the finishing of the mystery of God is close at hand.

BUT what is the mystery of God? The mystery of God is the gospel. Proof: In Eph. 3:3 Paul says, "By revelation he made known unto me the mystery." And in Gal. 1:11, 12 he says, "The gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." Here we have the statement that the *gospel* was given him *by revelation*, and also that *by revelation* there was made known to him "the *mystery*, which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel. . . . Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now . . . might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." "That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fullness of God."

"For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." Eph. 3:3-11, 17-19; Col. 2:2.

FROM these texts it is evident that the eternal purpose of God, which he purposed in Christ for us; that the unsearchable riches of Christ, which are brought to the children of men; that the immeasurable love of Christ and of God, for man; that the love of Christ and of God, which passeth knowledge, is the mystery of God. But this is nothing else than the gospel. The preaching of the gospel is only the effort of God to reveal this mystery, and to bring its depths to the comprehension of men.

AGAIN: in Eph. 6:19, Paul calls preaching the making known of the mystery of the gospel, saying: "Praying . . . for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in bonds." To the Colossians likewise he said: "Withal praying also for us, that God would open unto us a door of utterance, to speak the mystery of Christ, for which I am also in bonds." Col. 4:3. And to the Romans: "Now unto him that is of power to stablish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." Rom. 16:25, 26. There can be no question that the mystery of God is the gospel of God, that the mystery of Christ is the gospel of Christ; for it is called the "gospel of God" as well as the "gospel of Christ" (1 Pet. 4:17; 1 Thess. 2:2, 9; 1 Tim. 1:11), and properly enough so, for Christ is "God with us" (Matt. 1:23), and "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." 2 Cor. 5:12.

THE mystery of God being the gospel, when the angel said that the mystery of God should be finished, it was but saying, according to these scriptures, that the gospel should be finished. Paul said that the gospel "is the power of God unto salvation;" therefore to say that the mystery of God—the gospel—should be finished, is but to say that the power of God for the salvation of men will cease to be exercised. So then, according to the explanation given in these scriptures, the angel of Rev. 10:7 says, In the days—the years—of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the gospel should be finished, the power of God for the salvation of men shall cease to be exercised; and the work of God in Christ in those who truly believe in him, will be completed unto the measure of the fullness of the stature of Christ, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets. J.

July 20, 1888

"The Roman Catholic Church and Her Daughters" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 28 , p. 439.

LAST week we quoted from the following from Rev. Charles W. Shields, D.D., of Princeton College, as reasons why the doctrine of Apostolic Succession should not be forbidden in the proposed reunion of Christendom:—

"You would exclude the Roman Catholic Church, *the mother of us all*. . . . You would exclude also the Protestant Episcopal Church, the beautiful daughter of *a beautiful mother*."

So then Protestants have reached the point where they acknowledge the Roman Catholic Church as their mother, and not only that, but they see in her a beautiful mother. In view of the Scriptures on this subject, these statements are intensely suggestive. In Revelation 17:1-6 is written the following:—

"And there came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials, and talked with me, saying unto me, Come hither; I will show unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters; with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication, and the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication. So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness: and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication; and upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus; and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration."

This is the Lord's own description of the Roman Catholic Church. It will be seen at a glance that all who acknowledge her as their mother place themselves in very questionable company. She is a harlot who has committed fornication with the kings of the earth. With the wine of her fornication the inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk; and she has made herself drunk with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus. In the vigorous language of the historian, "The Roman bishops have deluged Europe and Asia with blood." Upon her bold, brazen forehead is written, "Mystery," and it is the "Mystery of Iniquity." And this is the character whom Protestant (?) doctors of divinity greet with the title of "beautiful mother," "the mother of us all"! The word of God says, "Jerusalem which is above . . . is the mother of us all." Gal. 4:26. But here are "Protestant" divines who deny our heavenly mother, and salute "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth," as the mother, the beautiful mother, of them all. This was published February . . . , and not yet have we seen a single paper that has repudiated, nor heard of a minister who has denied, this daughterly tribute to the "beautiful mother" of them all.

What was it that made the Church of Rome a harlot? She was not always so. Once she was the very excellence of purity and virtue. Said Paul to the church at Rome, "I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all, that your faith is spoken of throughout the whole world." Rom. 1:8. But she fell from her high estate; she lost the power of godliness, and courted the power of ungodliness; she forsook her rightful Lord, and joined herself to the kings of the earth, and committed

fornication with them. An illicit connection was formed between the Church and the State. The church leaned upon the arm of the State instead of upon that of her lawful Spouse. She sought the support of earthly power, instead of humbly depending upon the Source of all power in Heaven and in earth. And she who was once a lawful wife, espoused as a chaste virgin to Christ, became a confirmed harlot. She whose faith was once a source of joy throughout the whole world, became a wicked, drunken harlot, making the inhabitants of the earth drunk with the wine of her fornication. She who was once clothed with the pure white raiment of the righteousness of Christ, now sought to make up for the loss of it by arraying herself in purple and scarlet, and decking herself with gold and precious stones and pearls; and where once she held forth the word of life, now she held forth in her jeweled hand a golden cup, full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication. And the only things of which the Scripture says she is the mother are "harlots and abominations of the earth."

That there should be any professed Protestants who were willing to acknowledge as the mother of them all a church so described in the word of God, and which history shows to be abundantly worthy of the description, would be sufficiently surprising were it not that the course of the professed Protestant churches of to-day is giving clear evidence that they are walking in the ways of the wicked mother, and that they will soon show themselves to be true daughters of "Babylon the Great," the "beautiful mother" of them all. No one can look at the carnivals, the festivals, the "crazy" suppers, the ring-cakes, the grab-bags, the "sleeping beauties," the selling of young ladies at auction, the lotteries, and other gambling devices practiced by so many of the churches of the present day, and say but that in these things these churches are walking contrary to the ways of the Lord, whom they profess to serve. In all these things they show themselves "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness but denying the power thereof." And now, just like their Romish mother before them, having lost the power of godliness, they are grasping the power of ungodliness; having lost the power of God, by which they can *persuade* men, they are grasping for the civil power, by which they will *compel* men to conform to that which *they* say is the doctrine of Christ. These also are now turning away from the Lord and leaning upon the arm of the State; they are forsaking their lawful Spouse, and forming illicit connection with civil government. Among all the so-called evangelical Protestant churches of our country there is not one which is not, through Sunday laws, grasping for control of the civil power to wield it in their own interests.

This is precisely the way, even to the subject of the legislation, in which the Roman Catholic Church seized upon the civil power in the fourth century. This is precisely the course which she took by which she made herself that great harlot, committing fornication with the kings of the earth. And this course, in which the Protestant churches of our land are even now so far advanced, will inevitably lead them to the same impure end, and will make them, at last, worthy daughters of that pernicious one whom now they so admiringly call "a beautiful mother," "the mother of us all." We are not the only ones who see such a danger. Last March the Methodist Episcopal Conference of Kansas adopted resolutions refusing to

support any political party that will not grant to them certain concessions. Upon this the *Interior* (Presbyterian) made the following sound comments:—

"The Methodist conference in Kansas at its meeting in Topeka last week, passed resolutions demanding national prohibition and refusing to support any political party which does not stand squarely upon their platform. They demanded: 1. That the United States shall not issue permits to sell liquor in any State unless the same be countersigned by the State authorities. 2. Prohibition in the District of Columbia, the territories, etc. 3. The importation of liquors into any State to be by the consent of the State. 4. A prohibitory amendment to the constitution of the United States.

"Just what the practical effect of these provisions might be it is not safe to undertake in advance to determine. But the purpose of these brethren was to put down the liquor traffic, and therefore it was a righteous purpose. But we would not like to have our presbytery or assembly pledge our church to the defeat of any political party not committed to these particular measures. We would not like to have our church committed to a war of extermination upon the Republican party or the Democratic party. As the clause in our Confession forbidding the church to meddle with civil affairs is now under scrutiny, the action of the Methodist conference affords a very good illustration.

"Let us suppose, now, that the Methodist Episcopal Church, which at the North, we may say, is pretty nearly solidly Republican, should receive and obey a mandate from its general conference to vote against the Republican party—that would defeat that party. There are over one hundred thousand offices and over a thousand millions of treasure dependent upon that stake. Can a church have the awarding of such political spoils to one or another political party, and remain morally pure? No reasonable man will believe it. *Nothing has yet been seen in history in the way of ecclesiastical corruption, that would compare with the horrible mixture of cant and rascality that would follow.* This shows that, however attractive from a moral standpoint ecclesiastico-political action may be, *it is in the highest degree perilous.* In forbidding it our Confession of Faith deals with principles of religion and morality that are unchangeable and decisive."

This is sound doctrine. The churches cannot tamper with political influence and retain their purity. And just as soon as the churches take it upon themselves to control legislation, and to wield their influence for political purposes, just so soon she separates herself from Christ and forms an illicit union with worldly power. The church have already entered upon this course, which can end only in the union of Church and State. And only let the lines be a little more clearly drawn which show that political preference is dependent on church favor, and then the Babylon—mother and daughters—of the book of Revelation will be complete, and will "become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul

spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird." Then will be seen at the full, that tide of "ecclesiastical corruption," that "horrible mixture of cant and rascality," spoken of by the *Interior*. And there will be heard the voice from Heaven saying, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

"For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities. Reward her even as she rewarded you, and double unto her double according to her works; in the cup which she hath filled fill to her double. How much she hath glorified herself, and lived deliciously, so much torment and sorrow give her; for she saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire; for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her." Rev. 18:5-8.

J.

"Questions and Answers" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 28 , p. 440.

AN atheistic paper fell into the hands of one of our brethren, making some of the same old objections to the Bible, and he asks us the following:—

"QUESTION.—"How do you harmonize the following passages of Scripture?—Gen. 14:14 with Judges 18:29; also Ex. 12:40 with Gen. 15:13; and 2 Kings 8:26 with 2 Chron. 21:20 and 22:1, 2. The dates in the Gospels place Christ's baptism at A.D. 27 and his crucifixion at A.D. 33, when but three and one-half years should intervene. Please explain.

"C.H.H."

The first of these passages tells how Abram, when he heard that Lot had been carried captive, armed his trained servants and "pursued them unto Dan." The second tells how the children of Dan, the son of Jacob, burnt the city of Laish, and built a new city in its place, and "called the name of the city Dan, after the name of Dan their father, who was born unto Israel; howbeit the name of the city was Laish at the first." These two passages are of exceeding great comfort to scoffers at the Bible. "Behold," say they (but they are but vain words), "the books says Abram pursued them unto Dan, when the book itself shows that there was no such place as Dan for more than five hundred years afterward." But this is saying too much. For although there was no such *city* as Dan till more than five hundred years after Abram's expedition there *was* such a *place* as Dan at the time when Abram pursued the captors of Lot, and it is the truth that Abram pursued them unto Dan. Says Josephus:—

"When Abram heard of their calamity he was at once afraid for Lot his kinsman, and pitied the Sodomites, his friends and neighbors; and thinking it proper to afford them assistance he did not delay it, but marched hastily, and the fifth night fell upon the Assyrians near Dan, *for that is the name of the other spring of Jordan.*"—*Antiquities, Book 1, chap. 10, paragraph 1.*

The river Jordan has its principal source in a big spring near Cesarea Philippi, at the foot of Anti-Lebanon. From unknown time that spring was called Dan, as Josephus says, and that is why the river that flows from it has always been called Jordan, literally *Yar-Dan*, that is, the *river Dan*. And it was to this place that Abram pursued the captors of Lot, and surprised them "by night," in their camp there at the spring of Dan. This record about Abram and Lot has nothing to do with the *city* of Dan. It does not say Abram pursued them unto *the city of Dan*, but he "pursued them unto Dan." Before infidels can make their objection good, they must prove that the Dan in Gen. 14:14 is *the city of Dan*, of Judges 18:29. But this they cannot do, for their own objection as formed in their own words shows that then there was no such *city* as Dan; while both authentic history and philology show that there was the such a *place* as Dan and that it is the source of the river Dan—Jordan.

This is an old infidel objection, and has been answered over and over, but they still repeat it, although they know the truth about it. Here is a new point which we propose for them in place of this old, wornout one: In Gen. 13:10 the Book says, "And Lot lifted up his eyes, and beheld all the plain of Jordan," that is, all the plain of *the river Dan*. Now let them argue thus: "The plain of Jordan is literally the plain of the *river Dan*. Now Dan was one of the sons of Jacob, the grandson of Abraham, and there was no such city as Dan, till the children of Israel had possessed the promised land, and the tribe of Dan had destroyed Laish and built their own city in the place of it and called the city Dan after the name of their father. Therefore to say that Lot beheld all the plain of the river Dan is the height of absurdity, because then there could have been no such river as Dan, because there was no such city as Dan for more than five hundred years afterward."

Here is a parallel: History says that Columbus discovered America in 1492 A.D. Now what could be more preposterously absurd than to set forth a sober history, such a statement as that, when everybody knows that there was no such place as Columbus for three hundred and thirty-six years afterward. Everybody knows that Columbus is the capital city of the State of Ohio, and it is not only a fact of authentic history, but one also attested by the memory of men still living, that the foundations of the city of Columbus were laid in A.D. 1828. Quote to us as sensible history that Columbus discovered America! Pooh!

In the second reference, one passage, Ex. 12:40, speaks of the sojourn of Israel in Egypt 430 years, while the other said to Abraham that they should dwell in a land that was not theirs 400 years. The same difference is made between Gal. 3:17 and Acts 7:6, Paul saying it was 430 and Stephen 400. This is to be explained by the fact that Acts 7:6 and Gen. 15:13 do not speak definitely but only in round numbers, which was suitable to the purpose in both places; while Gal. 3:17 and Ex. 12:40 having occasion to be definite give the exact time and name the odd years. Another instance of this is Num. 14:33, 34. It is said, after they had spied the land, that they should spend forty years wandering in the wilderness, according to the forty days that they had spied the land. Yet it was really only thirty-eight years from that time, and the forty years include the two years which they had already spent since leaving Egypt. Another is in Judges

11:26. Jephtha said Israel had possessed the lands of Moab 300 years, but, to speak exactly, it was somewhat more than 300 years. Another is in Judges 9:18, 56, with verse 5. Abimelech is said to have slain the seventy sons of Gideon, though in reality he only slew sixty-nine, for Jotham escaped. In 1 Cor. 15:5 Paul speaks of Christ's appearance to the *twelve*, when there were but eleven, because Judas had hanged himself. In Mark 16:14, it says that he appeared to the *eleven*, when there were only *ten*, because John 20:24 says Thomas was not there. In all these instances, the numbers are used generally, but when Paul or any other is making an argument or a particular statement, then the definite number is given.

The next reference in the question relates to the age of Ahaziah when he began to reign. In 2 Kings 8:26 he is said to have been twenty-two years old; while in 2 Chron. 22:2 he is said to have been *forty-two* years old. Yet at the same time, 2 Chron. 21:20 shows that his father died at the age of forty years, which leaves no shadow of doubt as to the age of Ahaziah—he was twenty-two years old. How then could it come about that it is said in one place forty-two, and in the other twenty-two? It must be remembered that the ancient nations did not have figures as we have to express numbers, they had only letters. And in the Hebrew there are several letters so near alike that a very small scratch of a pen—a tittle—will turn one into the other. One of these letters is *Kaph*, and when used as a numeral counts twenty; another is *Mem*, and when used as a numeral counts forty. These two letters are so near alike that the scratch of a pen less than one-sixteenth of an inch in length will turn *Kaph* into *Mem*, and so turn twenty into forty. And that is how, in copying the ancient manuscript, 2 Chron. 22:2 was made to read forty-two instead of twenty-two, as it should be.

The discrepancy in the dates given in the margin of the Gospels, is a mistake of Archbishop Usher, who put them there. The date of the baptism of the Saviour is given correctly, A.D. 27. But how the Archbishop got three years between his baptism and his first miracle, when the Scripture gives it plainly as only *four days*, is more than we can understand. See Mark 1:7-9, and John 1:26-29, 35, 43, and 2:1. And how the Archbishop could get six years between the Saviour's baptism and his death, when the Scripture clearly shows that he attended but four Passovers, making but about three and a half years, for he was crucified at the fourth Passover, is likewise more than we can make out. See John 2:13; 5:1; 6:4; 11:55.

The reader must always bear in mind that, although the dates and marginal references in the Bible are often a great help to the understanding of the Scriptures, yet they are not given by the inspiration of God.

J.

"The Third Angel's Message. The Time of the Message" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 28 , pp. 440, 441.

THE TIME OF THE MESSAGE

(Lesson 5, Sabbath, August 4.)

1. WHAT was the purpose of the sanctuary and the service of the Levitical priesthood?—*It was a figure of the sanctuary and service of the priesthood of Christ.* Heb. 9:9, 22, 23, 11, 12, 24.

2. In the figure how often was the service completed?

"And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year." Lev. 16:34.

"But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people." Heb. 9:7.

3. In the reality how often will it be completed?

"Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us; nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." "But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year." "By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." Heb. 9:12, 24-26; 10:3, 10.

4. What was that day's service called which was performed on the last day of the annual service of the earthly sanctuary?—*The atonement, cleansing of the sanctuary, and "reconciling" the sanctuary.* Lev. 16:19, 20, 33.

5. What made it necessary to cleanse, or reconcile, this sanctuary?

"And he shall make an atonement for the holy [place], because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins; and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation, that remaineth among them in the midst of their uncleanness." "For on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord." "And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year. And he did as the Lord commanded Moses." Verses 16, 30, 34.

6. Is the heavenly sanctuary to be purified, cleansed, or reconciled?

"It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these." Heb. 9:23.

"And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself;

441

by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." Col. 1:20.

7. What says the prophecy on this?

"And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Dan. 8:14.

8. When did this period of time begin?—*B.C. 456*Ω. Dan. 9:25; Ezra. 7:7-26.

9. When did it end?—*A.D. 1844. For $2300-456\Omega=1843\Omega=1844$.*

10. Then when did the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary begin?

11. In the figure what was done with those who had not their sins taken away by the work of atonement?—*They were cut off without mercy; their probation was ended.* Lev. 23:29, 30.

12. As this sanctuary service was all in behalf of sinners, and as all who would not partake of it were cut off without remedy, what, in effect, was that work of atonement?—*A work of judgment.*

13. When the seventh trumpet angel should begin to sound what, among other things, was then to come?—*The time of the dead that they should be judged.* Rev. 11:18.

14. What says the angel of Rev. 14:6, 7?

"And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come; and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters."

15. What then is the date of the message of Rev. 14:6, 7?—*A.D. 1844.*

16. Was there such a message given at that time?

17. What was the result of the rejection of that message?

"And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." Rev. 14:8.

18. What was the result of the "falling away" after the first preaching of the gospel?

"Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." 2 Thess. 2:3, 4.

NOTES

THE sanctuary of the Levitical law was a figure of the sanctuary of the gospel. Heb. 9:0, 11, 23. That was on earth, this is in Heaven; that was made with hands and pitched by man, this was made without hands and pitched by the Lord. Heb. 9:9, 23, 24; 8:2; 9:11. The service of that sanctuary was by the men of the Levitical priesthood, and with the blood of beasts; the service of this sanctuary is by Christ the Lord, of the Melchizedec priesthood, and with the blood of Christ. Heb. 7; 9:6, 9, 12-14, 22-26; 8:1. The service of that sanctuary was completed once a year; the service of this when completed is once for all. Heb. 9:25, 26; 10:3, 10. The last work of the annual service in that sanctuary was upon what was called the day of atonement, and the service was called the cleansing of the sanctuary—the taking away of all the sins that had been conveyed into the sanctuary by the service of the priests at the confessions and sacrifices of the people during the year that then ended. Lev. 23:27-32; 16:2-34. The last work of

the once-for-all service of the heavenly sanctuary will be the great day of everlasting atonement, and the service will be to take away forever all the sins which have been borne by our High Priest, at our confession and the offering of him by faith as our sacrifice, as he offers himself in fact in our behalf. This also is called the cleansing of, not the earthly but the heavenly, sanctuary. As the cleansing of the earthly sanctuary was the last work for that year in behalf of that people, so the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary will be the last work forever in behalf of any people. As the cleansing of the earthly sanctuary was the very last day of that annual round of service, so whenever the world shall have reached the time of the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, the world will then have entered upon the very last days of the work of the gospel, and when the sanctuary shall have been cleansed, the gospel—the mystery of God—will "be finished as He hath declared to his servants the prophets."

Now when, according to the Scriptures, should the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary begin? In Daniel 8:14, from a certain time, it is said, "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." This also being prophetic time each day stands for a year, and is, therefore, two thousand and three hundred years. From what time? "From the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem." Dan. 9:25. Seventy weeks—four hundred and ninety years—were cut off from the two thousand three hundred, and appropriated to Daniel's people, the Jews, and the beginning of the four hundred and ninety years is the beginning of the two thousand and three hundred. This beginning, as quoted above, was at the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, which was in the year 457 B.C. Ezra 7. Although Ezra, with the decree, started from Babylon in the first month, it was not till the fifth month that he reached Jerusalem; and as the decree was to the treasurers "beyond the river" Euphrates and in Palestine, it was of no force till he reached that country, so about half the year was gone before the decree could be said to go forth to restore and to build the city, which would make it about the middle of the year 457, or really 456½ years before Christ. Two thousand and three hundred years from 456½ B.C. brings us to 2300-456½=1843½ after Christ. Eighteen hundred and forty three and a half years after Christ carries us into the year 1844 A.D. Then it was, the angel said to Daniel, that the time of the cleansing of the sanctuary should be: "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

THAT this cannot be applied to the earthly sanctuary is made certain by the statement in Dan. 9:25, that after the cutting off of the Messiah, the people of the prince that should come (the Romans) "should destroy *the city and the sanctuary*," and Christ said that when it should be destroyed, Jerusalem should be trodden under foot of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. Luke 21:24. As that city and that sanctuary were to be destroyed, and were destroyed but a few years after the expiration of the four hundred and ninety years, it is impossible that that should be the sanctuary that was to be cleansed at the expiration of the two thousand and three hundred years. Consequently the sanctuary that was to be cleansed at the end of the two thousand and three hundred years was the heavenly sanctuary, because it is the only one that was

then in existence. Therefore it is certain that the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary in A.D. 1844. (For an extended and thorough treatment of the subject of the sanctuary and connected dates, see "The Sanctuary and Its Cleansing," for sale at this office.)

THE cleansing of the sanctuary, the work of the atonement under the Levitical law, was a work of judgment. For said the Scripture, "Whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people." Lev. 23:29. Whoever did not make confession of sin that day could have no part in the atonement that was made that day; and when the sanctuary had been cleansed, and atonement made, he was to be cut off without mercy, he had no other chance, his probation was gone. So, likewise, in the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary, in the atonement made once for all, whosoever shall not confess his sins, and be partaker of the intercession of Christ, can have no part in the atonement of Christ, and when that sanctuary shall have been cleansed, and that atonement made, he will be cut off without mercy, he will have no other opportunity, his probation will be ended. Of such it will be said, "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still." No longer will the precious cleansing blood be applied. These are they who shall wring out and drink the dregs of the cup that is in the hand of the Lord (Ps. 75:8); these are they who "shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation." Rev. 14:10.

THIS cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary began in A.D. 1844, and in the very nature of the case must soon close. We are now living in the great day of atonement. Now is the time when it is urgent upon every soul to confess his sins, to put away all his transgressions, to be partaker of the intercession of Christ, to wash his robes and make them white in the blood of the Lamb. For soon the mystery of God will be finished, the work of the gospel will be closed, and the unmixed wrath of God and the Lamb will be poured upon all the wicked of the earth.

J.

July 27, 1888

"The Church the Body of Christ" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 29 , p. 455.

UNDER the figure of the church as the body of Christ, Paul in several of his epistles has discussed our relation to Christ and to one another. In Eph. 1:22, 23 he says of Christ, that God "hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body." To the Colossians he says, "He is before all things, and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church." Col. 1:17, 18. And in verse 24 he says that in his sufferings he was filling up "that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church."

Therefore, as the church is the body of Christ, to be a member of the church is to be a member of the body of Christ. And so saith the scripture, "Now we are the body of Christ, and members in particular." "For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." 1 Cor. 12:27; Eph. 5:30. When we were baptized, we were baptized into Christ. Rom. 6:3, and as many "as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." Gal. 3:27. And when we were baptized into Christ we were baptized into his body, which is the church, of which he is the head, and of which we became members by baptism. "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." 1 Cor. 12:12, 13.

We are not only members of his body, but in being that, we are at the same time members one of another. "We, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another." Rom. 12:5. "Putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbor; for we are members one of another." Eph. 4:25.

Thus we have set before us in the Scripture the church under the figure of the human body. Of his body Christ is the head; we are the members; and to be members of the body we must necessarily as members one of another. From Christ, the head, all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God." Col. 2:19. Or, as stated in the letter to the Ephesians, From Christ the head, "the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." Eph. 4:16.

Now, my brother or sister, before examining the scriptures which set forth our duties and obligations to one another individually in this relationship, we wish to ask a question or two upon the views of the church which is presented in the passages already quoted. How have you hitherto looked upon the church? What have you thought it to be? What have you supposed that membership of the church means? Have you looked upon it much as any other association or organization of men for a common purpose? Have you thought it to be a mutual association of persons rather conventional than otherwise? Have you looked upon membership of the church as a sort of fast and loose relationship, that was very good so long as everything went exactly to please you, but was to be lightly set aside as soon as matters went not according to your particular wishes or feelings? Do you look upon it as a relationship the chief object of which is to look with unkind and critical eye upon the weaknesses, and faults, and failings of the brethren, causing pain to them and leanness and misery to your own soul? If any such conception as this has been in your mind, we sincerely hope that it may be forever banished, and that, by the scriptures which we have given, you may obtain a higher and juster idea of what the church of God is, and what the relationship to it is, which you assumed when you took upon you the profession of the name of Christ.

We showed in a former article that the church is the house of God. Do you realize that it is so? Do you look upon it as such? Do you realize that by your

membership of the church you are a member of the household of God? that you are a part of that spiritual house which is the habitation—the dwelling-place—of God through the Spirit? Are you one of those lively stones reflecting the image and brightness of the precious Corner-stone, Christ Jesus? Are you, as a lively stone, gazing upon that Living Stone with such an intensity of look that you are being changed into the same image from glory to glory as by the Spirit of the Lord, and that he in turn may see imaged in you're his own precious character of meekness, gentleness, and holiness? Is it such a view as this that you have of the church of God and of membership of it,—such a view as gives you joy, and peace, and strength, and grace?

We have shown in this article that the church is the body of Christ. Do you realize that that is so? Do you realize that when you cause pain to the church, or to any member of it, you cause pain to Christ? Do you realize that when you bring reproach in any way upon the church, you bring reproach upon Christ? It is so whether you realize it or not. It cannot be otherwise; because he is the head, and it is the head which bears the real consciousness of pain wherever it may be in the body, and "we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones."

Let us see further what is the relationship of the church to Christ, and of ourselves as members thereof. The closest relationship which the human family knows is that of marriage. "He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh." Matt. 19:4-6. Now the Saviour said of himself, "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me." And in Rom. 7:4 it is shown that we become dead to the law that we should be married to Christ; and in 2 Cor. 11:2 Paul says, "I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy; for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ." These texts show plainly that the closest, the dearest, relationship that is known to the human race, is the only one by which the Spirit of God can fittingly represent the relationship between Christ and the church. In view of that now read the following scripture:—

"Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church; and he is the saviour of the body. Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything. Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish. So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself. For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church; for we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh." Eph. 5:22-31.

Now why did Paul write this long passage about husbands and wives and Christ and the church? He tells us in the next verse, "This is a great mystery; but

I speak concerning Christ and the church." Eph. 5:32, therefore, is not written primarily concerning husbands and wives at all. It is written concerning Christ and the church; and the relationship of husband and wife is employed to illustrate the closeness, and the sacredness, of the relationship that exists between Christ and the church. Therefore membership of the church of Christ is akin to the dearest relationship that is known to man. Oh, that everyone who is professedly a member of the church, would consider this subject well, and live fully up to that blessed consideration!

Next week we shall consider our relationship as members one of another in the church.

J.

"Let No Man Deceive You" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 29 , pp. 455, 456.

THE second coming of the Saviour is the most important event that awaits the world. And although the word of God is explicit in regard to it, and the signs are abundant which show it to be near, yet there will be more people deceived in regard to it than upon any other point the world has ever hear of. The Saviour's words, and also those of the apostles, in relation to this subject, show that it will be made a subject of fearful deception; and they have given clear and definite warning upon this one thought, probably more than upon any other one connected with the whole subject of his coming.

When the disciples asked the Saviour, "What shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world," the very first thing that he said in reply was, "Take heed that no man deceive you." Matt. 24:4. And when Paul wrote upon the same subject, he said, "Let no man deceive you by any means." 2 Thess. 2:3. The deception referred to by both Paul and the Saviour is not entirely unbelief in the coming of the Saviour, but it is in accepting that as the coming of Christ which is not his coming at all. This is shown by quoting another verse with the one already referred to in Matt. 24, "Take heed that no man deceive. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many." This shows that the deception will not be upon the question as to whether he will come, but that it will be upon the question as to whether it is really he who does come. This view also appears in Paul's words in 2 Thess. 2:1-10: "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

This was written to those who in Paul's own time were about to be deceived as to the time of the Lord's coming, and he assured them that all this must come

to pass before the coming of the Lord; and that when this man of sin should be revealed he would continue until the Lord does come. "For," said he, "the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. 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." But before that coming Satan will work "with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." This love of the truth which must be received to be saved, is of course the love of the whole word of God; but, as it is upon the point of the coming of the Lord that Satan is going to use his greatest deceptions, it becomes of particular importance to know what is the truth upon this special subject. It is only unto them that look for him, that he appears unto salvation. But they must not only be looking for him, they must be looking for him in the right way, lest they be deceived by some of the false christs that are to arise and deceive many.

What, then, is the truth about the coming of the Lord? What will then occur? The Bible answers these questions so clearly, and makes this matter so plain, that no one who will receive the love of that word, need to be deceived in the least by any pretended christ or false prophet. Suppose that Satan should "materialize," and, "transformed into an angel of light," should present himself to the world as Christ, come in glory. Suppose he should come thus and do great miracles and wonders, healing the sick, making the lame to walk, preaching the spiritualistic idea of love and beauty, and by this means should draw all men unto him: how should people be expected to know that that would not be the coming of Christ? They must know by the Scriptures. Let us see what must happen at the coming of the Lord.

1. The Saviour comes in his own glory, and in the glory of the Father, and in the glory of the angels. His own glory is "above the brightness of the sun." Acts 26:13. The glory of the Father is so also, because the city of God has no need of the sun nor of the moon to shine in it, because the glory of God lightens it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. Rev. 21:23. The face of an angel is like the lightning. Dan. 10:6; Matt. 28:3. But when he comes all the holy angels come with him. Matt. 25:31. And of the angels there are ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands,—and innumerable company. An innumerable company of angels with their faces like the lightning, and their raiment white as snow, reflecting the glory of Him who is greater than all, and in the midst of this glorious host, Him whose glory is above the brightness of the sun, surrounded also with the added glory of the Father—all this will fulfill the scripture, "His glory covered the heavens" (Hab. 3:3), and also the scripture, "As the lightning, that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall also the Son of man be in his day." Luke 17:24. That is the glory of the coming of the Saviour, and Satan and all his angels of light, can never equal it. But that is not all.

2. When he comes, the voice of God is heard saying, "It is done." Rev. 16:17. That voice shakes both heaven and earth. Heb. 12:26, 27; Luke 21:26. This shaking of the heaven causes it to split completely open, and part as a scroll

when it is rolled together. Rev. 6:14. The shaking of the earth is with such an earthquake as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake and so great; the cities of the nations fall; and every mountain and island are moved out of their places. Rev. 16:18, 20, 6:14. At the same time there falls a great hail out of heaven, every stone about the weight of a talent. Rev. 16:21. In the midst of this mighty tumult "the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every freeman," run hither and thither to go into the clefts of the rocks and into the tops of the ragged rocks, to hide themselves in the dens and rocks of the mountains, and call to the fleeing islands and tumbling mountains, "Fall on us, and hide us from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand." Rev. 6:15-17; Isa. 2:19-21.

Satan cannot speak with a voice that will rend the heavens and shake the earth so as to move every mountain and island out of their places. Nor will his appearance to wicked men ever cause them to wish for a mountain to fall on them rather than to have him look upon them.

3. At the coming of the Saviour he will descend from Heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God. At the sound of his voice and that trumpet, all the righteous dead arise, and the righteous living are changed, and all are caught up together to meet him in the air. 1 Thess. 4:16, 17. At the same time all the wicked are slain upon the earth (Rev. 19:11-21; Jer. 25:30-33), and there will not be a man left to dwell therein. Jer. 4:29. Then the whole earth will be made utterly empty and utterly desolate. Isa. 24:1-3, 18-20; Zeph. 1:14-18.

All these things are the accompaniments to the second coming of the Lord. Whoever comes pretending to be Christ, and is not accompanied with all these things, is a false christ. And whoever preaches a coming of Christ that is not accompanied by all these things, is a false teacher. These things are the truth, and he who receives the love of this truth and looks for the coming of the Lord accordingly, will not be deceived by any false christs or false prophets. Anything that pretends to be the second coming of Christ that is not accompanied by a voice that splits the heavens and shakes the earth so that every mountain and island are moved out of their places; that is not accompanied with a glory that covers the heavens, and which is above the brightness of the sun, and as piercing as lightning; that is not accompanied by the beating hail, every stone about fifty-seven pounds in weight, and by the terror of men calling to mountains and rocks to hide them from the face of Him that sitteth upon the throne and from the wrath of the Lamb; that is not accompanied by the shout, and the voice of the Archangel, and the trump of God, by the resurrection of the righteous dead, and the translation of the righteous living, and their being caught up together to meet him in the air, and that does not leave the earth utterly desolate—anything pretending to be the second coming of Christ that is not accompanied by all this, is a deception of Satan. Receive thou the love of the truth, and "take heed that no man deceive you." J.

"The Third Angel's Message. The Development of the Beast" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 29 , pp. 459, 460.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BEAST

(Lesson 6, Sabbath, August 17.)

1. WHAT power is represented by the first beast of Rev. 14?—*The Papacy*.
2. From what was it developed?—"A falling away." 2 Thess. 2:3.
3. In what was shown the first definite evidence of falling away from the truth of God?

The adoption of heathen rites and customs. "The bishops augmented the number of religious rites in the Christian worship, by way of accommodation to the infirmities and prejudices, both of Jews and heathens, in order to facilitate their conversion to Christianity." "For this purpose, they gave the name of *mysterious* to the institutions of the gospel, and decorated particularly the holy sacrament with that solemn title. They used in that sacred institution, as also in that of baptism, several of the terms so far, at length, as even to adopt some of the ceremonies of which those renowned mysteries consisted."—*Mosheim's Church History, cent. 2, part 5, chap. 4, par. 2, 3.*

4. How early was this manifested?

"This imitation began in the Eastern provinces; but, after the time of Adrian [emperor A.D. 117-138], who first introduced the mysteries among the Latins, it was followed by the Christians who dwelt in the western parts of the empire."—*Mosheim, Church History, cent. 5, part 2, chap. 4, par. 5.*

5. What worship was the most widely prevalent among all ancient nations?

Sun worship—"the oldest, the most widespread, and the most enduring of all the forms of idolatry known to man, viz., *the worship of the sun*."—*Tulled W. Chambers, in Old Testament, January, 1886.*

6. When this worship was not directed to an image, how was it performed.

"Before the coming of Christ, all the Eastern nations performed divine worship with their faces turned to that part of the heavens where the sun displays his rising beams. This custom was founded upon a general opinion that God, whose essence they looked upon to be light, and whom they considered as being circumscribed within certain limits, dwelt in that part of the firmament, from which he sends forth the sun, the bright image of his benignity and glory."—*Mosheim, Church History, cent. 2, part 4, chap. 3, par. 7.* See Eze 8:16.

7. Was this custom adopted by some who called themselves Christian?

"The Christian converts, indeed, rejected this gross error [of supposing that God dwelt in that part of the firmament], but they retained the ancient and universal custom of worshiping toward the east, which sprang from it. Nor is that custom abolished even to our

times, but still prevails in a great number of Christian churches."—*Mosheims, lb.*

8. What day was especially devoted to the sun?

9. What day was adopted by these Christians also?

"That very day was the Sunday of their heathen neighbors and respective countrymen; and patriotism gladly united with expediency in making it at once their Lord's day and their Sabbath."—*North British Review as quoted in History of the Sabbath, chap. 16.*

10. Upon what is the Papacy built?—*Self-exaltation. 2 Thess. 2:4.*

11. In behalf of what was manifested the first arrogant claims of the Papacy?—*In behalf of Sunday.*

12. By whom?—*By victor, who was bishop of Rome, A. D. 193-202.*

13. What did he command?

"He wrote an imperious letter to the Asiatic prelates commanding them to imitate the example of the Western Christians with respect to the time of celebrating the festival of Easter [that is, commanding them to celebrate it on Sunday]. The Asiatics answered this lordly requisition. . . with great spirit and resolution, that they would by no means depart in this manner from the custom handed down to them by their ancestors. Upon this the thunder of excommunication began to roar. Victor, exasperated by this resolute answer of the Asiatic bishops, broke communion with them, pronounced them unworthy of the name of his brethren, and excluded them from all fellowship with the church of Rome."—*Mosheim, lb., chap. 3, par. 11.*

14. How early in the second century had this question been made an important one?

"About the middle of this century, during the reign of Antonius Pius [about 101], the venerable Polycarp went to Rome to confer with Anicet, bishop of that See, upon this matter."—*lb. par 10.*

15. What is the great characteristics of the Papacy as a world power?

The union of Church and State,—the religious power dominating the civil power and using it to further its own ends.

16. When was the union of Church and State formed, out of which grew the Papacy?—*In the reign of Constantine, A. D. 414-447.*

17. What was the condition and work of most of the bishops at this time?

"Worldly-minded bishops, instead of caring for the salvation of their flocks, were often but too much inclined to travel about, and entangle themselves in worldly concerns."—*Neander, vol. 1, p. 16, Turley's edition, Boston, 1856.*

18. What had these bishops determined to do?

"This theocratical theory was already the prevailing one in the time of Constantine; and. . . the bishops voluntarily made themselves dependent on him by their disputes, and had their

determination to make use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims."—*Ib.*, p. 142.

19. What is the "theocratical theory"?—*The theory of government of a State by the immediate power or administration of God.*

20. What then is the effect of a man-made theocracy?—*To put man in the place of God.*

21. Was this the outcome of the theocratical theory of the bishops of the fourth century?

"Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." 2 Thess. 2:3, 4.

August 3, 1888

"God Loveth a Cheerful Giver" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 30 , pp. 470, 471.

"GOD loveth a cheerful giver," is the statement of Holy Writ. This seems rather a singular expression, in view of the Scripture declarations that God loves all the world. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Although this is true that God so loved all the world that while they were yet enemies, he gave his Son to die for them, yet there are certain ones whom he says he loves, which shows that between him and these there is a closer bond of love than that which exists between him and the wide world for whom he even gave his dear Son to die.

To illustrate: Jesus said, "If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him." John 14:23. This shows clearly that, though God loves all men, yet there is a closer bond of love between him and those who love Christ than there is between him and those who do not love Christ.

Again: The psalmist says: "A Father of the fatherless, and a judge of the widows, is God in his holy habitation." Ps. 68:5. Other scriptures show that God is the Father of all, and the Judge of all. And although this is true, yet this text shows that there is that in the condition of the fatherless and the widow, which brings God especially near, and leads him to single out these as special objects of his fatherly and judicial care.

And again: One of the twelve is mentioned as "that disciple whom Jesus loved." But did not Jesus love all of his disciples? Assuredly he did. He loved all men. While beholding the wicked city which was about to take him, and with wicked hands crucify and slay him, his great heart of love burst forth in an agony of grief. And when suspended upon the cross, while they jeered and scoffed at him, his dying love prayed for their forgiveness. Jesus loved all. Then why should this one be spoken of as "that disciple whom Jesus loved"? Because in the spirit

of this one there was that which more readily responded to the chords of love that thrilled in the heart of the Saviour. There was a bond of love between him and that disciple that was closer than between him and the others. And when we know the great love of Christ for all, what a world of meaning lies in those words, "that disciple whom Jesus loved."

These scriptures illustrate the meaning of the text, "God loveth a cheerful giver." Where there is one who sets his heart upon the cause of God, thinks about it, and studies and plans how he may help it forward in the earth, gives to the cause of that which God has bestowed in blessing upon him, and does it cheerfully, that is the man whom the Lord specially singles out as one whom he loves. And although he loves all men as only he can who is Love, yet between the Lord and such a man there is a bond of affection which draws from him the assurance that here is a man whom God loves. "God loveth a cheerful giver."

That which called forth this expression was the fact that there were a number of Christians who had given all they had for the gospel's sake, to send it abroad to all the world. In a few years a dearth came throughout all the land, and they were found in need. Then those who had been reached by the gospel through their love for it, were called upon to give for the gospel's sake to those who had made themselves poor for the gospel's sake. And it was said to them, "Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or

471

of necessity; for God loveth a cheerful giver." 2 Cor. 9:7.

Now how is it with you, brethren? The cause of the Third Angel's Message is the cause of the "everlasting gospel." Rev. 14:6-12. Means is required now, as well as at the first, to send it, according to the great commission, "into all the world," and "to every nation and kindred and tongue and people." Money must be furnished to send forth the gospel; this everybody knows; but how do you give it? grudgingly, or of necessity? or do you give it cheerfully? Does the work of the "everlasting gospel" have an important place in all your plans? or is it only the subject of occasional attention? The word of God has formulated a plan by which the work of the gospel shall become an important part of all our business transactions. On this subject this direction is written, "Upon the first day of the week, let everyone of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him."

There are no people more familiar with this text than are Seventh-day Adventists. It is a text that is always used by those who advocate the keeping of the first day of the week instead of the Sabbath; and we are constantly being called upon to show that there is in it no shadow of authority for substituting the observance of Sunday for that of the Sabbath. We all know that that is what the text does *not* mean. But in our duty of showing what the text does *not* mean, have we not neglected to show what it *does* mean? Has the text any meaning at all to the people of this age? We are perfectly assured that it has. The epistles of the apostles of Christ were not merely local communications, whose authority and instruction were to expire with the age in which they were written; they are divine communications to the church of Christ in all places and all ages, divine directions for the guidance of the church in all its work in fulfillment of the commission to preach the gospel to every creature. This proposition no Seventh-

day Adventist will for a moment dispute. Then is there not something which this text does mean? And if it has any meaning, does it not mean what it says? Does it not mean that on the first day of the week every one of us shall lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that portion of means which is to be devoted to the work of the church in spreading abroad the truth of God embodied in the everlasting gospel? Who will, say that the text means nothing to us? Not one. Well, then, if the text does mean something to us, it must mean what it says, and is it not high time that we began to obey it? We as a people make a profession of being strictly obedient to the Scriptures as they are written; *but do we obey this scripture?* Does every one of us lay by him in store, upon the first day of the week, as God has prospered him, a portion of means for the work of the Lord? If not, why not?

At the General Conference of 1887, this matter was duly considered, and obedience to this scripture was recommended to the whole body of Seventh-day Adventists, the proceeds to be devoted to foreign missions. Some had already been practicing it for years. Since this action of the General Conference many more have been obeying the scripture. But we know that there are many yet who are not obeying it. We are sorry that it is so, but so it is. These we would ask, How long are you going to continue to disobey? And if you are going to continue in that way at all, what reason have you for it? and how do you expect to meet the Saviour without spot and blameless when he comes? It is only a plain, simple, scriptural, moral, and business proposition. There is the word of God which says, "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him." That word assuredly has a meaning to the church. The meaning is clearly expressed in the words themselves. The only question that remains is one of obedience. Shall we obey this word of God? or shall we not? Who will assume the responsibility of saying that we shall not?

Brethren, we pray you to consider this matter in the light of the word and Spirit of God; and then, "every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give, not grudgingly, or of necessity; for God loveth a cheerful giver."

NOTE.—Let no one make the mistake of supposing that obedience in this text is to take the place of obedience to those Scriptures which enjoin the duty of tithing. This means referred to in 1 Cor. 16:2 is spoke of by Paul as a "contribution." The tithe is in no sense a contribution; it is the Lord's already. "All the tithe of the land, whether of the seed of the land, or of the fruit of the tree, *is the Lord's*; it is holy unto the Lord." Lev. 27:30. The tithe is the Lord's, and not ours, and no man can make a contribution of that which does not belong to him. 1 Cor. 16:2 is speaking of our own means, and gives directions how we may give systematically of that which is our own, "to prove the sincerity of our love."

J.

"Members One of Another" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 30 , pp. 471, 472.

WE noticed last week those scriptures which set forth the church as the body of Christ, and the members of the church as members of the body of Christ, and

therefore members one of another, as they by "joints and bonds" are "knit together in love." As the members of the church are members of the body of Christ, and also members one of another, how can it be but that there shall be unity in the church. If I am a member of the body of Christ and you are a member of the body of Christ, then if we have any respect for Christ how can it be that we shall have any disrespect for one another? If we love Christ how can we have anything but love for one another? But more than this, we are also members one of another, and as "no man ever yet hated his own flesh," how then can it ever be that we should not love one another.

This is the very test of our love for Christ: "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" 1 John 4:20. No man can appreciate the love of Christ while he is cross and spiteful and cruel to his brother, for whom Christ died. Church-members therefore cannot expect to honor Christ while they dishonor one another. In dishonoring one another they do dishonor Christ, because "we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." But when each one sees in his brother one for whom the Saviour died, and one who is a member of the body of Christ, then each one will treat his brother tenderly, lovingly, as the Saviour is tender and loving. When each one sees in his brother a soul so precious as that Christ died for him, he is not going to treat him slightly, nor needlessly cause him pain. To cause a brother pain cannot be without causing Christ pain, for we are members of his body, and he is the Head of the body, and it is the head always which is really conscious of any pain in the body. The Scripture would have us realize the closeness, the intricacy, of the relationship between Christ and the church, and between the members one with another in the church.

Paul sets this forth as follows:—

"For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him. And if they were all one member, where were the body? But now are they many members, yet but one body. And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much more those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary; and those members of the body, which we think to be less honorable, upon these we bestow more abundant honor; and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness. For our comely parts have no need; but God hath tempered the body together, having given more abundant honor to that part which lacked; that there should be no schism in the body; but that the members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all

the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." 1 Cor. 12:12-27.

In this it is shown that in the church—the body—of Christ, the members make up the body, as in the human body the eyes, the hands, the feet, etc., form the body. And as in the human body the different members are joined one to another, each in its proper place, to form the perfect body, so also is the body of Christ. And God hath "set the members every one in the body as it hath pleased him." and as in the human body one dislocated member disconcerts and deforms the whole body, so also is it in the body of Christ. As in the human body each member can properly fulfill its function only by working in the place in which it belongs, so also is it in the body of Christ. For each member to know his place, and keep it, in the church, is just as essential to the efficient working of the church as that each member of the human body shall properly be set in its proper place, in order to the easy, comfortable working of the human body. But "all members have not the same office;" and cannot be hands, all cannot be eyes, all cannot be feet. Let the eye and the hand change places, and the good of both would be destroyed, and each would be an evil to the whole body. Let the hands and the feet change places, and the efficiency of all would be destroyed. But with all the members—eyes, hands, and feet—in their proper places, each can be efficient in its own place, and all working together can do that which the hand finds to do. The eye sees that which is to be done, the feet carry us within reach, and the hands perform the task, and each is essential to the working of the other. Except they all work together no task can be efficiently executed. "The eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much more those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary." To no part of the body can any other part of the body say, "I have no need of you."

Thus it is with the human body, as everybody knows; and thus it is with the body of Christ, the church—as everybody ought to know. Each member of the church, *in his place*, is necessary to every other member of the church. Yea, even "those members of the body, which seem to be more feeble, are necessary." And those members of the body which we think to be less honorable, upon these we should bestow more abundant honor. Christ has honored them with a place in the church, shall we despise them? "The members should have the same care one for another. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be honored, all the members rejoice with it." Or as it is said in another place: "Remember them that are in bonds, as bound with them; and them which suffer adversity, as being yourselves also in the body." Heb. 13:3. "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." And, oh, that everyone who is a member of the church would realize how sacred is the relationship into which he has entered! Then indeed would the disciples of Christ be one, and the world would believe that God sent him.

For the edifying—the building up—of the church, the Lord has placed certain gifts in the church. "When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men." "When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive,

and gave gifts unto men." "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure

472

of the stature of the fullness of Christ." Eph. 4:8, 11-13. In another place it is written of these gifts, "God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." 1 Cor. 12:28. Thus we see that the gift of teaching the word of God is only third in importance of the gifts of the Spirit of God to members of the church. It is second only to the gift of prophecy, and is before miracles, or gifts of healings, or diversities of tongues. Paul expressed the matter thus: "I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than ye all; yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue." 1 Cor. 14:18, 19.

But though all could speak with the tongues of men and of angels, if they have no charity—the love of God—they are but as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. Though all had the gift of prophecy, and the gift of wisdom to the understanding of all mysteries and all knowledge; and though all had faith that could remove mountains, if they have not charity they are nothing. And though all were so benevolent as that they would bestow all their goods to feed the poor; and though they were all so perfectly assured of what they believe that they would die at the stake as witnesses to it, if they have not charity it will profit nothing. Charity is love. It is the love of God shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost. It is that love which keeps the commandments of God, "for this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments;" and "love is the fulfilling of the law." Therefore, though all have all these wondrous powers, and have not the keeping of the commandments of God, they are nothing. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." But if there be in the church the love of God, keeping the commandments of God, then all these gifts, working together with charity, build up the body of Christ, make increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love, and increase it with the increase of God.

How long shall it be ere the church of the living God comes up to the fullness of its high privilege?

J.

"The Third Angel's Message. The Development of the Beast" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 30 , p. 473.

1. WHAT did we find in the preceding lesson was the determination of the bishops of the fourth century?—*To make use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their own aims.*

2. What was one of the principal aims of the Western bishops, especially the bishop of Rome?—*The exaltation of Sunday*.

3. What did they secure from Constantine?—*An edict, in A.D. 321, in favor of Sunday—the first Sunday law that ever was*.

4. What was this law?

"Let all the judges and town people, and the occupation of all trades, rest on the venerable day of the sun; but let those who are situated in the country, freely and at full liberty attend to the business of agriculture; because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn and planting vines; lest, the critical moment being let slip, men should lose the commodities granted by Heaven. Given the seventh day of March; Crispus and Constantine being coequals each of them for the second time."—*History of the Sabbath, chap. 19*.

5. Who convened the council of Nice?—*Constantine, A.D. 325*.

6. What was one of the two principal decisions rendered by that council?—*That Easter should always and everywhere be celebrated on Sunday*.

7. Under what authority were its decrees published?

"The decrees of these synods were published under the imperial authority, and thus obtained a political importance."—*Neander, vol. 2, p. 133*.

8. Who was bishop of Rome during twenty-one years and eleven months of Constantine's reign?—*Sylvester, January 31, 414, to December 31, 415*.

9. What did he do with his "apostolic authority" shortly after the Council of Nice?

"He decreed that Sunday should be called the Lord's day."—*History of the Sabbath, p. 450*.

10. What was commanded by the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 363 to 364?—*That if Christians should rest on the Sabbath, "let them be accursed from Christ;" and that they should rest on Sunday*.

11. Did Constantine's Sunday law apply to all classes?

12. Were other laws demanded by the bishops, which should be more general?

"By a law of the year 386, those older changes affected by the Emperor Constantine were more rigorously enforced, and, in general, civil transactions of every kind on Sunday were strictly forbidden. Whoever transgressed was to be considered, in fact, as guilty of sacrilege."—*Neander, vol. 2, p. 300*.

13. What petition was made to the emperor by a church convention in A.D. 401?

"That the public shows might be transferred from the Christian Sunday and from feast days, to some other days of the week."—*ib.*

14. What was the object of all these State laws?

"That the day might be devoted with less interruption to the purposes of devotion." "That the devotion of the faithful might be free from all disturbance."—*ib., pp. 297, 301*.

15. What was it that so much hindered the devotion of the "faithful" of those times?

"Owing to the prevailing passion at that time, especially in the large cities, to run after the various public shows, it so happened that when these spectacles fell on the same days which had been consecrated by the church to some religious festival, they proved a great hindrance to the devotion of Christians, though chiefly, it must be allowed, to those whose Christianity was the least an affair of the life and of the heart."—*Ib.*, p. 300.

16. How was their "devotion" disturbed?

"Church teachers. . . were, in truth, often forced to complain, that *in such competitions the theater was vastly more frequented than the church.*"—*Ib.*

17. What does Neander say of all this?

"In this way, the church received help from the State for the furtherance of her ends. . . . But had it not been for that confusion of spiritual and secular interests, had it not been for the vast number of mere *outward conversions* thus brought about, she would have needed no such help."—*Ib.*, p. 301.

18. When the church had received the help of the State to this extent did she stop there?

No, she demanded that the civil power should be exerted to compel men to serve God as the church should dictate.

19. Which of the fathers of the church was father to this theory?—*Augustine, who lived from A.D. 434 to 480.*

20. What did he teach?

"It is indeed better that men should be brought to serve God by instruction than by fear of punishment or by pain. But because the former means are better, the latter must not therefore be neglected. . . . Many must often be brought back to their Lord, like wicked servants, by the rod of temporal suffering, before they attain to the highest grade of religious development."—Schaff's Church History, sec. 3; Augustine Epistle 185 and Bonfaciana, sec. 21:28.

21. What does Neander say of this?

"It was by Augustine, then, that a theory was proposed and founded, which. . . contained the germ of that whole system of spiritual despotism of intolerance and persecution, which ended in the tribunals of the inquisition."—*Church History, vol. 5, p. 147.*

THUS was formed the union of Church and State out of which grew the Papacy. Thus was developed "the beast," which made war with the saints of God, and wore out the saints of the Most High.

August 10, 1888

"That There Be No Gatherings" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 31 , pp. 487, 488.

LAST week we referred to 1 Cor. 16:2, as having a meaning to people in this day. We showed that in that scripture God has established a system of contributions for the support of the gospel; a system of contributions as regular and as constant as are the demands of the gospel as it is sent forth in obedience to the great commission, to "all nations," "to every creature." We know that some take refuge from this duty, under the plea that these contributions were for the poor. It is true that the people for whom this money was immediately donated were poor. But the reference in the text is not to making donations to the poor in general. These people were poor; but they had made themselves poor *for the gospel's sake*. This contribution was directly for the poor saints "at Jerusalem," and for the "brethren which dwelt in Judea." Rom. 15:26; Acts 11:29, 30.

The record is of these that in the first work of the gospel after Pentecost, "the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and one soul; neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things common. . . . Neither was there any among them that lacked; for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles' feet: and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need." Acts 4:32-35. And when the disciples, all, except the apostles, were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, and went everywhere preaching the word (Acts 8:1, 4; 11:19-21), money from this common fund bore their expenses; and their money therefore helped to send the gospel to all the countries roundabout, even to the Gentiles. Paul says as much. In writing of this very matter of the first-day contributions he says: "For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem. It hath pleased them verily; and their debtors they are. For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things." Rom. 15:26, 27. And again, in writing to the Corinthians on this subject, he shows that in this contribution to these who had made themselves poor for the gospel's sake, they were not only distributing to them but to all men. He says: "For the administration of this service not only supplieth the want of the saints, but is abundant also by many thanksgivings unto God;

488

whiles by the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your professed subjection unto the gospel of Christ, and for your liberal distribution unto them, and *unto all men*; and by their prayer for you, which long after you for the exceeding grace of God in you." 2 Cor. 9:12-14. All this shows plainly that that support of the gospel was the purpose of this system of regular laying by on the first day of the week. In doing it they showed the reality of their professed subjection to the gospel, and showed the reality of the grace of God in them, and showed the sincerity of their love for Christ. 2 Cor. 8:7-9. This being so, thus it follows that as long as the gospel lasts, so long will last this obligation to lay by in

store on the first day of the week as God hath prospered us, for the spread of the gospel.

There is given also by Paul a reason why this should be systematically and regularly carried out. That is, "that there be no gatherings when I come." Paul did not wish it to be so that when he came to Corinth he should have to spend his time in urging them to give, and they have to spend their time in getting together that which they should, in response to a powerful appeal, decide to give. More than this, under the influence of a strong appeal, and the example of others pledging, some might be wrought up to pledge more than they were really able to give, and only bring upon themselves a burden and perplexity. Paul did not want that, for he says, "I mean not that other men be eased, and ye burdened." 2 Cor. 8:13. And another thing, he did not want the support of the gospel of Christ to depend upon spasmodic giving. As the work of the gospel is and must be constant, so the support of it must also be constant; and the directions in 1 Cor. 16:2, if obeyed, will, in addition to the Lord's tithe, always assure an ample support to the work of sending abroad the gospel of Christ to all nations. There will always be occasional circumstances arising which will demand occasional offerings; but the regular work of the gospel demands regular offerings; and again we say that this demand is provided for in the direction given in 1 Cor. 16:2, "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him."

Upon this subject Conybeare and Howson have the following excellent remark:—

"Nor ought we . . . to leave unnoticed the calmness and deliberation of the method which he recommends of laying aside week by week what is devoted to God (1 Cor. 16:2)—a practice equally remote from the excitement of popular appeals and the mere impulse of instinctive benevolence.—*Life of Paul*, p. 464, T. Y. Crowell's edition.

That this should be equally remote from the excitement of popular appeals and the mere impulse of instinctive benevolence, is the real truth of the matter. God wants it to be a matter of principle, and he has made provision that it shall be so, through obedience to his word. If in obedience to this word we make it a matter of principle with ourselves, then our ministers in their visits to the churches can spend their efforts in building up the brethren in the most holy faith, instead of having to make such strenuous efforts to arouse them to such a sense of the needs of both the foreign and home mission work as that they will give something toward helping forward the work. Then we can be cheered with the good reports of the progress the cause is making in foreign fields, and also in seeing the fruits of our own home efforts.

There are other important advantages in this. One is that by regular, systematic giving, it soon becomes a habit; and it sits so well upon us that it is actually easier to give than not. Another advantage is that a little given regularly thus, really amounts to more than do considerable sums at odd times. A sum so small as to appear too insignificant, in itself, to give, may be given weekly according to the Scripture, and it will amount to more in the year than that person

could well afford to give at any one time in the year. Many people often cheat themselves by failing to give anything because they have but a little to give. They may have but five cents that they can give, but that is too small a sum for them to give. They have more respect for the dignity of the cause of God than to put it off with five cents; they will not give till they can give a larger sum—five dollars or such a matter. But, my brother, five *cents* that you give is worth a great deal more to the cause of God than is five *dollars* that you do *not* give. Please bear this in mind, and when you have but five cents that you can give, give that, remembering at the same time that "if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not." But do not cheat yourself with the idea that five cents will answer with a willing mind when you have five dollars that you can give.

Now, brethren, we ask you again, Shall we not every one obey from the heart that scripture that is plainly addressed to "every one." "Upon the first day of the week let *every one of you* lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings" when the minister comes.

May the Lord help all, that we may all be obedient, and show in *reality* our *professed* subjection to the gospel of Christ, and the fruits of the grace of God in us, and the sincerity of our love for Christ, and those for whom he died!
J.

"The Third Angel's Message. The Development of the Beast" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 31 , p. 489.

THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE. THE MAKING OF THE IMAGE OF THE BEAST

(Lesson 8. Sabbath, August 25.)

1. WHAT Government have we proved to be represented by the second beast of Rev. 13?

2. What power is to be exercised by this beast?

"And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him."

Verse 12, first clause.

3. For what purpose does he use this power?

"And causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed." Remainder of same verse.

4. What is said by him to them that dwell on the earth?

"Saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live." Verse 14, last part.

5. What power is represented by the first beast?—*The Papacy*.

6. What have we found to be the great characteristic of the Papacy?—*The union of Church and State—the Church using the power of the State for the furtherance of its own aims.*

7. For what then are we to look in this nation?—*For the religious power to exalts itself to that place, where it shall dominate the civil, and deploy the power of the State for the furtherance of its own ends.*

8. Is there any effort even now being made in this direction?—*Yes, a large and influential organization is working to this very end.*

9. What, according to their own words, is the object of the association?

"To secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as shall suitably express our national acknowledgement of Almighty God as the source of all authority in civil Governments; of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler of nations; and of his revealed will as of supreme authority; and thus indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of the Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

11. Of what does the organization consist in itself?

Of a president, the names of about one hundred and twenty vice-presidents, a recording secretary, a corresponding secretary, a treasurer, seven districts secretaries (at present), and the Reformed Presbyterian Church as a body.

12. Who are some of the prominent men actively engaged in favor of it?

Joseph Cook, Herrick Johnson, D.D., Julius H. Seelye, president of Amherst College; Bishop Huntington, of New York; Hon. Wm. Strong, ex-justice of the United States Supreme Court, and many others.

13. Of what other important bodies has it gained the support.

The "principal" churches, the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and the prohibition party in many States.

14. What was the prevailing theory of the church leaders in the time of constant theme?—*"The theocratical theory."*

15. What is the theory of the National Reformers?

"Every government by equitable laws, is a government of God; a republic thus governed is of him, and is as truly and really a theocracy as the Commonwealth of Israel."—*Cincinnati National Reform Convention, p. 28.* "A true theocracy is yet to come, [and] the enthronement of Christ in law and law-makers, and separate devotedly as a Christian patriot, for the ballot in the hands of women."—*Monthly Reading, W.C.T.U.*

16. What had the church leaders determined to do in the days of Constantine?—*"To make use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their own aims."*

17. What have these in our day determined to do?—*The same thing.*

18. What came of that in the fourth century?—*The Papacy.*

19. What will come of this in the nineteenth century?—*The image of the Papacy.*

20. Of what other bodies is the National Reform Association diligently working to secure the support?—*The workingmen and the Catholic Church*.

21. What does this Association say of the Catholic Church?

"We cordially, and gladly, recognize the fact that in the South American republics, and in France and other European countries, the Roman Catholics are the recognized advocates of national Christianity, and stand opposed to all the proposals of secularism. . . . *Whenever they are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them.* In a World's Conference for the promotion of National Christianity—which ought to be held at no distant day—many countries could be represented only by Roman Catholics."—*Christian Statesmen, December 11, 1884*.

22. What are all Catholics commanded by the pope to do?

"All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the constitutions of States and legislation to be modeled on the principles of the true church; and all Catholic writers and journalists should never lose sight, for an instant, from the view of the above prescription."—*Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII., 1885*.

23. Then is not the National Reform Association aiming to form a government modeled after the principles of the Papacy?

24. Then, if professed Protestants under the leadership of the National Reform Association succeed in this, what will there be erected in this Government?—*An image of the Papacy*.

August 17, 1888

"The Plea for National Sunday Legislation" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 32 , p. 503.

APRIL 6, the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor gave a hearing to arguments in support of the petitions of the W.C.T.U., for national Sunday legislation. Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, D.D., delivered what seems to have been the principal production on the question. He has since presented the same argument in the Philadelphia National Reform Convention. The paper is entitled, "National Sabbath Reform."

The petitions in support of which the argument was made ask Congress to prohibit Sunday railroad trains, Sunday mails, and Sunday parades in the army and navy. The Doctor instances the railroad strikes, riots, and wrecks, as proof that the Sunday train is a national evil, and says:—

"There is abundance of evidence in the testimony of railroad men themselves of the fact that their Sabbath-breaking is closely related to their train-wrecking. They feel that, having broken one commandment of God, they might as well go through the whole list. . . . It is a perilous thing to allow men to be started in law-breaking."

So, then, Doctor Crafts and his fellow-petitioners want Congress to set itself up as the guardian of the law of God, to define what is the law of God and what is its transgression—to define and to punish *sin*—for Mr. Crafts said also in this very connection that "most of the railroad work" "is a sin against God's law."

He demands that railroad trains shall be compelled to stop over Sunday wherever they may be when Sunday overtakes them, and then inquires:—

"Why may not a few railway passengers be detained for one day, even at some slight inconvenience or loss, on the same ground that steamboat passengers are detained in quarantine for a fortnight, namely, to protect the public health?"!!

Does Mr. Crafts mean seriously to assert that all steamboat passengers are detained in quarantine for a fortnight? He knows better. He knows that it is only the passengers of steamboats infected with cholera, or yellow fever, or small-pox, or some such deadly disease, that are detained in quarantine at all. Well, then, does he mean seriously to assert that a railroad train running on Sunday is as dangerous to the public health as is a cholera-infected steamboat? and that the train must therefore be quarantined on Sunday "to protect the public health"? If he does *not* mean this, then his argument is an utter *non sequiter*. And if he *does* mean this, then to what absurd lengths will men not run in their wild endeavors to find a basis for Sunday legislation?

His next proposition is of the same piece. Here it is:—

"An inter-State commerce bill to protect the health of cattle is now before the Senate. Why not add another to protect the health of railroad men?"

Well, Doctor, there are several reasons for this. As you seem not to have discovered any, let us endeavor to enlighten you. There are several points of distinction between railroad men and cattle. Allow us to point them out.

First, there has always been recognized, by everybody, unless, perhaps, certain Doctor of Divinity, a distinction between railroad men and cattle in this, that railroad men have more sense than cattle have; that they are capable of taking care of their own health, and that they have all the facilities for it.

Secondly, a distinction between railroad men and cattle appears in this, that railroad men are not bought and sold, nor are they crowded into cars and shipped, as cattle are.

Thirdly, an important distinction between railroad men and cattle appears in this, Doctor, that railroad men are not killed and eaten as cattle are. You see, Doctor, cattle are eaten by the public. Therefore you will see, perhaps, that if the cattle be diseased, the public will be eating disease, and the public health will be endangered. Therefore an inter-State commerce bill to protect the health of cattle is a necessity to protect the public health.

Next Doctor Crafts discusses Sunday mails, and it is in this that there appears the "true inwardness" of his whole Sunday law argument, and, in fact, of the whole Sunday-law movement. He says:—

"The law allows the local postmaster, if he chooses (and some of them do choose), to open the mails at the very hour of church, and to make the post-office the competitor of the churches."

There is the secret of the whole Sunday-law agitation. The churches cannot bear competition. They must have a monopoly. The Sunday trains must be stopped, because they are competitors of the churches. The Elgin Sunday-law Convention, which Doctor Crafts indorses, said so. The Sunday papers must be abolished, because they are competitors of the churches. The Elgin Sunday-law Convention said so. The post-offices must be closed on Sunday, because they are competitors of the churches. Doctor Crafts says so. Now by the side of these statements read this:—

"The Sunday train, the Sunday newspaper, and the Sunday mail are a combine against the public health."

That is to say, the Sunday train is a competitor of the churches; therefore it must be quarantined—"to protect the public health." The Sunday newspaper is a competitor of the churches; therefore it must be abolished—"to protect the public health." The post-office open on Sunday is a competitor of the churches; therefore it must be shut—"to protect the public health." The nation must secure to the churches a complete monopoly of Sunday, and all "to protect the public health." How very considerate of the public health these men are, to be sure! No, they are not. The public health is not in all their thoughts. It is national power to enforce religious observances that they want.

This is further shown by the fact that although Doctor Crafts repeatedly stated that this Sunday legislation is to protect the public health, he declared that:—

"A National Sabbath Committee, *representing the religious organizations* of the nation, will be necessary to secure clear convictions on the subject among Christians, and also the enactment and enforcement of wholesome Sunday laws. . . . This National Sabbath Committee should be appointed by the churches."

Now if this legislation is in the interest of the public health, why is it that the National Committee must be appointed by the *churches* instead of by the *public*? And why should this National Committee represent the *religious organizations* instead of the *public*? If all this legislation is in the interests of the public health, then why must the National Committee be chosen by the churches from the religious organizations, instead of by the *public*, from the *Boards of Public Health* of the different States? Ah! the truth is that the interests of the public health do not enter into the question at all.

Next Mr. Crafts tells what they want. In regard to closing the post-offices on Sunday during church hours, to stop this competition with the churches, he says:—

"A law forbidding the opening between ten and twelve would accomplish this, and would be better than nothing; *but we want more.*"

Again:—

"A law forbidding any handling of Sunday mail at such hours as would interfere with church attendance on the part of employes would be better than nothing; *but we want more.*"

And again:—

"A law forbidding all carrier delivery of mail on Sunday would be better than nothing; *but we want more.*"

Well, then, what do they want?

"What we ask is a law instructing the Postmaster-General to make no further contracts which shall include the carriage of mails on the Sabbath, and to provide that hereafter no mail matter shall be collected or distributed on that day."

And THEY WANT MORE THAN THIS. This is sufficient for them to begin with, but they will never stop here. Just as soon as these men get what they here ask, and find by that that the religious power can influence the civil in its own behalf, then they will push that power to the utmost that their influence can carry it. If they get what they here ask, in the very words of Doctor Crafts, there will be no stopping-place short of the fullest claims of the Papacy. If they get what they here as, the first thing to be done will be for the national power, by some tribunal, either the legislative or judicial, to declare what day is the Sabbath. To do this will demand the interpretation of Scripture, and the decision of a religious question. Therefore, by this one act, by this single step, the nation will be plunged at once into a whirl of religious controversy, of judicial interpretations of Scripture and judicial decisions of religious questions; and where shall the thing stop? This is precisely what the National Reformers are trying to do. They intend, in their own words, that "the whole frame-work of Bible legislation" shall be "thoroughly canvassed by Congress and State Legislatures, by the Supreme Courts of the United States and of the several States, and by lawyers and citizens;" and then, again in their own words, "the churches and the pulpits [will] have much to do with shaping and forming opinions on all moral questions, and *with interpretations of Scripture* on moral and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical, points;" "and the *final decisions* will be developed there." And that will be the times of the Papacy over again. And the one single step that will plunge the nation into this maelstrom is this Sunday-law action which Congress is now petitioned to take.

When this question came before the United States Senate before, the Senate replied: "Let the national Legislature once perform an act which involves the decision of a religious controversy, and it will have passed its legitimate bounds. The precedent will then be established, and the foundation laid, for that usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country which has been the desolating scourge to the fairest portions of the Old World." We are anxiously waiting to see what reply the United States Senate will make upon the question now. We are anxious to see whether the national Legislature will establish the precedent, and lay the foundation, for the usurpation of the divine prerogative in this country. We are intensely anxious to know whether the national Legislature is ready to inflict this desolating scourge upon this fair land.

J.

"The Third Angel's Message. The Making of the Image of the Beast"
***The Signs of the Times* 14, 32 , pp. 505, 506.**

THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE. THE MAKING OF THE IMAGE OF THE BEAST

(Concluded.)

(Lesson 9. Sabbath, September 1.)

1. IF the influence of Protestant churches, the Prohibition party, the W. C. T. U., the Workingmen, and the Catholic Church, were hardly united in favor of one measure, could not that measure be carried, but ever it might be?

2. Is there not any question upon which all these are united in sentiment, and upon which there fast uniting in action?—*There is.*

3. What is it?—*The enforcement of Sunday-keeping by the State.*

4. Who are the sole leaders in this movement?—*The leaders of the churches.*

5. To what extent are they working it?—*They are "working" and lobbying almost every State Legislature in the Union, and the National Legislature also.*

6. What do they ask the State to do?—*To stop all Sunday trains, abolish all Sunday papers, and stop all manner of work on Sunday.*

7. For what?—*So that there "devotion may not be hindered."*

8. What is there about Sunday train that hinders the devotion of the church-members?

"They get a great many passengers, and so break up a great many congregations."—*Elgin, Ill. Sunday-law Convention, November, 1887.* (1) "This railroad [the Chicago and Rock Island] has been running excursion trains from Des Moines to Colfax brings on the Sabbath for some time, and *ministers complain* that their members go on these excursions. . . . We need a Sabbath [Sunday] law that will bind the government and the corporation as well as the individual."—*M. A. Gault, in Christian Statesman, September 25, 1884.*

9. What is there about Sunday newspaper that hinders their devotion?

"The laboring classes are apt to arise late on Sunday morning, read the Sunday papers, *and allow the power of worship to go by unheeded.*"—*Elgin Convention.*

10. What was it that hindered the devotion of the church-members in the fourth century?—*Sunday games and theaters.*

11. How?

They got a great many spectators "and so broke up a great many congregations;" the church-members would go to the games and theaters, and would "let the hour of worship go by unheeded," and so their devotion was "greatly hindered."

12. Who were they whose devotion was thus especially disturbed?—*Those "whose Christianity was the least an affair of the life and of the heart."*

13. What then did they do?

As they had not enough conscience, nor love of right, to do what they consider to be right, they demanded that the State should take away from them all opportunity to do that which they deemed to be wrong.

14. How is the matter worked now?—*The same way precisely.*

15. Was the Papacy content with State laws stopping games in closing theatres?—*No, all manner of work must be stopped.*

16. Will the image of the Papacy be content with laws stopping Sunday trains, and abolishing Sunday newspapers?

506

"Let a man be what he may, Jew, seventh-day observer of some other denominations, or those who do not believe in the Christian Sabbath—let the law apply to everyone, that there shall be no public desecration of the first day of the week, the Christian Sabbath, the day of rest for the nation they may hold any other day of the week is sacred, and observe it; but that day which is the one day in seven for the nation at large, let that not be publicly desecrated by anyone, by officer in the Government, or by private citizen, high or low, rich or poor."—*Dr. McAllister, editor Christian Statesman.*

17. Why did they want to compel people to keep Sunday?

Because "he who does not keep the Sabbath [Sunday] does not worship God."—*Elgin Convention.*

18. Then what is the purpose of all their Sunday laws?—*To compel all men to worship.*

19. What is it *in reality* that they will compel men, by this means, to worship?

"And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed." Rev. 13:12.

20. What grew out of the Sunday-law movement in the fourth century?—*The beast.*

21. What will justice surely grow out of this Sunday-law movement in our day?—*The image of the beast.*

22. What did the beast do?—*He made war with the saints.* Rev. 13:7; Dan. 7:21, 25.

23. What did the beast do?

"And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and Bonn, 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." Rev. 13:16, 17.

"*Resolved*, That we give our patronage to such business men, manufacturers, and labors as observe the Sabbath [Sunday]."—*Elgin Sunday-law Convention.*

24. What further will the image of the beast endeavor to do?

"And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed." Rev. 13:15.

25. Is it in the minds of these National Reformers to do this?

At the Lakeside National Reform Convention, 1887, a certain person said of the enforcement of Sunday-laws, "There is a law in the State of Arkansas in forcing Sunday observance upon the people, and the result has been that many

good persons have not only been in prison, but have lost their property and even their lives."

And Dr. McAllister replied: "It is better that a few should suffer than that the whole nation should lose its Sabbath."

26. Under what plea did the chief priests and Pharisees justify themselves in killing the Saviour?

"It is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation should perish not." "Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put him to death." John 11:50, 53.

27. Will these in our day accomplished their purpose upon those who refuse to worship the beast and his image?

"And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire; and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the hearts of God." Rev. 15:2.

NOTES

IN the *Christian Nation*, December 14, 1887, Rev. W. T. McConnell, a representative national reformer, published an "open letter" to the *American Sentinel*, in which he said:—

"You look for trouble in this land in the future, if these principles are applied. I think it will come to you if you maintain your present position. The fool hearty fellow who persists in standing on a railroad track may well anticipate trouble when he hears the rumble of the coming train. If he shall read the signs of the times in the screening whistled and flaming had-light, he may change his position and avoid the danger, but if he will be influenced by these most gloomy forebodings of trouble will be realized when the express strikes him. So you, neighbor, if, through prejudiced or the in mentee of unregenerate hearts, you have determined to oppose the progress of this nation in fulfilling its location as an instrument in the divine work of regenerating human society, may rightly expect trouble. It will be sure to come to you."

August 24, 1888

"Church Officers" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 33 , pp. 518, 519.

THERE are but two classes of church officers named in the Scriptures, namely, bishops and deacons; for that the terms elder and bishop refer to the same officer is evident. In his letter to Titus, Paul says: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain *elders* in every city, as I had appointed thee; if any be blameless, . . . for a *bishop* must be blameless." Titus 1:5-7. In his first letter to Timothy, in giving directions in regard to church officers, he names only bishops and deacons. 1 Tim. 3. In the address to the church at Philippi, we read, "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of

Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." Phil. 1:1. As Paul was on his way to Jerusalem, it is said, "And from Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the *elders* of the church." But when Paul addressed them he said, "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you *overseers*" (*bishops*, Revised Version, Greek, *episkopous*, *bishops*). Peter uses the two words in the same way to designate the same officer: "The *elders* which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, . . . feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the *oversight* [Greek, *episkopountis*, bishopric] thereof, not by constraint but willingly." 1 Peter 5:1, 2.

Says Mosheim of the church in the beginning:—

"The rulers of the church were called either *presbyters* [elders] or bishops—titles which, in the New Testament, are undoubtedly applied to the same order of men.—*Church History, cent. 1, part. 2, chap. 2, sec. 8.*

Says Neander:—

"That the name *episkopoi*, or bishops, was altogether *synonymous* with that of presbyters [elders] is clearly evident from those passages of Scripture where both appellations are used interchangeably. Acts 20:17 with 28; Titus 1:5, 7; and from those where the office of deacon is named immediately after that of bishop, so that between these two church offices there could not still be a third intervening one. Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:1, 8. This interchange in the use of the two appellations shows that they were perfectly identical.—*Church History, vol. 1, p. 184, Torrey's edition, 1856.*

But, it may be asked, why are there two titles for

519

the same officer? The following from Schaff will explain:—

"BISHOPS or PRESBYTERS.—These two terms denote in the New Testament the same office; the first signifying its *duties*, the second its *dignity*."—*Church History, vol. 1, sec. 42.*

The term presbyter, or elder, is a continuation of the Hebrew usage, while that of *episcopos*, or bishop, is adapted from the Greek. Of *presbyter* Mosheim says:—

"The word *presbyter*, or elder is taken from the Jewish institution, and signifies rather the venerable prudence and wisdom of old age, than age itself."—*Church History, Id., note.*

And of both the terms *elder* and *bishop* Neander says:—

"In the Jewish synagogue, and in all sects that sprang out of Judaism, there existed a form of government . . . consisting of a council of elders, *presbuteroi*, who had the guidance of all affairs belonging to the common interest. To this form, Christianity, which unfolded itself out of Judaism, would most naturally attach itself. . . . The guidance of the communities was accordingly everywhere intrusted to a council of elders. It was not necessary that these should be the oldest in years, though some respect doubtless was

had to age. But age here was a designation of worth. . . . The founding of communities among the pagans led to another name, more conformed to the Grecian mode of designating such relations. . . . This name was *episkopoi* [bishops], borrowed from the city form of government among the Greeks, and applied to the presiding officers of the Christian communities, as overseers of the whole, leaders of the community."—*Church History, Id.*

Thus much for the titles of the officers of the church; now, how are they to be chosen? There is no proposition that can be made plainer than that among Christians there is no superiority of persons or rank. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." 1 Cor. 12:13. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Gal. 3:28. "There is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all, and in all." Col. 3:11. "If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last of all, and servant of all." Mark 9:35. "Be not ye called Rabbi [master]; for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. . . . But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted." Matt. 23:8-12. "Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves." Phil. 2:3. "All of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility; for God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble." 1 Peter 5:5. "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but *fellow-citizens* with the saints, and of the household of God." Eph. 2:19. "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light." 1 Peter 2:9. "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion forever and ever." Rev. 1:5, 6. "As many as received him, them gave he power [right or privilege] to become the sons of God." John 1:12.

Thus all are "sons of God;" all are "priests;" all are "fellow-citizens;" all are "brethren." Primarily, therefore, among Christians there is no superiority of dignity or of rank; but there is perfect and entire equality, each one possessing, in his own right, all the rights that belong to any or all others. It is as certainly true of the new creation in grace as of the old creation in nature, that "all men are created equal," and "are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights." But God is the God of order. He is not the author of confusion, either in nature or in grace. He is the author of government and order, both in nature and in grace; both in the world and in the church. He has established an organization, and an order of government, among Christians. This organization is the church; this order of government is that which is set forth in the Scriptures as the means of assuring to the church order, efficiency, and discipline. Organization is essential to the efficiency of any class of people with a common purpose. For whereas one

in his individual capacity can chase only a thousand, two with a common purpose and with their efforts united can put *ten* thousand to flight.

But, although it be true that each one possesses all the rights and privileges that belong to all, yet it is equally true that everyone cannot perform the duties and offices that are common to all, with equal profit to all. Therefore, by the united wisdom of all, those are chosen who possess most fully the qualifications by which they can perform the offices that are common to all, with the greatest benefit to all. We say that it is by the voice of all that these are to be chosen, because no one can exercise the offices that are common to all without the common consent. The following passage from Luther states the case exactly:—

"It has been said that the Pope, the bishops, the priests, and all those who people convents, form the spiritual or ecclesiastical estate; and that princes, nobles, citizens, and peasants, form the secular or lay estate. This is a specious tale. But let no man be alarmed. All Christians belong to the spiritual estate; and *the only difference between them is in the functions which they fulfill*. We have all but one baptism, but one faith; and these constitute the spiritual man. We are all consecrated priests by baptism, as St. Peter says: 'You are a royal priesthood;' although all do not actually perform the offices of kings and priests, because no one can assume what is common to all without the common consent. But if this consecration of God did not belong to us, the unction of the Pope could not make a single priest. If ten brothers, the sons of one king, and possessing equal claims to his inheritance, should choose one of their number to administer for them, they would all be kings, and yet only one of them would be the administrator of their common power. So it is in the church. Were several pious laymen banished to a desert, and were they, from not having among them a priest consecrated by a bishop, to agree in selecting one of their number, whether married or not, he would be as truly a priest as if all the bishops in the world had consecrated him. . . . Hence it follows that laymen and priests, princes and bishops, or, as we have said, ecclesiastics and laics, have nothing to distinguish them but their functions. They have all the same condition, but they have not all the same work to perform."—*D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation*, book 6, chap. 3.

This is the genuine philosophy of the election and ordination of officers in the church. As all cannot exercise, with equal benefit to all, the functions that are common to all, by the common consent certain ones who are considered best qualified are chosen to exercise those functions, as the representatives of all. And by the laying on of hands, the powers of all, to the fulfillment of that office, are delegated to the ones chosen by common consent. So absolute is this principle that where men were already chosen and appointed by the Lord to the work of the ministry, they were not allowed to enter upon that work until the action of the church was taken in setting them apart with the common consent and delegation of powers. Paul when on the way to Damascus was apprehended by

the Lord Jesus himself, and was then made a chosen vessel unto him, to bear his name before the Gentiles and kings and the children of Israel. Acts 9:15. Yet it was several years after this when the following occurred; "Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." Acts 13:1-3. Thus, although Paul had already been chosen most miraculously to the work of the ministry, yet order and governmental authority in the church were of such importance that the Lord, who had already so miraculously chosen him, would not suffer him to go forth without the express consent of the church and his setting apart by the church in the laying on of hands.

As the numbers in the church were generally too great to allow the hands of all to be conveniently laid on, it was done by those to whom the powers of the church had already been delegated. Thus Timothy was ordained "by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," that is, by the laying on of the hands of the elders. 1 Tim. 4:14. And when Paul and Barnabas had been sent forth they "ordained them elders in every church." Acts 14:23. And Titus was appointed to ordain elders in every city. Titus 1:5. But the choice of the elders and deacons lies always with the brethren from among whom they are to be chosen; while the choosing of a minister for the work of the Lord at large lies with the Lord, and the choice sanctioned by the action of the church according to the order of God.

J.

"Trusts" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 33 , pp. 519, 520.

THE "Trust" is now the favorite scheme by which the greedy increase their gains. There is the Whisky Trust, the Sugar Trust, the Coffee Trust, the Oil Trust, and Trusts of all kinds too numerous to mention. A "Trust" is formed by the leading dealers in a certain article of trade laying together all their interests in that line, making a combination so strong as to control the market, and then putting up the price to the highest possible point. If a dealer refuses to join the Trust and does not follow the rise in price which is laid upon the article by the Trust, then the Trust takes steps to compel him either to join the Trust or go out of the business. If the Trust cannot so fully control the market as to keep him from buying anybody but them, at their own price, then they will run down the price so low that he cannot afford to sell at such a rate, and in one way or the other the object of the Trust is accomplished,—he is either forced into the Trust or out of the business,—and then the Trust, having the field entirely to itself, puts up the price to the highest possible point, clears immense sums, pays its trustees enormous salaries, and divides the profits amongst the managers of the combination, making them, many times, millionaires in a very few years. The Standard Oil Trust, for instance, has nine trustees, who are paid a salary of \$25,000 a year, and divides among its managers profits amounting to millions every year.

It will readily be seen that the word "Trust" is but another name for an organized monopoly, but with this characteristic: it is wholly irresponsible. A corporation, a railroad or steamboat line for instance, may secure a monopoly [*sic.*] of the traffic in a certain locality, but, being a corporation, receiving its charter from the State, it is responsible to the State, and the State may put a check upon its exorbitant greed. But a Trust is not incorporated, is responsible to nobody but itself. The following from the *Christian at Work* fitly describes the Trust:—

"What after all is a Trust? Well, for one thing it is neither a corporation nor a well-defined common-law Trust; it avoids the checks and safeguards which a wise public policy has thrown around corporate acts; its articles of agreement are secret and jealously guarded even from the investor himself; no charter nor statements need be filed for public inspection; no reports need be made or published; it may carry on any business it desires; the principles of *ultra vires* acts do not check it; no limit is placed by statute on its capital stock; no law prevents an increase or decrease of its Trust certificates; no qualifications are prescribed for its trustees; no tax is levied on its charter or franchises or capital stock; no limit is placed by the public on the power and discretion of its trustees; no publicity is given to its acts. It may move from State to State; it may evade taxation and defy the powers of courts; it wields vast sums of money secretly, instantaneously, and effectively to accomplish its nefarious ends; and it does all this not for the advancement of the community and the nation, but for the purposes of extortion and for the annihilation of independent firms. Such a trust is the Sugar Trust; such are the four great Oil Trusts,—such in short are almost all the Trusts."

It is evident that, in its accepted use, the word "Trust" signifies a combination of capital for the for-

520

mation of an irresponsible monopoly to rob the consumer of the extra price which he can thus be forced to pay. This is the one extreme. There is another monopoly, although not called a Trust, at the other extreme, which is as irresponsible, and consequently as despotic, as any Trust in existence can be. Although not called a Trust, to all interests and purposes it *is* a Trust. Although, by those who compose it, it is not granted that it is a monopoly, yet a monopoly it is. Instead of calling this a Trust it is called a *Union*. Instead of a monopoly in certain lines of trade, it is a monopoly of labor. What we refer to is the trades-union. It is as really a Trust, and as certainly a monopoly, as any Trust or any monopoly that was ever formed. And, like any other monopoly, its greed grows by what it feeds upon.

An instance in point (if any instance were needed to show what is palpable to all) will show that the action of the Union is identical with that of the Trust: In the fishing season of 1888 the Fisherman's Union in the Columbia River formed a combination so strong that no outside fisherman was allowed to enter the

Columbia to fish. Then, having secured control of the river, they forced up the price of fish so that each fisherman of the Union made from seven to ten dollars a day. The only difference between this and the Trust is in the amount secured to the parties interested in the monopoly.

More than this, the trades-union not only assumes the monopoly of work within the trades, it monopolizes the trades themselves. This combination that is responsible to no law, presumes to make and enforce the law that nobody shall learn any trade without the consent of the Union; and that consent is granted only to a limited number. Under this "law" of the trades-union Trust a manufacturer cannot apprentice his own son, at his own trade, in his own shop, without the consent of the labor Trust. Not long since a young man wrote a letter to Mayor Hewitt, of New York City, asking to be directed to some place where he could learn some mechanical employment. He said that he had applied to more than fifty employers to be received as an apprentice, but could not find an entrance anywhere. The Mayor replied, regretting that he could not give him a favorable answer, and said:—

"In this great city there ought to be abundant opportunity for every young man to learn a trade. Under the regulations adopted by the various trades-unions, the number of apprentices is limited, so that there is growing up in our midst a large number of young men who cannot find access to any mechanical employment. This is a lamentable state of affairs, because these young men are turned loose upon the streets, and grow up in habits of idleness, resulting in vice and crime. If this action of the trades societies in this matter really limited the competition for employment which they experience, it might be defended, at least upon selfish principles; but, inasmuch as foreign workmen are free to come to this country in unlimited numbers, the only effect of these regulations is to keep our own young men out of useful employment, which is freely open to those who are born and trained in foreign countries. This is of the most serious character, and I trust that this statement of it may lead to a reconsideration on the part of the various trades organizations who now restrict the right of employment without benefit to themselves, but to the great injury of the rising generation."

We seriously doubt whether this statement, or any other, will ever lead to any such reconsideration as the Mayor suggests. Monopolies never voluntarily loose their grip.

Only lately some boys in Chicago made application to the Police Court to be sent to the Industrial School, or House of Correction, that they might become sufficiently acquainted with some trade so as to enable them to follow some useful occupation. We are not informed whether their request was granted or not. But even if it were, we know that even this refuge is not long to be left them; for the despotism of the labor Trust is controlling the State, and is already declaring that the trades shall not be followed to any material extent even in penal institutions, but that all criminals shall be supported in comparative idleness.

The third week of last July, the Legislature of New York, in response to the "labor" agitators, enacted a law which provides that no manufacturing machinery shall be used in any of the penal institutions of that State; that hand-labor only shall be employed; that only such articles shall be made therein as can be used

in the penal or public institutions of the State; and that none of the prison products shall be sold to the public. And why is this? Because, it is said, articles manufactured in prison by convict labor and sold outside, come into competition with articles manufactured outside by "free labor," thus lowering the prices of the outside articles, which tends to reduce wages and degrade "labor"!

Is it necessary to point out to any man who thinks, the blind fallacy of such an argument? Do these men not know that if the State is not allowed to make the convicts support themselves, they will have to be supported by taxation? And if the manufacturer has to pay increased taxes, wages will be lowered accordingly. But the labor monopoly may say, We will not allow him to lower the wages. Very well, he will then add to the price of his goods the extra tax which he pays to support idle convicts, and when the laboring man buys any manufactured article he will pay the tax. And if the merchant or the grocer has to pay an increased tax for the support of convicts, he will add the amount to the price of his goods, and when the laboring man buys a piece of muslin, or a pound of coffee, he pays the tax which the State is compelled to levy to support the criminals, whom he himself has declared shall not be allowed to do enough to support themselves. The whole subject then resolves itself into this simple question: Shall the convicts be made to do enough work to clear the expense which they cause, or shall the laboring man support them in idleness so that the proper dignity of labor may be maintained?

Thus the labor monopoly forces the youth into idleness, rather than to allow them to support themselves by honest trades. Through enforced idleness they are led into vice and crime, and by that into jails and penitentiaries; and even there the labor monopoly compels him to dwell in idleness. Therefore of all Trusts the labor Trust is the most heartless; of all monopolies the labor monopoly is the most wicked. To say that such organizations are in the interests of labor, is a perversion of language. Their principal effect, if not their direct aim, is solely to promote idleness, with its inevitable consequences—vice and crime.

J.

"The Third Angel's Message. The Third Angel's Message" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 33 , pp. 522, 523.

THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE. THE PURPOSE OF THE SABBATH IN THE MESSAGE

(Lesson 10, Sabbath, September 8.)

1. WHAT warning does the Lord send to the world, against the worship of the beast and his image?

"And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of

his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." Rev. 14:9-11.

2. How widely was the first message of this chapter announced?

"And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people." Verse 6.

3. What is said of the second?—*It followed.* Verse 8.

4. And what is said of the third?—*The third angel followed them.* Verse 9.

5. If, then, the first one went to every nation and kindred and tongue and people, and the third one follows, what must be the extent to which the Third Angel's Message will go?

6. What does the first angel have to preach?

"And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people." Verse 6.

7. What does this angel proclaim?—*The hour of God's judgment is come.* Verse 7.

8. What does he call upon all people to do?—*"Worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters."*

9. What results from the rejection of this message?

"And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." Verse 8.

10. What came of the first falling away from the everlasting gospel?—*"That man of sin," "the mystery of iniquity," "The beast."* 2 Thess. 2:2-8; Dan. 7:11; Rev. 19:19, 20.

11. What comes of this second falling away from the everlasting gospel?—*"The image of the beast," and the enforced worship of the beast.*

12. When men refuse to worship him that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of water, what are they led to do?—*To worship the beast and his image.* Rev. 13:12, 13.

13. What then do the three messages of Rev. 14:6-12 form?—*One threefold message rather than three distinct messages.* See note.

14. When the first in order tells men that the hour of God's judgment is come, what does the third tell them to do, to be prepared for the judgment?

"Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Verse 12.

15. What is to be the rule in the judgment?

"For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law." "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel." Rom. 2:12, 16.

16. When the first angel calls upon all men to worship Him that made heaven and earth, etc., what does the third tell them to do that their worship may be acceptable to Him, and also that they may avoid the worship of the beast and his image?

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

17. Is a man's worship acceptable to God if he does not keep the commandments of God?

"He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." Prov. 28:9.

18. Is it possible to keep the commandments of God and without the faith of Jesus?

"For whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Rom. 14:23, last part.

19. Is there any part of the commandments of God that points especially to Him that made heaven and earth?

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20:8-11.

523

20. Therefore in the time of the preaching of the Third Angel's Message, what will be done?—*Every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people will be called upon particularly to keep the fourth commandment.*

21. What day is the Sabbath of the Lord?

"But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." Ex. 20:10.

22. Of what is it a sign?

"A sign. . . that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." Eze. 20:30.

23. Why is it such a sign?

"For because in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed." Ex. 31:17.

24. Then of what is the keeping of the seventh day a sign?—*It is a sign that those who do so worship the true God—"him that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters."*

25. What is the one great question under the Third Angel's Message?—*Whether men will worship Him that made heaven and earth, or worship the beast and his image?*

26. What is the keeping of the seventh day—the Sabbath of the Lord?—*It is the God-given sign that those who do so are worshipers of Him that made heaven and earth.*

27. Therefore what is the inevitable conclusion?—*That the keeping of the Sabbath of the Lord—the seventh day—is the one point above every other that distinguishes the worshipers of Him that made heaven and earth from the worshipers of the beast and his image.*

NOTES

THE word rendered "followed," in Rev. 14:8, 9 is *obsouotheo*, which means, in constructions like that in this text, "to go with." Liddel and Scott render the word thus: "To *follow* one, *go after*, or *with* him." Robinson says: "To *follow*, to *go with*, to *accompany* anyone." It is the same word that is used in Mark 5:21: "And Jesus went with him; and much people followed him, and thronged him." It is also used of the redeemed one hundred and forty-four thousand, where it is said: "These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth." Rev. 14:1. In both these places it is evident that of going together in company with. So in 1 Cor. 10:4, where we read of the children of Israel that they drank of the spiritual Rock that followed them," the word "followed" is translated from the same Greek word, and the margin has it, "went with them." From this we learn that the idea in Rev. 14:8, 9 is not simply that the second and third angels followed the first in point of time, but that they were with it. Therefore the second and third messages must necessarily be as widespread as the first. As a matter of fact, they are now inseparable; it is impossible properly to preach one without preaching the other two.

QUESTION 13.—It is the rejection of the first message that causes the falling away referred to in the second message. From this falling away the image of the beast and his worship are developed. And the third message warns against the worship of the beast and his image. From this it is evident that these three messages are inseparably connected, and form the threefold message.

AGAIN: The first message calls upon all men to "worship Him that made heaven and earth," etc. Those who refuse to do this are led to worship the beast and his image. The third angel follows, warning against the worship of the beast and his image, and calls upon all men to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. The fourth commandment points directly to the worship of Him who made heaven and earth; and this is the very thing which the first message calls upon men to do. Therefore it is certain that these three messages are but one threefold message. They are *three* only in the order of their rise. But having risen, they go on together and are inseparable.

August 31, 1888

**"The Qualifications of Church Officers" *The Signs of the Times* 14,
34 , pp. 535, 536.**

THE officers of the church named in Scripture are, as we have shown, bishops and deacons. The bishopric or eldership of a church is a most important office. This is evident from three considerations: First the Scripture says so; secondly, it is the highest office in the church; and thirdly, it is evident from the number and nature of the qualifications which the Scriptures require shall be found in him who is to be chosen to the office. These qualifications we shall notice fully and in detail as they are given in the directions to Timothy and Titus: 1 Tim. 3; Titus 1.

1. "A bishop then must be *blameless*." This word in itself tells all that it means. It cannot be made much plainer than it is. The definition of the Greek word is, "not open to be attacked." Webster's definition is: "Without fault, innocent, guiltless, not meriting censure." "We speak of a thing being *blameless* when it is free from blame, or the just imputation of fault, as a *blameless* life of character." "A bishop then must be blameless" signifies therefore one whose life is so fully conformed to the rules of right that no one can justly lay blame upon him, or find fault with him.

2. "The husband of one wife." This needs no explanation. We might however observe that we do not think that the meaning is that he *shall* be a married man; but that he shall not have more than one wife.

3. "Vigilant." That is, "attentive to discover and avoid danger, or to provide for safety, wakeful, watchful, circumspect." The word "circumspect" is from two Latin words, *circum*, around, and *specere*, to look; that is, to look all around a thing. "A man who is circumspect habitually examines things on every side, in order to weigh and deliberate."

This idea is in the Greek word rendered *vigilant* in the text. The importance of this qualification is evident at once in view of the many different dispositions that are brought together in church relationship, and the readiness with which so many accuse one another. The one who is chosen to deal with all these, as for those for whom Christ died, *must* be one who will not only be attentive to avoid danger and provide for safety, but who will examine things on every side before he decides or acts in the premises.

4. "Sober." This word signifies one of sound mind, a well-regulated mind, collected, discreet, self-controlled. "Sober supposes the absence of all exhilaration of spirits, and is opposed to flighty." One who is "not wild, visionary, or heated with passion," but who exercises "cool, dispassionate reason" in all things.

5. "Of good behavior." The Greek word here is *kosmion*, from *kosmeo*, which signifies "to adorn, decorate, embellish;" and it conveys the same idea as is expressed in Titus 2:10, "*adorn* the doctrine." The meaning of the expression "of good behavior," therefore, is that he must be one who is "desirous of order and decorum; one who is "modest, orderly, decent,

and becoming;" one who will so conduct himself as to "dignify," and "be an honor to" the position to which he is called; not exalting nor magnifying himself, but exalting *his calling* and magnifying *his office*.

6. "Given to hospitality." This word signifies, literally, "loving strangers," "kind to strangers." Thus he must be "one who receives and entertains strangers, with kindness and without reward;" "with kind and generous liberality."

7. "Apt to teach." He must be one who is skillful in the word of knowledge, so that he may be able to instruct by proofs, and "show by argument."

8. "Not given to wine." The word here rendered wine is defined by Liddell and Scott, "the fermented juice of the grape." Therefore he must be one who does not drink the fermented juice of the grape.

9. "No striker." *Not* "one who is contentious, or given to reproaches."

10. "Not greedy of filthy lucre." Not a lover of money. Nor is this all, the word signifies not a lover of wealth or abundance of any kind; or, as is said further on in the verse, "not covetous," close, or stingy, but "liberal and generous."

11. "Not a brawler." Not disposed to fight, not quarrelsome or contentious; not a complainer, nor one who scolds.

12. "But patient." Reasonable, fair, kind, gentle, yielding.

13. "One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity;" or, as is said to Titus, "Having faithful children not accused of riot or unruly." And the reason for this qualification is plainly given: "For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?" The man who will allow his children to be disobedient, or unruly, or self-willed, and allows them to domineer in the family, will allow the same elements to rule in the church; and under such a man the church will be just anything but what the church ought to be. Upon this point God has given to fathers a lesson for all time. Eli was descended in the right line in a house which God had established in the priesthood, but his two sons were a pair of hoodlums. And "the sin of the young men was very great before the Lord; for men abhorred the offering of the Lord." This is another great evil that would spring from having a man as elder who did not govern his own children. Their unruly conduct brings reproach upon his office, and other men seeing it are led to despise the worship and service of the church. Because of the wickedness of Eli's sons, "men abhorred the offering of the Lord." "And the Lord said to Samuel, Behold, I will do a thing in Israel, at which both the ears of every one that heareth it shall tingle. In that day I will perform against Eli all things which I have spoken concerning his house; when I begin, I will also make an end. For I have told him that I will judge his house for ever for the iniquity which he knoweth; because his sons made themselves vile, and he restrained them not." 1 Sam. 3:11-13; 2:12-36.

14. "Not a novice." Not a new convert, not one newly come to the faith; and here also the reason is given, "Lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil." Let him grow up, and *build* up, in the faith, but never do anything that will tend to *puff* him up. "Knowledge puffeth up, but charity buildeth up."

15. "Moreover he must have a good report of them that are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil." The church must have a care for the

opinion of those who are outside of the church. We must "walk in wisdom toward them that are without." "See then that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise." Eph. 5:15. It is a most proper—yes, a necessary—question to ask in choosing a man for a bishop, How does he stand toward those who are without? How do his neighbors look upon him? for they may despise his faith; but how do they look upon him as a man, and as a neighbor? Is he neighborly? Is he kind, gentle, and accommodating? Is he straightforward and honest in all his dealings? Does he pay his bills promptly? or is he careless about running into debt? "He must have a good report of them that are without."

16. "Not self-willed." Titus 1:7. Not governed by his own will; "yielding to the will or wishes of others; accommodating or compliant;" not dogged, stubborn, nor presumptuous.

17. "But a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate; holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers." Titus 1:8, 9.

There are the qualifications which the word of God requires in him who is to be an elder of the church of God.

The qualifications to the office of deacon are much the same, for says the word:—

"Likewise must the deacons be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre; holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience. And let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless. Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well. For they that have used the office of a deacon well purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus." 1 Tim. 3:8-13.

It is very likely that many, as they have read the foregoing, have said within themselves, "Where can such a man be found?" Well, he *ought* to be found in every church in the land. He ought to be found in the very church to which you belong. He ought, in fact, to be found in *yourself*. See: These are the qualifications which the word of God requires that there shall be in the officers of the church. The officers of the church are to be chosen from among the membership of the church. Therefore these are the qualifications, these are the virtues, which the word of God requires shall be found in every member of the church. If these qualifications are not found there, then whose fault is it? It is your own fault. And if such persons as are here required are not found in the church, then whose fault is that? It is still the fault of the individual members. For every member of the church of God is required by the word of God to be just such a person as is described in these scriptures.

J.

"The Third Angel's Message. The Mark of the Beast" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 34 , pp. 538, 539.

THE THIRD'S ANGEL'S MESSAGE. THE PURPOSE OF THE SABBATH IN THE MESSAGE

(Lesson 11, Sabbath, September 15, 1888.)

1. WHO will be required to worship the beast and his image, and to receive his mark?

"And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed." "And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed. And 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." Rev. 13:12, 15-17.

2. In opposition to this what does the Third Angel's Message say?

"And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb." Rev. 14:9, 10.

3. What are those led to do who heed the voice of this message?

"Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Verse 12.

4. What does this show?—*That the power spoken of in Rev. 13:12-17 will put forth all their strength to compel men to do something that is contrary to the commandments of God.*

5. What have we found was the principal object of the Papacy, in the fourth century? and what is the purpose of the Protestantism of to-day?—*To see the power of the State to compel all people to keep Sunday as the Lord's day, or Christian Sabbath.*

6. Of what day is Christ the Lord?

"But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." Ex. 20:10.

8. Then what day is the Lord's day?

539

9. What does the Lord call the seventh day?

"If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy days; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own

ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words." Isa. 58:13; Ex. 20:10.

10. Is there any commandment of God for keeping Sunday?—*None whatever.*

11. What testimonies can you give on this point from eminent first-day authorities?

The \$500 prize essay of the American Tract Society acknowledges the "complete silence of the New Testament so far as any explicit command for the Sabbath [Sunday, the first day of the week] or definite rules for its observance are concerned."—*Abiding Sabbath*, p. 184. And the \$1,000 prize essay of the American Sunday-school Union says: "Up to the time of Christ death, no change had been made to the day." And, "so far as the record shows, they [the apostles] did not however, give any explicit command enjoining the abandonment of the seventh-day Sabbath and its observance on the first day of the week."—*Lord's Day*, pp. 186-188. See note.

12. What was the single link that in the fourth century united Church and State, which developed the beast?—*The Sunday institution.*

13. What is the single point in a similar movement in our day which develops only an image to the beast?—*The Sunday institution.*

14. What does the papacy set forth as the sign of its authority to command men under penalty of sin for disobedience?

"The very act of changing Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow of. . . . Because by keeping Sunday strictly they acknowledge the church's power to ordain feasts, and to command them under it."—*Catechism of the Catholic Christian Instructed.*

15. Then what is the mark of the beast?

16. Then what is the keeping of Sunday?

"The keeping of Sunday is an homage they pay, and in spite of themselves, to the Catholic Church."—*Plain Talk about Protestantism.*

17. Then when Protestant churches attempt to compel people by law to keep Sunday, what is that only to do?—*It is only to compel men to worship the Papacy—to worship the beast.*

18. But, as in the very act of compelling people to do this these churches make an image to the beast, what then will be the enforced observance of Sunday in this nation?—*It will be the worship of the beast and his image.*

19. But may not Sunday-keeping be enforced as a *civil* duty?—*Never; because Sunday is wholly a religious institution; and the civil power has no right to enforce religious duties.*

20. What does Christ command on this subject?

"Then said he unto them, Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's; and unto God the things are God's." Matt. 22:21.

21. By what power was Sunday-keeping instituted?—*The church.*

22. Why were the ancient Sunday laws enforced?—*The Church demanded it and it was done to satisfy and help the church.*

23. Why are Sunday laws now enacted?—*For the same reasons precisely.*

24. Is the church Cesar?—*No.*

25. Is the church God?

26. Then what follows?—*That as Sunday-keeping belongs neither to Cesar nor to God, there is no place in existence that can of right command it.*

NOTE

QUESTION 11.—The student is at liberty to present any other testimonies on this point that he may choose.

September 7, 1888

**"The Duties of Church Officers. The Bishops" *The Signs of the Times*
14, 35 , pp. 551, 552.**

THE BISHOPS

WE have already shown that the terms "elder" and "bishop" denote the same officer, the one being derived from the Hebrew usage, and the other being adapted from the Greek: the term "elder" signifying the *dignity* of the office, while that of "bishop" signifies its *duties*. It is not at all necessary, therefore, to avoid the term bishop in speaking of the elder of a church. Any man who is regularly chosen and ordained to the eldership of a church is, so far as the office is concerned, as really a bishop as anybody is or can be; and it is perfectly proper to call him bishop.

The duties of the bishops are suggested in the Greek word used to designate the officer—*episkopos*. This word is composed of two others—*epi* and *skopos*. The word *skopos* is the real root, as *epi* is but a prepositional prefix. The word *skopos* signifies, "one that watches, one that looks about, or after things;" spoken of a "housekeeper," a "guardian," a "protectors." Mostly, however, it is used with the meaning of a "lookout man, watchman, watcher, stationed in some high place (*skopia*) to overlook a country, especially in war;" used also to designate "a scout." (Liddell and Scott.) It is very easy to be seen how readily and appropriately this word would be chosen from the Greek, and adapted to the office of the elder, when it is remembered how often in the Scriptures Christians are spoken of, not only as dwellers in a *strange* country, but in an enemy's country. The Christian life is represented as a warfare. 2 Cor. 10:3-5. The Christian is a soldier clothed in complete armor; protected by a shield; holding a sword; and ever watchful, prayerful, and vigilant. 2 Tim. 2:3, 4; Eph. 6:11-18; 1 Peter 5:8, 9.

This little band of soldiers, then, on the way to their own country, having to make their way through both a strange and an enemy's country, choose one of their number and set him upon—*epi*—a high place—*skopia*—thus making him their *episkopos*, their lookout man, their sentinel, to watch for danger; their scout, to detect the plans of the enemy. This is the idea conveyed in the texts which speak of the bishops and their duties. In Paul's address to the elders of the church at

Ephesus, he said: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you *overseers*." Acts 20:28. And Peter says to the elders, "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the *oversight* thereof." 1 Peter 5:2. And in Hebrews it is said, "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for *they watch for your souls*, as they that must give account." Chap. 13:17. The duty of the bishop is, therefore, to be a watchman, not only outside of the church but in the church as well—not only to watch the enemy, but also to watch those within his own camp.

This view corresponds to the idea suggested by the phrase above quoted from both Peter and Paul, "Feed the flock of God." The idea here suggested is that of a shepherd; and this is directly conveyed by Peter in the same chapter before referred to, where he says: "And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." 1 Peter 5:4. Christ is the chief Shepherd, he is "that great Shepherd of the sheep," and the bishops are under-shepherds. This word and its scriptural illustrations give an excellent, perhaps the best, view of the duties of the bishop.

Peter in writing thus to the elders speaks of himself as "also an elder;" and when he exhorts the elders to "feed the flock of God," he is only repeating to them the command which Christ gave to him. As that conversation which the Saviour had with Peter has a direct bearing upon this subject, we shall here repeat it entire.

"So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs. He saith to him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my sheep. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep." John 21:15-17.

These words of Christ to Peter are too often passed by with the observation only that Jesus in asking Peter this question three times, was delicately bringing to his mind his thrice-repeated denial of his Lord. We do not deny that that idea was in the Saviour's words; but we believe that there is also another point in his words, a point that is weighted with a most important meaning for everybody, and especially to everyone who is called to the office of elder. It will be noticed that three times the Saviour told Peter to feed the flock, and each time *before* he told him this he asked him, "Lovest thou me?" Thus he would impress upon Peter, and upon every soul who should come after Peter, in his place, the all-important consideration that before he should attempt to feed Christ's flock, he must be assured in his very soul that he *loves Christ*. To every man who is chosen to the office of elder, this question is asked: "Lovest thou me?" "Feed my lambs." And again the second time: "Lovest thou me?" "Feed my sheep." And the third time: "Lovest thou me?" "Feed my sheep." And oh, that it might be repeated from the depths of the heart of every elder of every church in the land, "Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee?"

Jesus himself has given us one characteristic of a good shepherd: "The good shepherd giveth his life

552

for the sheep." At the reading of this, the mind of one who is familiar with the Scriptures, not only remembers that Jesus gave his life for the sheep, but almost instantly reverts to the instance that occurred in the life of David: "And David said unto Saul, Thy servant kept his father's sheep, and there came a lion, and a bear, and took a lamb out of the flock; and I went out after him, and smote him, and delivered it out of his mouth; and when he arose against me, I caught him by his beard, and smote him, and slew him. Thy servant slew both the lion and the bear." 1 Sam. 17:34-36. Think of that stripling facing a lion to rescue a lamb; and not only facing him, but facing him so closely that when the lion rose to strike him, he could grasp the lion by the beard. There was a good shepherd. He put his life in the balance against that of a lamb. He risked his life to save the life of a sheep. "But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth; and the wolf catcheth them, and scattereth the sheep. The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep." John 10:12, 13. To protect the sheep, the good shepherd will face a bear, or a lion, or both; but the hireling will run when he sees but a *wolf* coming.

Another duty of the good shepherd is to seek for the straying. "If a man have an hundred sheep, and one of them be gone astray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and goeth into the mountains, and seeketh that which is gone astray? And if so be that he find it, verily I say unto you, he rejoiceth more of that sheep, than of the ninety and nine which went not astray. *Even* so it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish." Matt. 18:12-14. When one of the flock has gone astray and is lost, it is not sufficient excuse for the shepherd to say, "I had not time to visit him." He has not time for anything else just then. That is what he is there for. Of the Lord it is said: "He shall feed his flock like a shepherd; he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young." Isa. 40:11. This is the work of a shepherd.

David, in that beautiful psalm, the twenty-third, speaks of the Lord as his shepherd:—

"The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; he leadeth me beside the still waters. He restoreth my soul; he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me. Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies; thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over. Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever." This is the way the chief Shepherd does with his flock. Therefore, as the elders are under-shepherds, as they must be like the chief Shepherd, thus must they do; to make the flock to lie down in green pastures—fresh pastures, pastures of tender grass; to lead them beside the still waters; to restore their souls; to lead them in the paths of righteousness for his

name's sake; to comfort, and encourage them as they enter the valley of the shadow of death; to prepare a table before them in the presence of their enemies; and thus to make goodness and mercy to follow them all the days of their lives, and that they may dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

To the elders of the church it is said by Paul:—

"Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Acts 20:58. [*sic.*]

And by Peter:—

"The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed; feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." 1 Peter 5:1-4.

THE DEACONS

To be a deacon of the church is to be a *servant* of the church, for in the Greek the meaning of the word deacon is a servant. This is also shown by translation of the word in Rom. 16:1: "I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a *servant* of the church which is at Cenchrea." The word translated servant is *diakanon*—deaconess. Phebe was deaconess of the church at Cenchrea, and was going to Rome on business, and Paul asked the Roman Christians to help her because she had been a helper of many.

The account given in the Scriptures of the first election of the deacons shows what their duties are: "And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration. Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word. And the saying pleased the whole multitude: and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas a proselyte of Antioch; whom they set before the apostles: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them." Acts 6:1-6.

It is recorded before, that there was a common fund, that whosoever had houses or lands sold them and brought the money and laid it at the apostles feet, "and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need." Acts 4:34, 35. The very purpose, therefore, of the choosing of deacons was that they should have charge of the temporal matters of the church. In short, they are properly the treasurers of the church, and the sooner we as a people reach the

place where we shall have the deacons filling the office of treasurers the sooner we shall be in harmony with Scripture order on that point.

As the deacons are the servants of the church, to them also properly falls the duty of providing and preparing the elements for the celebration of the ordinances of the Lord's house; of arranging for baptisms; and, in short, all such things that pertain to the work of the church.

We are glad, indeed, that this subject of church officers and their duties is being given special attention among us as a people. We earnestly pray that it may end in securing that efficiency in the work of the church that becometh a "people whose God is the Lord."

J.

September 14, 1888

"That Banished Book" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 36 , pp. 567, 568.

BY the exclusion of that little book from the public schools of Boston, there has been revived considerable notice of the subject of indulgences. We have owned, for a number of years, a copy of the little book that has caused all this stir—Swinton's "Outlines of the World's History." The passage that has shut out the book, and a teacher with it, from the public schools of Boston is as follows:—

"When Leo X. came to the Papal chair, he found the treasury of the church exhausted by the ambitious projects of his predecessors. He therefore had recourse to every means which ingenuity could devise for recruiting his exhausted finances, and among these he adopted an extensive sale of *indulgences*, which in former ages had been a source of large profits to the church. The Dominican friars, having obtained a monopoly of the seal in Germany, employed as their agent Tetzel, one of their own order, who carried on the traffic in a manner that was very effective, and especially so to the Augustinian friars."

To this paragraph in the book there is added the following note:—

"These indulgences were, in the early ages of the church, remissions of the penances imposed upon persons whose sins had brought scandal on the community. But in process of time they were represented as actual pardons of guilt, and the purchaser of indulgence was said to be delivered from all his sins."

Now we should like for anybody candidly to state where there is anything said in this that should subject the book to banishment from the public schools. It is simply a statement of facts, and a very mild statement at that. Whether the treasury of the church had been exhausted by the ambitious projects of Leo's predecessors; or whether it was exhausted by his predecessors at all, is a question upon which it is not necessary to enter, because it is not germane to the subject. The main question is one of simple fact, "Was the treasury exhausted? and did that lead to the traffic in indulgences, which stirred up Luther, and led to the Reformation?"

Leo's immediate predecessor, Julius II., had spent the whole time of his pontificate—a little more than nine years—in almost constant wars, in some of which he led the troops himself and acted the part of general. It was he who began the building of the church of St. Peter at Rome; and he issued a bull granting indulgences to those who would contribute to the project. Although to sustain his wars and alliances the expenses of Julius were enormous, yet he did leave considerable treasure. But even though the treasury was not exhausted by his predecessors, it was easy enough for Leo X. to exhaust it, for he was almost a matchless spendthrift. Says Von Ranke:—

"That the Pope should ever keep a thousand ducats together was a thing as impossible,' says Francesco Vettori of this pontiff, 'as that a stone should of its own will take to flying through the air.' He has been reproached with having spent the revenues of three Popes; that of his predecessor, from whom he inherited a considerable treasure, his own, and that of his successor, to whom he bequeathed a mass of debt."—*History of the Popes, book 4, sec. 2.*

Says Lawrence:—

"He was the spendthrift son of an opulent parent; he became the wasteful master of the resources of the church." "It was because Leo was a splendid spendthrift, that we have the Reformation through Luther. The Pope was soon again impoverished and in debt. He never thought of the cost of anything; he was lavish without reflection. His wars, intrigues, his artists and architects, his friends, but above all the miserable Lorenzo [his nephew], exhausted his fine revenues; and his treasury must again be supplied. When he was in want, Leo was never scrupulous as to the means by which he retrieved his affairs, he robbed, he defrauded, he begged; he drew contributions from all Europe for a Turkish war, which all Europe knew had been spent upon Lorenzo; he collected large sums for rebuilding St. Peter's, which were all expended in the same way; in fine, Leo early exhausted all his spiritual arts as well as his treasury."—*Historical Studies, pp. 66, 77.*

The "Encyclopedia Britannica" says that Leo "bequeathed his successors a religious schism and a bankrupt church;" that "his profusion had impoverished the church, and indirectly occasioned the destruction of her visible unity."—*Art. Leo X.* It is a fact, therefore, that the papal treasury was exhausted.

Now to the second question of fact, Did this lead to the sale of indulgences? Before his coronation as Pope, Leo had entered into an engagement "to issue no brief for collecting money for the repair of St. Peter's;" but neither that, nor anything else, was allowed to stand in the way when he wanted money. Says D'Aubigne:—

"Leo was greatly in need of money. . . . His cousin, Cardinal Pucci, as skillful in the art of hoarding as Leo in that of lavishing, advised him to have recourse to indulgences. Accordingly, the Pope published a bull, announcing a general indulgence, the proceeds of

which were, he said, to be employed in the erection of the church of St. Peter, that monument of sacerdotal magnificence. In a letter, dated at Rome, under the seal of the fisherman, in November, 1517, Leo applies to his commissary of indulgences for one hundred and forty-seven ducats to pay for a manuscript of the thirty-third book of Livy. Of all the uses to which he put the money of the Germans, this was doubtless the best. Still, it was strange to deliver souls from purgatory, in order to purchase a manuscript history of the wars of the Roman people."—*History of the Reformation, book 3, chap. 3.*

Says Bower:—

"Leo, wanting to continue the magnificent structure of St. Peter's Church, begun by his predecessor Julius, but finding his coffers drained, chiefly by

568

his own extravagance, in order to replenish them, granted, by a bull, a plenary indulgence, or remission of all sins, to such as should charitably contribute to that work."—*History of the Popes, under Leo X., A.D. 1517.*

Says Macaulay:—

"It was to adorn Italy that the traffic in indulgences had been carried to that scandalous excess which had roused the indignation of Luther."—*Essays, Von Ranke.*

And a Roman Catholic "History of the Church of God," written by B. J. Spalding, Roman Catholic priest, with a commendatory preface by Bishop Spalding, of Peoria, Ill., says:—

"The incident which served as an opportunity for the breaking out of Luther's revolt, was the promulgation by Leo X. (1517) of a plenary [bull] indulgence, the alms attached to the gaining of which were to defray the expenses of a crusade against the Turks and aid in completing the magnificent basilica of St. Peter's at Rome. The Dominican Tetzel was appointed to preach this indulgence in Germany."—*Page 506.*

It is a fact, therefore, that the papal treasury was exhausted; and that Leo resorted to the sale of indulgences to replenish it.

Now to the third question of fact. The banished books says: "These indulgences were, in the early ages of the church, remissions of the penances imposed upon persons whose sins had brought scandal on the community." Notice, this does not say that indulgences were remissions of *sins*, but that they were remissions of the *penances*, or penalties, imposed upon persons *because* of their sins. Nor does it say *by whom* the penances were imposed. Now read the following definition of indulgence by Archbishop Purcell:—

"An indulgence is nothing more nor less than a remission of the temporal punishment which often remains attached to the sin, after the eternal guilt has been forgiven the sinner, on his sincere repentance. . . . The doctrine of indulgences is this: When a human being does everything in his power to atone

for sin, God has left a power in the church, to remit a part or the entire of the temporal punishment due to it."—*Debate with Campbell*, pp. 307, 308.

What Archbishop Purcell means by "*temporal punishment*," is precisely what Swinton's note means by *penances imposed*; for, to sustain his doctrine, the archbishop quoted 2 Cor. 2:6, 10, where Paul, speaking of that man who had been disfellowshipped and had repented of his sin, says: "Sufficient to such a man is this *punishment, which was inflicted* [penance imposed] of many." "To whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also; for if I forgave anything, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave I it in the person of Christ." Then the archbishop says:—

"'In the person of Christ,' mark these words, that he, in the person of Christ, forgave—what? Not the eternal guilt of the incestuous man—God alone can forgive that—but the temporal punishment; to restore him to the privileges of the church and Christian society."

Therefore it is demonstrated that Sinton's note in that book is precisely the same statement of the doctrine of indulgences as that given by an archbishop of the Catholic Church.

J.

"The Third Angel's Message. The Seven Last Plagues" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 36 , pp. 569, 570.

The Commentary

THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE. THE SEVEN LAST PLAGUES

(Lesson 13, Sabbath, September 29, 1888.)

1. WHEN the Third Angel's Message shall have done its work, what voice will then be heard from the heavenly temple?

"And I heard a great voice out of the temple saying to the seven angels, Go your ways, and pour out the vials of the wrath of God upon the earth." Rev. 16:1.

2. In addition to all these plagues, what awful famine will be upon men?

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord. And they shall wander from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east, they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord, and shall not find it." Amos 8:11, 12.

3. What will be the first plague? And upon whom will it fall?

"And the first 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 upon them which worshiped his image." Rev. 16:2.

4. What will be the second plague?

"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." Verse 3.

5. What will be the third plagues?

"And the third angel poured out his vial upon the rivers and fountains of water; and they became blood." Verse 4.

6. Why will the rivers and fountains of water be turned to blood?

"For they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink; for they are worthy." Verse. 6.

L7. What will be the fourth plague?

"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." Verses 8, 9.

570

8. What will be the further effect of this?

"How do the beasts groan! the herds of cattle are perplexed, because they have no pasture; yea, the flocks of sheep are made desolate. O Lord, to thee will I cry: for the fire hath devoured the pastures of the wilderness, and the flame hath burned all the trees of the field. The beasts of the field cry also unto thee: for the rivers of waters are dried up, and the fire hath devoured the pastures of the wilderness." Joel 1:18-20

9. What will be the fifth plague?

"And the fifth angel poured out his vial upon the seat of the beast; and his kingdom was full of darkness; and they gnawed their tongues for pain." Rev. 16:10.

10. Will those who love the truth of God be afraid in this time of darkness and dread?

"Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night; nor for the arrow that flieth by day; nor for the pestilence that walketh in darkness; nor for the destruction that wasteth at noonday. A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee." Ps. 91:5-8.

11. What will be the sixth plague?

"And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the kings of the east might be prepared." Rev. 16:12.

12. Does this refer to the literal river Euphrates, or to the nation that dwells in the country of the Euphrates?—*The nation*. Note.

13. What then does the drying up of the river mean?—*Evidently the wiping out of the Turkish power,—the nation that now rules the Euphrates country.*

14. What did the prophet see at this same time?

"And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet." Rev. 16:13.

15. What are these spirits?

"For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles." Verse 14, first part.

16. What do they go forth to do?

"Which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." Verse 14, last part.

"And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war." "And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God." "And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army." Rev. 19:11, 15, 19.

17. When the seventh angel pours out his vial what is heard?

"And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the temple of Heaven, from the throne, saying, It is done." Rev. 16:17.

18. What is this voice?

"Therefore prophesy thou against them all these words, and say unto them, The Lord shall roar from on high, and utter his voice from his holy habitation; he shall mightily roar upon his habitation; he shall give a shout, as they that tread the grapes, against all the inhabitants of the earth." Jer. 25:30.

19. What will then happen to heaven and earth?

"Speak to Zerubbabel, governor of Judah, saying, I will shake the heavens and the earth; and I will overthrow the throne of kingdoms, and I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the heathen; and I will overthrow the chariots, and those that ride in them; and the horses and their riders shall come down, every one by the sword of his brother." Hag. 2:21, 22.

"Whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven." Heb. 12:26.

"And there were voices, and thunders, and lightnings; and there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake, and so great." "And every island fled away, and the mountains were not found." Rev. 16:18, 20.

20. What then falls upon men?

"And there fell upon men a great hail out of heaven, every stone about the weight of a talent: and men blasphemed God because of the plague of the hail; for the plague thereof was exceeding great." Rev. 16:21.

21. What will the people of God do in this fearful time?

"The Lord also shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall shake: but the Lord will be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel." Joel 3:16.

"And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us: this is the Lord; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation." Isa. 25:9.

22. Will any of these plagues afflict them?

"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. 91:9, 10.

23. What will assure to all this perfect safety?—*The love of the truth of the Third Angel's Message*. Ps. 91:4; Zeph. 2:3.

24. Then is not that message the most precious boon this world can know?

NOTE

QUESTION 12.—It is not possible that it should refer to the literal river, because never in all history have the waters of the literal river Euphrates been a hindrance to any kings wither of the East or of the West. A thousand years before Christ, the kings of Assyria crossed it regularly every spring—at the very time when the waters were the highest—in their campaigns. In the year 269 A. D., Tiridates, king of Armenis, swam it with his armor on. (Gibbon, chap. 13, par. 21.) The view that the reference is to the power that rules the country of the Euphrates, and not to the literal river, is strengthened by the fact that Isaiah in speaking of the king of Assyria and his armies plainly calls them, "The waters of the river." "Now therefore, behold, the Lord bringeth up upon them [the people of Judah] the waters of the river, strong and many, even the king of Assyria, and all his glory; and he shall come up over all his channels, and go over all his banks." Isa. 8:7.

September 21, 1888

"That Banished Book. (*Concluded.*)" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 37 , pp. 583, 584.

(Concluded).

THE other statement in the note is, that, "in process of time they [indulgences] were represented as actual pardons of guilt, and the purchaser of indulgence was said to be delivered from all his sins." Notice, this does not say that they *were* actual pardons of guilt, but only that they were *represented* as such. He does not say that the representation was true. It is but the statement of the fact that does not say that the purchaser of indulgence *was* delivered from all his sins; nor does it say that the Catholic Church teaches or taught that it was so; it simply states the fact that the purchaser *was said* to be delivered from all his sins.

Now is it a fact that they were *represented* as actual pardons of guilt? Says the "Encyclopedia Britannica:"—

"The doctrine of indulgences is singularly open to misunderstanding; and in its practical applications it has too often been used to sanction the most flagrant immorality."—*Art. Indulgences.*

If, therefore, that doctrine has been so used, will the Catholic Church say that indulgences were *never* represented as actual pardons of guilt? or that the purchaser was *never* said to be delivered from all sin? Will that church say that

no person who ever handled or dispensed indulgences ever gave a wrong impression as to the precise effect of them? This of itself would show that in the words used there is no reproach cast upon the Catholic Church. But read the following. A Jesuit historian, quoted by D'Aubigne, speaking of the associates of Tetzel, the chief indulgence peddler, says:—

"Some of these preachers failed not, as usual, to outrage the subject which they treated, and so to exaggerate the value of indulgences as *to make people suppose* they were sure of their own salvation, and of the deliverance of souls from purgatory, as soon as the money was paid."—*History of the Reformation, book 3, chap. 1.*

And the Catholic "History of the Church of God," before quoted, says:—

"There had been for some time abuses in the form of dispensing and preaching indulgences; pious bishops had pointed them out, and statesmen had protested against them. Tetzel did not altogether avoid the abuses, and later the Papal legate, Miltitz, sharply rebuked him for his indiscretions."—*Id.*, p. 506.

Now read the following words of Tetzel himself:—

"Think, then, that for each mortal sin you must, after confession and contrition, do penance for seven years, neither in this life or in purgatory. Now, how many mortal sins are committed in one day—in one week? How many in a month—a year—a whole life? Ah! these sins are almost innumerable, and innumerable sufferings must be endured for them in purgatory. And now, by means of these letters of indulgence, you can at once, *for life*—in all cases except four which are reserved to the Apostolic See—and afterwards at the hour of death, obtain a *full remission* of all your pains, and *all your sins*."

These words make positive the *fact* stated in Swinton's note that indulgences *were represented* to be actual pardons of guilt, and that the purchaser *was said* to be delivered from all sin. It is not sufficient for Catholics to say that such is not the teaching of the Catholic Church. The banished book does not say that such is or ever was the teaching of the Catholic Church. It simply says that such things "were represented," and "were said," and here are the words of Catholics showing that that is the fact.

So the case of the book and the Boston School Board stands just thus:—

1. The book says that at the time of Leo X. the papal treasury was exhausted; and that is a historical fact.

2. The book says that to recruit his exhausted finances, he adopted an extensive sale of indulgences; and that is a historical fact.

3. The book says that indulgences were remissions of the penances imposed upon persons because of their sins; and that is a doctrinal fact of the Catholic teaching according to the words of a Catholic archbishop.

584

4. The book says that in process of time indulgences were represented as actual pardons of guilt; and that is a literal historical fact.

5. The book says the purchaser of indulgence was said to be delivered from all his sins; and that is the literal historical fact as to what was said.

All of which conclusively demonstrates that the action of the Boston School Board in banishing that book from the public schools, rests not upon the slightest particle of justice or reason, but is wholly an exhibition of that arbitrary and unreasoning despotism which is characteristic of the Papacy everywhere that it secures enough power to make itself felt. It demonstrates the fact that it is not the statements in the book that the Catholics hate, so much as it is that they hate everything that is not subject to the despotic authority of Rome. For if historical facts in regard to which both Catholic and Protestant authorities agree, cannot be taught in the public schools without the interference of Rome, then what *can* be taught there without her *dictation*?

That everyone may see for himself how the matter stood we append a copy of the indulgence that was actually sold by Tetzel. Here it is:—

"May our Lord Jesus Christ have pity on thee, N— N—, and absolve thee by the merit of his most holy passion. And I, in virtue of the apostolic power intrusted to me, absolve thee from all ecclesiastical censures, judgments, and penalties, which thou mayest have deserved; moreover, from all the excesses, sins, and crimes, which thou mayest have committed, how great and enormous soever they may have been, and for whatever cause, even should they have been reserved to our most holy father the Pope, and to the apostolic See. I efface all the marks of disability, and all the notes of infamy which thou mayest have incurred on this occasion. I remit the pains which thou shouldst have to endure in purgatory. I render thee anew a partaker in the sacraments of the church. I again incorporate thee into the communion of saints, and re-establish thee in the innocence and purity in which thou wert at the hour of thy baptism; so that, at the moment of thy death, the gate of entrance to the place of pains and torments will be shut to thee; and, on the contrary, the gate which leads to the heavenly paradise, will be opened to thee. If thou art not to die soon, this grace will remain unimpaired till thy last hour arrive. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

"Friar John Tetzel, commissary, has signed it with his own hand."—*D'Aubigne—History of the Reformation, book 3, chap. 1. J.*

"The Third Angel's Message. The Wrath of the Dragon" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 37 , pp. 584, 585.

The Commentary

THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE. THE WRATH OF THE DRAGON

(Lesson 11. Sabbath, October 6, 1888.)

1. JUST after what notable working will the Saviour come?

"Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." 2 Thess. 2:9, 10.

2. How great will be the signs and wonders?

"For there shall arise false christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders, insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." Matt. 24:24.

3. Why is it they deceived them that perish? 2 Thess. 2:10, last part.

4. What special manifestation of the truth have we found that there will be just before the coming of the Lord?

"And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb."

"And I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle." Rev. 14:9, 10, 14.

5. Are the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus the truth?

"Thou art near, O Lord; and all thy commandments are truth." Ps. 119:151.

"Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." John 14:6.

6. Are the commandments of God in the faith of Jesus *righteousness*?

"My tongue shall speak of thy word, for all thy commandments our righteousness." Ps. 119:172.

"For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love." Gal. 5:5, 6.

7. What is the object of Satan is deceiving, line miracles and wonders?

"And deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live." Rev. 13:14.

8. What is the object of the Third Angel's Message?—*To save men from the worship of the beast and his image.*

585

9. Then with what will be Satan's last conflict before the coming of the Lord.—*With the Third Angel's Message and with those who receive the love of it.*

10. What does this message lead men to do?

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

11. In what manner does the second beast of Rev. 13 speak?

"And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon." Verse 11.

12. What power, and seat, and authority as the first beast?

"And the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority." Verse 2, last part.

13. What is the great dragon?

"And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world; he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him." Rev. 12:9.

14. What then is the source of the dragon spirit?

15. Through what power did he manifest his wrath when the Saviour was on the earth?—*Pagan Rome*. Verses 4, 5; Matt. 2:1, 2, 8, 16; John 18:31; 19:12, 15, 16.

16. Through what power did he manifest the wrath in the Dark Ages?—*The beast*. Rev. 13:2, 5-7; 12:14-16; Dan. 21:33, 34; Matt. 21:21, 22.

17. Through what power will his wrath be poured out against the last of the church?—*The image of the beast in association with the beast*. Rev. 13:12, 14.

18. What will specially excite his wrath against the poor remnant in this last effort?

"And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." Rev. 12:17.

19. What will the Third Angel's Message do just at this time?—*It will go to every nation, and people, urging them to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus*.

20. What is it then that will cause the devil to be a particularly wrathful, and to put forth all of his power?—*The Third Angel's Message*.

21. Which side will get the victory?

"And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire; and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God." Rev. 15:2.

"The Third Angel's Message. The Working of Satan" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 37 , p. 585.

THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE. THE WORKING OF SATAN

(Lesson 15. Sabbath, October 13, 1888.)

1. WHAT will be said to the people just before the Lord comes? Compare Isa. 8:19 with verse 17.

2. What is the object of their seeking unto them that have familiar spirits?—*To obtain communication with the dead*. Verse 19, last part.

3. What is that doctrine called?—*Spiritualism*.

4. Do the dead know anything?

"For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun." Eccl. 9:5, 6.

5. What are the familiar spirits which these persons have, and with which men are invited to communicate?

"For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." Rev. 16:14.

6. What have we found to be one great object of these miracles and lying wonders?

"And deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live." Rev. 13:14.

7. What does this prove?—*That Spiritualism will act a most important part in making the image to the beast, and enforcing the worship of the beast and his image.*

8. When the National Reformers secure their National Constitutional acknowledgment, what do they expect?

"Let us acknowledge God as our Father and Sovereign, and Source of all good, and his blessing will be upon us. Crime and corruption will come to an end, and the benign reign of Jesus, our rightful Lord, will be established." "Either like them [the Jews] we will reject him and perish, or, become a kingdom of our Lord and his Christ, we shall fill the earth and endure for ever." "And when we reached the summit. . . the train will move out into the mild yet glorious light of millennial days, and the cry will be raised, 'The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ.'"—*New York National Reform Convention, 1888, pp. 49, 75, 47.*

9. When they shall have set up what they call his kingdom, what then do they expect?

"When we finish our testimony, *then Christ will come and finish his work.*"—*Secretary J. M. Foster, in Reformed Presbyterian and committee, December, 1887, p. 403.*

10. By whom will there be great signs and wonders wrought to deceive?

"For there shall arise false christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." Matt. 24:24.

11. Who will finally manifest, and work with, all power?

"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." 2 Thess. 2:8.

12. As these great wonders are to be wrought by false christs, and as Satan is to work the greatest of them, then in what form will Satan present himself in this?—*In the form of a false christ.*

13. When the National Reform kingdom shall have been formed, and Satan, by this great wonder-working power, shall be transformed into an angel of light, and thus shall come impersonating Christ, then what will be the universal shout?—"Christ is come;" "*the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ.*"

14. Then who will be the king of the National Reform government?

15. Is Spiritualism expecting such a new messiah?

Spiritualism promises a new messiah, and announces his coming "to this very generation." The *World's Advance Thought* is the *avant-courier* of the new spiritual dispensation, and in its issue of April 5, 1886, says:—

"Another sun of righteousness is called for on earth, and the messenger cannot be far off whose life mission it shall be to practically illustrate the new truths that will be vouchsafed. He will not be a mere racial messiah, nor a half-world messiah, as was the great Nazarene; but steam locomotion and lightning communication, and the harmonizing influences of commercial intercourse, have made a whole world messiah possible, and such the next one shall be. Though themselves ignorant of the fact, as the body, the great and multiplying army of mediums are his *avant couriers.*" "The unanimity of the answers may thrill the world with the promise of a new messiah."

16. What says infidelity?

"Now I think I can safely say that if the National Reform movement succeeds, and God will sign and send his edicts, so that there can be no doubt about their authority, the disbelievers will cheerfully obey them, and if Jesus will come and sit visibly on the throne, where we can see and talk to him, there will be no unbelievers, and all will obey."—*P. F. Shumber, First Creek, La.*, in a letter to the editor of the *American Sentinel*, September 1, 1887.

17. What says the National W.C.T.U.?

"The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, local, State, National, and world-wide, has one vital, organic thought, one all-absorbing purpose, one undying enthusiasm, and it is that *Christ shall be* this world's king. Yes, verily, this world's king in its realm of cause and effect; king of its courts, its camps, its commerce; king of its colleges and cloisters; king of its customs and its constitutions."—*Union Signal*, December 1, 1887, p. 2.

18. Taking all these with the other different bodies that now favor the National Reform movement, and how general will be the acceptance of the king of the National Reform government?

19. What have we found is given to save men from this terrible deception?
20. Then who alone will refuse to acknowledge the National Reform king?—
Those who receive the love of the truth of the Third Angel's Message.

October 5, 1888

"Those First-Day Offerings" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 38 , pp. 598, 599.

THE New England *Evangelist* takes us gently to task, for saying that 1 Cor. 16:2 refers to a gathering of means for spreading abroad the gospel. It says this collection was for the saints at Jerusalem, because for some reason the disciples there were poor. This is all true, and is just what we showed in the article which the *Evangelist* chooses to criticize. The saints at Jerusalem were poor for the gospel's sake; for at the beginning of the gospel those who "were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them at the apostles' feet; and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need." When that persecution arose, and scattered them abroad everywhere, some of the means had to go with each one as he had need, and then when that dearth came throughout all the land in the days of Claudius Cesar, the fund was soon exhausted and the disciples were left in need.

Then it was, and that is why it was, that Paul established this order of laying by in store on the first day of the week. Because, said he, the Gentiles were their debtors, "For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things." Rom. 15:27. And the same apostle says that in this service they were proving their professed subjection to the gospel, and were distributing not only to those in Judea, but to all men. "While by the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your professed subjection unto the gospel of Christ, and for your liberal distribution unto them, and unto all men." 2 Cor. 9:13. In these first-day offerings, therefore, they were distributing to all men. We wish the *Evangelist* would tell how they could distribute unto all men in any other way than by the spreading abroad of the gospel.

Says the *Evangelist* further:—

"It is not apparent that the disciples in those days ever raised a fund of money to send anybody out to preach the gospel; but we read much about them going out to preach because *God sent them*, and we find that God supported them through the labor of their own hands, and raising up friends who ministered unto them."

It is not apparent that God supported, through the labor of their own hands, any of the apostles except Paul and Barnabas, and Paul asserted that they had "power to forbear working," because no man "goeth a warfare any time at his own charges," and because "the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." The power not to work with their own hands Paul asserts he and Barnabas had, "nevertheless we have not used this power." It is

not ordained of God that those who preach the gospel shall support themselves either by their own means or by working with their own hands. They may do so if they choose, but the Lord has ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel. We invite the *Evangelist* to read 1 Cor. 9:1-18. More than this, God did not send men out to preach, without the indorsement of the brethren. When Paul and Barnabas were distinctly singled out by the Holy Ghost to the work of the gospel, the brethren "laid their hands on them," and "sent them away;" for it is written: "The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." Acts 13:2, 3.

The other statement is, that "it is not apparent that the disciples in those days ever raised a fund of

599

money to send anybody out to preach the gospel." This statement is as far from the truth as the other two; for this very thing is decidedly apparent. Paul wrote to the Philippians these words: "I rejoice in the Lord greatly, that now at the last your care of me hath flourished again; wherein ye were also careful, but ye lacked opportunity." "Now ye Philippians know also, that in the beginning of the gospel, when I departed from Macedonia, no church communicated with me as concerning giving and receiving, but ye only. For even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my necessity." Phil. 4:10, 15, 16. And at the very time when Paul was preaching the gospel at Corinth and working with his own hands, he was supplied also with funds sent from Macedonia, for he says to the Corinthians: "I robbed other churches, taking wages of them, to do you service. And when I was present with you, and wanted, I was chargeable to no man; for that which was lacking to me the brethren which came from Macedonia supplied." 2 Cor. 11:8, 9.

It is certainly apparent, therefore, that in those days they *did* raise a fund of some kind, in some way, for the support of those who were sent out to preach the gospel. We do not say that the system of first-day offerings was the only way of raising money for the work of the gospel, but it certainly was *one* of the ways.

J.

October 26, 1888

"The Sentinel Extra" *The Signs of the Times* 14, 41 , p. 647.

THERE has been issued a special edition, or rather extra, of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, particularly designed for distribution before election day, or upon that day, though good at all times and everywhere in the country. Its object is to disclose the danger threatened to the liberties of citizens of the United States from the proposed Religious Amendment to the Constitution, and the National Sunday law, both of which are now pending in the United States Senate. It gives an analysis of the Sunday law by sections, and gives the proposed constitutional amendment, with an article showing what it means, and an article on "The National Reform Association" and what its purposes are, an article on "The

Woman's Christian Temperance Union," and one on "The Prohibition Party," besides a number of short, pointed items.

The analysis of the Sunday law bill shows that the spirit of that bill is simply and only the spirit of religious bigotry and intolerance. The examination of the proposed amendment to the Constitution shows that it is simply an establishment of a national religion for which it provides. The article on "The Savor of Tyranny" is a reprint of a judicial decision rendered by Judge Sullivan, of the Supreme Court of California, upon a principle identical with one contained in the Sunday bill, and clearly shows that the Blair Sunday Bill is uncertain and unreasonable; that it is subversive of liberty, and that it savors of tyranny. An article on the "National Reform Association" gives in their own words what the National Reformers propose to do when they get the amendment to the national Constitution that they want. This article, in connection with the foregoing ones, clearly demonstrates that the result of the proposed amendment and Sunday law introduced by Senator Blair, if adopted, will be the establishment of a religious despotism as cruel as any that ever was.

The article on "The Woman's Christian Temperance Union" is to show, not only that the political theory of that union is identical with that of the National Reform Association, but also to show that the union is, in fact, a part of the National Reform Association, and the political workings are directly in the line of the National Reform Association.

The article on "The Prohibition Party" shows that that party is doing the same thing. It is shown also that the principles of the Prohibition party and the National Reform Association are precisely the same as those which Pope Leo XIII. has commanded all Catholics to keep ever in view, and for which the Catholics in the United States are also working.

The short items are brief comments upon different points suggested in all these lines.

It will be seen that this *Sentinel* touches upon living questions, and such questions, and such questions as are of the most vital importance to American citizens. An edition of about 200,000 has been printed, and apportioned among the different Conferences of the country, 25,000 being retained for the Pacific Coast. We ask the readers of the SIGNS everywhere, and especially in California, to give the matter of the distribution of this extra their closest thought and attention. Hand it to your neighbors of all classes and conditions, whether they are interested in the Sunday law or not—hand it to them and ask them to read it. Send it to your friends afar off, scatter it everywhere. Any number in addition will be printed on short notice if required. If you have not enough send to the office for all you want and they will be furnished at \$10 a thousand.

This is giving the Third Angel's Message. All who love the truth and the work of that message should spare neither time, labor, nor expense to see that this paper has the widest possible circulation. Everybody who loves liberty and human rights, civil and religious, should see that it shall be so also. Who loves civil and religious liberty and human rights? Who loves the truth and the work of the Third Angel's Message? Who will not read and circulate the *Sentinel*? J.

The Signs of the Times, Vol. 15 (1889)

August 19, 1889

"The Relation of the W. C. T. U. to Sunday Laws" *The Signs of the Times* 15, 32 , pp. 504-506.

IN the *Union Signal* of June 6, 1889, under the head of "Special Difficulties," is the following:—

"Query—'Does the W.C.T.U. favor a Sunday law that will oppress seventh-day believers?'

"Answer—'"The N.W.C.T.U. has repeatedly placed itself on record by resolution as desiring protection for conscientious observers of Saturday as the Sabbath, and the petition to Congress at the National Convention in New York City, expressly asked for this. In the now celebrated "hearing" before the Congressional Committee in December, the national superintendent especially urged this point, as can be seen on page twenty-four of the report. The American Sabbath Union at its Washington convention, did not join this special request, believing that the bill as prepared by Senator Blair already provides for all protection which is possible if we have any Sunday law at all. This is also Senator Blair's opinion.

"The clause of the Sunday-rest bill referred to not only excepts work of necessity, mercy or humanity, but forbids only secular work, labor, or business, to the disturbance of others. What shape the bill will finally take before Congress, it is impossible to foresee.

"Our seventh-day friends make it hard for us to get an exemption clause, because they insist on the same rights for Sunday as for any other day of the week, which would result, wherever there were many of them, in having not two Sabbaths, but no Sabbath at all, as is already the case in many such places, according to the most reliable testimony. The American people have a right to insist that the Sabbath must be maintained, and Dr. A. H. Lewis, representative of the Seventh-day Baptists, says on page forty-three of the "Notes of the Hearing," in reply to a question of the Chairman: 'If the pursuing of railroad business upon the first day of the week, by Seventh-day Baptists or any others, were shown to be necessarily inimical to the best interests of the commonwealth, we would agree that it should be restrained.' In other words, the rights of the few must yield to those of the many, when they necessarily conflict, and this doctrine is fundamental to our form of government.

"[Signed] MRS. J. C. BATEHAM.

"*Superintendent Sabbath Observance.*"

It is plain from this that the seventh-day friends, who make it so hard for the Sunday folks to get an exemption clause into their law, are the Seventh-day Adventists and not the Seventh-day Baptists; because Dr. Lewis, who is referred to by Mrs. Bateham in behalf of the Seventh-day Baptists, asked for an exemption clause to be inserted as

505

section seven of the original Blair bill, while I, at that same hearing, absolutely denied the right of any legislation upon the subject, even to the extent of an exemption clause. I here insert that part of my argument before the Committee which deals with this point. This argument is enlarged somewhat, upon what is given in the official hearing, but no change is made from the position there taken.

Senator Blair—Is there any other point you would wish to present?

Mr. Jones—There is another point, and that is, that we will be sufferers under such a law when it is passed. They propose to put in an exemption clause. Some of them favor an exemption clause, but it would not in the least degree check our opposition to the law if forty exemption clauses were put in, unless, indeed, they should insert a clause exempting *everybody* who does not want to keep it. In that case, we might not object so much.

Senator Blair—You care not whether it is put in or not?

Mr. Jones—There is no right whatever in the legislation; and we will never accept an exemption clause as an equivalent to our opposition to the law. It is not to obtain relief for ourselves that we oppose the law. It is the principle of the whole subject of the legislation to which we object; and an exemption clause would not modify our objection in the least.

Senator Blair—You differ from Dr. Lewis?

Mr. Jones—Yes, sir; we will never accept an exemption clause, as tending in the least to modify our opposition to the law. We as firmly and as fully deny the right of the State to legislate upon the subject with an exemption clause as without.

Senator Blair—There are three times as many of you as of his denomination?

Mr. Jones—Yes, sir; There are nearly thirty thousand of us, and we ask for no exemption clause. We stand wholly upon the principle of the question. There should be no exemption from a just law. If the law is right, it is wrong to exempt.

In 1887 Mrs. Bateham herself wrote and printed a "Letter to Seventh-day Believers," proposing in substance that if we would help them to secure a Sunday law, they would exempt us from its penalties. We replied then as we reply now and always. We will not help you to put upon others what we would not have put upon ourselves.

Senator Blair—You object to it?

Mr. Jones—We object to the whole principle of the proposed legislation. We go to the root of the matter, and deny the right of Congress to enact it.

Senator Blair—You say that the proposed exemption does not make it any better?

Mr. Jones—Not a bit; because if the rightfulness of the legislation be admitted, then we admit that it is the right of a majority to say that such and such a day shall be the Sabbath or the Lord's day, and that it shall be kept. The majorities

change in civil government; the majority may change within a few years,—may change, in fact, at any election,—and then the people may say that the day which we believe should be kept must be observed, or they may say that this day shall not be kept. If we admit the propriety of the legislation, we must also admit the propriety of the legislation to the effect that a certain day shall not be kept, and it makes every man's observance of Sunday, or otherwise, simply the football of majorities. That has been the course of religious legislation from the formation of the Papacy onward, and that is the end of religious legislation of all kinds everywhere.

Senator Blair—Do you not think there is a distinction between a majority in a monarchical government, and a majority in a republican government? In a monarchical government the majority is simply one man who has power.

Mr. Jones—But in a republic, when you throw this subject into civil affairs, it makes a great deal of difference. Why, sir, we would object to the passage of a law enforcing the observance of the day which we keep, and to accept an exemption clause would only be to contradict ourselves. Allow me to illustrate this: There was a time when we did not keep the seventh day as the Sabbath. While we did not keep it, we had the right not to keep it. We became convinced that we ought to keep it; and we are now doing so. We have the right to keep it. More than this, we have the right again not to keep it if we choose not to keep it. But if, while keeping it, we should consent to the State's assumption of power to compel us to do that which we have the right to omit if we please, we would therein resign our freedom of religious faith and worship. If these people would only *think* on this question, they would see that they themselves cannot afford to consent to this legislation, much less demand it. No man can ever safely consent to legislation in favor of the form of faith or worship which he himself professes. In so doing he resigns his right to profess some other form of faith if he should become convinced that other form is nearer the truth than his own. He virtually resigns his right to think any further on the subject of religious observances, and must thenceforth accept them ready made from the legislative power; that is, as the majority may dictate. The Sunday observers may thus give away their religious liberty if they choose; but as for us, we do not propose to do it. We are going to assert and maintain our rights. And when these give theirs away, we are going to assert their right to re-assert their rights.

Another thing: An exemption clause is only a toleration clause in disguise. For us to accept it would be but to confess that all religious rights are summed up in the majority, and that we are willing to accept from *them* whatever religious liberty *they* think we ought to have. But no such confession, sir, will we ever make. To no such thing will we ever consent or submit. We are Americans, sir, and citizens of the United States, too, and we assert all the rights of American citizens. The vocabulary of American ideas knows no such word as "toleration." It asserts *rights*. As was said by the Senate Committee on this very subject sixty years ago, so say we:—

"What other nations call religious toleration, we call religious rights. They are not exercised by virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which

government cannot deprive any portion of citizens, however small. Despotism may invade those rights, but justice still confirms them."

Nor is this all that there is to be said on this point. There is another principle involved. If we should accept the exemption clause, it would not help the thing. It would be exceedingly short. Suppose an exemption clause were given. There are people who would profess to be Seventh-day Adventists for the express purpose of getting a chance to open saloons or houses of business on Sunday. Therefore in outright self-defense, the majority would have to repeal the exemption clause.

Senator Blair—Call Mrs. Bateham's attention to that.

Mr. Jones—Let me repeat it. If you give an exemption clause—it has been tried—there are reprehensible men, saloon keepers, who know they will get more traffic on Sunday than they can on Saturday, and they will profess to be Seventh-day Adventists, they will profess to be Sabbath keepers. You cannot "go behind the returns," you cannot look into the heart, you cannot investigate the intention, to see whether they are genuine in their profession or not. They will profess to be Sabbath-keepers, and then they will open their saloons on Sunday. Then in outright self-defense, to make your position effective, you will have to repeal that exemption clause. It will last but a little while.

Senator Blair—I agree with you there.

Mr. Jones—For that reason these people cannot afford to offer an exemption clause; and for the reason that it puts the majority in the power of our conscience, we deny the right to do anything of the kind. I ask the organizations represented here to think of this after this hearing is over. It will bear all the investigation they choose to give it.

Senator Blair—I should like to call everybody's attention to the point. If you need any legislation of this kind, you would better ask for legislation to carry out your purposes, and be careful that in the effort to get the assistance of the parties against you, you do not throw away the pith and substance of all for which you ask.

Mr. Jones—It has been objected to this, that this supposition is only imaginary; because such characters could not be members of any Seventh-day Baptist or Seventh-day Adventist Church. It is certainly true that, so far, a saloon-keeping Seventh-day Baptist, or Seventh-day Adventist, either, is an unknown thing. But if Sunday laws are enforced with an exemption clause in favor of those who keep the seventh day, this would not be an unknown thing much longer. It is true, also, that such a man could not obtain membership in an Seventh-day Baptist or Seventh-day Adventist Church. But what is to prevent the saloon keepers from organizing Seventh-day Baptist or Seventh-day Adventist churches of their own, and for themselves? What is to prevent them, or any class of business men, from organizing their own churches, electing their own officers, and even ordaining their own pastors, and calling themselves Seventh-day Baptists or Seventh-day Adventists? There is nothing to prevent it; unless, indeed, the State itself shall take charge of all seventh-day churches, and doctrines, and attend to their organization and the admission of members. This is precisely what was done

before. In the days of the New England theocracy, Massachusetts enacted a law that,—

"For the time to come, no man shall be admitted to the freedom of this body politic, but such as are members of some of the churches within the limits of the same."

There were considerable numbers of men who were not members of any of the churches, and who could not be, because they were not Christians. These men then took to forming themselves into churches of their own. Then the next step for the authorities to take, and they took it, was to enact a law that,—

"Forasmuch as it hath bene found by sad experience that much trouble and disturbance hath happened both to the church and civill State by the officers and members of some churches, weh have bene gathered . . . in an undue manner, . . . it is . . . order that . . . this Court doeth not, nor will hereafter, approue of any such companies of men as shall henceforthe ioine in any pretended way of church fellowship, without they shall first acquainte the magistrates and elders of the greater pte of the churches in this jurisdicon, with their intencons, and have their approbacon herein."—*Emancipation of Massachusetts*, pp. 28-30.

By this it will be seen that the enactment of such a Sunday law, though the first step, would not be by any means the last step, and that in more directions than one. Their offer of an exemption clause is a voluntary confession that the enforcement of the law without one would be unjust; but if that exemption clause be embodied and maintained, the State is inevitably carried beyond its proper jurisdiction; and if the exemption clause is retained and not maintained in its strictness, the whole law is at once nullified. Congress would better learn wisdom from this prospect, and utterly

506

refuse to have anything at all to do with the subject. The whole subject is beyond the jurisdiction of the civil power, and the civil power can do no better than to let it entirely alone.

Yes, we should think it would be hard for the Sunday-law workers to get an exemption clause for a people who insist on the same rights that they themselves have.

ALONZO T. JONES.