

The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, Vol. 61 (1884)

January 8, 1884

"Sound Speech That Cannot Be Condemned" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 61, 2 , pp. 27, 28.

BY ELD. ALONZO T. JONES

IN these days of "departure" and "new departures" from the faith, especially in what are called the "educated" or "advanced" circles, it is refreshing to find such faithful words as the following, from Dr. Daniel T. Spear. Certainly, no one can question the ability or scholarship of Dr. Spear, and he speaks with no uncertain tone on these subjects, and his words are more than an offset to the so-called scientific advance of Beecher, McCosh, and others. The paragraphs presented below are taken from a speech by Dr. Spear at Saratoga Springs, last summer, on "Alleged Progress in Theology." The speech was printed entire in the New York *Independent* of Sept. 29, 1883. It is on four points, viz., Higher Criticism, Inspiration of the Bible, Eschatology, and The Atonement of Christ. The whole speech is excellent, but too long to be given entire; yet that part on the inspiration of the Bible is worthy of especial notice, I think, and therefore I present it entire. He says:—

"The second phase 'of advanced thought' relates to the inspiration of the Bible, which is one of the questions of the age, though not really a new question.

"Modern infidelity, as you are aware, claims that modern science has made the discoveries in the kingdom of matter, organic and inorganic, which contradict the Bible and prove it to be false on certain questions of fact, particularly in reference to some Bible statements in the book of Genesis. The statements in question relate to the antiquity and organization of this globe and the creation of man. This infidelity says that these statements are false, and that modern science has proved them to be so. You see at once that this is a pretty large subject to be handled in a single speech, and then as only one item in four.

"What shall we do with this modern science that is battering down the truth of the Bible? I begin my answer to this question by saying that I observe in a portion of the Christian ministry a tendency to *assume* as already settled and established, and therefore indisputable, the *truth* of these alleged scientific discoveries, and then, in order to obviate their apparent destructive relation to the Bible, to look around for some method of apologetic defense. So far as I have observed, two methods of such defense have been resorted to. One is to change the interpretation of the Bible, and give to its language another meaning so as to avoid the apparent conflict. The other method is to reconstruct the theory of Bible inspiration as to its statements on questions of fact, so as, on the one hand, to admit the alleged discoveries of science as corrections of the mistakes of the Bible on these questions, and, on the other hand, to save the credibility of the Bible in respect to certain other questions of a moral and spiritual nature in regard to which science has nothing to say. Both of these methods agree in *assuming* that the so-called science is all right, not only in respect to the facts alleged, but also in respect to the conclusions drawn therefrom. Both make a very respectful obeisance to science, and simply inquire how they can rescue the Bible from its verdict of condemnation.

"You have an example of the first method in the attempt to make the word 'day' as occurring in the first chapter of Genesis, mean an *age* or a geological period. This overlooks the fact that the 'day' here mentioned is described as the first, the second, the third day, and so on, and also the fact that in the fourth commandment this same

'day' is spoken of as a day in a week consisting of seven days, each of which was twenty-four hours in length; and the still further fact that the Jews, for whom the record in Genesis and Exodus was originally made, not being geologists, would understand the term 'day,' as thus described, to mean a natural day of twenty-four hours. They could give it no other meaning; and *no man would give to it other meaning* unless led to do so in order to meet a supposed

difficulty. The fact that the term is used for an indefinite period, *does not make it in this use*, with this description, and *in these connections, anything but a natural day of twenty-four hours*. [These italics mine.] To force another meaning into it *is to give it a meaning which it does not bear*; and moreover, when this meaning is forced into it, the supposed difficulty created by geology is by no means removed. I have a way of disposing of this difficulty that satisfies my mind, but which I cannot pause to detail; yet that way does not consist in placing a *new, unnatural and false* meaning upon the term 'day' as it occurs in the first chapter of Genesis and in the fourth commandment.

"The other method of dealing with scientific infidelity involves a change of view in respect to the inspiration of the Bible, in effect giving up this doctrine when and where science says or claims to say that the Bible is wrong on questions of fact, and holding on to it where science says nothing because the field lies beyond its province. It is in respect to this phase of the question of inspiration that I submit for your consideration the following remarks:—

"1. We know nothing *a priori* on the subject of inspiration. Whether God would inspire all men or only some, and in what way and to what extent, if at all, are matters which, except as we may be informed by him, lie above and beyond the range of our faculties. The first thing to be done is to confess our natural ignorance on this subject.

"2. If we accept the Bible as of divine authority at all, we must accept it as of such authority in relation to the subject of inspiration, provided it contains any statements bearing upon the point. The main question then, is this: What does the Bible say on this subject? Does it assert its own inspiration? And in answer to this question, I will cite a few passages as examples of what the Bible does say.

"Take the first and second verses of the first chapter of Hebrews: 'God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son.' God, as here stated, is the speaker. He does the speaking. He puts himself in real communication. He did so 'in time past,' and continued to do so 'in these last days.' He did so in the first instance 'unto the fathers by the prophets,' and he continued to do so in the second instance 'by his Son.' The point that I want you to observe is, that *God spake* in both instances, and in the way mentioned. I care not what you call it, if you get this fact into your minds.

"Take another passage: 'For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' 1 Peter 3:21. Here, 'holy men of God,' evidently

alluding to the Jewish prophets, are said to do the speaking, not from their intuitions or from their experience, but 'as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.' That is to say, the Holy Ghost moved them to speak, and they spake as he moved them.

"Take still another passage. Paul, in the third chapter of his second epistle to Timothy, reminds him of the fact that from a child he had 'known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make men wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus,' and then proceeds to say in respect to these scriptures that 'all Scripture is given by inspiration of God,' etc. Here Paul affirms the divine authority of the Jewish Scriptures as a fact, in the sense that they were 'given by inspiration of God.'

"Take a fourth passage. Paul, in first Corinthians, chapter second, and verse thirteen, alludes to the things 'freely given to us of God,' and then proceeds to say: 'Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.' That is to say, The Holy Ghost teacheth the words, as Christ promised to his chosen apostles that he would, and under this instruction we do the speaking.

"I might multiply such passages indefinitely; but these will suffice to give you the Bible idea of inspiration. 'Thus saith the Lord' is the one great idea of this Book. It treats itself and speaks of itself as 'the word of God.' It commits God's authority to the truth and reality of what it declares to be true and real, so that we are to believe on this authority and for this reason. It does so without any limitations, qualifications, or discriminations as to the matter revealed, or a fact stated. God himself is behind the words and in the words; and what they mean he means. This is the Bible idea of the inspiration of the men who originally wrote it. They did so under the direction of the Holy Ghost. You, of course, understand that this applies only to the original Scriptures. Whether these Scriptures have been preserved and correctly translated into other languages, is another question with which in this discussion I have nothing to do.

"3. Believing, as I do, that the original Scriptures were 'given by inspiration of God,' and that they *have been preserved without corruption or essential change*, then, if as to any point there be a real conflict between what the Bible says and what *science* is *assumed* to say, so that both cannot be admitted as truthful, I *will not interpret out of a Bible passage its true and proper meaning*, and I *will not abandon its theory of inspiration* and substitute one of my own; but I will raise the question whether the *proof* of the *Bible* is *stronger* than that of the *science* that conflicts with it, and so far as my own faith is concerned, abide by that inquiry. I must be sure in the first place that the conflict is real; and then I will accept the result which the proof forces upon me. I cannot think as a rational being and do otherwise. [Italics mine.]

"And now in regard to this question of comparative proof, I know of no science which contradicts the Bible on any question of fact, and *is at the same time as well proved as the Bible* itself. Take geology, for example. It says as an *inference* [italics his] from certain facts, that this globe, as to the matter composing it, is much older than six thousand years. This is an *inference* the truth of which I do not understand the Bible to deny. If the Bible did deny this inference, *then I would reject the inference* [italics mine], and I would do so because I hold the *truth of the Bible to be more certain than this conclusion of the geologist* [ditto]. There is an enormous space between the mere facts gathered by the geologist and the conclusion which he draws therefrom. He has to jump over this space in order to get to his conclusion. I confess frankly to you that I think his conclusion is probably correct; but when I compare the evidence of that correctness with the vast and varied evidence that sustains the divine authority of the Bible, the probability in favor of the latter, to my mind, rises to a much higher grade of certainty. Drive me to the wall on this subject, and *I shall take the Bible and let the geological inference go to the dogs*. [Good. Italics mine still, but this last is good enough to be in capitals.] I think I could show you, did the time permit, that this inference rests on several assumptions which may be true, but are far from being proved. [This is a strong confirmation of the late article in the REVIEW on the "Uncertainty of Geological Science," and I am glad it comes from such a source.]

"Take the modern doctrine of evolution which traces man back to a monkey, and from a monkey back to a vitalized protoplasm, and which undoubtedly contradicts the Scripture record of man's creation and all the references in the Bible so that record. The two systems cannot stand together. If man was originally created as the Bible says he was, then he was not created as evolution says he was, then he was. What are you going to do with this conflict? If you will take my advice, you will dismiss this sort of evolution as a sheer *speculation*, sustained by no evidence that even begins to equal that which supports the divine authority of the Bible. You will not reconstruct your theory of inspiration so as to get protoplasm into your creed.

"4. [Last paragraph] Let me say that I have not one particle of concern as to any destruction or serious damage to this religion by infidelity whether it be scientific or vulgar. This, by the very constitution of things, is a religious world in the instincts and necessities that belong to human nature; and infidelity, which consists in negatives, cannot unmake it as such. Christianity has come into such a world; and it everywhere meets a race of beings that want it, whom it fits, and whom it lifts in the scale of being. It has power with them, and has made its home among them.

Downright infidelity, in any of its forms, is the exceptional condition of humanity, and a weak one at that, in this country and in every other country where Christianity prevails.

"5. Let me say finally on this point, especially to those of you who are in comparatively early life, speaking as one who has seen more than threescore years and ten, that if I were an occupant of the Christian pulpit, I would in the main preach the Bible to the people just as if I supposed they fully believed it and needed no argument from me to prove its truth. I would seek to impress them with the idea that I fully believed it myself. I would deal with its facts, its doctrines, its duties, its threatenings, and its promises, as being of complete, absolute, divine, and therefore infallible, authority, as a guide to faith and practice on all the subjects and questions of which it treats. I would not be afraid to say *Hell*, where the Bible says Hell. I would not modify the teaching of the Book of the breadth of a hair to suit any man, or adapt it to the proclivities of any age. Having been both preacher and hearer, I have come to the conclusion that just this sort of preaching is the best practical cure for infidelity, so far as the pulpit ordinarily has to do with it; and I am sure that it is best to impress the truth upon those who, though not infidels, are not Christians in the spirit and temper of their minds, and who great need to flee for refuge to the hope set before them in the gospel."

Golden words are these under number 5, and worthy to be forever remembered by every preacher; so likewise are his closing words at the end of "The Atonement," and also at the close of the whole speech. These I will subjoin also:—

6. "My final remark is that the best way to preach the doctrine of the atonement is to do so without much speculation, and largely in the language of the Bible. There is, after all, no more effectual way of stating the doctrine than to say that Christ died for our sins, or that he tasted death for every man. The statements of inspiration so blend the fact of the death with the reason therefor, and the relation thereof, as to make the most impressive appeal alike to the head and the heart. The pulpit will most effectually preach the cross of Christ that preaches it under the forms of thought, and largely in the expressions of thought, which the Bible supplies. These are the objects which faith needs to grasp and affirm, and upon which every soul needs to pillow its head when smitten with a sense of guilt, or called to meet its God in judgment.

"I have thus submitted to you my thoughts on the four points named. And in conclusion will simply say that the longer I have lived, and the nearer I come to the final exit from time, the better I am satisfied with the Bible as the rule of faith and practiced, as a shadow of a great rock in a weary land, as the solution of all religious questions that flash across the firmament of my mind, and as the sheet-anchor of all my hopes for another world. I am disposed to adopt the words of the psalmist, and say of the Bible and of the God of the Bible: 'In the multitude of my thoughts within me, thy comforts delight my soul.' If there is any better position

than this, I know not what it is, nor where to find it. I want no advance and no retreat in theology that takes me away from this position."

How much sweeter, how much more devout and trustful, how much tenderer are these words, and how vastly more they reach, and take hold of the heart, than the vulgar infidelity of Henry Ward Beecher, or the scientific infidelity of Dr. McCosh. And how thankful, we are to Dr. Spear that he has sent these "good words and comfortable words" ringing through the ranks of the so-called "scientific" and "advanced thought" controversialists.

January 22, 1884

"The Sermon. Daniel 7:21, 22" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 61, 4 , pp. 49, 50.

BY ELD. A. T. JONES

TEXT: "I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom."

THESE are the closing words of Daniel's inquiry of the angel about the truth of the fourth beast, and of the horns which were in his head, and of the other *one* before whom three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots, and they apply to that *one* of which he said he had a mouth which spoke great things, and whose look was more stout than his fellows. And the angel in his reply gave specifications further which fix the application truly upon the papacy. But there is a point in the words of Daniel, verse 22, which is not specially touched by the angel in his reply, that is, the *entire* length of time in which the little horn should make war against the saints. The angel gives the length of time during which the dominion, the saints, the times, and the laws, should be *given into his hand*; viz., the time, times, and a half, or 1260 years, or to 1798. Yet the words of Daniel in the 22nd verse declare that he beheld the same horn make war against the saints until judgment was given to them, which by Rev. 20:4, 1 Cor. 6:3, and 4:5, clearly appears to be not in this life, but at the coming of the Lord and the resurrection of the saints.

This is made emphatic by the remaining words of Daniel: War was made with the saints "until the time came that the *saints possessed the kingdom*." But as at the present time the papacy is not waging open and decided war with the saints, and as Daniel saw it making war upon them at the time when they shall possess the kingdom, which is, as has been plainly shown, at the coming of the Lord, therefore it seems clear that there is to be a revival of the persecuting power of the papacy. This view seems to be confirmed also by Rev. 13 and 14. In Rev. 13:4 they worshiped the beast *after* the deadly wound was healed. But there the expression is, they *worshiped*, while the 8th verse says, "All that dwell upon the earth *shall worship* him." This is after he had gone into captivity, after the *wound*

to death, and after "the deadly wound was healed;" that is, after the restoration of the papacy, after the end of the 1260 years, after 1798.

Now how is this revival of the persecuting power of the papacy to be brought about, especially in our own country? It seems to be clearly presented in Rev. 13:11-18, and 14:9-12. There is shown the rise of a power just before the coming of the Lord (Rev. 14:14), which carries on its work up to the very time when the saints possess the kingdom. Rev. 15:2. And what is the work that this power is to do? It is to cause "all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond," to "worship the beast," and to "receive his mark." And this mark is something contrary to the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus; because it is only by keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus that we shall be protected from the wrath of the beast and his image, and finally delivered in victory from it. As this mark of the beast (Rev. 14:9; 13:16) is contra-distinguished from the "seal," "sign," or "mark," of God (Rev. 7:3; Eze. 20:20; Ex. 31:17; Eze. 9:4); and as by these scriptures the mark of God is shown to be his Sabbath; and as everything is shown to be his Sabbath; and as everything is fairly rushing toward the accomplishment of an amendment to the United States Constitution, expressly for the enforcement of the observance of Sunday, the most shamefully illegitimate of of [*sic.*] all the illegitimate fruit of "the mistress of witchcraft, and mother of abominations,"—it is not a far-fetched inference, but is evidently the most reasonable conclusion, that the Sunday institution is the mark of the beast. And more than this, she sets it forth before all as the sign than this, she sets it forth before all as the sign (mark) of her authority.

Now, knowing this as we know it, and as she knows it, and as all may know it, does any one, can any one, suppose that, when the Constitutional Amendment shall have been adopted, she is going to sit idly by with folded hands, and take no interest in the enforcement of it, or that she will leave the enforcement of it entirely to the so-called Protestants? Nay, verily. At present, in strict accordance with the "policy" (Dan. 8:25) which has distinguished her whole history, she apparently takes very little interest in the movement; because she knows that if she should appear actively engaged in the enterprise, it would seriously compromise it; but when the time comes to vote on the question, we shall see her engaged by all the wiles known to her wily experience, in bringing the work to a successful issue. And when success has crowned the effort, and the amendment is adopted and ready for enforcement,—then, when the long wished-for, the long worked-for, time has come, for which she has waited ever since her dominion was taken away,—then we shall see her start up from her throne, and, like a terrible *muezzin*, call her votaries to the slaughter of the heretics. Then we shall see her long pent-up fury burst forth afresh. And, alas! orthodox Christians, American Protestants, are laboring diligently to open the way, and to bring about this fearful result.

When we speak of our convictions and point out the inevitable results of such a policy, they speak very soothingly and say, "Oh no! you need not fear, we will not hurt a hair of your heads." Even granting that it be true (which, however, is by no means to be granted) that *they* will not hurt a hair of our heads, I do not see that it will be any better for us if they bring about a condition of affairs by which

not only the hairs of our heads, but our heads themselves shall be entirely devoted. If I had hold of the bar which kept a tiger in his cage, and was doing my very best to remove the bar and let the tiger loose, these gentlemen would not think it a very comforting assurance if I should say, "Oh dear sirs! never fear! I will not hurt a hair of your heads," and then slip the bar and let the tiger loose upon them. Neither do we "lay their flattering unction" to our souls, for a like reason. As late as 1626 the Jesuits established the Inquisition in Abyssinia to crush out the observance of the Sabbath (see Gibbon, ch. 47, last paragraph, and he says, "The Abyssinians were taught to work and play on the Sabbath"), and has Rome, or Jesuitry, changed since then? No. In this she never changes. Therefore, just as surely as the Constitutional Amendment is adopted, so surely will the persecuting spirit of the papacy be revived against all who keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.

But it will not be long, and the saints shall not be delivered *into*, but *out of* her hand; for there will be heard the voice from heaven, "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;

50

and she shall be utterly burned with fire; for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her." Then, too, will be heard the joyous command, "Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets; for God hath avenged your blood at her hands." And then "the mighty angel" shall take up the "stone like a great millstone, and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all. And the voice of harpers, and musicians, and of pipers, and trumpeters, shall be heard no more at all in thee; and no craftsman of whatsoever craft he be, shall be found any more in thee; and the sound of a millstone shall be heard no more at all in thee; and the light of a candle shall shine no more at all in thee; and the voice of the bridegroom and of the bride shall be heard no more at all in thee; for thy merchants were the great men of the earth; for by thy sorceries were all nations deceived. And in her was found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth." Rev. 18.

Yes, the *blood* of the prophets and the saints was found in her, but the prophets and the saints themselves are not found there. Oh no! High above her ruin, her woe, and her torment, are these with "the harps of God," singing the song of *victory* over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name," and their voices are heard in the midst of that "voice of much people in heaven, saying, Alleluia; Salvation, and glory, and honor, and power, unto the Lord our God; for true and righteous are his judgments: for he hath judged the great whore, which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand. And again they said,

Alleluia. . . . And the four and twenty elders and the four beasts fell down and worshipped God that sat on the throne, saying, Amen; Alleluia. And a voice came out of the throne, saying, Praise our God, all ye his servants, and ye that fear him, both small and great." Then will be heard that "voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings [even as Milton says, "Loud as from numbers without number, and sweet as from blest voices uttering joy"], saying, Alleluia: for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. Let us be glad and rejoice; for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready." And there will be heard the voice of the glorious Bridegroom in tones of measured sweetness, thrilling with eternal joy the glad hearts of his happy people. There will be seen the glorious Bride, clothed in the righteousness of saints, bound in fair colors, and decked with the sapphire, the emerald, the carbuncle, and gold. There, above all, is the Lord God, in the midst of them, who is mighty; he has saved, he rejoices over them with joy, he will rest in his love, he rejoices over them with singing. Zeph. 3:17.

But storms and tempests are between us and that blessed shore. O God, give us courage in faith to stand, and strength to overcome. And, Father in heaven, and Jesus our Lord, as thou hast given us a part in the conflict, and in the strife, oh, we pray thee, let us not be denied a part in the victory! Amen.

January 29, 1884

"Impossible" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 61, 5 , p. 68.

BY ELD. A. T. JONES

WE are all familiar with the true saying of Alexander Campbell, that the Sabbath could not be changed "unless creation were gone through with again." It is conceivable that by that means the Sabbath could be changed to another day. But I conceive, or think I do at least, that we may go a step farther, and inquire whether there is any one day of the week to which the Sabbath could not be changed, or upon which the Sabbath could not be placed.

Let us begin with Alexander Campbell's conception, that creation is to be gone through with again for the purpose of changing the Sabbath, and that the present creation is relegated again to chaos. The Lord proceeds to create again. He might employ more than six days, or more than seven, in the work of creation; then if he should rest on the eighth or ninth day, that eighth or ninth would be the Sabbath, the rest-day; or however large the number of days which he might employ in the work, when he should finish and rest, the day upon which he should rest would be the Sabbath, whether it be the tenth, the hundredth, or the thousandth day. Or, he might employ five days in creation, and rest the sixth; then the sixth would be the Sabbath; or employ four days, and rest the *fifth*, or three days, and rest the *fourth*, or two days, and rest the *third*, or one day, and rest the *second*, then the fifth, the fourth, the third, or the second day, as the case might be, would be the Sabbath, the rest-day. But suppose, to please the

orthodox of the present day, it be desired to change it to the *first day*, can it be done? It cannot; for the day on which creation was performed, would of consequence and necessarily be the *first day*, and the same day cannot be both a working *day* and a rest-*day*. It matters not how small a portion of the day might be employed in the work, however small it might be, it would effectually destroy the possibility of its being made a rest-day. For, to be a rest-day, the *whole* of the day would have to be spent in rest. Therefore, upon the hypothesis of creation being gone through with again, we can conceive a change of the Sabbath. But even upon *that* hypothesis we *cannot* conceive of a possibility of changing it to the *first day*.

In a great many instances we think the papal church has outdone every other system in the absurdity of its errors. But in this she has fairly outdone herself in absurdity. For of all days which can be conceived of, she has chosen the very one, and the *only one*, which is entirely shut out from all conceivable possibility of ever being made a Sabbath (I write it with reverence) *even by the Lord himself*. For, as it is impossible for God to lie (Titus 1:2), he cannot say that he rested a *day* upon which he had *worked* even a part of the day.

Consequently here again the man of sin has exalted himself above God, in adopting and passing off, solely upon his own authority (because all other authority is excluded), an institution which cannot by any possibility be true, and therefore how appropriately that one thing is pointed out as the "mark of the beast," and how well those are described as worshipers of the beast who, contrary to Scripture, reason, and all persuasion, will observe the institution above all else. And so God is just in declaring against them, and visiting upon them the plagues of his wrath; because the very thing that by ever possibility is excluded, the beast has adopted, and they with pains and penalties have enforced.

February 4, 1884

"Who Has Declared Independence?" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 61, 6 , pp. 82, 83.

BY ELD. A. T. JONES

IN 1698 Ireland was subject to England. Although she had her own parliament, yet she, parliament and all, was governed by the mother country and by the parliament of the mother country. And in this, England was distinctly the mother country; because the governing class in Ireland was composed of colonists from England; and it was only by the power of England that these were enabled to govern either Ireland or themselves. So entirely was this true, that if the protecting power of England had been withdrawn, any and all government in Ireland, in which the English colonists could have had any part at all, would have ceased to exist. Therefore, it was literally true that the very existence of the then government of Ireland depended wholly upon the mother country. Yet for all this,

the Irish parliament took a step which, if allowed to stand, would have not only severed its connection with the home government, but with that would have cost it its own existence. We will give this in the words of the historian himself. He says:—

"The Irish Lords and Commons had presumed, not only to re-enact an English Act passed *expressly* for the purpose of *binding them*, but to re-enact it with *alterations*. The alterations were indeed small; but the *alteration even of a letter* was tantamount to a *declaration of independence*."—*Macaulay's England*, chap. 23, p. 63. [The italics are mine.]

Now, according to this *true* principle of government, those people who claim that Christ re-enacted the ten commandments, and that, too, with alterations, virtually assert that Christ declared independence of the Supreme Government. But against all such claims, we have the words of Christ, in strictest accordance with this true principle, which declare: "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law," knowing

83

full well that to alter a "jot or tittle," or, in the words of Macaulay, "even a letter," would be equal to a "declaration of independence." Therefore among the very first words that he uttered as a public teacher, "as one having authority," he lays down the fundamental principle of true allegiance. And every other word, and every other act of his life, is strictly consistent with it. Matt. 26:39: "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, *not as I will*, but as thou wilt." John 5:30: "I seek *not mine own will*, but the *will of the Father*, which hath sent me." John 6:38. "I came down from heaven, *not to do mine own will*, *but* the will of Him that sent me." John 4:34: "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to *finish his work*." Was the work of God not done until by the ministration of Christ he had "re-enacted with alterations" his own law, and had thus declared himself *independent of himself*? That would *finish his work* indeed, and with a vengeance. But God forbid. He *cannot deny himself*. 2 Tim. 2:13. On the contrary, his work can be, and will be, and was intended to be, finished in righteousness (Rom. 9:28), and "in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." 2 Cor. 5:19. This "will" and this "work" Christ came to do, and in justice and in righteousness he pledges himself and all his followers to the firmest allegiance to the government of the Most High. Matt. 7:21; 19:17; Rev. 22:14; 14:12.

On the other hand, how aptly this exploit of the Irish Lords and Commons with the English government illustrates the arrogance of the papacy with the God of heaven! There was the Irish parliament ruling Ireland; yet itself dependent on the English parliament and power for its very existence. Here was the papacy ruling the world in things temporal, and in things spiritual, yet itself dependent upon the mercy, the forbearance, and the long-suffering and power of the Most High. There the supreme power had passed an Act for the express purpose of binding them. Here the Power Supreme above all had passed Acts for the express purpose of binding, not only the papacy, but all upon the earth. There, they presumed to re-enact with *slight* alterations, the Act which bound them. Here, he has presumed to re-enact with the *most material* alterations those Acts which

God had passed to bind the human race. That, the historian says, was "tantamount to a declaration of independence." This was nothing less than an out and out declaration of independence. He has assumed all the titles of the King of kings and Lord of lords. But it is not enough that he should make himself *equal* to God, but he must exalt "himself *above* all that is called God or that is worshiped." And in the matter of subordinate government acting with Supreme Government, and subordinate with Supreme Ruler, I cannot conceive of a more decided and effectual means that could be employed for asserting independence than just the very means which he has employed, and which is so perfectly illustrated in the historical point under notice; that is, "to re-enact with alterations" the Law of God, the *Ten Commandments*.

March 11, 1884

"'Evolution' and Evolution" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 61, 11 , pp. 162, 162.

BY ELD. A. T. JONES

In view of the fact that not only Henry Ward Beecher and Dr. McCosh but almost all of the acknowledged scientific teachers, not only in the United States, but in Europe, are avowed evolutionists, it may be of interest, and perhaps of value, for us to notice briefly what evolution really is, and what is its manifest tendency. Some time ago the *Independent* presented the following list of evolutionists:—

"Of all the younger brood of working naturalists whom Agassiz educated, every one—Morse, Shader, Verrill, Niles, Hyatt, Scudder, Putnam, even his own son—has accepted evolution. Every one of the Harvard professors whose departments have to do with biology—Gray, Whitney, A. Agassiz, Hagen, Goodale, Shaler, James, Farlow, and Faxon—is an evolutionist, and man's physical structure they regard as no real conception to the law. They are all theists, we believe; all conservative men. They do not all believe that Darwinism—that is, natural selection—is a sufficient theory of evolution; they may incline to Wallace's view, but they accept evolution. It is not much taught; it is rather taken for granted. At Johns Hopkins University, which aims to be the most advanced in the country, *nothing but evolution* is held or taught [italics mine]. In the excellent University of Pennsylvania all the biological professors are evolutionists,—Profs. Leidy and Allen in Comparative Anatomy, Prof. Rathrock in Botany, and Prof. Lesley in Geology. We might mention Michigan University, Cornell, Dartmouth, or Bowdoin; but what is the use of going farther? It would only be the same story. *There can scarcely an exception be found*. Wherever there is a working naturalist, he is sure to be an evolutionist. We made an

inquiry of two ex-presidents of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. One wrote us, in reply: 'My impression is that there is no biologist of repute nowadays who does not accept, in some form or other, the doctrine of derivation in time, whatever be the precise form in which they suppose the evolution to have occurred.' His successor replied, 'Almost without exception, the working naturalists in this country believe in evolution. . . . In England and Germany the belief in evolution is almost universal among the active workers in biology. In France the belief is less general, but is rapidly gaining ground. . . . I should regard a teacher of science who denied the truth of evolution, as being as *incompetent* as one who doubted the Copernican theory.' We challenge the *Observer* to find three working naturalists of repute in the United States, or two (it can find one in Canada), that are not evolutionists. And where a man believes in evolution, it goes without saying that the law holds as to man's physical structure."

In this article, however, I do not propose a complete analysis of evolution, but only an examination of the leading phase of its tendency; and that is, as stated by Mr. James Sully, joint author with Prof. T. H. Huxley of the Article Evolution in "Encyclopedia Britannica," ninth edition, this: "*It is clear that the doctrine of evolution is directly antagonistic to that of creation.* Just as the biological doctrine of the transmutation of species is opposed to that of special creations, so the idea of evolution, as applied to the formation of the world as a whole, is *opposed* to that of a *direct creative volition.*"

Now, in view of this statement of the highest authority on the subject of evolution, is it not equally clear that these professors of Harvard, and Yale, and Brown, and Bowdoin, and Amherst, and Princeton, and Cornell, and Johns Hopkins, and Michigan, and Pennsylvania Universities, and the teachers of science in England, Germany, France, and the United States, and those who accept their teaching, are all in direct antagonism to the Bible? For whatever else the Bible might be held to teach, it assuredly does teach this one thing, that God created all things. And it is purposely that I have written the word "Bible" above instead of "Genesis" alone; for it is not alone the testimony of Genesis, but of the whole book, that God *created all things.*" "In the beginning God *created* the heaven and the earth. . . . And God *created* great whales, *and every living creature* that moveth." Gen. 1:1, 21. "So God *created man.*" Gen. 1:27. "And the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have *created.*" Gen. 6:7. "God *created man upon the earth.*" Deut. 4:32. "Thus saith God the Lord, he that *created* the heavens," etc. Isa. 42:5. "I have made the earth and *created man* upon it." Isa.

163

45:12. "Hath not one God created us?" Mal. 2:10. Now the words of Christ (Mark 13:19), "For in those days shall be affliction, such as was not from the beginning of the creation which God *created* unto this time." Of man he says (Mark 10:6), "But from the beginning of the *creation, God made them male and female.*" God "*created* all things by Jesus Christ." Eph. 3:9. "By him were *all things created* that are in heaven and that are in earth, *visible* and *invisible.*" Col. 1:16. "Thou hast

created all things." Rev. 4:11; also Rev. 10:6; 14:7. So just as surely as evolution is "directly antagonistic to the doctrine of creation," so also are those who hold to evolution placed "directly antagonistic to the Bible. And this will plainly appear from their own words as we proceed.

Because the disciples of Darwin have pressed his *theories* into service as *facts*, evolution has come to be considered (and not improperly) as almost, if not entirely, synonymous with Darwinism. Yet there is a distinction claimed, and it is stated as follows by the *Independent* of Jan. 8, 1880: "In the first place let it be clearly understood that evolution, or development, is not synonymous with Darwinism. A man may be an evolutionist and not be a Darwinian. Let us explain.

"The doctrine of evolution is this: that all the existing forms of animal and vegetable life have been produced through the process of succession, birth, and generation from original vital germs. This is all. The doctrine of evolution does not assert how the first germs came, whether by God's special creation, or by the unaided action of law out of inanimate matter. Nor does the doctrine of evolution assert how or why, whether rapidly or gradually, under what laws or what providence, the evolution has proceeded as it has. These are theories of evolution, which are brought forward to account for its operation; but they are not the doctrine of evolution itself. *The doctrine of evolution is opposed to the doctrine of creationism*; and it teaches simply that living and extinct species of animals and plants were not directly created out of dead matter by the fiat of God, but were produced by birth out of plants and animals previously existing.

"Now, Darwinism—properly so called—is not evolution, but a theory or hypothesis of evolution. It has become confused in the unscholarly popular mind with evolution, because it was the way in which Charles Darwin first explained evolution. Darwinism is the theory that evolution is explained by the law of Natural Selection; *i.e.*, a law of variation by which the young of any animal vary slightly from their parents. Those of the young whose variations help them in the struggle for existence are more likely to live and propagate their kind. . . . Thus, by slow gradations, and by the retention of favorable minute changes, all present life was evolved. This is one theory of evolution, and is called by Darwin's name, 'Natural Selection,' or by Spencer's name, 'Survival of the Fittest.' This Darwinism is not necessarily atheistic. Darwin himself allowed that life may have been started by a few created germs. But, once started on Darwin's theory, there is no further need of God. Law produces everything, from the diatom to the oak, from the amúba to the man. According to him, even mind, heart, conscience, are just as much the product of physical evolution as is the physical structure itself. Given two or three germs at the beginning, perhaps,—or perhaps not,—and given the laws which we find, then there is no more use for God, and all things have come out as we

find them with none of his supervision. There may have been a God once, but law and not God is the great Creator."

Apparently, there is a great deal said here, but in reality there is very little said. Let us analyze this statement, and see wherein lies the actual difference, if any, between these two statements of evolution and Darwinism. 1. Evolution says all forms of life come in successive births and generation from original germs. Darwinism says the same. 2. Evolution does not say how the first germs came. Neither does Darwinism. 3. Evolution says that living and extinct species of animals and plants were not directly created out of dead matter by the fiat of God. Darwinism says exactly the same. 4. Evolution says these were produced by birth, out of plants and animals previously existing. Darwinism is identical with it here also. 5. Darwinism holds that this birth and generation of plants and animals in succession, is according to established law. Evolution being "directly antagonistic" to *creationism*, how else can successive birth and generation proceed but in accord with the law universal of birth and generation. So in this also they are identical.

6. Darwinism says that the process of evolution has been very slow. The above statement of evolution says that it does not assert whether the process has been rapid or gradual, but we have abundance of evidence to show that this is not correct. And we need go no farther than the editorial columns of the *Independent* to prove its incorrectness. In an editorial entitled "Deliver us from our Friends," in Dec. (I think), 1879, appears a quotation from Wallace's "Natural Selection," as follows: "We can with tolerable certainty affirm that man must have inhabited the earth a thousand centuries ago, but we cannot assert. . . . that there is any good evidence that he positively did not exist for a period of ten thousand centuries." And the whole tenor of the article, which is a defense of evolution, is that the evolution of man is a process of ages upon ages; and it says that the evidence that man was pre-glacial, *i.e.*, that he existed scores or hundreds of thousands of years ago, and that he was fashioned out of apes, "is so strong that it is *very unsafe* to deny" it. (Italics his.)

Again, what room has evolution to show its successions of "birth and generation" if the earth be only six thousand years old? The very language in which evolution is defined and explained, asserts that the process has been gradual. And further, if evidence were produced that the process had been rapid, it would immediately turn the scale in favor of creationism, and evolution would be destroyed. Admitting, however, that evolution makes no *assertion* either way, does it not make very loud *demands* for "hundreds," or "thousands," or even "tens of thousands of centuries"? If not to say nothing of Darwin, why do Wallace and Le Conte, and A. S. Packard, and I. Quatrefages, Hughes, Evans, and all the rest speak and wrote of it in no other language than such as the above? And these *demands* are nothing short of an *assertion* of the absolute poverty of evolution with less than "thousands and tens of thousands of centuries," and therein asserts its "gradual" process, and fully agrees with Darwinism where it says: "The high antiquity of man. . . is the *indispensable* basis for understanding his origin."—*Descent of Man*, 1, p. 3.

7. The process "once started, on Darwin's theory there is no further need of God." Evolution says the same, as the following from Prof. Huxley shows: "If all living beings have been evolved from pre-existing forms of life, it is enough that a single particle of living protoplasm should once have appeared on the globe as the result of no-matter-what agency. In the eyes of a consistent evolutionist any further independent formation of protoplasm would be sheer waste." Again: "But living matter once originated, there is no necessity for another origination, since the hypothesis postulates the unlimited. . . modifiability of such matter."—Article "Biology." So again we see that *consistent* evolution and Darwinism are identical.

It is unnecessary to pursue this line further, as everything that might be brought to bear upon the subject would simply confirm the points already made, that consistent evolution and Darwinism are essentially synonymous. The simple fact is, and is plainly shown by Mr. Sully, that to Darwin, first of all, belongs the honor of first reducing the theory of evolution to "a substantial basis of fact." And whether in England, Germany, or the United States, evolution without Darwin is, as the phrase goes, the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out.

(To be continued.)

March 18, 1884

"'Evolution' and Evolution. (Continued.)" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 61, 12 , pp. 178, 179.

BY ELD. A. T. JONES

(Continued.)

BUT now as evolution is so "directly antagonistic to the doctrine of creation," what do those persons who pretend to hold to both evolution and the Bible do with those scriptures *which speak of the creation* of the world, of man, etc.? Why, that is all set aside as "not historical," "not historically correct," Etc. Wm. Hayes Ward, D.D., editor of the *Independent*, in his issue of Feb. 26, 1880, says: "For reasons which almost, if not quite, compel their ascent, one of which is the general acceptance of the doctrine of evolution, many believe as I do, that the story of the creation and fall of man, told in Genesis, *is no more the record of actual occurrences* than is the parable of the prodigal son [italics mine]. Dr. Dörner, the greatest among German evangelical theologians, whose name is honored here as in Germany, holds that this story *is not to be accepted as history*. So hold perhaps a quarter, perhaps a half, of the educated ministers in our leading evangelical denominations. When Dr. Boardman, of Philadelphia, repeated with great applause and then published a year ago his lectures on the Bible cosmogony, *taking this view*, I do not remember that *a single* Baptist paper in the North found any fault. . . . Nevertheless, Paul doubtless believed that the story of the fall was true historically, and used it as an illustration convenient and pertinent for the purpose he had in mind. But it cannot be proved *that God might not properly allow* Paul to use the illustration, which occurred to him as being to

his purpose, *even though it were not an actual verity.*" But ["be astonished, O ye heavens, at this"!!] "we do know that a commandment given on Sinai assumes as a reason for working six days and resting on the seventh, that God made the heavens and the earth in six days, and rested on the seventh; *but we know* that this statement *is not historically correct.* The world was *not* made in six days."

Now is it sufficient to say simply that evolution is antagonistic to creationism? Is it not antagonistic to the whole Bible, and even to the Creator himself, when in reply to the words of Jehovah, spoken with a voice that shook the earth, "In six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth," the evolutionist boldly asserts, "We *know* that the world was *not* made in six days"? It is sufficiently astonishing in itself, to realize that a man could be so boldly irreverent as to thus flatly contradict the living God in the only words ever written by his own hand; but our astonishment is increased when we realize that this same man claims to be Christian, and not only that but is a "Rev.," a "Doctor of Divinity," and more, that he is only one of thousands of the same titled gentlemen who hold to the same views. I would willingly stop here with these words so bold that I almost tremble as I copy them; but doubtless it were as well to bring out to a fair view this "scientific" system fully, so that we may know, in a measure, what we shall yet have to meet in our defense of the third angel's message, and the whole truth of God.

Again Dr. Ward says in an editorial: "But we are told that certain statements—for example, as to the origin, the early history and character, and the age of man—are made in the Bible, and that their acceptance as historical facts is binding upon any one who accepts the Christian system taught in the Bible. To this we have replied that if this is true Christianity is already gone, and to the educated mind the Bible is already gone, or very soon must go; because the scientific authorities, the only authorities on which we can depend, are now substantially agreed in holding and teaching certain theories about man's origin, as well enough established, which are quite inconsistent with the story in Genesis of the creation of man and woman. This we have stated as a fact, and have concluded that the friends of the Christianity which we so heartily believe in and support, must adopt a theory of the Bible which will not put God's word into direct contradiction with the teachings of our best authorities in science. We have said that we, laymen in science, are compelled to allow the now well-nigh unanimous authority of our best teachers, that man was physically, at least, evolved from irrational animals, and has lived on the earth scores of thousands of years." [This is from the editorial before quoted, entitled, "Deliver us from our Friends".]

So, then, it appears from all this that the Bible is of no authority at all, but the "scientific authorities are the *only* authorities on which we can depend;" and to these "authorities," we all, and the Bible, and even the Lord himself, must bow in unquestioning credence; for, as is said in another place, "It is so generally taught that it is inevitable that our thinking and scholarly young men will generally accept it on the word of those whose business it is to study the matter." And by this same token the "inevitable" result is that the word of man supplants the word

of God. And right in the face of all this, we are gravely told that "this evolution is held and taught in harmony with Christian faith."

If all this can be held and taught in harmony with Christian faith, I should most intensely like to see that form of doctrine which can *not* be held and taught in harmony with the Christian faith. And that it is not and cannot be so held and taught, is betrayed by Prof. Francis L. Patten, in an article on this subject originally published in the *Interior*, and quoted in the "Editorial Notes" of the *Independent*. He says:—

"Neither the preacher who cries 'infallible Bible' without showing that it is infallible, nor the priest who cries 'infallible church' without giving proof of her claims, will satisfy the man who, with all earnestness in his eye, and all uncertainty in his speech, asks, What must I do to be saved? The church must defend the doctrines she preaches. The pulpit must meet the skeptic with something better than assertion and something more satisfying than earnestness. And if the pulpit has not the time

179

to do this work, and the existing societies have no interest in it or no means of carrying it on, it is not a day too soon for those who know the importance of the controversy to put their heads together to *devise a scheme* for the preparation of a *literature suited* to the wants of the doubters of the day." [Italics mine.]

Exactly! the literature of the Bible is not suited to the wants of the scientific doubters of the day, and therefore the evolutionists must devise a scheme to prepare something that will suit them. And what a blessed scheme that will be, of man's devising, and above all, when he is an evolutionist! It will suit though. And then when the man, not with all "earnestness" in his eye and "uncertainty" in his speech, but with all pride in his eye, and all arrogance in his speech, asks, What must I do to be saved? the answer comes from that splendid scheme, Believe in evolution; Deny the plain statement of positive facts of the Bible; Flatly contradict the words of the Lord, although spoken with his own voice, that shook the earth, and written by his own blazing finger on tables of stone; and instead accept evolution "on the word of those whose business it is to study the matter," and hold them as "the only authorities on which you can depend," and thou shalt be saved. yea, evolution and Darwinism shall be the stability of thy times and strength of salvation; and great shall be the peace—of the apes.

That will suit them every one and every time. And even if it should not, all that will be necessary is simply to "devise" another "scheme" "suited to the wants of the doubters" of this.

But not to treat them cavalierly, we will examine that other form of evolution known as "Theistic Evolution;" that is, a form of evolution which acknowledges God: and inquire where in the theory this acknowledgment comes in, and why. It is plain from all that has gone before that this acknowledgment of God, especially as a creator, does not lie at the beginning; because, as has been often stated, "evolution is opposed to creationism," is "directly antagonistic" to it. and as evolution is opposed to creation generally, or once for all, so biology, its chiefest

handmaid, is opposed to special creations; *i.e.*, of any interference of a creator after the process has started. And in this evolution and biology are both plainly consistent, and reasonably so, too; because it is certainly a reasonable position before quoted from Prof. Huxley, that "if all living beings have been evolved from pre-existing forms of life, it is enough that a single particle of living protoplasm should once have appeared on the globe as the result of no-matter-what agency. In the eyes of a consistent evolutionist any further independent formation of protoplasm would be sheer waste."

And further he says: "If the hypothesis of evolution be true, living matter must have arisen from not-living matter; for by the hypothesis the condition of the globe was at one time such that living matter could not have existed in it." Now surely it is no more than reasonable and consistent, upon this basis, to suppose that if living matter could arise entirely of its own evolutionary power from not-living matter, and start onward in its progress without a creator, it certainly could keep itself a-going just as easily without him.

Then what is it that impels these other gentlemen to the adoption of theistic evolution, *i.e.*, that God has interfered in a certain place? There is just one thing, and that alone, and herein is the pivot upon which turns the whole theistic process; and that one thing is, the immortality of the soul. Believing as these men do, in the immortality of the soul, it is impossible to adopt such an idea, or doctrine, as that immortality should be evolved from materiality, and therefore God must have interfered in the process just at the place where the immortal soul was bestowed upon man. But the moment that view is adopted, there appears the inconsistency also; for theistic evolution, holding, in common with evolution straight, the antagonism to the doctrine of creationism, when it admits the interference of God in behalf of the immortal soul, it therein admits the doctrine of creation; for assuredly the bestowal of immortality upon that which has been evolved from apes and lower forms of animals is nothing short of a creative act, or volition, of God. And the inevitable consequence is, the doctrine is inconsistent with itself.

Now for proofs that the soul is the *main*, if not the only, point of distinction between evolution and evolution. It appears dimly in the above first-quoted statement of Darwinism; thus: "According to him, even mind, heart, conscience, are just as much the product of physical evolution as is the physical structure itself." And again in the foregoing list of leading evolutionists the qualifying word "physical" is applied thus: "Man's physical structure they regard as no real exception to the law;" "And where a man believes in evolution it goes without saying that the law holds good as to man's physical structure;" plainly implying that his mental structure is held as an exception. But Darwin has shown conclusively, not by speculation, but by genuine science, that the difference in the mental power of man and the lower animals consists not in kind but in degree. And surely none of these theistic evolutionists, ultra as he might be, would deny at least some mental structure to the lower animals. Consequently, when they differ from Darwinism, it can only be on that one point of the immortality of the soul.

Happily, however, we are not left to this conclusion drawn from qualified statements, necessary though it may be, but we have the unqualified statement itself by one of the highest authorities on evolution. Mr. Sully, before quoted, says: "At first sight it might appear that the doctrine [of evolution] as applied to the subjective world, by removing the broad distinction between the human and the animal mind, would discourage the hope of a future life for man's soul." Exactly; and this is consistent with evolution throughout, and consequently when these "orthodox," "evangelical" gentlemen, holding fast to that intensely "orthodox" and "evangelical" doctrine, the immortality of the soul, adopt evolution, they are compelled to adopt such a form of it as will admit this doctrine, even though it involve them in the glaring inconsistency of antagonizing "creative activity," yet being obliged to antagonize their antagonism to save their theory.

But of what worth is all this "contrivance to save appearances" if the soul be *not immortal*? It is "nothing worth." And as the soul is absolutely *not* immortal but in this, "man hath no pre-eminence above a beast" (Eccl. 3:19), this consideration removes the whole and sole ground of distinction between the two forms of evolution; and then this would-be *theistic* evolution appears just where consistency and the logic of pure evolution demand that it should appear,—that is, in the bald reality of *atheistic* evolution,—and brings out the plain truth plainly that there is no such thing as theistic evolution.

But when this so-called theistic evolution, resting only upon a fallacy the exposure of which so surely lands it in atheistic evolution, is so wide-spread, so almost all-pervading in the orthodox and evangelical churches, schools, and colleges, are we not brought in another form to the contemplation of the text, "Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth"? Not alone, Shall he find faith in his second coming? But, shall he find faith at all? In studying these evil tendencies of the times, I am persuaded that "when the Son of man cometh," he will not find faith in his word, he will not find faith in faith in himself, he will not find faith in God the Lord, the Creator of all. And I am persuaded that we are again coming fast upon the time in the world's history, when "in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom" will know "not God" (1 Cor. 1:21); and when again, as of old, it shall please God "by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." And in view of it all, I feel as never I felt before, how holily, how unblamably, how sacredly, we whom it may please God to call to do the preaching, should conduct this holy work—how humbly, meekly, and again, as of old, not with excellency of speech or wisdom, not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in *demonstration of the Spirit* and of power. May God help us all, in these dark and trying times, and when they become still more fearfully dark and trying.

(Concluded next week.)

March 25, 1884

"'Evolution' and Evolution. (Concluded.)" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 61, 13 , pp. 194, 195.

BY ELD. A. T. JONES
(*Concluded*).

NOW just a few words before closing, upon the foundation of Evolution. In the first part of this article is a quotation of the words of a, then, President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, saying that he "should regard a teacher of science who denied the truth of evolution as being as incompetent as one who doubted the Copernican theory." Does this President mean to assert that the theory of evolution is as well established as is the Copernican theory? If so, will he or any other evolutionist please give us three laws in proof of it that will correspond to Kepler's Three Laws? Or will he give us *one* law that will correspond to *any one* of Kepler's Three, and which will be as susceptible of absolute demonstration as are Kepler's? Nay, verily. It is with this as with geology, simply and only, "perhaps," "no doubt," "probably," and "must have been," and these repeated over and over again, and then all of them capped with an "assumption." Prof. Clifford says, "Of the beginning of the universe, we know nothing at all." Prof. Huxley says, "The fact is, that at the present moment there is not a shadow of trustworthy direct evidence that abiogenesis [spontaneous generation] does take place, or has taken place, within the period during which the existence of life on this globe is recorded." Yet he says that this "fact does not in the slightest degree interfere with the conclusion from other considerations, that at some time or other, abiogenesis must have taken place."

What kind of *science* is that wherein *facts* do not in the *slightest degree* interfere with a hypothesis? And why is it that they do not? Oh! because "if the hypothesis [supposition] of evolution be true, living matter must have arisen from not-living matter." See Encyclopedia Britannica, Biology.

To be sure. And so the Creator, revelation, reason, and *facts*, even as acknowledged by themselves as facts, must all stand aside, so that a supposition may have free course to run and be glorified. With a little more of this kind of science I should, "doubtless," be almost tempted, "perhaps," to cry out for "about the space of two hours," Great is the science of the evolutionists!

Mr. Sully says, after speaking of the "gaps" in their knowledge, and the limits set to explanation, of evolution, "The question arises whether these apparently permanent gaps in our scientific knowledge can be filled up by extra-scientific speculations." That is, these gaps are to be filled not only by "speculations," but they are not even scientific, but "extra [above, outside of] scientific" speculations.—*Enc. Brit.*, Evolution.

Now we come to Darwin himself, who Mr. Sully says is entitled to "the first notice as the one to whom belongs the honor of working out this theory of evolution upon a substantial basis of fact;" and of whose work Prof. Huxley says, "'The Origin of Species' appeared in 1859, and it is within the knowledge of all

whose memories go back to that time, that henceforward the doctrine of evolution has assume a position and acquired an importance which it never before possessed." And owing to the important place which he holds in this doctrine, I hope I may be pardoned for giving him quite an extended notice: but it will need to be in nothing but his own words; for, as will be seen, the words themselves are all-sufficient to show the "substantial," "scientific," or "extra" scientific basis of evolution. I quote from Darwin's "Descent of Man," Appleton's Edition, 1871. The italics are mine.

Page 23. "*No doubt* he inherits the power [of smell] in an enfeebled and so far rudimentary condition from some early progenitor to whom it was highly serviceable, and by whom it was continually used. We can thus perhaps understand how it is, as Mr. Maudsley has truly remarked, that the sense of smell in man is singularly effective in recalling vividly the ideas and images of forgotten scenes and places."

Page 81. "It is *probable* that the early ape-like progenitors of man were likewise social. Although man, as he now exists, has few special instincts, having lost any which his early progenitors may have possessed, this is no reason why he should not have retained from an extremely remote period some degree of instinctive love and sympathy for his fellows."

Page 103. "In order that an ape-like creature should have been transformed into man, it is necessary that this early form, as well as many successive links, should all have varied in mind and body. It is *impossible* to obtain *direct* evidence on this head; but if it can be shown that man now varies, . . . there can be little doubt that the preceding intermediate links varied in a like manner."

Page 144. "Nevertheless it may be well to own that no explanation, as far as I am aware, has ever been given of the loss of the tail by certain apes and man."

Page 150. "In regard to bodily size or strength, we do not know whether man is descended from some comparatively small species like the chimpanzee, or from one as powerful as the gorilla."

Page 151. "The early progenitors of man

195

were *no doubt* inferior in intellect, and *probably* in social disposition, to the lowest existing savages."

Page 154. "It is therefore highly *probable* that with mankind the intellectual faculties have been gradually perfected through natural selection, and this conclusion is *sufficient* for our purpose. Undoubtedly it would have been very interesting to have traced the development of each separate faculty from the state in which it exists in the lower animals to that in which it exists in man; but neither my ability nor my knowledge permits the attempt."

Page 189. "If the anthropomorphous apes be admitted to form a natural sub-group, then, as man agrees with them, . . . we may *infer* that some ancient member of the anthropomorphous sub-group gave birth to man."

Page 191. "But we must not fall into the error of supposing that the early progenitor of the whole simian stock, including man, was identical with, or even closely resembled, any existing ape or monkey."

Page 192. "At the period and place, whenever and wherever it may have been, when man first lost his hairy covering, he *probably* inhabited a hot country. We are *far from knowing* how long ago it was when man first diverged from the Catarrhine stock, but this may have occurred at an epoch as remote as the Eocene period.

Page 195. "In attempting to trace the genealogy of the mammalian, and therefore of man, lower in the series, we become involved in greater and *greater obscurity*."

Page 198. "The early progenitors of man were *no doubt* once covered with hair, both sexes having beards; their ears were pointed, and capable of movement, and their bodies were provided with a tail, having the proper muscles. . . . At a still earlier period the progenitors *must have been* aquatic in their habits; for morphology plainly tells us that our *lungs* consist of a modified *swim-bladder*, which once served for a float. The clefts on the neck in the embryo of man show where the branchee once existed. These early predecessors of man. . . *must have been* as lowly organized as a lancelet or amphioxus, or still more lowly organized."

Page 205. "The most humble organism is something much higher than the inorganic dust under our feet."

Yes, of course, to be born of an ape is vastly higher than to be fashioned by the perfect hand of the living God!!! And we are given to understand, by the President of the American Association, etc., that such a string of great swelling words as this is from beginning to end, is no more to be doubted as science than is the Copernican theory, which is demonstrated by the exact science of mathematics. It is scarcely to be wondered at that such a theory is atheistic. And no warning of the Bible is more pertinent to the present times than that one in 1 Tim. 6:20, 21: "O Timothy, *keep that* which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science, *falsely* so-called, which some professing have *erred concerning the faith*."

Now I would not be understood as being, in the slightest degree, opposed to true science. On the contrary, I will yield to none in genuine admiration of science; but it must be real science, not sham science,—a science which, when it says "doubtless," means doubtless in its absolute sense of having removed all doubt by sound reasoning and demonstrative evidence; and not as it is used by the "falsely so-called" science of our day, simply to give expression to a whole system of doubt. The truth is, that the most charming book, the Bible always excepted, of course, that I have ever had the pleasure of reading, is the most profoundly scientific book that I ever read. And that is "Maury's Physical Geography of the Sea." He does not deal much in those terms, but when he does say "doubtless," it is doubtless. Simply as an illustration of what science is, I give the following from Lieutenant Maury's treatise, sections 88-93:—

In December, 1853, the fine new steamship sailed from New York bound for California with a regiment of United States troops on board. While crossing the Gulf Stream she was overtaken by a fearful gale, and by one single blow of a terrible sea, one hundred and seventy-nine persons, officers, and men were washed overboard and drowned, and the ship so crippled that she was simply

adrift. The next day she was seen by a vessel, and again the next day by another; but neither of these could render any assistance, and so she was left still adrift. When these two ships reached the United States, they reported the matter; and vessels were sent out by the Government to search and relieve the drifting ship. But the questions were, Which way should they go? and where should they look? Appeal was made to Maury, and he, sitting in the National Observatory, prepared a chart of the Gulf Stream for that time of year, and from a point where the disabled ship was last seen, he drew two slightly diverging lines thus. . . . and said that the ship had drifted between these lines. Then one of the relief cutters, which was at New London, was told to go along a dotted line between these two lines thus. . . . to the last dot, and there she would see the object of her search. And right in sight of that very place the disabled ship was found. (For full particulars see the work referred to.)

That was science in the fullest sense. When evolution can show such accuracy as that, it may lay claim to being a science; but it is entitled to no such claim as long as "facts can in no way interfere with the theory." And yet Lieutenant Maury was so much a lover of God and the Bible that he saw God's greatness manifested in every and all of the winds, currents, and creatures of the air and the ocean, and constantly found the beautiful truths of the Bible, most beautifully demonstrated, in the "wind in his circuits," and by the rivers which "run into the sea," as well as in the "sweet influences of Pleiades," and held his reverence for the Bible at such a height that in one instance at least, and which he has recorded, he actually gave up entirely a generally accepted theory, because, for one reason, as he himself says, "I found evidence in the Bible which seems to cast doubt upon it." And so, like the true scientist that he was, he gave up the human theory, adopted the view that the Bible seemed to present, and soon demonstrated it as a scientific truth, although it was in direct opposition to one of the most eminent geologists of the day. That is the kind of science that I love; because, being based on the truth of God, it is part of the truth of God itself. And so, consequently, when men depart from the truth of God as recorded in nature, we can expect nothing else than, as I think is plainly shown by the evidence of this article, that they will depart from the truth of God as recorded in revelation.

"I charge thee, *therefore*, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom, PREACH THE WORD." 2 Tim. 4:1, 2.

Farmington, W. T.

"How Is the Amendment to Be Carried out Practically!" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 61, 13 , pp. 202, 203.

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

been thoroughly canvassed by Congress and State legislatures, by the Supreme Courts of the United States and of the several States, and by lawyers and citizens generally."

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

203

citizens generally, or between lawyers themselves, or citizens, or congressmen themselves?

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

But it is not a sufficient answer to say that "the Bible is the standard and source of appeal;" because the Bible is just what all the controversy and "conflict of opinion" is about. And to say that there the Bible is to be the source of appeal, is only to say that the very subject of controversy is to be the standard by which to decide the controversy. It is plain, therefore, that there must be something to which appeal may be made, and which can interpret the Scriptures, and decide between the disputants, as to what the truth of the question is; and this decision must, in the very nature of the case, be final. It cannot be the courts, because they are parties to the controversy, and again, because there are certain principles of law which courts recognize in their decisions; such as this: "When words are put in a written law, there is an end to all construction. *They must be followed.*" (See Hon. Jno. A. Bingham, in "Impeachment of Johnson," p. 23.) And this: "The words of a statute, if of common use, are to be taken in their natural, plain, obvious, and ordinary signification and import."—*Kent's Commentaries, section 462*. These principles will not be accepted by the Amendment party.

To illustrate: Suppose the Amendment is secured, and, therefore, Ten Commandments are the supreme law of this nation. I, to be loyal to my government, as well as loyal to my God, take the Bible, find the Ten Commandments, and begin to study diligently to learn what is my duty under this government. I am taught by these fundamental principles in the interpretation of law, that "when words are plain in a written law, there is an end to all construction; they must be followed." And having this plain rule, from the Hon. John A. Bingham, for my guide, and believing that the Congress of the United States made no mistake when it chose Mr. Bingham as the Special Judge Advocate to conduct the trial of the assassins of President Lincoln, and again when it chose him to conduct its impeachment of President Johnson; therefore be leading him to be a safe guide in the interpretation of law, and having also the plain directions of Chancellor Kent, I proceed to the inquiry, as to what is required of me by the Ten Commandments. I come to the fourth commandment. I read, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt not do any

work." I applied my rule, thus: (1) This is a written law; (2) the words are plain,—"The seventh day is the Sabbath." Now if I find what day is the seventh day, my duty is plain. I turn to that subject, and I find that all the sources of inquiry to which I reply, answer with one voice, "The day commonly called Saturday is *the seventh day*." Having found the seventh day, and the words been "plain," (3) "there is an end to all construction," "they must be followed." Now I apply Chancellor Kent's rule, that by the testimony of two witnesses I may be right. First, are the words of the statute to such as are of "common use it"? I read the statute over carefully, and I find not a single word that is not of common use, and not one which I do not understand. Then I must take them "in their natural, plain, obvious, and ordinary signification and import." Therefore, by these plain principles of the highest authority, I am compelled to admit that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and also to keep it as such.

Having now learned my duty in relation to the Sabbath, and having kept it, I proceed to learn and obey the rest of the commandment. I read just as plainly as the other, "Six days shalt thou labor." When the Sabbath is passed, I go to work on the first day of the week, that I may work the six "working days." But my neighbor sees me at work, and calls out to me, "Halloa! Why are you working on the Sabbath?" I reply, This day is not Sabbath, and therefore I am not working on the Sabbath. I kept Sabbath yesterday. He answers, "Oh! that was the Jewish Sabbath that you kept. This day is the Christian Sabbath; this now a Christian Government, and the Christian Sabbath must and shall be kept. "I refuse to yield to that argument, and here is a "conflict of the individual opinion." He has me arrested, and brought to trial. Suppose I providentially obtain the services of Hon. Jno. A. Bingham to defend my cause, and he, by his consummate ability, convinces courts and juries that from the plainest reading of the statute I have to obey the supreme law of the land, and therefore innocent. And now suppose that just here the prosecution enters a plea that that is not the *correct interpretation* of the commandment; that, correctly interpreted, it means, not the definite seventh day, but "one day in seven." Mr. Bingham insists that, by the fundamental rules of law, it must mean the seventh day. They reply, "Are we to apply the rules of civil law in the interpretation of a religious question? This is a religious subject, and it must be decided, and the commandment interpreted, in accordance with the Christian sentiment of this Christian government. We are the majority, and the majority must decide."

Now in such a case is this, is it not plain that the Bible will not be the source of appeal, but that it will be the Church as the interpreter of the Bible, which must render the final decision? Plainly, Yes. Is this an unjust illustration, or an unfair conclusion? Let us have their own words for answer. Please read again the question that the head of this article, and to the last word of that quotation connect the following and read it right onward; for it belongs there: "The churches and the pulpits have much to do with shaping and forming opinions on *all* moral questions, and with *interpretations of Scripture on moral and civil* . . . points; and it is probable that in the almost *universal* gathering of our citizens about these the . . . *final decision* of most points will be developed there. . . . There is

certainly no class of citizens more intelligent, patriotic, and trustworthy than the leaders and teachers in our churches." (?)

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

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

Seriously, now, from reading the *Christian Statesman*, and studying this movement, how is it possible for any one to doubt that the "*image to the beast*" is to be formed in this United States Government, and that it is that the very doors? And we fully agree with them that their movement does decidedly "*contemplate sufficiently practical ends.*"

ALONZO T. JONES.

April 1, 1884

"Another Fallacy" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 61, 14 , pp. 209, 210.

BY ALONZO T. JONES

THE fifth resolution of the Cleveland National Reform Convention reads: "*Resolved*, That we *re-affirm* that this religious amendment, instead of infringing on any individual's right of conscience, or tending in the least degree to a union of church and State, will afford the fullest security against a corrupting church establishment, and form the strongest safeguard of both the civil and religious liberties of all citizens." It is apparently necessary for that party to constantly "*re-affirm*" that this movement does not tend to a union of church and State; for as

their actions and writings all betray that very tendency, a blind must be kept up by each convention *re-affirming* that it does *not* so tend.

Mr. W. J. Coleman, one of the chief speakers in the movement, in explaining to "Truth Seeker" the changes that will have to be made in the existing Constitution when the proposed amendment shall have been adopted, says: "The first sentence of Article I. of Amendments reads, 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' This would be made consistent with the proposed amendment by substituting the words 'a church' for 'religion,' making it read, 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of a church.' This is what the Reform Association believes should be the rule in a rightly constituted State. There should be religion, but no church."

Now it is a fact that, by that "very wholesome doctrine and one very full of comfort," of "unity in diversity," those sects which used to be only warring factions, are now all recognized as "but parts of one stupendous whole." What used to be the Presbyterian *church*, is now only the Presbyterian *branch* of the *Christian church*. That which once was the Methodist or Baptist church is now merely the Methodist or the Baptist branch of the church of Christ, or the one true church. And it is a subject of constant rejoicing to them that all the differences that once made them antagonists, are being accommodated, and that the one grand object of the "Unity of the Church" and its work is about to be realized. And even the Catholic church is not excluded, but is recognized by some of the leading religious papers of our land as a part of the true church, and is recognized by the Reform Association in its work (not in its theory) as an efficient helper. So then, if, as they claim, all these are but *branches* of the *one* church, of course it requires all of them to make up the church. And if it requires all of them to make up the Christian church, and the representative of Christianity in the earth, when they all unite, as they are doing, and all work to the one point of securing this religious amendment to the Constitution, and under it enforcing their united views, what is that but church and State?

Again, when this amendment shall have been adopted, and "Christian laws, institutions, and usages" become a part of the "supreme law of the land," who is to interpret these "laws, institutions, and usages"? Will it not be this united body, *in the capacity* of a united body? And must not every "law, institution, and usage" be interpreted and enforced in harmony with the views of this united body? Let that party answer: "The churches and the pulpits have much to do with shaping and forming opinions on all moral questions, and with interpretations of Scripture on moral and civil, as well as on theological and ecclesiastical, points; and it is probable that in the almost universal gathering of our citizens about these, the chief discussions and the *final decisions* of most points will be developed there. Many nations shall come, and say, "Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for the *law shall go forth of Zion.*" Again, "We will not *allow* the *civil government* to decide between them [the churches] and to ordain church doctrines, ordinances, and laws."—*Statesman*, Feb. 21, 1884. Exactly; the united churches are "Zion"; "the law shall go forth of Zion;" "the *final decision* will

be developed there"; and "WE *will not allow* the *civil* government," etc. Therefore, if the civil government, out of a regard for pure justice and equity, should wish, as did the State of Pennsylvania, to regard the wishes of Sabbath-keepers, and to relieve them from the rigors of the Sunday law, "WE *will not allow it*," say they. If that will not be church and State, then no such thing ever existed.

Again: they often quote that Scripture, "And gave Him to be head over all things to the church." And the way in which they apply it, and the sense in which they use it, show plainly, in connection with the above, that when they get their views embodied in the supreme law of this land, they will use that law in the interests of the church. Claiming Him, in their sense, as head over all things *to the church*, when they succeed in placing their views, and *themselves* as the interpreters of those views, at the head of the nation, as his representatives, will they not then exert all the power of the nation in behalf of the church? Plainly, Yes; by their own words. And then we shall have an absolutely perfect *image* to the papal church.

The claims of the papacy never transcended the above. Christ was made head over all things to the church. The pope was his representative on the earth. Then why should he not use all the powers of earth in behalf of the church? Were not the "chief discussions" settled by the church? Were not the "final decisions developed there"? And when John Huss on his knees before the Emperor Sigismund, in presence of the Council of Constance, listened to the vindictive denunciation of the Bishop of Lodi against heresy, he felt comparatively safe as he held in his hand the pledged honor of the empire, in the form of a safe-conduct signed by the Emperor's own hand. But when the Bishop turned to the powerful Emperor, and, while pointing to the kneeling saint, cried out, "Destroy this obstinate heretic," poor Huss mentioned his safe-conduct, and its shameful violation, with his sad eyes turned appealingly upon the Emperor; and although Sigismund was deeply moved, Huss could receive no answer from him, except in the deep blush that overspread his face; then he knew that although he held the safe-conduct of the empire, and although the Emperor was disposed to let him go, yet the church held him, the

210

Emperor, and the empire all in its cruel power, and that the church could say, "We will not allow the civil government to decide" in matters that concern the church. Where is the difference between the arrogance of the papal church not allowing the civil government to do thus and so, and the arrogance of the National Reformers saying that when they get the power "we will not allow the civil government" to do this or that? If *that* was church and State, why is not this the same? If *that* was the *beast*, what else will this be but the *image* to the *beast*? If persecution was there,

WILL THERE NOT BE PERSECUTION HERE

Again let them answer. In the same article before quoted from Mr. Coleman, we read: "What effect would the adoption of the Christian amendment, together with the proposed changes of the Constitution, have upon those who deny that

God is the sovereign, Christ the ruler, and the Bible the law? This brings up the conscience question at once. . . . The classes who would object are, as 'Truth Seeker' has said, Jews, infidels, atheists, *et al.* These classes are perfectly satisfied with the Constitution as it is. How would they stand toward it if it recognized the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ? To be perfectly plain, I believe that the existence of a Christian Constitution would *disfranchise* every logically consistent infidel."—*Christian Statesman*, Nov. 1, 1883, page 4. Again J. C. K. Milligan, in *Statesman* of Feb. 21, 1884, page 5: "The worst result will be to disfranchise them."

Now, on their own showing, this applies, not *only* to infidels and Jews, but to every one who does not acknowledge the sovereignty of God. But how is that acknowledgment to be made? Answer, By keeping *Sunday*. They say truly, "The keeping of the Sabbath is an acknowledgment of the sovereign rights of God over us." Again they say, "Sunday is the Sabbath." Therefore, if Sunday be the Sabbath, and the keeping of the Sabbath is an acknowledgment of the sovereign rights of God, then it inevitably follows that whosoever will not keep Sunday for Sabbath thereby denies the sovereignty of God, and therefore must be *disfranchised*. And there is to be no persecution! Is disfranchisement for opinion's sake no persecution!! These men will embody their arbitrary views in the supreme law of the land; and to all who will not conform to those views they say, "If you obstinately adhere to your opposition to our 'decisions' as to what is Scripture, you shall not be burned, for that would be persecution; you shall not be hanged, for that would be persecution; you shall not be maimed, nor whipped, nor banished, for such would be persecution; and we will never persecute. Oh no! you shall not be persecuted, you shall not even pay a fine; you shall *only* be *disfranchised*. You shall simply be shut out from all situations in which you might exercise your talents with honor to yourself and advantage to your country. The floors of Congress, the halls of Legislation, the bench of Justice, shall not be occupied by such as you. You shall see other men, your inferiors in talents and acquired abilities, rise to the highest places and attract the admiration of multitudes, while you are doomed to obscurity. You shall be doomed to lead the abject life of a Chinaman, in the midst of the great American people. All those high honors with which a free country decorates its illustrious citizens shall be to you objects, not of hope and virtuous emulation, but of hopeless pining. We will allow you to be educated, that you may the more feel your degradation. We will allow you to become educated, the more to stimulate your craving for that which you never may enjoy, but you shall not be persecuted."

No persecution! What would a fine of thousands of dollars be? what would imprisonment be? what a scourging be? what would banishment for a year, or for two years, be, in comparison to this, the deprivation of my birthright to the most inestimable right of earth,—that for which thousands upon thousands of the human race have laid down their lives; that for which our fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor,—the right to be a citizen amongst a free people, and in this instance a citizen of the best government on the earth? And all this for what? Why, for not keeping Sunday for the Sabbath, in direct violation of the plainest reading of the law of God. And we are told this is

"infringing on no individual's rights of conscience;" "this is the *strongest safeguard* of both the civil and religious liberties of all." If this be no infringements of the right of conscience, then there never has been such a thing in the world's history. If this be the strongest safeguard of civil and religious liberty, then no man's civil or religious liberty has ever been in danger in all this world. And if in all this there is no persecution, we would like exceedingly for these National Reform gentlemen to give us their definition of what persecution would be.

Again Mr. Coleman says (in the place before quoted), "If there be any Christian who objects to the proposed amendment on the ground that it might touch the conscience of the infidel, it seems to me it would be in order to inquire whether he himself should not have some conscience in this matter." So then, in this National Reform Christianity it is the perfection of conscientiousness to outrage some other man's conscience. And the reverse of the Golden Rule is to them the law and the prophets. Their chief complaint is that the present Constitution disfranchises them (which is false), and therefore they must have it changed so that it will disfranchise every one but themselves.

And so, All things whatsoever ye would not that men should do to you, *this do ye even so to them*; for this is the law of National Reform.

Do we judge them harshly in this? Nay, verily. Witness the following: In the *Statesman* of Feb. 21, 1884, Mr. M. A. Gault, reporting a Convention at North Page, Iowa, says: "Rev. Mr. DOdds said he could not vote for it [the amendment] on the principle of the Golden Rule. He could not impose on the Jew or on Ingersoll a belief which he would not wish others to impose on him if he were in their place. Rev. Wm. Johnston followed, and with his *incisive logic* pulverized this objection. If we are, in government, to apply the Golden Rule without reference to any higher law," etc., etc. "Be astonished, O ye heavens, at this!" A higher law than the Golden Rule!!! of which Christ says, It "*is the law and the prophets,*"—the sum of all duty. And these men have found a "higher law" than that sum of all. What "incisive logic" that must be, to be sure! And how infinitesimally it must "pulverize" every objection! And what can this "higher law" be? As they have not yet defined it, nor directed us to the statute, we are left to conjecture. And from a long and deep study of their writings, their speeches, and their ways and methods generally, I hesitate not to pronounce that this "higher law," this law that transcends and sets aside the Golden Rule, that now "pulverizes" every objection in actions, is, *The Success of the National Reform Party*. Success is their *summum bonum*; their *prima* and *ultima ratio*. Success at the expense of all the accumulated experience of history. Success even at a cost as dear as that which was paid for the abolition of slavery. They care nothing for logic, consistency, human rights, civil and religious, nothing for Sacred Scripture itself, that stands in the way of their *success*. This "higher law" of success, with them supreme, necessarily takes precedence of all laws, rights, and rules, human or divine. And this is a specimen of their interpretation of "Christian laws, institutions, and usages,"—an interpretation which at the first step takes them clear beyond every Christian law, institution, or usage. If they will do this in simply reaching after power, what will they *not* do when they obtain that power? There will be literally no restraint upon them; for their "higher law" will justify them in

anything that they may choose to do, in "pulverizing" objections, especially where it is the highest effort of their consciences to offend the consciences of others.

And because we distrust their movement, because we see the result of it when they shall have secured the power, they choose to think us possessed of a wonderful "compound of folly and fanaticism." (See editorial comment in *Statesman* of Feb. 21, 1884.) But from their own words, fairly quoted in this article, we are justified in saying that the success of their movement will be a *union of church and State*, and that *they will persecute*.

April 8, 1884

"National Reform (Mis-)Reading of History" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 61, 15 , pp. 226, 227.

BY ALONZO T. JONES

WERE it not for the solemn ending that there is to be to the work of the National Reform party, their claims, and the arguments, speeches, and propositions by which they attempt to set them forth, would be a constant source of amusement. And I recollect no single statement in all of theirs that I have seen that is more absurdly ridiculous than the following, which I take from the very first speech of the Cleveland Convention: "As a grain of corn does not grow but in harmony with the laws which the Creator has ordained for corn, a nation does not prosper but in harmony with the laws which the God of nations has ordained for nations."

Now the veriest tyro knows that this proposition, in the sense in which it is meant, is contradicted by the unanimous voice of all history; and the most cursory glance over the field of history will discover the strongest kind of contradictions. Take, for an instance, Frederick the Great, an out-and-out infidel, if not an entire atheist, who always spoke of Christianity in a mocking tone, and of whom it might almost be said that Voltaire was his "patron saint;" who in affairs of statecraft pretended to no form of virtue, but was moved solely by sheer, unhallowed ambition. To quote his own words, "Ambition, interest, the desire of making people talk about me, carried the day." He broke his plighted faith with the Queen of Hungary, and deliberately plundered her of one of the richest provinces of her dominions; and for no purpose whatever but to "extend his dominions, and see his name in the gazettes." To more effectually accomplish his robbery, he had leagued himself with France and Bavaria; but when he had torn away Silesia, and France and Bavaria were about to help themselves as he had done, he saw that it would add too much to the strength of France for his safety, and he withdrew from the league, and concluded a treaty with the Queen. When she was relieved of his opposition, Maria Theresa easily conquered both France and Bavaria; but when Frederick saw how easily she had swept them from the field, he became alarmed for his possession of Silesia, and again broke faith with her, and allied himself closely with France, again invaded the Queen's dominions,

took Prague, and threatened her capital; and in the very next year, again broke faith with France, and concluded another peace with Maria Theresa.

Here, then, we have four times that he had broken his plighted faith, and all inside of four years. Yet for all this his kingdom so prospered that in just two years after his last peace with Maria Theresa, through the Seven Years' War, he was able to hold his own during the whole seven long years against the allied powers of the continent. France, Austria, Russia, Saxony, Sweden, and the body of German States, were all allied against him. His little kingdom, all told, contained less than *five* millions of people, and the stolen province of Silesia was the fourth part. The population of the countries leagued against him was fully a *hundred* million. His army was less than a hundred thousand. The army of the confederates was *six hundred thousand*. Yet against all this vast odds he maintained his cause, and at the end of the Seven Years' War concluded a peace in which he ceded nothing, not even a foot of the stolen province. "The whole continent in arms had proved unable to tear Silesia from that iron grasp."

It was not alone in a military point of view that his kingdom prospered. It prospered civilly as well. At the close of the war, his kingdom was one scene of desolation, but "his kingdom was one scene of desolation, but "his energy soon brought back the national prosperity." And when he died, in 1786, he left 70,000,000 thalers in the treasury, and an army of 200,000 men, of the best soldiers of Europe. Civilly his rule was remarkable in other things. Freedom of speech and the press was so absolute that, outside of the United States, to this day it would be difficult to find its equal. "Order was strictly maintained throughout his dominions. Property was secure." "*Religious persecution* was unknown under his government. The scoffer whom the parliaments of France had sentenced to a cruel death, the Jesuit who could show his face nowhere else, who in Britain was still subject to penal laws, who was proscribed by France, Spain, Portugal, and Naples, who had been given up even by the Vatican, found safety and the means of subsistence in the Prussian dominions. His policy with respect to the Catholics of Silesia presented an *honorable contrast* to the policy which, under very similar circumstances, England long followed with respect to the Catholics of Ireland."

He was one of the very first rulers who abolished the cruel practice of torture. "No sentence of death was executed without his sanction, and that sanction was rarely given except in cases of murder." And so he prospered, and his kingdom prospered, through all his absurd infidelity as a man, and his faithfulness as a king.

Another instance we have in the Empress Catharine of Russia, who, among the rulers of that country, may fairly rank as second only to Peter the Great. She greatly enlarged on the west, the south, and the east, the dominions which she, a foreigner, had obtained by dethroning her husband and excluding her son; she conquered her enemies by land and sea, wrought real improvement in the administration of justice, and commerce. She, too, was a disciple of Voltaire, and was shamefully and systematically immoral. And, too, the nation prospered.

Another instance we find in Henry IV, (Navarre), of France, the greatest of the Bourbon line, "who restored order, terminated a terrible civil war, brought the finances into excellent condition, made his country respected throughout Europe,

and endeared himself to the great body of the people whom he ruled." Yet he changed his religion *four* times. First he was a Huguenot; but to escape the consequences of St. Bartholomew's day (1572), turned Catholic. As soon as that danger was fairly past, and he made his escape from Paris, he was a Huguenot again; then soon after, when all that stood between him and the throne was his Huguenot profession, it was again conveniently renounced, and he was again converted to the Catholic faith. Nor in his private life was he under much more restraint from any regard to the principles of morality.

But not to multiply instances, we will come at once to the great prototype of National Reformers, the uniter of church and State, Constantine. Surely the National Reformers will not deny that the nation prospered under his rule. Yet he was a hypocrite from the day that he crossed the Milbian Bridge, faithless, if not a perjurer, and a quadruple murderer,—a hypocrite, as his whole future life shows; faithless, in that although he gave his solemn promise and confirmed it *by an oath*, that, if Licinius would resign his claims to the purple, he should be permitted to pass the remainder of his life in peace. And this promise and this oath were made not alone to Licinius but also to his wife, the own sister of Constantine, in behalf of her husband. Yet for all this, only a little while after Licinius reached Thessalonica, the place appointed for his abode, he was foully murdered by order of Constantine. And the circumstance that Licinius had at the time fully reached the allotted *threescore and ten* years, added to his first murder. This was in A.D. 324. In 326 his own son Crispus was put to death by his orders, and for no other crime than his abilities; and at the same time he murdered his nephew, the son of the murdered Licinius, "whose rank was his only crime," and the obdurate heart of the emperor "was unmoved by the prayers and tears of his favorite sister, pleading for the life of a son whose loss she did not survive."

But this is enough mention of his fearful crimes, and we gladly turn from it without narrating the bloody tragedy of his own wife. And all this while he professed to be a Christian. It was before the battle of the Milbian Bridge (312) that he professed to have had his vision of the flaming cross and its inscription. In 321 he issued his Sunday edict. It was in 324 that he murdered Licinius. In 325 he convened the Council of Nicea, presided over its deliberations, took part in its discussions, and published and enforced its decisions. In 326 he murdered his nephew and Crispus. And in 330, May 11, his new capital, Constantinople, was dedicated to the Virgin Mary. In 337, May 22, he died, and there ended one of the basest characters of human history. To quote

227

the words of another, "Tested by character, indeed he stands among the lowest of all those to whom the epithet [Great] has in ancient or modern times been applied."—*Encyclopedia Britannica*, ninth edition, Art. Constantine. Yet through all this defiance of all principle, of all the laws of God, and of civilized men, he prospered as a ruler, and the nation prospered under his shameful rule.

Again, upon their own claims, our own country is a positive contradiction of this proposition. *They* say that this nation is, and has been from the beginning, governed by a "Constitution so very wicked, so entirely Godless, that a man who fears God and honors Christ, cannot support nor swear allegiance to it." Yet in

spite of all this, this nation has prospered most, has grown most rapidly, has reached the highest place in the shortest time, of any nation that the world has ever seen.

And in the bright shining of the light of the last years of the nineteenth century, and flatly in the face of universal history, which is in itself a universal refutation, they set forth the proposition that nations do not prosper except as they "recognize and *obey* the *moral laws* which God has ordained." I verily believe that such another set of blunders and mis-reading of history and human experience as is held to by the National Reform party, cannot be found outside of the history of the Jesuits. And if that party does not yet fairly *out-Jesuit* the Jesuits themselves, I shall be willing to learn that I have mistaken them. The fact of the matter is that this party utterly mistakes the functions of human government, and consequently views government, and consequently views everything in connection therewith in its reverse. But when men deliberately turn their backs upon the nineteenth century, and seek to revive the forms and methods of *government* of the Dark Ages, we cannot expect from them any other than the forms and methods of *argument* of the Dark Ages.

May 13, 1884

"Are Our Politics to Be Purified?" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 61, 20 , pp. 306, 307.

BY ALONZO T. JONES

THIS is a question asked by the National Reform party. We, too, may ask the same question. The Reform party place great reliance upon the success of their movement for the accomplishment of this (much to be desired, indeed!) result. Dr. Merrick in his address at the Cleveland National Reform Convention, said, "Where, then, is the antidote [for corrupt politics] to be found? Unhesitatingly I answer, In the religion of Jesus Christ. . . . How can it fail to purify our politics, if Christianity be allowed its legitimate place in our government?"—*Christian Statesman*, Dec. 20, 1883.

Dr. M'Allister, also, in the same Convention, said, "Finally, the proposed amendment will draw to the administration of the government such men as the law of God requires,—not the reckless, the unprincipled, the profane, but able men, who fear God and hate covetousness."—*Ibid.*, Dec. 27, 1883.

This thing has been tried several times, and always with the same result, namely to make corruption more corrupt. Given, human nature what it is, and make profession of religion a qualification for governmental favor, or political preference, and the inevitable result will always be that thousands will profess the required religion expressly to obtain political preferment, and *for no other reason*; and so, to *dishonest ambition* is added *deliberate hypocrisy*.

The first to employ this method was he to whom can be traced almost every ill that Christianity has suffered (this last one being by no means the least),—

Constantine. He made the bishop of Rome a prince of the empire, and clothed the inferior bishops with such power that they not only *ruled* as princes, but imitated the princes in pride, luxury, worldly pomp, and hateful haughtiness,—imitated the princes in these, and imitated the emperor in persecuting with relentless vigor all who differed with them in faith. And the bishop of Rome, above all in rank, held the supremacy also in pride, arrogance, and profusion of luxury, to such a degree that one of the most eminent of the heathen writers exclaimed, either in envy or in indignation, "Make me bishop of Rome and I will be a Christian."

Nor were the governmental favors of Constantine confined to the bishops; they extended to all orders; and by the promise of a white garment, and twenty pieces of gold to every convert, there was secured in a single year the baptism of no fewer than twelve thousand men, besides a proportionate number of women and children.—See Gibbon, "Decline and Fall of Rome", chap. 20, sec. 17. And the inevitable consequence was the "*formalism* succeeded *faith*, and Religion fled from a station among the rulers of Christendom to find shelter in her native scenes among the suffering and the poor." Was politics purified there? No! Religion was corrupted, and faith debased; and amidst and by it all, were taken the widest and most rapid strides of the man of sin toward that fearful height of power and depth of degradation which was the astonishment and the shame of the world.

Another notable instance was Louis XIV. of France. The early part of his reign was a time of much license; "but in his old age he became religious; and he determined that his subjects should be religious too. He shrugged his shoulders and knitted his brows if he observed at his levee, or near his dinner table, any gentleman who neglected the duties enjoined by the church. He rewarded piety with blue ribands, pensions, invitations to Marlé, governments, and regiments. Forthwith Versailles became in everything but dress, a convent. The pulpits and confessionals were surrounded by swords and embroidery. The marshals were much in prayer; and there was hardly one among the dukes and peers who did not carry good little books in his pocket, fast during lent, and communicate at Easter. Madame de Maintenon, who had a great share in the blessed work, boasted that devotion had become quite the fashion.

And was politics purified? With a vengeance! We read on: "A fashion indeed it was; and like a fashion it passed away. No sooner had the old king been carried to St. Denis than the whole court unmasked. Every man hastened to indemnify himself, by the excess of licentiousness and impudence, for years of mortification. The same persons who, a few months before, with meek voices and demure looks, had consulted divines about the state of their souls, now surrounded the midnight table, where, amidst the bounding of champagne corks, a drunken prince, enthroned between Dubois and Madame de Parabere, hiccoughed out atheistical arguments and obscene jests. The early part of the reign of Louis XIV. had been a time of license; but the most dissolute men of that generation would have blushed at the orgies of the Regency."—*Macaulay's Essay on Leigh Hunt.*

But undoubtedly the most notable instance of all is that of the Puritan rule, of the Commonwealth of England. "It was solemnly resolved by Parliament 'that *no person shall be employed but such as the house shall be satisfied of his real godliness.*' This pious assembly had a Bible lying on the table for reference. . . . To know whether a man was really godly was impossible. But it was easy to know whether he had a plain dress, lank hair, no starch in his linen, no gay furniture in his house; whether he talked through his nose, and showed the whites of his eyes; whether he named his children Assurance, Tribulation, and Maher-shalal-hash-baz; whether he avoided Spring Garden when in town, and abstained from hunting and hawking when in the country; whether he expounded hard scriptures to his troops of dragoons, and talked in a committee of ways and means about seeking the Lord. These were tests which could easily be applied. The misfortune was that they proved nothing. Such as they were, they were employed by the dominant party. And the consequence was that a *crowd of impostors, in every walk of life*, began to mimic and to caricature what were then regarded as the *outward signs of sanctity.*"—*Ibid.*

Thus has it ever been, and thus will it ever be, where governments as such attempt to propagate a religion. The only means which it is possible for governments to employ are "*reward and punishment*"; powerful means indeed for influencing the exterior act, but altogether impotent for the purpose of touching the heart. A public functionary who is told that he will be promoted if he is a devout Catholic, and turned out of his place if he is not, will probably go to mass every morning, exclude meat from his table on Fridays, shrive himself regularly, and perhaps let his superiors know that he wears a hair shirt next his skin. Under a Puritan [or a National Reform also we may say] government, a person who is apprised that piety is essential to thriving in the world [see *Christian Statesman* of Nov. 21, Dec. 21, and 27, 1883, and Feb. 21, 1884, particularly, but in fact almost any number], will be strict in the observance of the Sunday, or, as he will call it, Sabbath; and will avoid a theater as if it were plague-stricken. Such a show of religion as this the hope of gain and the fear of loss will produce, at a *week's notice, in any abundance which a government may require.* But under this show, sensuality, ambition, avarice, and hatred retain unimpaired power, and the seeming convert has only added to the vices of a man of the world all the still darker vices which are engendered by the constant practice of dissimulation. The truth cannot be long concealed. The public discovers that the grave persons who are proposed to it as patterns, are more utterly destitute of moral principle and of moral sensibility than avowed libertines. It sees that these Pharisees are further removed from real goodness than publicans and harlots. And as usual, it rushes to the extreme opposite to that which it quits. It considers a high religious profession as a sure mark of meanness and depravity. On the very first day on which the restraint of fear is taken away, and on which men can venture to say what they think, a frightful peal of blasphemy and ribaldry proclaims that the

short-sighted policy which *aimed at making a nation of saints* has made a *nation of scoffers*."—*Ibid*.

Yet in the very face of these plainest dictates of pure reason, and these most forcible lessons of history, and in utter defiance of all the teaching of universal history itself, the National Re-

307

form party, with that persistence which is born of the blindness of bigoted zeal, is working, and will continue to work, with might and main, to bring upon this dear land all this fearful train of disorders. Their movement reminds us of nothing so much as of these quack medicines that are so abundant, warranted to cure every ill that the human system has never known before. As with these, so with the National Reform; it is warranted to cure all the ills of the body politic, while, as any one with half an eye can see, it bears in its hands a perfect Pandora's box, wide open, to inflict its innumerable evils upon our country; and, as they will learn when it is too late, they will have no power to retain even hope. She herself will have flown away, and nothing remain but utter, irretrievable, awful ruin.

And so we know that instead of the church purifying politics, political power will make the already corrupt church still more corrupt,—will make it, in short, just what the Scripture says of it, "the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird." Rev. 18:2. And as the reaction from the zeal of Louis XIV., gave to France a reign of dissoluteness, such as to fairly put license itself to the blush; and as the reaction from the Puritan "reign of the saints" gave to England the "reign of the strumpets;" so also, I verily believe, the reaction which will surely follow the reign of the National Reform saints (?) will give to the United States, and to the world, that most fearful of all reigns, *the reign of the devils* (see Rev. 16:14; Luke 17:28, 29), and license upon license, iniquity upon iniquity, and abomination upon abomination, and Satan working "with *all* power and signs and lying wonders." 2 Thess. 2:9-11; Lev. 18:27; 20:23. May we indeed "watch and pray always, that we may be accounted worthy to escape all these things, and to stand before the Son of man." Luke 21:36.

June 10, 1884

"Historical Necessity of the Third Angel's Message" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 61, 24 , pp. 370, 371.

BY ALONZO T. JONES

I PROPOSE to 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. Although the Reformation actually began 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, 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.

Now, reader, I ask your thoughtful attention throughout; because I shall make no comment, nor application of any point, until the close; but then it will be summed up in few words, and you want to have the points well in your mind.

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 promises laid down by the age. And in view of the times and the events, it is difficult to conceive 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 Azcharias 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 proceeds to the sale of indulgences, covering both worlds for the past, present, and future. And now begins the Reformation. Luther resists the sale of indulgences, and the claims upon which they are sold. It is plain that if both sides stand firmly to their principles, nothing else can come out of it but renunciation of the church of Rome, on the part of Luther, the adoption of Christ as Head of the church instead of the pope, 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? (5) 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 opens a new scene of controversy. Opposition is not confined between the reformers and the papacy; on this subject it opens between the reformers 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 Zwingli 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 Zwingli 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 Wittenberg; 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.—*D'Aubigne*, book 9, chap. 8.

Carlstadt was to a certain extent influenced for awhile by these enthusiasts; but only for awhile, and then only so far as to despise learning and advise his students at the College to return to their homes.—*Ibid.* 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 this 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

371

"mathematical proofs."—*Ibid.*, book 13, chap. 7. In the way in which the subject was brought prominently before him, it appeared to him that, to hold the view of the bread and wine being 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 Bâle; and when before this Zwingle'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 against anything else that he deemed error, and his opponents in this 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*.

The death of Luther (Feb. 18, 1546) left Melancthon at the head of the Reformation in Germany; and his views on the Supper were almost, if not identical with, those of the Reformed, *i.e.*, the Swiss 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 Zwinglians. 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 king 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; *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 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 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 Pilugius, bishop of Nuremburg, Michael Sidonius, a creature of the pope, and John Agricola, of lesleben, 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," but finally in 1548 he assembled the Saxon nobility and clergy in several conferences, to take counsel about what should be done. In all these conferences, Melancthon was accorded the chief place. 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 of fury, and accused them of apostasy from the true religion."—Mosheim.

Melancthon and his friends, however, defended his view, 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.

(*To be continued.*)

June 17, 1884

"Historical Necessity of the Third Angel's Message. (*Continued.*)"
***Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 61, 25 , pp. 386, 387.**

(*Continued.*)

BY ALONZO T. JONES

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 assert that good works are an impediment to salvation. This added new fuel to the flame, and on it raged.

Out of this debate grew another, known as the "Synergistical" controversy, from a Greek word signifying *co-operation*. The disciples of Melancthon, led by Strigelius, held 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. This 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.

In 1560 Melancthon died, glad, as he said on his deathbed, to be freed from the contentions of theologians. After his death, many who wished to see these divisions and animosities healed, endeavored to put an end to the controversies. 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 effort; and James Andreas, professor at Tubingen, 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 now widened, so that the Calvinists and Zwinglians were all included in the whirl of controversy.

Now that Calvin appears upon the scene, the field was not only enlarged, but new material was supplied; for he differed from both Lutherans and Zwinglians, not only with regard to the Lord's Supper, but his essential tenet of *absolute decrees of God*, in the salvation of men, was an entirely new element in the strife; and from the very nature of the case it propagated a multitude of new disputes. It is not necessary to enlarge upon them, nor to draw them out in their

full members. It will be sufficient merely to 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 re-opened, and again canvassed through all its forms: First, What is the nature of the institutions called Sacraments? Second, What are the fruits of the same? Third, How great is the majesty and glory of Christ's human nature? Fourth, How are the divine perfections communicated to the human nature of Christ? Fifth, What is the inward frame of spirit that is required in the worship addressed to the Saviour?

On the divine decrees: 1. What is the nature of the divine attributes? 2. Particularly those of justness 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: 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, 1st. The Immortality of the Soul. 2nd. The Trinity. 3rd. Predestination (against his opponents in Geneva). And above all, 4th. 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. I am making no attack upon Calvin. I simply state facts as they come in the course of controversy. To give a proper view of affairs in Geneva, I will quote a passage of the highest authority:—

"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 so 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."—*Encyclopedia Britannica*, ninth edition, art. Calvin, which was written by W. L. Alexander, D.D., one of the Bible revisers, and which is *prima facie* favorable to him.

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 "*exclusively* by the body of preachers and elders," with Calvin the head of that body, his power was practically unlimited; and 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, called him "bishop of Asculum," and "the new pope." Among other points of dissent, Gruet denied the immortality of the soul. He may have been an infidel, but it is not certain; at any rate

387

he was brought before the council, by which he was condemned and punished with death. Another opponent was Castalio, master of the public schools of Geneva who attacked Calvin's 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 attention to the nobleman, who was obliged to leave Geneva, lest a worse thing should befall him.

Another, and the most notable of all the victims of Calvin's theocracy, 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.

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 Anabaptists, signifies *re*-baptizers, 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 Albigenses and the 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 even then to be considered abominable heretics; but when, unfortunately, in the early days of the Reformation, some of the name ran into wild 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 heresies."—*Mosheim, Church History*, Cent. 16, sec. 3, part 2, paragraph 6.

As before remarked, the Anabaptists became the one object of the attack of all parties, civil and religious. Their opposition to infant baptism somewhat 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 any one 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, "Psychopamychia," on the immortality of the soul, in opposition to the Anabaptists in France. (For these points, see *Envy. Brit.*, arts. Melancthon, Baptism, Baptists, and Calvin.) 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 *Andrew's 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 offices 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 only," 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 plead for release from condemnation at the hands of men, and was denied as was its Lord, "Not this man, but Barabbas."

(To be continued.)

June 24, 1884

"Historical Necessity of the Third Angel's Message. (*Continued.*)"
***Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 61, 26 , pp. 402-404.**

(Continued.)

BY ALONZO T. JONES

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

"So difficult, however, was her [Elizabeth's] position that a change might have been forced on 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 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 officer 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 rain 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 for 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 condemners of them.' Nor was this work of the civil power likely to be 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 legal form of church government, but all other forms, Episcopalian or Separatist, were to be ruthlessly put down. For heresy there was the punishment of death. 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 1851, there occurred a division among the Puritans, which was fol-

403

lowed 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.

In entering the seventeenth century we find a new element upon the sea of controversy. Philosophy of the different schools was in each school striving for ascendancy; and if not a direct cause of many of the disputes of this century, it gives 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 the places of learning; and held that all who questioned Aristotle were 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 scope for yet more exercise of the controversial propensity.

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 Wittemberg.

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 Udislaus 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 all 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 Duraeus, a Calvinist, a native of Scotland, "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. 2, part 2, 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 Duraeus. But the opposition was so bitter that Matthias was obliged to resign his bishopric; 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. This "crime" was called *syncretism*.

The *Pietistical* controversy was another that engaged the attention of the Lutherans during this century. This originated in the efforts of Philip James Spener, of Frankfort, who "had in view the promotion of *vital religion*, rousing the lukewarm and indifferent, stemming the torrent of vice and corruption, and reforming the licentious manners of both the clergy and people."—*Id.* par. 26. And 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 to them and their designs, was as strong as was that to any of the others.

This subject was carried further by some of the professors at Leipsic, who for the purpose of instructing the candidates for the ministry in something better than how to perpetuate broils, "undertook to explain in their colleges certain books of

Scripture in order to render these genuine sources of religious 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 effects 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, animosities 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 Wittemberg thought themselves obliged to proceed publicly, first against Spener in 1695, and afterward 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 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; and (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 on such questions as, (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, which, unqualified, were certainly capable of being interpreted as granting indulgence. Such as, "No man is able to attain that perfection which the divine law requires. Good works are not necessary to salvation." 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 character; and then from that, whether any human actions are truly 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" in themselves, but about the *nature* of the decrees. "The majority held that God simply *permitted* the first man to fall into transgression; while a respectable 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 events that our first parents could not possibly avoid falling."

404

—*Id.* chap. 2. par. 10. The two parties in this division were the *Sublapsarians* (those who held to *permission*) and *Supralapsarians*.

But these forgot their differences whenever and wherever there appeared those who "thought it their duty to represent the Deity, as extending His goodness and mercy to all mankind." This new controversy arose in the early part of the 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 entertained the Scriptural doctrine that the grace of God is free to all, and brings salvation to all men; 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 this 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, "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 procedure 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 which had been 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 Friseland, Zeeland, 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.

(*Concluded next week.*)

July 1, 1884

"Historical Necessity of the Third Angel's Message. (*Concluded.*)"
***Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 61, 27 , pp. 418, 419.**

BY ALONZO T. JONES

(*Concluded.*)

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 no 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 doubtless be questioned; bt 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 as 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 ever say. This caused a division and endless discussion within the Episcopalian Church. Those who refused to take the oath were denominated *Non-jurors* 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 proportion 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)

419

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 days, when 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 unconsciousness 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 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.

Now, reader, please recall the subjects in this course of controversy, and see whether the following extracts from Mosheim do not state the facts in the case:—

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

"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.*, 17th cent., sec. 2, part 2, chap. 1, paragraph 19.

Mosheim gives at the same time a very good reason for this defect. 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, ad robbed them of that precious leisure which they might have consecrated to the advancement of real piety and virtue, they would certainly have been free from the defects now mentioned. . . . All 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 obliged the doctors of the contending churches to be perpetually in actions, or at least in a posture of defense."—*Id.*

"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 just 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 various 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 words of trivial distinctions and metaphysical subtleties, and very illly furnished with that kind of knowledge which is adapted to touch the heart, and to reform the life."—*ib.*, 17th cent., sec. 2, part 2, chap. 1, paragraph 13.

"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 systems of doctrine, few were employed in cultivating or promoting that noblest of all sciences, which has virtue, life, and manners for its objects."—*Id.*, cent. 16, sec. 2, part 2, chap. 2, paragraph 37.

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 whole 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 entire during this [the seventeenth] century; its fundamental principles received no alteration, no *could any doctor* of that church, who should have presumed 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.*, 17th cent. sect. 2, part 2, chap. 1, paragraph 16. Again: "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.*, 16th cent., sec. 3, part 2, chap. 2, paragraph 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, I lay down the proposition that, "If ever there is to be a clearly defined reformation upon the pure principles of morality, *those principles* must be the one leading subject above all others, set forth in such reform. Will any one deny that the necessity for such a reform is as great as for any one of the steps that have been taken from the days of Luther to this day? I 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 discerned in that direction. But what I say is that, until the present, 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? I answer, As the ten commandments compose the moral law of God, and are the sum of all duty toward God or man (Eccl. 12:13), when such reform shall have presented itself to the world, it must bear high and prominent upon its crest those same ten commandments, demanding obedience thereto as the supreme effort of moral obligation. Now the third angel's message does just that

thing. Therefore by thus tracing the Reformation through its course of controversy, we prove, 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 justification by faith; with Zwingli, 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 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 general 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 prove to a demonstration 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 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 DeQuincey'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,

420

but rolling in with all the impulse of a mighty tide, irresistible, soon "to fill the whole capacity of the shore" indeed. And we who see it should realize, *must* realize, that it is the one only tide in our affairs which taken at the flood, will lead on, not to fortune, but to ETERNAL SALVATION.

November 4, 1884

**"The Sabbath in Egypt" *Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 61, 44 ,
pp. 697, 698.**

THE Sabbath was kept by the Israelites in Egypt; at least Pharaoh charged Moses and Aaron with causing them to keep it, and for that reason made their burdens heavier, and took away the straw. In Ex. 5:5, Pharaoh said to Moses and Aaron, "Behold the people of the land now are many, and ye make them *rest* from their burdens." The word here translated "rest" is in Hebrew *shabath*, and in every other place where the word is translated *rest* it is in connection with the rest of the *seventh-day* Sabbath, except in Lev. 26:34, 35, where it refers to the land resting while it should be desolate. But when we turn to 2 Chron. 36:21, to the fulfillment of the words in Leviticus, there we have the word translated plainly, "As long as she lay desolate, she kept *sabbath*."

Following are all of the places wherein the word "*Shabath*" is translated "rest" or "rested":—

Gen. 2:2: "And he *rested* on the *seventh day*."

Gen. 2:3: "Because that in it he had *rested*."

Ex. 5:5: "Ye make them *rest* from their burdens."

Ex. 16:30: "So the people *rested* on the *seventh day*."

Ex. 23:12: "On the *seventh day* thou shalt *rest*."

Ex. 31:17: "The *seventh day* he *rested*."

Ex. 34:21: "On the *seventh day* thou shalt *rest*."

Ex. 34:21: "In caring time and in harvest thou shalt *rest*."

Lev. 26:34: "Then shall the land *rest* and enjoy her Sabbaths."

Lev. 26:35: "It shall *rest* because it did not *rest*."

And in 2 Chron. 36:21 the same word is translated as stated above, plainly, "sabbath," in fulfillment of Lev. 26:34, 35, "As long as she lay desolate, she kept *sabbath*."

So, therefore, with the exception in Leviticus, in every place in the Bible where the word is translated "rest," it refers to the rest of the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord, unless we *make* a further exception of these words of Pharaoh in Ex. 5:5. But why should this be more an exception when there is

nothing in the text nor context which demands it as an exception? and when besides we have all these instances of the use of the word to justify the use of it in that same sense in this place?

Further: the context appears to justify this meaning; for Pharaoh said also (Ex. 5:8), "For they be *idle*." Now what good reason could he have for saying they were *idle* unless it be in view of what he had said to Moses and Aaron that they made them *rest*, and in view of that rest being the Sabbath in which they should "not do *any work*." Consequently, there was a conflict of authority. Moses and Aaron came to the people with the authority of God, teaching the people to rest. Pharaoh refused to recognize the authority, and made their burdens heavier and their tasks harder, and would not let them serve God. Then (Ex. 8:1) "the Lord spake unto Moses, Go unto Pharaoh and say unto him, Thus saith the Lord, Let my people go, *that they may serve me*." And this is further confirmed by the fact that the very first service that the Lord demanded of them, after Pharaoh had finally let them go, was to keep the Sabbath,—to rest on the seventh day.

Another thing that strongly confirms this view of the text is, "And they sing the *song of Moses* the servant of God." Rev. 15:3. Who sing this song? "They who had gotten the victory over the beast and over his image, *and over his mark*, and over the number of his name." How did they get the victory? "By keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:12. How did they get the victory "over his *mark*?" By being sealed with the seal (mark) of the living God (Rev. 7:3; 14:1), in opposition to the mark of the beast. Rev. 14:9-12. We know that the last oppression that the people of God will suffer in this world, will be because they recognize their duty (and will do it) of keeping the Sabbath of the Lord, resting on the seventh day. We know, likewise, by Rev. 13:15-17, that an attempt will be made to prevent our serving God, and therefore when the oppression of the modern Pharaohs becomes so cruel upon us, again the Lord will say unto them, "Let my people go that they may serve me." Rev. 22:3. And when that shall have been said, and he shall have given us the victory over the beast and over his image and over his mark, etc., then indeed will it be that we shall "sing the song of Moses" the servant of God, as well as "the song of the Lamb." But how can we sing the song of Moses, unless we have a similar experience to that which gave rise to the song of Moses. Oppression alone does not give that experience; because if that were so, all of the martyrs could sing the same song; but in this, none but those who have "gotten the victory over the beast and over his image and over his mark," etc.,—"the hundred and forty-four thousand,"—none but these sing this song. Rev. 15:3; 14:3. Therefore it cannot be oppression alone, but oppression for the same cause which gives rise to that song of Moses. And this text (Ex. 5:5), and this view of the text, furnishes not only a parallel oppression, but a parallel *cause* for the oppression. And if this view of the text be not allowed, *there is no fitting parallel* between the circumstances and events of that time of old and the one soon to be. Therefore, I firmly believe that Ex. 5:5 was emphatically one of the things which was written for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come. 1 Cor. 10:11.

This view of the text furnishes additional light also upon other texts, Deut. 5:14, 15, for instance. There, Moses, after rehearsing the fourth commandment

up to the place where the man-servant, the maid-servant, and the stranger are mentioned,

698

breaks off and adds, "That thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou. And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt." In this view, this was an appeal to the personal experience of every one, under the Sabbath commandment. And more, they were to remember how God had wrought for them with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm, and how he had punished their oppressors. They were to draw from that the lesson that they should not oppress the keepers of the Sabbath of the Lord, lest they be like Pharaoh [*sic.*] and all his host. And the lesson was not for them alone, but for all people, and all time. Rev. 13:10-18; 14:9-12.

Further: this view of the text shows that the duty of keeping the Sabbath was the main cause of their deliverance, and decisively excludes it as the consequence. For if they had not been required to keep the Sabbath, their oppression would not have been so great; and if their oppression had not been so great, they would not yet have been delivered.

Once more, and with this I close: if this view of the text be allowed, and if it be shown that the keeping of the Sabbath was a point of conflict in Egypt, before the Exode, then we have a strong additional refutation of the claim that it originated in the wilderness. Other reasons might be given for this interpretation of the text, but I think these are amply sufficient to justify us in the belief that it is the correct one.

ALONZO T. JONES.

The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, Vol. 66 (1889)

March 19, 1889

**"Circulate the Petitions" *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 66,
12 , pp. 183, 184.**

THE fiftieth Congress has expired; and both the national Sunday law and the proposed Religious Amendment to the Constitution are dead, so far as legislation is concerned, for the present. But this must not be taken as a sign for us to stop circulating the petition against religious legislation, and for the maintenance of the Constitution as it is. Instead of being taken as a sign to stop circulating the petitions, it ought to be the signal for more active circulation of them, if possible, because it gives us another little time of assured peace in which to work. Although the proposed legislation is dead, the movement for the Sunday law and the Religious Amendment is not by any means dead; those in favor of these things are just as active as ever, and as much determined to make their movement successful. Between now and the time when the next Congress meets, next December, the workers for religious legislation will do all in their power to gather such strength that when that body does assemble, they can

renew their efforts, backed by such influence as will make their efforts successful. And from the way that they have conducted their movement so far, it may be fairly concluded that they will not be overscrupulous as to the means by which they shall secure support and influence. Besides, at the next effort, they will have before them two years in which to work to carry the legislation which they demand. If the session which has just expired had not been a short one, there is no assurance at all that the Sunday bill would not have passed almost as it is. But when they shall come to it the next time, with a new Congress, and two years in which to work, and probably with a considerably modified bill, the probabilities are that they may secure it. this being so, it becomes us to be more diligent and more earnest than we have yet been, in the circulation of the petitions, and the spread of the truth which makes known the principles of righteousness and of liberty. We have from not till next December assured us in which to work. After that, we cannot be so sure of further time, to any great length, while that Congress shall continue. Therefore, as the Lord in mercy has given us this little time of assured peace and liberty, it certainly becomes us to show our gratitude for it by more diligent work and more earnest spreading of the truth than we have ever before shown. Let every lover of the third angel's message awake to the importance of the time, and work while it is called to-day; for we know not how soon shall come the night, when no man can work.

In circulating the petition which we have, persons are sometimes met who propose a modification of it to suit themselves, saying that if it were modified thus and so, they could freely sign it; and that they have friends whom they could also get to sign it. we have received letters to this effect, proposing, at the suggestion of certain persons, modified forms of petition, and asking to have some printed to suit this demand, so that these persons might be induced to sign them.

We here insert the genuine petition which is being circulated:—

We, the undersigned, adult residents of the United States, twenty-one years of age or more, hereby respectfully, but earnestly, petition your Honorable Body not to pass any bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord's day, or any other religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite; nor to favor in any way the adoption of any resolution for the amendment of the National Constitution that would in any way give preference to the principles of any one religion above another, or that will in any way sanction legislation upon the subject of religion: but that the total separation between Religion and the State, assured by our National Constitution as it now is, may forever remain as our fathers established it.

One brother, writing to us, said that in his town there is a friend of his "who is a lawyer of more than ordinary standing and influence, most of whose practice is in the higher courts, a member of the Congregational Church, a prohibitionist of national reputation, having run on that ticket for Judge of the Supreme Court of his State twice, and once for governor of his State, and once for Vice-President of the United States; he being, furthermore, very liberal toward our people, and anxious to sign the petition if some slight modifications could be made in it." The brother thought that the influence and help of such a man were worth securing.

The petition modified as proposed by this gentleman, would read as follows, his modifications in italics:—

We the undersigned, adult residents of the United States, twenty-one years of age or more, hereby respectfully, but earnestly, petition your Honorable Body not to pass any bill *to coerce—but only to protect* the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord's day, or any other religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite; nor to favor in any way the adoption of any resolution for the amendment of the National Constitution that would in any way give preference to the principles of any *religious sect or sects* above *others*, or that will in any way sanction legislation upon the subject of *sectarian* religion: but that the total separation between *church* and the state, assured by our National Constitution as it now is, may forever remain as our fathers established it.

We doubt not at all that the gentleman is anxious to sign such a petition. There is no National Reformer in the country, nor a person who favors religious legislation, that is not equally anxious to sign the petition, if it could only be modified as this one is. His modification in regard to the Sabbath, or Lord's day, clause is apparently harmless, although Senator Blair says that "protect" is a stronger word than "promote," as it implies the use of the national power; but this modification in reference to the amendment to the Constitution would make the petition ask for the very thing that Senator Blair proposed in his resolution for the amendment of the Constitution. And his substitution of the word "church" for "religion" is precisely the National Reformers' argument: they want to put the word "church" instead of "religion" into the first amendment to the Constitution as it now is. But what the National Reformers want our Constitution to say, and the kind of legislation they want on the subject of religion, is precisely what no man who has any respect for his own religion or that of anybody else, or any respect for the rights of men, ought ever to want. We can never circulate any such petition as is proposed in this modified form. Such a petition would justify legislation upon religious questions, and a perfect union of church and state.

Another modified form has been sent us by a brother in another State, who is circulating the petition at the capital of his State. He says that members of the State legislature and other leading men at the capital objected to the Sabbath clause in our petition, and on that account refused to sign it. he had succeeded in mollifying all but one, a State senator, by presenting to them for signature the following petition:—

We, the undersigned, adult residents of the United States, twenty-one years of age or more, hereby respectfully, but earnestly, petition your Honorable Body not to pass any bill *favoring any* ecclesiastical institution or rite; nor to adopt any resolution for the amendment of the National Constitution that *will* give preference to the principles of any one religion above another, or that will sanction legislation upon the subject of religion: but that the total separation between *church* and the state, assured by our National

Constitution as it now is, may forever remain as our fathers established it.

So far as any material change goes, this petition calls for almost precisely what the other one does. This one asks that no bill may be passed favoring any *ecclesiastical* rite or institution. But the ones who would sign this petition are fully in favor of a bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord's day, or other *religious* institutions; that is, they would be in favor of enforcing religious institutions, if they are not institutions established by the *church*. But this does not mend the matter a particle. Enforcing religious observances of any kind, whether the institution be established by the church or by the Lord, is only religious despotism, and is the enforcement of hypocrisy, and can only multiply sin. This petition also, as the other, proposes to substitute the word "church" for "religion;" and like that, therefore, this petition and those who sign it would favor exactly what the National Reformers favor, and this petition would ask for the very thing that they ask for. Thus the brother, in being so ready to modify our petition, and to get their signatures, is working directly in favor of the legislation and the movement which he professedly opposes. Undoubtedly he could get all the National Reformers he could visit, to sign that petition. But we are not working in favor of the National Reform movement; we are working against it. more than this: we are not working for numbers; we are working for principles.

Another proposed to substitute a new petition entirely, as follows:—

We, the undersigned, citizens of the United States, earnestly and respectfully remonstrate against the passage of a bill now pending in Congress, entitled, "A bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, as a day of rest, and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship;" and also against any bill or amendment to the Constitution in relation to the observance of Sunday, or religious services and observances on any day of the week, that would tend to give a preference or advantage to one religious sect over any other, or to create a union between the church and the state.

This was drawn up by a prominent lawyer in a large city. He argued in favor of it, that Congress has the right to legislate in regard to the Lord's day or any day that it may choose; but that it had no right to legislate in such a way as to infringe on the rights of others. But if Congress has the right to legislate in regard to the Lord's day, it has an equal right to legislate in regard to the Lord's Supper, or the Lord's prayer, or anything or everything else that is the Lord's. The fact is, Congress has no right to legislate on anything that is the Lord's. This also proposes the National Reform substitute of "church" for "religion," so

184

that legislation may be to any extent in favor of religion and be all right, so long as no particular church is named. Nobody should ever sign any such petition or remonstrance as this.

The object of circulating the petition is not simply to get people to sign some petition, and if they will not sign the genuine one, modify it till they are so satisfied with it that they can sign. Such is not at all the purpose of circulating the petition.

The petition which we circulate, embodies the principles of the American Constitution and of Jesus Christ on this subject; and it is to maintain these principles that the petition is being circulated. And these principles are to be maintained without modification and without compromise. The petition represents the third angel's message in that phase of it, and the third angel's message makes no compromise. It does not propose to move by the influence of numbers obtained by compromise and modification. It proposes to move upon principles,—the principles of Jesus Christ, the Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution, with no modifications, and with no compromises.

Therefore, whoever will not sign this petition as it is printed, needs to be enlightened upon the subject of the relation between religion and the civil government; he needs to be instructed as to what the petition represents, instead of modifying the petition to satisfy himself and confirm National Reform views, and promote National Reform principles. If the brethren who are circulating the petitions are not prepared to give such instruction, and to explain to others what it represents, they should become prepared to do so before going any farther. And in becoming prepared to do so, they are only becoming acquainted with the principles of the third angel's message; and in explaining to others the object of the petition, they are, in fact, making them acquainted with the third angel's message. Instead, therefore, of modifying the petition to suit the views of different persons, become acquainted with the principles which underlie it, so that you can explain them, that those persons may discover the danger there is in the very modifications which they propose.

This brings up another question which has been asked. It is, What is the real object of circulating the petition anyhow? Is it to defeat legislation on this subject? or is it only a means of spreading the third angel's message? Well, it is certainly not with the expectation of defeating the movement in behalf of religious legislation, because that cannot be defeated: that is coming anyhow, though this work may delay it for a time. If we work earnestly and faithfully, in the fear of God, the oppressive law may be delayed, and our work can mostly be done in peace, instead of under dreadful oppression and persecution, so that it may be said that, in a certain sense, the object of the circulation of the petitions is to delay the legislation for a while, if possible. But the principal object of it is to spread the third angel's message, and to warn everybody against the making of the image of the beast. The third angel's message is given to us to give to the world; that message warns against the worship of the beast and his image. The making of that image is now being prosecuted with all the might of those who are engaged in it. But the people are not to be left without excuse; God has a warning to give against this. The principles of his truth, of his law, and the word of Christ are to be spread abroad to all the world, that they may not be led into this thing without having been warned of the danger and the evil that is in it. To thus warn them is the principal object of circulating the petitions. It gives every member of our ranks opportunity to work in spreading the message as never before. But these letters which we have received, proposing this modification of the petitions, and which really favor the making of the image of the beast, show that there are those even among Seventh-day Adventists, who do not understand the object of the third

angel's message. This is too bad. The time has come when every Seventh-day Adventist must become such a student of the third angel's message as he has never been before. We cannot do the work of the message without understanding its principles. The time in which we shall have opportunity to make it a study is very short indeed. There is no time to idle away; there is no time to be listless. There is only time for earnest, diligent, prayerful study, and faithful work. The crisis will soon be upon us; God will cut short his work in righteousness, and the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name, shall be given to those who shall have loved the truth, and endured the conflict.

Then let the petition and its principles, without any modification or compromise, be circulated to the remotest corners of the nation.

A. T. JONES.

May 14, 1889

"The First Commandment with Promise 11" *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 66, 20 , pp. 305, 306.

BY ELD. A. T. JONES

(Battle Creek, Mich)

TEXT: "Honor thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." Ex. 20:12.

This, the first duty presented in the second table of the law, is not only the first duty of the second great commandment, but it is literally the very first duty that can possibly come to any creature born into the world. This commandment, then, is of very great importance, and is here most clearly defined, because of the reason that the child must be taught to honor its parents before it is old enough to be taught, or to learn anything whatever about God; hence, the duty to honor parents is really the very first duty that comes to every creature at its entrance into life. Further than this, as it is man's duty to love God with all the heart, and with all the soul and to honor him above all else, it devolves upon the parents (who stand in the place of God toward a child) so to train up and teach their child until he reaches mature years. A great responsibility, then, rests upon parents, that they should so act toward a child, and so walk before it, as ever to be an example and guide, leading it upward to God. If so instructed and guided while young, the child will continue, as it advances in years, to follow the precepts early inculcated, and to honor God. If not so guided and controlled, the reverse is almost sure to follow.

Who, then, is responsible for the future, the parent or the child? The Scripture says: "Train up a child in the way he should go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it." This is positive proof that a parent will have God's sanction upon intelligent efforts to train a child properly. "Honor thy father and thy mother" is laying an injunction not only upon the child but the parent also. As the child must

be taught, it will depend upon the character of the teaching as to whether it will or will not honor its parents. In Prov. 29:15, the last clause shows that a neglected child brings disgrace upon its mother. A parent, then, who leaves a child to grow up self-taught, is inexcusable. Habits become confirmed by age, and a child left to itself brings its mother to shame.

A parent should be persistent in instructing, never on any account slackening effort, ever so slightly, in the training and education of children. Paul says: "Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right. Honor thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise; that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth. And ye, fathers, provoke not your children to wrath; but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Eph. 6:1-4. How, then, it may be asked, would the Lord desire parents to train their children? Has God given explicit directions for parents to follow? Let us read what he has said, for truly we have no other authority. By reading Deut. 4:6-10, the last verse more particularly, it is found that the caution is given not only to remember all that has been heard and seen, but especially to teach the ten commandments to the children. In Deut. 6:4-7 is presented the first great commandment with promise, and that the same is to be taught diligently to children. Notice carefully the marginal reading ("*whet* or *sharpen*"). The figure used is that of a very dull-edged tool, an ax for instance. The injunction is to whet and sharpen the mind of the child diligently, by constant teaching of the commandments of God.

The human mind is frequently and naturally very dull, and a child's mind, if left to itself, is sure to be sluggish and stupid. It is lamentable that parents, as a rule, leave to others—disinterested parties—the training and educating of their children,—to the teachers of the day and Sabbath-schools, who have supervision over them for a brief period, an hour or so, at a time. And yet parents express astonishment, sometimes that their child is so slow to learn. How many of these same parents can remember the numerous sermons they have listened to, upon the commandments of God, or can even repeat the commandments *verbatim*? Very few, and yet, with all the opportunities enjoyed, if they prove dull of hearing and understanding, should they cast blame upon their neglected child, whose mind has been left perhaps, entirely untrained or uncared for? Parents, what better or more noble employment can you possibly be engaged in than fitting your child to honor God and to be an honor to you? Never be discouraged, then, but continue daily, hourly, to sharpen that mind; and eventually you will find the lessons instilled coming to the child's lips—repetitions of precious words, truths, and promises, learned from you.

Let not the teaching be confined to formal lessons or seasons of instruction. The efforts put forth should be patient, diligent, continuous, varying with the circumstances and surroundings. In Sabbath-schools, too, while the lessons must necessarily be made plain and intelligible, yet underlying the instruction, in order to be successful, comes the faculty of studying the children themselves, and adapting the lesson to their various temperaments. So with the work of the parents. Children cannot all be treated alike. Each character should be carefully studied, and the instruction varied to suit each little mind. A pious divine once

said that, when a young man, he had frequently to split many a knotty, gnarled log, and he learned to begin at the biggest knot and follow it in to the heart. Brethren, so act with your children.

"Therefore shall ye lay up these my words in your heart, and in your soul, and bind them for a sign upon your hand, that they may be as frontlets between your eyes. And ye shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt write them upon the door-posts of thine house, and upon thy gates, that your days may be multiplied, and the days of your children, in the land which the Lord sware unto your fathers to give them, as the days of heaven upon the earth." Deut. 11:18-21. Brethren and sisters, what think you would be the condition of the people to-day, and the condition of the earth, if all honored God and their parents in this way. In this connection, examine Gen. 18:17-19. There God declares that he knows Abraham, and that he is a man that will command his children, and so he trusts him, and takes him to be the foundation for the promise; but if his children had not been controlled, and so had not kept the way of the Lord, the promise could not have been fulfilled through Abraham. Yet back of that, is this thought: if Abraham had not been a man who would command his children, he would never have been called. Now read in 1 Sam. 2:12-17, the case of Eli, the high priest, who allowed his sons to take such a vicious course that the people coming to worship, turned away in abhorrence from the service of the Lord. Had Eli ever taught them to hearken to his voice?—No, he simply talked to them. "Why do ye such things, for I hear of your evil-dealings by all this people." (See verse 22-25). It was different with Abraham. He commanded his children; and they knew that when their father spoke, he meant what he said, and that they must obey him.

Whenever parents take the course that Eli did, it teaches children to be disobedient. Do not trifle with a child. When you give a command, insist upon its being obeyed; otherwise you teach the child to despise your authority. It is human nature to go as near to disobedience as possible and evade punishment. Let the parent,

306

therefore, ever be careful in commanding children, that nothing be required of them which, if neglected, will not merit punishment. The wise man says, "Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child, but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him." "Chasten thy son while there is yet hope, and let not thy soul spare for his crying." Prov. 22:15; 19:18. If a parent partially punishes a child, it soon learns to make use of pathetic appeals for mercy, to stay the correcting hand. In this way the value of the punishment is lost.

From such a stand-point, then, there can be no study presented to a parent that is more worthy of close attention than the methods of training children properly, because it is a portion of the study of the law of God. It is said also, "He that spareth his rod hateth [loves less] his son; but he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes." Prov. 23:13. I do not mean that punishment should be the sole rule of the house. It is really the last remedy. No one takes medicine until compelled to do so, particularly strong medicine—the latter only in critical cases. If Eli had

taken the right course,—and he was not too old when his children were young,—and he was not too old when his children were young,—he could have trained them, and brought them up to fear the Lord. See, now, what were the consequences of his neglect of duty. Read 1 Sam. 3:11-13. Why was such a terrible judgment pronounced upon his house?—Because he was aware of the crimes committed by his children, yet made no attempt to correct or to control them. In doing so, Eli honored his children more than he did God. If a parent is so tender of a child that it is never corrected, but allowed to have its own way, after it is grown, it is almost certain to be guilty of disgraceful and disreputable acts. God had promised that Eli's house should walk before him forever. It was much such a promise as that given to Abraham, yet it was withdrawn; it could not be fulfilled, because he failed to train his children as Abraham did. Be careful, then, when a command is given, to see that it is obeyed. Whenever such a rule is established, it will do away with fully one-half the strife in a household.

Paul says, "Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right." Eph. 6:1. A child is often taught to value more highly the opinion of the world than the teachings of God's word, and parents often teach a child to do a thing because of the construction the world will put upon it, rather than to do an act because it is right to do it. When a child is taught to live out what he knows to be right, because it *is* right, he is already far along in that training which God commends, and which makes of him a commandment-keeper. Insist upon a child's obeying because it is right and pleasing to God (not man) that he should do so. When such a course is taken, and the child comes to maturity, his life will be governed by the principle received in his early youth, and he will be certain to act from convictions of right. How early, then, should a parent begin instruction? is an important question. A physician was once asked the same question, and immediately inquired the age of the child. On being told that it was a year old, he replied, "You have lost just one year." It might well be said, however, that two years had been lost, because pre-natal influences often cause the bringing of a child into the world handicapped with a multitude of influences that tend to drag it downward.

"And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath; but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." "Fathers, provoke not your children to anger, lest they be discouraged." Eph. 6:4; Col. 3:21. Let not the correction be given in such a way as to provoke, torment, or make the child angry, because it might result in discouraging him. Use no extravagant language, such as "I'll eat your ears off!" "I'll put you in a dark cellar where a black man will catch you!" Such things are shameful, and should never be indulged in. A traveler upon a hot, dusty road in a broiling sun once came upon some children playing by the side of a cool cave. "Children," he said, "why do you not go into the cave to play, where it is cool and shady!" "Oh," replied a little one, "mamma says there are bears in there, that will eat us up." "Why, my child," said the traveler, "there are no bears there, nor any animal that will hurt you." In astonishment, the little one looked up in his face, and in a puzzled, startled way said, "Why, then mamma lied!" The harm done by the falsehood uttered by that careless mother will never be known until the day of judgment! Let your aim be to have your children realize that you always speak the truth. Never forfeit their confidence. If stories are told, let them

be such as will raise the child's thoughts to God, and help it to understand that God is a good and merciful Father. May it ever be our study, how to bring up our children in the fear, the nurture, and the admonition of the Lord.

May 21, 1889

"The Sermon. 'Thou Shalt Have No Other Gods Before Me' 21" *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 66, 21 , pp. 321, 322.

BY ELD. A. T. JONES

(Battle Creek, Mich)

TEXT: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Ex. 20:3.

The first commandment is now the subject of investigation. The first thing necessary in order to understand the commandment, and to know whom to obey is to know who God is, and what he is, that we may not have any other gods before him; because if we have wrong ideas in reference to God, we do not worship him, but another god.

There was once a people who supposed they were worshiping God, but they worshiped they knew not what. In John 4:22, we find this: "Ye worship ye know not what." This was spoken to the woman of Samaria, by Jesus, and spoken of the Samaritans. This people always insisted that their worship was the true one, and that their city of Samaria was the right place in which to worship, yet the Saviour told the woman that they worshiped they knew not what. The trouble was that their people had wrong ideas of God, and as they could worship only according to the ideas which they had, they were worshiping a false god. But said the Saviour: "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him." There is no worship other than this. He must be worshiped in spirit because he is a spirit, and can only be so discerned. No one can know him otherwise. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." Matt. 22:37. "So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God." Rom. 7:25.

With the mind, the spiritual part, man serves God, and the Holy Spirit enlightening and guiding us in all the holy ways of the Lord, shows us how we can worship him in spirit and in truth. Then certainly we, of all people, ought to know who and what we worship. Paul said, "I know whom I have believed." 2 Tim. 1:12. Do we? To attempt to worship God, and to entertain false views of him is to worship another god; that is, our views of God become our god, because we can worship only according to our thoughts. As we think God to be, so will the god be which we worship. If our views of God are wrong, we do not worship him, but another god, as truly as does the heathen who carves his out of wood. He knows it is not God because he made it, yet it embodies his idea of God, so he worships it. when we entertain wrong views of the character of God, we worship

another god as really, though not as tangibly, as though we should embody that idea in the form of a perceptible image.

As we gain a living connection with God by his Spirit, we are guided into the truth according to the way we are to worship him, his word telling us what he is; so we must worship him as he has revealed himself in the Scriptures. What, then, has he said about himself? This question brings to mind the importance of the Saviour's words: "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." Matt. 10:15. In coming to the Scriptures, then, we must not have our own ideas, because the carnal mind cannot picture to itself the true God. We must be willing to accept without question what the Scriptures say of him. Let us lay aside, then, all preconceived ideas, and try to find out who and what God is, and worship him as he is, and love him and him alone, and with all the heart.

That God is a real being, and not, as some creeds make him out, "without body or parts," or as another, "without body, parts, or passions," we must believe, because his own word speaks of him in words that in every way imply real personality of being. The Bible says he loves. This is a sentiment, feeling, or passion; but how can he love, and be loved, as the Scriptures say he is, if he has no passions? That he has form, parts, and passions the Bible plainly shows. "And he said, I will make all my goodness pass before thee. . . . Thou canst not see my face, for there shall no man see me, and live. And the Lord said, Behold, there is a place by me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock: and it shall come to pass, while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a cleft of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by; and I will take away my hand, and thou shalt see my back parts; but my face shall not be seen." Ex. 33:19-23.

The originators of certain creeds refer to Deut. 4:14-19 to prove that God has no form or parts. It does not say, however, that when the Lord descended on Mount Sinai, there was no similitude there, only that the people saw no similitude; and Moses tells why God screened himself from their sight: "Lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female." There was danger that the people would copy the forms of the heavenly beings into images, and worship them. Did they not finally make a calf and worship it, and say: "These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt"? Ex. 32:4. To prevent the people from so sinning, God shrouded himself and the holy angels in darkness. But God is real: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son. . . . who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of *his person*, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high." Heb. 1:1-3. There are too many such expressions for us to doubt that God has a person and parts: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who being in *the form* of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." Phil. 2:5, 6.

All such texts prove that God is real, that he has a form. The ideas of the creeds are all not only contradictory to these assertions, but they are self-contradictory. They say that Christ is "very God of very Gods," that he was born

of the virgin, that he died, was buried, and rose again, and ascended to heaven, where he sits at the right hand of God; and shall come again to judge the world. How, then, is it possible that he can be without body or parts? The trouble with the creeds is, they are man-made, and therefore express simply man's ideas. Let us read a few more verses, not that we can obtain a personal description of God, for the reason that he dwells in light to which no man can approach; but his dwelling, his throne, etc., have been seen, and I read about them to prove that he is an actual being. Paul tells us this: "But without faith it is impossible to please him; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Heb. 11:6.

In the first chapter of Ezekiel will be found a beautiful description of God's throne; and if this chapter is compared with Rev. 19:5; 4:5, it will be found that the throne is not a stationary one of precious stones, or gold, but a living, moving throne. The "terrible crystal" mentioned by Ezekiel is the same as "the body of heaven in his clearness" of Ex. 24:9, 10. If, in connection with the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain, spoken of by Ezekiel, Rev. 4:2-8 is read, it will be noticed that John saw exactly what Ezekiel describes. Let the 10th chapter of Ezekiel now be read; and although it is not possible to comprehend it all, some idea of the glory can be gathered, and also what the cherubim meant which were placed on the ark of the covenant, and embroidered on the curtains of the sanctuary; and why the priest in entering the holy of holies, carried incense to burn and form a cloud to shield him from the glory of the Lord. In Daniel is found a complete corroboration of the description of Ezekiel. (See chap. 7:9, 10.) Hence there is pictured before us the throne of the living God, with all the surround-

321

ing hosts of heaven. Now, then, what is he?—"The Almighty;" the "Self-existing;" the "I am that I am." In the 4th chapter of Revelation John gives a beautiful picture of God and his holy attendants, and the living creatures under the throne and round about it: "And they rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come."

So much for the reality of God. Now how shall we worship him? He has described himself most perfectly, that we might learn what it is to worship him in spirit and in truth: "And the Lord descended in the cloud, and stood with him [Moses] there, and proclaimed the name of the Lord. And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin." Ex. 34:5-7. That is God, full of goodness and mercy. To be merciful is to treat an offender better than he deserves. "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, . . . but is long-suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." 2 Peter 3:9. That is God, and "God is love." He delights in mercy, and is "a very present help in time of trouble." Every possible expression is used to show his goodness and his mercy; and so when we conceive the notion that God is not love, and that he hates us, our impressions lead us away from him. God hates sin, because sin is the very opposite of what he is; but he loves the

sinner, and wishes to redeem him from the curse of sin. When we believe he hates the children of men, we do not worship him, but worship another god instead. We must search the Scriptures, and believe what he there says he is, and then worship him for what he is; so shall we have no other gods before him. We do not want any other god when we have one who is absolute perfection, one who is all kindness, love, mercy, and long-suffering to usward. What need can we have for another? And God has revealed himself in this character for you and for me—not for angels, but for us. If, then, we do not take him for what he reveals himself to be, we have another god. Every worshiper becomes assimilated to that which he worships. If we entertain wrong ideas of God, our worship will be wrong, and our character consequently wrong. God is pure, and he wants us to become so, and it is necessary that we understand him, that we may become as he is.

Let us, then, from this time on, worship God in spirit and in truth. Let us know what he is, that by the aid of his Spirit we may know whom we worship. "Let us, who are of the day, be sober, putting on the breastplate of faith and love; and for a helmet the hope of salvation, for God hath not called us unto wrath, but to obtain salvation." 1 Thess. 5:8, 9. Our great trouble is that we commit sin, and then being ashamed of it and too proud to confess it, we hold God afar from us, and picture him as a stern judge instead of a merciful, long-suffering father. When we act thus, we worship a false god; and as we have no faith in the living God, we do not bring our sins to him, and thus begin a course of self-punishment; this is identically the way a heathen worships his false god. Every good and pure and tender word in the language of man has been used to express the goodness of God; and above all, the cross has been used to convince us of his tender compassion for us, God so loving the world that he gave his only begotten Son to die for us. This glorious Saviour who walked our earth, exemplifying all of these noble qualities, said: "He who hath seen me hath seen the Father." He was the manifestation of the Father whom we are to worship, and he the God revealed to us that we might be saved from our sins. Why, then, should we want another god? If we want to become pure and perfect, we must worship the God who combines all these qualities. Unless we believe that God possesses these qualities, we can never possess them ourselves. It becomes us to lay aside every doubt as to God's goodness, and worship for what he is, that we may finally become like him. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." 1 John 3:3. We cannot be like him unless we worship him as he is. We must not doubt God, or have any idea that he is anything but perfection in love and goodness. We must draw from him that strength and power that will make us pure and good. From him, through Christ, comes righteousness; and when we stand before his throne, clothed with that righteousness, then will we worship him as he is, and with all the heart.

When we talk of God, we talk of Christ, for they are one. We worship God as the Creator of all, who is over all, above all, and who upholds all, by the word of his power and might. God was manifested in the flesh; so when one is mentioned, both are spoken of. He started the planets in their course, and they continue to-day according to his ordinances. Heaven, it is said, is the center of

the universe. But to speak of the center of illimitable space, however, is virtually to speak of the center of that which has no circumference. We know that heaven is, and that it is the place where God, the Saviour, and the angels are; but more than that we cannot know.

In the effort to grasp the immensity of space, the mind is overwhelmed, and devoutly takes refuge in the contemplation of Him who made it all, and who is above and beyond it all,—our Father to whom all can come,—and with him another, our Saviour, counseling together. Blessed thought that it is a council of peace for you and me! Do we then want another god? Let his goodness, his love and purity, draw us to him, and let us worship him in spirit and in truth, so that when he comes, we may see him as he is. When we see God as he is revealed in the Bible, we do not feel the need of any other God. Then there is nothing fearful or terrifying about this commandment. In it there are peace, joy, and the blessed promise of the fullness of God.

July 2, 1889

"Those Books—What Shall Be Done with Them?" *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 66, 27 , p. 426.

THE question will probably at once be asked, What books? The answer is, Those books which have been made necessary by the movement for religious legislation, and which have been written especially upon the point involved.

"The National Sunday law." This pamphlet is the argument that was made before the Senate committee last December, upon the National Sunday law. It is, in fact, more than the argument that was actually made there, because there were so many interruptions that it was impossible to make a connected argument as was intended. This pamphlet is the argument that was made, with such additions throughout as are necessary clearly to develop all the points that were raised; and there is scarcely a single point involved in the question of Sunday laws that is not here fully discussed and explained. All the fallacies and the wickedness of Sunday laws that is not here fully discussed and explained. All the fallacies and the wickedness of Sunday legislation are exposed; the Scripture principles upon the connection between religion and the State are clearly brought out; the objections that we have to meet in the minds of statesmen are there reported in the very words of United States Senators themselves, and the answers given in full to all the objections and to all the counter-arguments. The papal authority for Sunday legislation is clearly shown by plain historical facts that no one can successfully deny; and the utter baselessness of any Sunday law in connection with the fourth commandment, is fully shown by the plain established principles of legislation and of law.

This little work is now issued by both the REVIEW AND HERALD and the Pacific Press. It contains 192 pages, price twenty-five cents, with liberal discounts to tract societies. This pamphlet ought to be sown broadcast over the land before Congress meets in December next. The Sunday-law workers are

laying their plans as thoroughly as possible, to renew the effort at Sunday legislation just as soon as Congress assembles. This pamphlet will forestall the movement, at least to the extent of making legislators cautious in dealing with any such legislation; and this it would do in the mind of every man who reads it, the pamphlet being the product of actual argument, the outcome of a real occurrence, and the objections being those which are made by United States Senators themselves. All this makes it matter of such a kind as would be read by public men everywhere, and by all classes, whether they be in favor of Sunday law or against it, or whether they be practically uninformed on the controversy. Now, will our brethren take hold of this work in earnest? Will they place this pamphlet before the people? Those who have circulated the petitions for signatures, and those who are doing so still, can go right over the same ground. They can go to the same persons, and introduce this pamphlet on the "National Sunday Law." This is what should be done.

Another book for the times, is "Civil Government and Religion." This is a companion, we might say, to the "National Sunday Law." There are some things in each that are not in both; so that both books can, with perfect propriety, be sold to the same person. We will not say that both should be sold at the same time, but either of the books, when read, will make way for the other one. If the pamphlet on "Civil Government and Religion" has been distributed, this is an excellent preparation for the "National Sunday Law" pamphlet. If the "National Sunday Law" has been distributed first, it will prepare the way for "Civil Government and Religion." "Civil Government and Religion" has 176 pages, price twenty-five cents, issued by both the REVIEW AND HERALD and the Pacific Press.

We have already seen some of the effects of circulating these pamphlets. Persons who have been thoroughly in favor of Sunday laws, and were actually working to secure them, have been turned just as strongly against any such legislation as they were before in favor of it. As was said at the beginning of this article, these pamphlets have been made necessary by the course of current events. The third angel's message has now been brought to national notice, and it is never going backward. It will become more and more a matter of national concern. The message has now reached that point, and we to whom the message has been committed, must work to that point, or we will not be doing the work of the message. The Lord has given us this truth and this message to give to the people. We have been looking for this time to come these many years. It has already come, and now is the opportunity to reach the nations with the message. Shall we do it? or shall we fail? Here are the means made ready to the hand of every one. By the effort which is being made throughout the whole nation in favor of a Sunday law, the way has opened for every one to do something. The question is, whether we will do it now, while we have our liberty, or leave it till our liberty is taken from us, and the law shall have passed, and we have not even the liberty to buy or sell. It ought to be an easy matter for every one to decide, whether our work ought to be done before our liberties are taken away or afterward.

There is yet another book that must be mentioned. It has not been left until the last because it is the least important; for it is not so by any means. This is "Great Controversy, Vol. IV." It is true that this book must be distributed more by the regular canvassers than by the mass of our brethren; but this makes it none the less important that it should be circulated. None can read "Vol. IV." And have any excuse if they are overtaken by the perils of the last days, and are not saved. the matter in "Vol. IV." concerns our own time; and the very things that are now coming on, and the time of trouble which is to come, are of greatest importance; and the canvassers who can sell "Vol. IV." Ought to consider that they are indeed spreading the message in so doing.

These three are emphatically books for the times, and I repeat, The way is open for every individual to do something in spreading the third angel's message easily and effectively. Shall these books be printed to no purpose? Shall they lie on the shelves unused? or will our people everywhere enter at once, with all their energy, upon the work of circulating them everywhere?

A. T. JONES.

July 9, 1889

"The Sermon. 'Thou Shalt Have No Other Gods Before Me' ³¹" *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 66, 28 , pp. 433, 434.

BY A. T. JONES

(Battle Creek, Mich.)

TO-DAY I will call your attention to some passages of Scripture, to show you what it is to have other gods before the Lord. Turning to Job 31:24-28, we find that if we worship the sun or the moon, we have other gods. In ancient times, he who secretly or openly worshiped the sun as representing the One we cannot see, turned his face toward it; and the moon-worshippers—for instance, the Assyrians and Babylonians—kissed their hands to it as they worshiped, and as Job describes it. if we should do the same, we would deny God. None of us are inclined to do as these ancients did, yet we do see in the world to-day a sun-worship in the consecration of the sun-day, and its observance as a sacred day, being a part of, and adopted from, the ancient worship of the sun. In verses 24, 25, we find a still closer and more searching test. Job says that if he had made gold his hope, or had rejoiced because his hand had heaped together great riches, he should "have denied the God that is above." Such trust or reason for rejoicing is as much a form of idolatry as would be sun-worship. The tendency of each is to alienate our minds and our hope from God, and so to slacken our hold upon him, and inevitably draw us away from him.

It is natural to feel safer and more at ease with a good sum of money safely deposited in a bank, than when we have but a single dollar; but when this is the case, where, let me ask, is our trust? Is it not in our bank account? It is certainly not in God; for the man whose trust is in him, feels equally safe and at ease

whatever sum he possesses. "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy." 1 Tim. 6:17. "For riches certainly make themselves wings; they fly away as an eagle toward heaven." Prov. 23:5. "For in him we live, and move, and have our being." Acts 17:28. Now, if a man has but a single dollar, and that be sufficient for his wants, has he not all that he needs? has he not enough?

If the Lord chooses to prosper the work of my hands, and I hold it all subject to his order, I do well. This Paul tells Timothy: "That they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate." 1 Tim. 6:18. Let us not get the idea that it is a sin to be rich or to make money. One of the very best men spoken of in the Bible (Job) was exceedingly rich; so was Abraham. God attached no reproach to either because of it. Paul says: "Not slothful in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." Rom. 12:11. These are necessary qualifications in order to please the Lord. Now, if a man is not slothful in his business, and has the faculty of turning goods into money, where is the sin? Not in the making of it, but in trusting in the wealth after it is accumulated. "Godliness with contentment is great gain. For we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. And having food and raiment, let us be therewith content. But they that *will be rich* fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition." 1 Tim. 6:6-9. It is not they who *are* rich, but they who want to be, those who set their heart upon accumulating riches, that fall into temptation and the snares.

A man in business who follows his business, honoring the Lord and fearing him, prospers, and his prosperity honors and glorifies God. "Beware that thou forget not the Lord thy God." "And thou say in thine heart, My power and the might of my hand hath gotten me this wealth. But thou shalt remember the Lord thy God; for it is he that giveth thee power to get wealth." Deut. 8:11, 17, 18. If we remember this, and are "diligent in serving the Lord," being always "ready to distribute," we honor God in using our means; but "the love of money is the root of all evil." 1 Tim. 6:10. "But thou, O man of God, flee these things," writes Paul to Timothy,—turn away from the love of money, or the desire to be rich.

To know how to use our means that God may be pleased with us, let us turn and read what Job did with the wealth committed to him. By Ezekiel Job is classed with Daniel and Noah as righteous before the Lord. How, then, did he use his means? We find him saying that if he had withheld aught from the poor, wronged the widow, or eaten without considering the fatherless; had seen any suffer for clothing, or done anything against the orphan,—then, he says, "Let mine arm fall from my shoulder-blade, and mine arm be broken from the bone." It is safe to say that there are not many men living to-day who could take such an oath, expecting God to take them at their word, and not become one-armed men.

What lesson is to be gathered from this?—Why, that humble, righteous Job knew that his hands were simply a channel through which God dispensed money and necessaries to those who did not possess the faculty of accumulating for themselves, and that those who have means should imitate his example. Job did

not wait to be told where the poor were, but he searched for them. Does not God, then, give means to some that they may bless others? "Cast thy bread upon the waters: for thou shalt find it after many days. Give a portion to seven and also to eight, for thou knowest not what evil shall be upon the earth. If the clouds be full of rain, they empty themselves upon the earth." Eccl. 11:1-3. If the clouds never emptied themselves, what then? God forms them by causing the sun to drink up the water from the ocean, the lakes, etc., which rises and floats as clouds to regions requiring rain. If now the clouds should selfishly withhold the water for fear of needing it personally, or of coming to want, what would be the result? If now the Lord places in our hands more than we need, is it not that we may dispense to others who lack? Let every S. D. Adventist make as much money as possible, honorably and honestly, but hold every additional penny above that which is necessary for personal wants, subject to God's call. If every one acted in this spirit, the cause of God would go forward with a power never yet witnessed.

Now, if God uses the faculty of some to accumulate means for distribution to others, would it not be foolish for him to dry up the channels, and let the talents of his servants lie idle at the expense of others? It is not sin to make money, but it is sin to put our trust in it, and to accumulate for our own personal comfort and aggrandizement, instead of casting our bread upon the waters, that we may find it after many days. "But," says one, "I must lay up something for my children." It is far better, brethren, to teach them to make a living for themselves, and not to rely upon the money you may leave to them. It is better that your child should have less money from you, and be taught to make a

434

man of himself, than inherit a competence, which, perhaps, would make a fool of him. "Then I saw that wisdom excelleth folly, as far as light excelleth darkness. The wise man's eyes are in his head; but the fool walketh in darkness: and I myself perceived also that one event happeneth to them all. Then said I in my heart, As it happeneth to the fool, so it happeneth even to me; and why was I then more wise? Then I said in my heart, that this also is vanity. . . . Yes, I hated all my labor which I had taken under the sun, because I should leave it unto the man that shall be after me, and who knoweth whether he shall be a wise man or a fool? yet shall he have rule over all my labor wherein I have labored, and wherein I have showed myself wise under the sun." Eccl. 2:13-19. To leave a child a competence really causes him to slight the faculties with which God endowed him, and which God intends shall be used to his honor and glory. Is it not, then, better for a man to distribute personally the surplus means which God permits him to acquire, in a manner that will be pleasing and acceptable to the Lord, than to leave it to another who may in time become a fool and dissipate it? And even if the recipient does keep the amount intact, the almost universal reule is that wealth never goes beyond the fourth generation. Is it not the wisest course, then, to teach the children to become independent of all such chances? Such a course would leave one free to use the surplus means as God calls for it, and all danger of misapplication after death, by chicanery of lawyers or heirs, would be avoided. The Bible teaches the necessity of distribution while living, not the leaving to others to do this after our death.

As I before remarked, there is no wrong in having money, but much depends upon the use we make of it. "And Jesus looked round about, and saith unto his disciples, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God. And the disciples were astonished at his words. But Jesus answereth again, and saith unto them, Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God." Mark 10:23, 24. Those who have wealth, and trust in it, and rejoice because their hands have gotten it, and can sit down and take their ease, to them it is said: "Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee: then whose shall those things be, which thou hast provided? So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God." Luke 12:20, 21. Let God be above it all, else we deny him, and have another god. "Many," Paul says, "walk, of whom I have told you often, and not tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ: whose end is destruction, whose god is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things." Phil. 3:18, 19. These make appetite their god. Why are they enemies of the cross of Christ? Jesus said, Whosoever will be my disciple, "let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me." We cannot do either of the last two of these commands without doing what goes before it: first, deny self; next, take up our cross; and, lastly, follow the Lord. Those who are governed by their appetite are enemies to the cross of Christ, because their desires are paramount, and they cannot deny themselves. These have other gods before the Lord.

Alcohol, tobacco, tea, opium, all are gods; and those who allow any of these things to gain the mastery of them are not Christians, because they do not deny themselves, and do not take up their cross, and therefore *cannot* follow the Saviour. All these evil habits separate from Christ. All such are enemies to the cross of Christ. Paul says, "I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." Rom. 7:21, 23. And again, "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway." 1 Cor. 9:27. Conybeare and Howson say that literally the meaning is, "I keep under my body, beating it black and blue," the idea being that such a course would cause mortification of the carnal nature, and the old man (sin) would thus die. If our bodies rule, appetite and passion control us; we cannot sense the law; but if the body is kept under, then the mind can reach out and serve God. Why is it that men cannot overcome their tobacco and other evil habits?—Because they cannot *will* strong enough to do so. The will is not strong enough to conquer the body. What is to be done then?—Why, let them have their wills bound to the will of Christ, and then he will weaken the carnal nature, and give the mind power to resist the encroachments of habit.

Jesus wants our minds to rule so that we can serve the law of God. It is a pitiful truth that parents call children into the world weakened by their own indulgences, so that from the first the will is powerless against the appetites and the temptations to evil habits. Nothing can lift these above themselves, other than

the power of Jesus. The mind must be in subjection to nothing but God. If subjugated by carnal things, man is serving self and not God.

"For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God." Eph. 5:5. This is the pivot around which all other forms of idolatry turn—covetousness. A covetous man is one who trusts in riches and rejoices in the works of his own hands. He is an idolater. "Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth, fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry." Col. 3:5.

But there is a root beyond covetousness which must be destroyed. Paul tells Timothy this: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous," etc. 2 Tim. 3:1, 2. What results from men being lovers of their own selves?—Covetousness; and then all else follows. Selfishness, then, is the root of all. Paul calls selfish, covetous people enemies to the cross of Christ, because they want to serve themselves. Therefore it is that when the Saviour points out the way to God, he strikes at the root of the enmity against God—selfishness. "Let him deny himself." What was it brought sin into the world?—Satan became exalted with pride, love of himself. If, then, selfishness is the root, and covetousness is idolatry, we are doing one of two things—either serving ourselves or serving God. Which shall it be? let us compare the two masters? "For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: all these evil things come from within, and defile the man." Mark 7:21-23, with which compare Rom. 3:10-18. Now, as a contrast, let us read the character of God: "And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, The Lord, The Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." Ex. 34:6, 7. Can we hesitate? Shall we love God, or ourselves? Is he not purer, more righteous, better, more perfect in every element of goodness, purity, and truth? "Thou shalt have no other gods before me."

The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, Vol. 69 (1892)

May 31, 1892

"The Sermon. Late Decision of the Supreme Court, and the Image of the Beast ⁴¹" *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 69, 22 , pp. 337-339.

BY ELDER A. T. JONES
(*Battle Creek, Mich.*)

ABOUT this time in the month of March, it will be remembered by many who are here this morning, that I spoke in the Tabernacle on the third angel's message, and said that it was not essential that there should be any legislation at all for the making of the image to the beast, and the bringing about of all that the third angel's message warns against. There are many here this morning who doubtless remember the statement I then made; that from what I had already seen, and from what had already appeared in the drift of things in the United States courts, legislation was not at all essential to bring that about; but that there were elements at work already in the courts, that would establish it independent of any legislation, and that therefore legislation was not essential, nor an amendment to the Constitution, nor anything of the kind; and therefore, we were not to look for an amendment particularly, before we were to begin to prepare for the great things of the message and the coming of the Lord.

It was about this time in March, when I called your attention to this. Well, as a matter of fact, that thing had then already been done, though I did not then know it. on the 29th of February the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision that does more than any constitutional amendment could possibly do, or Congress either, to make the image to the papacy. Although I did not know then that this decision had been rendered, I knew from the drift of things before that time, that such a thing could be done, and perhaps would be done, without any legislation whatever.

I say again, that on the 29th of February of 1892, the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a decision on another question entirely, a question upon which there could by no possible means be fairly brought in such a point as this; nevertheless it was brought in, entirely out of place, and the image to the beast was practically made. All that remains is to give life to it by the enforcement of whatever religious observances any bigots may choose, who can control the civil power.

I thought best this morning to call your attention to that decision: to what it is, and to what it does. I received an official copy of it about a week ago, from Washington; and it does so much that it is of interest, that every one should know about it. It is of supreme interest to every one who knows anything about the third angel's message, and scarcely of less interest to those who do not know about it, but of supreme interest to those who do know about it, in order that they may tell it to all others who do not know about it.

It came about in this way: Several years ago, Congress enacted a law forbidding any aliens to come to this country under contract to perform labor or service of any kind. The reason of that law was that large contractors in the United States, and corporations of great wealth who wanted to increase their wealth with as little expense as possible, would send agents to Europe to employ the lowest of the people whom they could get, to come over and work. They would pay their expenses over, and allow them to work it out at very small wages after they got over here. This was depreciating the price that Americans should receive for their labor, and therefore Congress enacted a law as follows:—

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That from

and after the passage of this act it shall be unlawful for any person, company, partnership, or corporation, in any manner whatsoever, to prepay the transportation, or in any way assist or encourage the importation or migration of any alien or aliens, any foreigner or foreigners, into the United States, its Territories, or the District of Columbia, under contract or agreement, parol or special, expressed or implied, made previous to the importation or migration of such alien or aliens, foreigner or foreigners, to perform labor or service of any kind in the United States, its Territories, or the District of Columbia.

A certain church corporation in New York City hired a preacher in England to come over here and preach for them. They contracted with him before he came. He was an alien, and came over under contract, to perform service for the church. The United States District Attorney entered suit against the church for violating this law. The United States Circuit Court decided that the church was guilty, and rendered judgment accordingly. An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, upon writ of error.

The Supreme Court reversed the decision, *first* upon the well-established principle that "the intent of the law-maker is the law." The court quoted directly from the reports of the Senate Committee and the House Committee who had the bill in charge when it was put through Congress; and these both said in express terms that the term "laborer" or "labor or service," used in the statute, was intended to mean only *manual* labor or service, and not *professional* service of any kind. Therefore, that being the intent, and the only intent of the law, and the intent of the law-maker being the law, the Supreme Court reversed the decision of the lower court, and said that the act complained of was not a violation of the law.

So far as this goes, the decision is perfectly proper, and it needed to have gone no further. But between that paragraph and the closing paragraph of the decision, the declaring of this nation to be "a Christian nation," this making of the image of the papacy, was stuck right in, as much out of place as anything could possibly be. It is altogether false; it is totally subversive of the government of the United States as the people established it at first, and virtually makes an image to the papacy. So I turn to that part of the decision.

After reviewing the act of Congress, the reports of the committees, etc., and deciding that the law had no such intent as the lower court gave it, the Supreme Court proceeds thus:—

But beyond all these matters, no purpose of action against religion can be imputed to any legislation, State or national, because this is a religious people. [Everybody knows that this is not true.] This is historically true. From the discovery of this continent to the present hour, there is a single voice making this affirmation.

Suppose it be granted that this is "historically true," what kind of religion was this "historical" religion? Was it of a kind that the people of the United States now desire to see perpetuated? We shall presently see what kind it is; and that

whatever be the kind, or whether the people desire to see it perpetuated or not, it *is* perpetuated by this decision.

In order to get it before you in the most forcible way, I will first run down to the end of the decision, and show the interpretation and application which the court makes, of the Constitution as it respects religion. After citing "historical" statements which show that the Roman Catholic religion might be the religion of this nation; which establish the righteousness of religious test-oaths as a qualification for office; which require belief in the doctrine of the Trinity—the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, of course—and in the inspiration of the Old and New Testaments; and which establish the righteousness of Sunday laws,—after citing statements which establish the legality of all these religious things, then the court quotes from the First Amendment to the Constitution that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," and upon this, flatly declares:—

338

There is no dissonance in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning; they affirm and re-affirm that this is a religious nation.

Now when I read these "historical" statements, and you see what they say, and what they mean, you will know that is the estimation of the Supreme Court of the United States, *that is what the Constitution of the United States means*. I begin to read, as follows:—

From the discovery of this continent to the present hour, there is a single voice making this affirmation. The commission to Christopher Columbus, prior to his sail westward, is from "Ferdinand and Isabella, by the grace of God, king and queen of Castile," etc., and recites that "it is hoped by God's assistance some of the continents and islands in the ocean will be discovered," etc.

What religion did Ferdinand and Isabella have in mind when they issued that document? What religion did they profess? And what religion did they *possess*, too? Does anybody know?—(From the audience, "The Catholic religion.") Yes, the Catholic religion. And not only that, it was the Catholic religion with the Inquisition in full swing. For it was Ferdinand and Isabella who established the Inquisition in Spain under the generalship of Torquemada; and who, because Spain was a "Christian nation," sentenced to confiscation of all goods and to banishment, every Jew who would not turn Catholic. And by virtue of such religious activity as this, Ferdinand and Isabella fairly earned as an everlasting reward, and by way of pre-eminence, the title of "THE CATHOLICS." And that is a part of the historical authority by which the Supreme Court of the United States makes American citizens "a religious people," and by which that court makes this a "Christian nation"!

Now that is quoted to prove that this is "a religious people" and "a Christian nation:" and it is declared that the language of Ferdinand and Isabella, and the language of the Constitution of the United States, "have one meaning."

Then in view of that quotation and this decision, should it be wondered at if the Catholic Church should claim that this is so indeed, and should demand favors from the government as such? Everybody knows that the Catholic Church already is not slow to take part in political questions, to interfere with the government, and to have the government recognize the Catholic Church and give it money from the public treasury. The people know that this is already the case. And now, when the Catholic Church is virtually recognized by official action of the Supreme Court, and when the Supreme Court declares that this is what the Constitution means, should it be thought strange if the Catholic religion should claim that that is correct, and act upon it?

It is true, the Supreme Court does not stick to this side of the question all the way through, but turns over to the Church of England, and to Puritan Protestantism. But this rather intensifies than modifies the danger, as it opens the way for a strife among these religions, to see which shall be indeed the religion of the nation.⁵² This decision opens the way for that thing to be done, and all that the message tells about will come as the consequence of this.

As the intentions of Ferdinand and Isabella did not reach the part of the continent now occupied by the government of the United States, the court now proceeds to introduce documents which give to Protestantism the prior right here, and which do in fact make this the national religion, so I read:—

The first colonial grant, that made to Sir Walter Raleigh in 1584, was from "Elizabeth, by the grace of God; of England, France, and Ireland, queene, Defender of the Faith," etc.; and the grant authorizing him to enact statutes for the government of the proposed colony; *Provided*, That "they be not against the true Christian faith nowe professed in the Church of England." . . . Language of similar import may be found in the subsequent charters, . . . and the same is true of the various charters granted to other colonies. In language more or less emphatic, is the establishment of the Christian religion declared to be one of the purposes of the grant.

This establishes as the religion of this nation and people the religion "professed in the Church of England" in Queen Elizabeth's time. What religion was this? The queen's title of "Defender of the Faith" will help us to understand this. That title was obtained in this way: Henry VIII., Elizabeth's father, wrote a book against Martin Luther and the Reformation. He sent a copy of his book to the pope. In return, the pope bestowed upon him the title and dignity of "Defender of the Faith." And this was the Catholic faith. Shortly afterward, Henry wanted a divorce from his wife. The pope could not make his political ends meet so as to grant it; and Henry took the matter into his own and Cranmer's hands, and divorced both his wife and the pope. This separated the Church in England from the Catholic Church. Then that which had formerly been the Catholic Church *in* England, became the Church *of* England, the only difference being that Henry was head of the church instead of the pope. Thus Henry still maintained his title of "Defender of the Faith," and it was the same faith—except only as to the head of it.

Under Edward VI., a few very slight steps were taken further away from the absolute Catholic faith. Under Mary, a powerful effort was made to bring all back into full harmony with the papal religion. Mary soon died, and Elizabeth succeeded, and would have been glad to complete Mary's scheme, but could not, and was obliged to be content with things as they were left by Edward, for the nation and people, while in her own private individual life, she inclined strongly to the papal religion outright. So that the sum of the matter is, that the religion professed in the Church of England in Queen Elizabeth's time, was a religion which was just as near to the Roman Catholic religion as was possible, without being precisely that religion.

And this is the religion which the Supreme Court of the United States finds to be historically intended to be established here, and which by this decision the court declares now to be established here, according to the meaning of the Constitution of the United States; because the language of the Constitution and the language of all these other documents *is one language*, "having one meaning." It is to be expected also that the religion established should be as much like the papal religion as possible, without being precisely that religion itself, as the prophecy says that it would be said "that they should make an image to the beast"—the papacy.

Yet the court does not propose to be partial, nor presume to establish strictly this particular phase of religion without giving any other any chance or recognition. It proceeds next to introduce Puritanism, as follows:—

The celebrated compact made by the Pilgrims in the "Mayflower," 1620, recites:—

"Having undertaken *for the glory of God and Advancement of the Christian Faith*, and the honor of our King and Country, a Voyage to plant the first colony in the northern Parts of Virginia; Do by these Presents, solemnly and mutually, in the Presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil Body Politick, for our better Ordering and Preservation, and Furtherance of the Ends aforesaid."

Having thus established what it chooses to declare to be "the Christian faith" as the religion of this nation, the court next proceeds to cite historical evidence that it is legitimate to use the civil power to maintain "the disciples of the churches." This is done by citing the compact of the Puritans who settled Connecticut, as follows:—

Forasmuch as it hath pleased the Almighty God by the wise dispensation of his dinyne prudence so to Order and dispose of things that we the inhabitants and Residents of Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield are now cohabiting and dwelling in and vppon the River of Conectecotte and the Lands thereunto adioyneing; And well knowing where a people are gathered together, the word of God requires that to mayntayne the peace and vnion of such a people there should be an orderly and decent Gonerment established according to God, to order and dispose of the affayres of the people at all season as occation shall require; doe therefore

assotiate and conioyne ourselues to be as one Publike State or Comonwelth; and *doe, for our seluce and our Successors and such as shall be adjoined to us all day tyme hereafter, enter into Combination and Confederation together, to mayntayne and preserve the liberty and purity of the gospel of our Lord Jesus wch we now prfesse,* AS ALSO THE DISCIPLYNE OF THE CHURCHES, *wch according to the truth of the said gospel is now practiced amongst vs.*

By this "historical" citation, the Supreme Court just as certainly establishes and justifies the employment of the "Civil Body Politick" for the maintenance of "the discipline of the churches," as by the previous ones it establishes the Christian religion as the religion of this nation. And this decision declares that the language of this citation and the language of the national Constitution is "one language," "having one meaning." By this, therefore, the Supreme Court has decided that the civil power, even of the United States government, can rightly be employed to maintain the discipline of the churches. And this, as we know and have shown over and over again, is exactly what the churches are aiming to bring about by the national enforcement of Sunday laws; and this is precisely what is done by the enforcement of Sunday laws, either State or national. And this the decision of the Supreme Court fully establishes by its decision, and sanctions and justifies by its (mis)interpretation of the national Constitution.

So far, therefore, in this decision, we find a national religion established with the maintenance of the discipline of the churches. What next?—Why, the requirement of the religious oath of witnesses, and the religious test oath as a qualification for office. After citing William Penn's grant of privileges to the province of Pennsylvania, and the Declaration of Independence, in which "the Creator," "the Supreme Judge of the world," and "Divine Providence" is referred to, and the constitution of Illinois, in which God is recognized, the court quotes from the constitution of Maryland, as follows, and for the purpose of establishing the legality of the religious oath and the religious test oath:—

"That as it is the duty of every man to worship God in such manner as he thinks most acceptable to him, all persons are equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty; wherefore, no person ought, by any law, to be molested in his person or estate on account of his religious persuasion or profession, or for his religious practice, unless, under the color of religion, he shall disturb the good order, peace, or safety of the State, or shall infringe the laws of morality, or injure others in their natural, civil, or religious rights; nor ought any person to be compelled to frequent or maintain or contribute, unless on contract, to maintain any place of worship, or any ministry; nor shall any person, otherwise competent, be deemed incompetent as a witness, or juror, on account of his religious belief; *Provided*, He believes in the existence of God, and that, under his dispensation, such person will be held morally accountable for his acts, and be rewarded or punished therefor, either in this world or the world to come."

"Provided he believe in the existence of God." That is, in other words, no man ought to be interfered with in his profession or principles of religious belief, *provided* he holds these according to the dictates in all the history of the Catholic Church. It is the very doctrine of the papacy. It was also the doctrine of pagan Rome, before the papacy supplanted it. Paganism declared that "no man should have particular gods of his own, except they are recognized by the laws of the State." But the court continues this quotation, providing further:—

That no religious test ought ever to be required as a qualification for any office of profit or trust in this State, *other than a declaration of belief in the existence of God*; nor shall the Legislature prescribe any *other* oath of office than the oath prescribed by this Constitution.

That is the provision and the requirement of the constitution of Maryland. But, says the Supreme Court, that speaks the same language as the Constitution of the United States, and that the Constitution of the United States and this quotation have "one meaning." And although the Constitution of the United States positively declares that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office or public trust under this government, this decision says that it

339

means that no *other* religious test shall ever be required, as does the constitution of Maryland, for these documents "all" have "one language" and "one meaning."

So, then, we find that so far, this decision establishes a national religion, with the maintenance of the discipline of the churches, and the requirement of the religious oath in court, and the religious test-oath as a qualification for office. And what next?—Why, public taxation for the support of religion. This is justified and established by a quotation from the constitution of Massachusetts, as follows:—

"It is the right as well as the duty of all men in society, publicly and at stated seasons, to worship the Supreme Being, the great Creator and Preserver of the universe. . . . As the happiness of a people and the good order and preservation of civil government essentially dependent upon piety, religion, and morality, and as these cannot be generally diffused through a community but by the institution of the public worship of God, and of public instructions in piety, religion, and morality: Therefore, to promote their happiness and to secure the good order and preservation of their government, the people of this commonwealth have a right to invest their legislature with power to authorize and require, and *the Legislature shall*, from time to time, *authorize and require*, the several *towns, parishes, precincts*, and *other bodies-politic* or religious societies *to make suitable provision, at their own expense*, for the institution of the *public worship of God*, and for *the support and maintenance* of public *Protestant teachers* of piety, religion, and morality in all cases where such provision shall not be made voluntarily."

And says the court, This document and the Constitution of the United States have the same language, have "one meaning," and both alike, with all the other

quotations, "speak the voice of the entire people." So far, then, by this decision there is established here a national religion, with maintenance of the discipline of the churches by the civil power, the requirement of the religious oath and the religious test-oath, and public taxation for "the worship of God" and for "the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of religion." The wicked thing grows rapidly as it goes.

But what next?—Why, the requirement of all officers, of a belief in the doctrine of the Trinity and the inspiration of the Scriptures. This is established and justified by a quotation from the constitution of Delaware of 1776, as follows:—

"I. A. B., do profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his only Son, and in the Holy Ghost, one God, blessed forevermore; and I do acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be given by divine inspiration."

And the doctrine that is held all through the decision, that this thing and the Constitution speak the same language and have one meaning, is just at this point emphasized in the following words:—

Even the Constitution of the United States, which is supposed to have little touch upon the private life of the individual, contains in the First Amendment a declaration common to the constitution of all the States, as follows: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." And also provides that the Executive shall have ten days (Sundays excepted) within which to determine whether he will approve or veto a bill. [And there is a sly recognition of Sunday observance as constitutional.] There is no dissonance in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning; they affirm and re-affirm that this is a religious nation. These are not individual sayings, declarations of private persons; they are organic utterances; they speak the voice of the entire people.

Having now established a religion for "the entire people," with all the appurtenances thereto, the court cites and sanctions the declaration of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, that "Christianity is, and always has been, part of the common law," and then proceeds to establish the doctrine that it is blasphemy to speak or act in contempt "of the religion professed by almost the whole community." And this is done by citing the pagan decision of Chief Justice Kent of New York, which "assumes that we are a Christian people."

There remains but one thing more to complete the perfect likeness of the whole papal system; and that is the direct and positive sanction of Sunday laws. Nor is this one thing lacking. It is fully and completely supplied. As before observed, it is broadly hinted at in the quotation last made above. But the court does not stop with that; it proceeds to cite the Sunday laws as one of the "organic utterances," which proves conclusively that "this is a Christian nation." The words of the court are as follows:—

If we pass beyond these matters to a view of American life, as expressed by its laws, its business, its customs, and its society, we find everywhere a clear recognition of the same truth. Among other

matters, note the following: The form of oath universally prevailing, concluding with an appeal to the Almighty; the custom of opening sessions of all deliberative bodies, and most conventions, with prayer; the prefatory words of all wills, "In the name of God, Amen;" *the laws respecting the observance of the Sabbath*, with the general cessation of all *secular* business, and the closing of courts, legislatures, and other similar public assemblies on that day. . . . *These*, and many other matters which might be noticed, *add a volume of unofficial declarations* to the mass of *organic utterances* that THIS IS A CHRISTIAN NATION.

Now let us sum this up and see what has been done: There is a national religion established, and it is called Christianity and Protestantism. With this there is also specifically justified and established as the meaning of the Constitution of the United States, (1) the maintenance of the discipline of the churches by the civil power; (2) the requirement of the religious oath; (3) the requirement of the religious test-oath as a qualification for office; (4) public taxation for the support of religion and religious teachers; (5) the requirement of a belief in the Trinity and the inspiration of "holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments;" (6) the guilt of blasphemy upon every one who speaks or acts in contempt of the established religion; (7) and laws for the observance of Sunday, with the general cessation of all secular business. All this is declared by unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, to be the meaning of the Constitution of the United States.

Now what more was ever the papacy than that? What more than that was ever required by the papacy?—Not one thing. And all this is declared in favor of Protestantism. What, then, is this but the legal establishment, and that by the highest court of the government,—what is this but the legal establishment of the very likeness of the papacy? If there is one here who does not think so, then I wish he would tell us what more needs to be done, or what more could be done, to make the likeness of the papacy, in the *principle* of the thing?—in principle, I say, not yet in its practical workings, for life has not yet been given to it. But so far as the *making* of the things goes, and the establishment of the principles of it, the likeness of the papacy is made in this decision.

Look at it from another standpoint. Suppose an amendment to the Constitution has been passed by Congress and presented to the people for adoption. Suppose that amendment had recited in a preamble these very historical statements here cited by the Supreme Court, and then upon that had declared that this is a Christian nation. What then ought Seventh-day Adventists to think? I do not say, what would they think, but what ought they to think? Ought they not to think that if that should be adopted and become a part of the Constitution of the United States, that the image to the beast would be made? I think they ought, don't you? But even more than this has been and is now actually done by this decision. If such an amendment were even adopted, and so were made a part of the Constitution, it would still remain for the Supreme Court to define the meaning of it. But the court has already done all this.

The court has traced the whole course of religious purposes in government from Ferdinand and Isabella down "to the present hour," and has declared that this is the "meaning" of the Constitution *as it now stands*. This is the unanimous voice of the authoritative interpreter of the Constitution. Legally, and so far as the governmental action is concerned, what the Supreme Court says the Constitution means, that *is* what it means. Such then being the officially declared meaning of the Constitution as it now is, what more could be done even by an amendment containing these very statements, when it would still remain for the same court to declare its meaning?

This decision, therefore, is actually stronger, if anything, than an amendment would be in itself. Consequently if we would be justified in saying to the people that such an amendment would be the making of an image to the beast, how much more are we justified in lifting up the voice and saying to all people that this is the making of the image to the beast, that that image is now made, and that this decision opens the way for the fulfillment in completest meaning, of all that the third angel's message announces and warns against.

Now do not misunderstand. I do not say that the image is living and speaking and acting. I only say that in principle it is made. There yet remains that life shall be given to it, that it shall speak and act. The prophecy says, "They should make an image to the beast," and that "he had power to give life unto the image of the beast that the image of the beast should both speak and cause," etc. The thing must be made before life can be given to it. And so far as the *making* of it goes, that is as certainly done by this decision, as it could possibly be done in any other way. As to how long it will be before the evil thing shall be given life by the enactment or enforcement of whatever religious laws or observances bigotry in possession of power may choose to enforce—as to this I know nothing.

But this I *do* know: that in view of what this decision has done, it is high time to awake out of sleep. It is time every one should know just where he stands before God, and with respect to the message of warning which the Lord has given to us, that we may give it to all the world. Where do you stand? What are you doing? Are you ready for the work that is now before us?

(Concluded next week.)

June 7, 1892

"The Sermon. The Late Decision of the Supreme Court, and the Image of the Beast. (Concluded.)" *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 69, 23 , pp. 353, 354.

BY ELDER A. T. JONES

(Battle Creek, Mich.)

(Concluded).

THERE is another thing to which I would like to call your attention, and ask what it means. In the REVIEW AND HERALD for the last three or four weeks, the first article has been upon the subject of persecution, and giving directions how we are to act when persecuted. I would like to ask you what you think that means. God does not send messages to people to whom these messages have no reference. God does not speak to people whom he does not expect will listen. He sends a message from week to week directly upon the subject of persecution, and our standing before judges and authorities for the truth's sake. Is that entirely meaningless? In view of the situation of things, as God knows they exist, whether we do or not, is not the time of the crisis and the trouble right at the door? and the time of persecution hanging right over our heads? He has sent to you and me instruction how to get ready for it. Is that the use you are making of the instruction that has been given in the REVIEW for the last three or four weeks? I will read a passage or two:—

Jesus says, "Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves." But you need not meet the wolves in the same spirit that they themselves possess. You are to be "as harmless as doves." In meeting those who are fierce of spirit, you must manifest meekness and love, and the manifestation of this spirit will frequently change the spirit of the wolf, and a wonderful transformation will take place. "But beware of men." Do not open to men all your counsels. Do not put implicit confidence in those who know not God, and open to them the whole of the sacred treasure of the truth. "For they will deliver you up to the councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues." This does not mean simply that you will be scourged in the synagogues with the tongue, as many of you are to-day in the pulpits of the land, but that men making high professions will treat you with violence.

"And ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles." The light is to be brought before kings and before the great men of the earth, although they may receive it in the same manner in which Pharaoh received the testimony of the Lord, and ask, "Who is the Lord, that I should obey his voice?"

Kings, governors, and great men will hear of you through the reports of those who are at enmity with you, and your faith and character will be misrepresented before them. But those who are falsely accused will have an opportunity to appear in the presence of their accusers, to answer for themselves.

Then when you have opportunity to appear to answer for yourselves in courts before judges, will you be ready? Are you getting ready? Is that what this means to you?

They will have the privilege of bringing the light before those who are called the great men of the earth, and if you have studied the Bible; if you are ready to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and

fear, your enemies will not be able to gainsay your wisdom. You now have an opportunity to attain to the greatest intellectual power through the study of the word of God. But if you are indolent, and fail to dig deep in the mines of truth, you will not be ready for the crisis that is soon to come upon us. O that you would realize that each moment is golden!

If you will live by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God, you will not be found unprepared. If your work is wrought in God, and you will do as Christ has commanded you, your intellect will expand; for "the entrance of thy words giveth light." David exclaims, "O how love I thy law! It is my meditation all the day. Thou through thy commandments hast made me wiser than mine enemies: for they are ever with me. I have more understanding than all my teachers; for thy testimonies are my meditation. I understand more than the ancients, because I keep thy precepts."

"But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." You are now to get ready for the time of trial."

Now, are you doing that? Are you storing your mind with the truth? Are you storing your mind with the principles of righteousness, so that when you are called before courts, God's Spirit may bring to your remembrance whatsoever Jesus has said unto you? Paul stood there; he was brought to the test. He says, "No man stood with me,"—in the presence of Nero, too. "No man stood with me," nevertheless God "stood with me." How do you stand with God from day to day, from hour to hour? If you are standing with him now, you will certainly know that then he is standing with you, and he will stand with you both now and then; for he says, "I am with you always." If you do not know that *now*, how will you know it *then*? Now is the time to prepare. Are you read? Everything is ready but us. Everything in the world is ready but the Seventh-day Adventists. But the blessedness of it is that God is getting his people ready, those who will be made ready. But if you despise the message and the word, how can he possibly get you ready? But I read further:—

When you are brought to the test, how do you know that you will not be alone, with no earthly friend at your side? Will you then be able to realize that Christ is your support? Will you be able to recall the promise, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world?" There will be invisible ones all about you bent upon your destruction. Satan and his agents will seek in every way to make you waver from your steadfastness to God and his truth. But if you have an eye single to his glory, you need not take thought as to how you shall witness for his truth. . . . The time is not far off when the people of God will be called upon to give their testimony before the rulers of the earth. *Not one in twenty has a realization of what rapid strides we are making toward the great crisis in our history.*

That was written in Australia, but sent here and published. And while it was being written, the very thing that it pointed out was being done—that which opens the way for the very things that these words say are coming upon you and me. What use are you making of these things? The time is not far off when the people of God will be called upon to give their testimony before the rulers of the earth. Everything is ready but Seventh-day Adventists. In many cases it is the hardest thing in the world to get Seventh-day Adventists to see where they are. Everything is ready but the church; but God is getting the church ready, and he will get everything ready that will be got ready. It is so, we know that this must be accomplished in a little while. I thank God it takes but a little while for him to make a Christian. So many Seventh-day Adventists have been working for so many years to make themselves Christians, and have failed, that they fear to trust God, lest it take him longer than it did them.

You cannot make yourself a Christian; you have tried it all these years. When you and I in times past have been thinking that the coming of the Lord was so near, we hoped that it might not come so soon, that we might have a little longer time to get ready. How much longer would it take, in the way we have been working in times past, to get ourselves ready, fit to be accepted in the sight of the Lord? How long? You who have been at it the longest, and tried it the hardest, how long do you think it would take to get yourselves ready? You and I cannot do it. we have tried that long enough, and at times have been so discouraged with our efforts that we have almost given up in despair, but did not dare to give up entirely, because eternal life is precious, and we want to obtain it.

354

Yet the fact is, that we must have a character that the Lord himself cannot see a single flaw in,—a character to which the perfect law of God will witness that it is righteous,—a character that will stand in perfect harmony with the ten commandments, in their deepest, completest meaning. But we have tried our best to attain to this, but have only failed, deplorably failed. Now how long shall that thing continue before we become righteous enough to be accepted of God, and to pass the searching test of the judgment?

I say, another means must be resorted to. We must look beyond ourselves for righteousness. We must have something better than our own efforts to depend upon. We must look to another source for power to make us fit to stand before God. Thank God, there is a power that can accomplish that: and that power will accomplish it, if you will only let it. it is not a question of time with God. It is a question as to whether *you will submit* or not, to let him accomplish his own holy purpose. It is not a question of how much power is required to do it, but whether you will let him employ that power.

"Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God." How are you dealing? Are you swindling? Are you cheating your neighbors? What are you doing? That kind of people are not going into the kingdom of God. But thank God, there stands that other verse: "And such were some of you; but ye are

washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." I know there is virtue enough in the blood of Jesus to wash the sinner clean. I know that there is power in the name of Jesus and in the Spirit of our God to make the vilest clean in the sight of God. I know that there is power in Jesus Christ to make any man a Christian. I know there is power there, and it does not require a great deal of time for it to work. That power can make a man a Christian if the man will let it. For God has set forth Jesus "to declare *his righteousness* for the remission of sins that are past." It is the righteousness of God himself, and it is a free gift unto all and upon all them that believe, and there is no difference. And the righteousness of God will be accepted by the holy law. This is the character that will pass every test of the righteous judgment of God. This righteousness, this character, is the gift of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ. There is a character which, if you will receive it and depend upon it, will safely pass you in the judgment which is now pending, and which will soon be past forever. It is the character which God himself formed in Jesus Christ. There is a character that reaches from infancy to the grave; it is the free gift of God to every one who will take it. and if any one does not have it, he will be left outside the kingdom of God. But says this word that I have read:—

Not one in twenty has a realization of the rapid strides we are making toward the great crisis in our history. The angels of God are holding the four winds, and this leads many to cry. Peace and safety. But there is not time for vanity, for trifling, for engaging the mind in unimportant matters. We must empty the soul temple of every defilement, and let the Spirit of God take full possession of the heart, that the character may be transformed.

"Not one in twenty." On which side do you stand? Do you stand with the "one" or with the "twenty"? For my part, I would rather stand with the "one," even at the risk of being considered fanciful and extreme, than to stand with the "twenty."

The paper of the following week goes on with the same object; the paper of the preceding week talks about the same thing. What do these things mean? Why is it that instructions are coming to us as a people, saying that persecution is near, and giving instruction as to what to do when it comes? What does that mean if it does not mean what it says? if that time is not at the door, and before our eyes? It *is* coming, and God wants us to be ready when it comes. Are you ready?

Here is this letter from Tennessee, published in the REVIEW the other day, as to how the brethren were arrested there. I want to read that, and ask you what that means:—

Springville, Tenn., April 13, 1892

A. O. Tait, Battle Creek, Mich.

DEAR BROTHER: Yours of March 27 was received some time ago, and you requested that I should let you know all of the particulars in regard to the arrests made here for Sunday labor. Since my last writing, other facts have come to light. One of our neighbors was at the county-seat on business, and the State's

attorney came in and asked him if he lived in the Advent community. He replied that he did. The attorney asked, "Do they keep up their Sunday work?" He answered, "Yes, and none of the Advents will deny it."

Then the attorney requested him to give him the names of five of the leading church-members, which he did. The State's attorney said he had heard the circuit judge. Judge Swiggart, say he was going to put a stop to that Sunday desecration.

So the five warrants were issued, and are in the sheriff's hands. But it seems that he has understood that we will not give bonds, and so will wait until court sits, which will be the fourth Monday in May. These are the facts in the case. I will write again as soon as there are further developments.

Your brother in the one faith, J. MOON.

What does that clause mean which says that he asked for the leading members of the church? Such inquiries as that will be made sometime for the leading members of the Seventh-day Adventist church in Battle Creek. What does that mean to those who are now leading members of this church? What does it mean to those who are not? It means that when a whole people are violating the law, the leaders of that people will be the first to be prosecuted and the first called. I simply ask you, brethren and sisters, to think of these things.

Here is another pointer I picked up yesterday:—

Dr. Parkhurst, of unsavory notoriety because of his sensational methods for the "suppression" of vice in this city, has been invited to Washington by a number of prominent persons, including Senators Cullom and Dawes, Postmaster-General Wanamaker, Ex-Justice Strong and Justice Brewer, to tell what he knows about the "duty of the Christian church in relation to the execution of the civil law." This is significant.

This is indeed significant. For when men standing at the head of the government of the United States, send for a preacher who resorts to such devices as Dr. Parkhurst and all these modern inquisitors use; when men at the head of the government send for such preachers to know how the church can aid in executing the law, what does that mean?—It means that the two bodies, the Church and the State, are coming together. But in the day when the government of the United States calls the clergy of the United States to its aid in enforcing the law of the country, that day the government of the United States would better give up the whole thing bodily to the bad, and let it go. For it is impossible for any government ever to be as bad separate from the church, as every government is bound to be which is joined to the church. These are some of the things that are going on right before our eyes. What use are you making of them, brethren? It is time to awake out of sleep. Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed.

Do not these things mean that there is now coming to pass what the Lord said would come? Doesn't this mean that the things which the third angel's message has so long been speaking of are now here? Forty-one years ago this month, Elder Andrews wrote the first article that was ever put in print, stating that there

would be in this country a union of Church and State. In 1851 that was printed. It had been talked of before, but that was the first time it had been printed and spread before the nation. Suppose brother Andrews should stand to-day in this tabernacle and read that decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. What would he say to you? Would he not say to-day, "Brethren, there stands the thing that I told you of forty-one years ago"?

O, that he were here to tell it! He has been called away. But there are others who have not been called away. Will you not tell it? is it not time for you to tell it? How much longer shall we wait for the people to accept these things? What shall we do? God tells us what to do. Awake, awake; that is what he tells us to do.

Think of these things, brethren. There is much more of it. but think of this that has been told. I beg of you, think seriously of these things; for they are laden with meaning. They mean just what the third angel's message has been saying all these years. The thing is done. As respects the principle of the thing, the image of the beast is made. Yet *life* is not yet given to it. These warnings that God gives, show that it will not be long until life is given to it.

This, however, is not the only side to look at. Here is the bright side; God has shown it. This is the side that makes bright even the other side. Here is God's message to us in this time: "Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath: for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner: but my salvation shall be forever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished. Harken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law; fear ye not the reproach of men, neither be ye afraid of their revilings. For the moth shall eat them up like a garment, and the worm shall eat them like wool: but my righteousness shall be forever, and my salvation from generation to generation. *Awake, Awake, put on strength, O arm of the Lord; awake, as in the ancient days, in the generations of old. Art thou not it that hath cut Rahab, and wounded the dragon? Art thou not it which hath dried the sea, the waters of the great deep: that hath made the depths of the sea a way for the ransomed to pass over? Therefore the redeemed of the Lord shall return, and come with singing unto Zion; and everlasting joy shall be upon their head: they shall obtain gladness and joy; and sorrow and mourning shall flee away. I, even I, am he that comforteth you: who art thou, that thou shouldst be afraid of a man that shall die, and of the Son of man which shall be made as grass: and forgettest the Lord thy Maker, that hath stretched forth the heavens, and laid the foundations of the earth: and hast feared continually every day because of the fury of the oppressor, as if he were ready to destroy? And where is the fury of the oppressor? The captive exiles hasteneth that he may be loosed, and that he should not die in the pit, nor that his bread should fail [shall speedily be loosed; and he shall not die and go down into the pit, neither shall his bread fail. Revised Version.]. But I am the Lord thy God, that divided the sea, whose waves roared: The Lord of hosts is his name. And I have put my words in thy mouth, and *I have covered thee in the shadow of my hand*, that I may plant the heavens, and lay the foundations of the earth, and say unto Zion, *Thou art my people.*" Isa. 51:6-16.*

Are you his people? Are you his people? Let his words be true indeed. There is where we are to look. God says, Ye shall live. He says, You shall pass through unharmed. "I am with you." The time has come of which he has told us, of which he has warned us. May the Lord's Spirit rest upon us, that we may realize where we are, and be ready for this time of trial and test that hangs right over our heads.

June 14, 1892

"The Sermon. The Late Decision of the Supreme Court, and the Image of the Beast ⁶¹" *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 69, 24 , pp. 369, 370.

BY ELDER A. T. JONES
(*Battle Creek, Mich.*)

A GOOD many questions have been asked since this time last Sabbath, besides the ones I asked while here. Some have been asked to me; many, to others. I want to ask some more to-day. There were three classes in this audience last Sabbath: one class saw the truth of what was set before them; another class did not know whether to believe it or not, exactly: a third class did not see it at all, because they did not believe it. I have no qualifications to make to-day of what was brought before you last Sabbath. If I should speak on that same subject again, all I could do would be to emphasize what has been said,—that the evidences that are brought before everybody in the United States now show plainly that practically, so far as principle goes, the image of the beast is made. I say again, all that remains is to give life to it. I do not know how long it will be before that is done; I make no comments nor remarks upon that at all. I know nothing about it; but I do know that the thing is true that far. As to how long it will take to give life to it and carry these things into practice, I know nothing. I am waiting to see; that is all.

Here is what I would like to lay before you all. I shall do it slowly, and ask you all to think: I suppose that nineteen twentieths of those who are here to-day, and those who were here last Sabbath, are Seventh-day Adventists. That which makes us Seventh-day Adventists is the third angel's message; and that message is a warning to all people against the worship of the beast and his image. We, being Seventh-day Adventists, are, therefore, by the very name as well as the profession itself, professedly giving that message to the world. That is well enough. Now is any Seventh-day Adventist who cannot tell the image of the beast when he sees it, qualified to give that message of warning against the worship of it and the beast? I want you to think of this, therefore I will say it again.

The third angel's message warns against the worship of the beast and his image. That message has made us Seventh-day Adventists. We are therefore in a place to give that warning, and that is what God expects of us, that is what the world expects of us, and that is what our name demands we shall do. I say that is

all right so far; but further, I say, being a Seventh-day Adventist, if I cannot discern indeed, and know the image of the beast when I see it, then am I qualified to give that message to other people not to worship him? If you are in that position, are you qualified to give that message? If you do not know, and would not know, the image of the beast when you saw it, then what are you here for? I do not mean what are you in the Tabernacle for, I mean what are you Seventh-day Adventists for? What are you professing to give that message to the world for? Ask yourselves this question, please.

Let us look at the Scripture a little while. Let us read that prophecy of the beast and his image image in Revelation 13. The first half of the chapter gives a description of the beast and what it did; the latter part, a description of the image of the beast, and what it is to do: "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. And he had power to give *life* unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both *speak*, and *cause*," etc. That speaks first of the image of the beast, then a living image, then a speaking image, then an acting image. It is to be therefore a living, speaking, acting image of the papacy.

Then it will not be a mere statue, or a picture on paper, lifeless, but it will be a living image of the original. It will be alive; it will *live* like the other, and it will *speak* like the other, and it will *act* like the other. Now we have seen statues or pictures of men, and being acquainted with the persons, we could tell whether the statue or the portrait was a very close likeness or not. In general, they are so very close that any one who is at all acquainted with the original can recognize the likeness. Now when a person wants to express the closest possible likeness of one thing to another, he says it is a living image of it. you have doubtless heard persons, looking at a portrait, say, "It seems almost as though he ought to speak." That is exactly what the Scripture says about the image of the beast; the likeness is so close that every feature will be so precisely like the original that he will actually speak.

But how are we going to be able to recognize, and to know, that this thing is the image of the other? Suppose I had here a photograph, or portrait, large enough for all to recognize the features plainly, and should hold it up before you, how could you tell of whom that was a likeness? Who alone in the house would be best able to tell? Those who know nothing about the original, or those who are best acquainted with the original? I ask you to think of these things, brethren, because they will be for you to think of every day from this day forward, and more and more as the days go by.

I ask again, If I should hold up the picture of some one, who in this house could tell of whom that was a picture? You all know that it would be the one who is best acquainted with the original. If there was any one here who was acquainted with the person himself, had seen him, had studied his countenance and his features, and was perfectly familiar with him, he would be the best qualified to tell how correct the likeness was, would he not? If there should be one here who knew nothing about the original, who knew none of his features, would he be qualified to tell whether that was a likeness of him or not? This is the point I want to get into your minds: *If you want to know and recognize the image*

of the beast, and know every feature of him just as quick as you see him, STUDY THE ORIGINAL, study the beast. Isn't that correct? Isn't that the way to get at the trust of this thing?

Let us take that picture again, and hold it up before you: Suppose no one of you, nor I either, ever saw the person, or knew anything about the person of whom it is a picture, how could we tell of whom it was a picture? How could we tell that it was not simply some man's fancy that had graven it, and had made a picture of no particular person, but simply a picture from his own imagination? Not one of us could tell. But if any one had seen the person of whom this is a picture, and was acquainted with him, had studied his features and his characteristics, he could say in a moment, "That is the likeness of" such and such a person. Then, if you had any confidence in his statement; if you had any idea that he was acquainted with that person, or that he had ever seen him, then ever after, when you should see that picture, you could tell whose picture it was. Yet this would be to you only borrowed knowledge. The only possible way in which you could ever know of yourself, of your own knowledge, that that was a picture of that other person, is for you to see that very person yourself. And the more you should study the original, the more fully you should become acquainted with him, with his features, the expression of his countenance, and his characteristics, the more readily you would be qualified to recognize him in the picture wouldn't you?

Now the Scripture says that an image of the beast is to be made. It is to be a *living* image, it will *speak* and *act* just like the other. Then when the Scripture tells you and me to look out for the image of the beast, and be afraid of that image of the beast,—not afraid in the sense of being afraid that it will hurt you, but being afraid of falling into the way of worshiping it,—then the thing for you and me to do is to study the thing of which it is an image. Study that,

370

and get acquainted with that, and then you will have no difficulty whatever in detecting the image of the beast whenever, and in whatever way it appears.

Now aside from this Supreme Court decision which has struck the key of the whole situation, there are no fewer than a dozen distinct things now before the American people, any one of which if left to itself to run to its logical course and reach its logical outcome, would make all that the third angel's message warns against, and all that it tells about. I say there are no less than a dozen of these things. Now do you know that? Are you able to see the image of the beast, the features of the papacy, in all these things that are before your eyes? If not, why not?

As I said last Sabbath, more than forty years this thing has been talked about. For forty years it has been said that this thing was coming. Is it going to be forty years more before it comes? I very much fear that it will be more than that to many who do not see it now; for the very reason that the unbelief or the carelessness which has blinded the minds of those who do not now see it, will simply grow more and more upon them, and they will be unable to see it when it stands up alive, in its direct and positive workings; and so when it does come and stand here in its direct workings, enforcing the mark of the beast, I have fears

that they will compromise with it, and that they will actually keep Sunday, because the law says so.

Now some do not see the image of the beast in this thing, because they have a scheme fixed up in their own minds as to just what the image to the beast will be, and just how it is going to be made. But just as certain as one is in that position, he will never see it as long as he holds to that idea. Because that thing is not going to be made in the way that any man may imagine, nor according to any plan he would lay out. No one but the Lord knows exactly how that thing is going to be made. and it will be made in such a way that none can see it clearly except through the third angel's message. Just as sure as we fix up a plan in our minds, and say it will come just so, then just that way it will never come, because that is our way: that is the way we would have it come, and that is not the way it is going to come.

So please let me say to you, Never you fix any plan in your mind, not let any other people's ideas come into your mind, as to just *how* that thing will come. For just as sure as you do it, you will be just that far unprepared to see the thing and recognize it and meet it when it comes. If you have any such ideas now, banish them this minute, and never entertain them again. Never originate any of your own as to how it is going to be, nor let anybody lead you off, never.

This is the thing to do: Seek God, study his word that speaks of this, as he tells you to study it, and then stand, watch, wait, and be ready to detect that wicked thing the moment it appears, however it may come, and in whatever way it may come. Be thus ready to detect it and to understand its principles, and then you will not be taken unawares, you will not be caught in the trap. But just as surely as you set up your own idea and form a plan as to how that thing is going to be, how it will come in, and what features will come in first, just so certainly you will not be able to discern it at all when it does come: for your eyes will be on the wrong thing.

Let us return to the necessity of studying the original in order to recognize an image. There is the papacy, the beast, that has been made: its history, its living self, stands before the world. There is the original of which this is to be so close a likeness. Now I say if you and I will be prepared to recognize that image just as soon as it appears, and whatever feature of it does appear, we must be acquainted with the original. And if we would understand the *making* of this, we must understand the making of the other. Do you know how the other was made? Let me read a line or two from "Testimony No. 32," p. 205: "Protestants are working in disguise to bring Sunday to the front, *as did the Romanists.*" How did the Romanists do it? Do you know? That is simply saying that the image of the beast is being made now, just as the beast was being made then. How was he made? do you know? Have you studied that thing?

Well, says one, "I have not had time to give to these things as I know I ought to." Let me tell you, my brethren, you have no time for anything else. I know that there is in a measure an excuse for some of *the brethren*; but there is no shadow of excuse for any Seventh-day Adventist *minister* in that respect. No Seventh-day Adventist minister has any kind of excuse whatever for not having studied the making of the beast, and what the beast is, until he is perfectly familiar with every

feature of it, because that is just what he is here for. He is called of God as a watchman to this people and this generation, and he must not let his time run by listlessly and carelessly, and not study that thing and know every feature of it, so he can point it out to the people in whatever way it may appear.

The minister is entirely without excuse from that standpoint alone; but he is doubly so in view of the fact that, *nine years ago*, in this Tabernacle in General Conference, a testimony was presented in which the ministers were told plainly that that thing was working secretly, and would be sprung on the people unawares; and for this reason every minister of the Seventh-day Adventist Church was told to study that thing, to be ready and watchful, so that the moment it appeared, the warning might be given. This has been neglected these nine years, and to-day ministers who were in that Conference know scarcely any more about it than they did then. Those who were in a position then to take the lead in the study of that thing, and in following the directions of that testimony, took the other course, and instead of preparing the people, and preparing themselves to prepare the people, to see that thing, to show it to them the moment it appeared, they thought, "Well, that is all good enough to talk about, but then we must be very careful not to discuss that subject at the expense of the third angel's message and to the neglect of that." You cannot discuss that subject to the neglect of the third angel's message, because it is the third angel's message. Any one who is afraid of discussing or studying that subject to the neglect of the third angel's message, does not know what the third angel's message is.

In the words of "Testimony No. 33," p. 243, I would say: "May the Lord forgive our brethren for thus interpreting the very message for this time." Again: I say from the principle of the thing, standing as a minister, called of God at this time, it should be his sole object, and he has no time for anything else than to study that thing and become acquainted with it, so that he can detect any feature of the image when it appears, and show it to the people, that none may be deceived. From that standpoint along every Seventh-day Adventist minister is without excuse; but when God sends special instruction upon it, how to prepare for it, they are doubly without excuse in not knowing. All are still less without excuse now than before; because in the book "The Two Republics," every material feature of the papacy, in itself and in its making, is portrayed. And it is now *seven months* since the book was issued—long enough for every Seventh-day Adventist in the United States to have studied it thoroughly. How much longer will they put it off? Thus it is that some are now unable to recognize it when it stands right before their faces.

But just let me say to you, There are some people, *not* Seventh-day Adventists, who are able to recognize it. the Sunday-law people recognize it. Therefore I call your attention to what they say about it. I have here a copy of the *Christian Statesman*, the number in which was printed that very Supreme Court decision which I read here last Sabbath. The *Statesman* of April 30, 1892, says:—

The Seventh-day Adventists and other advocates of the secular theory of government are greatly agitated by this decision.

Is that true? Are you agitated over it? Strictly speaking, that statement was written, there was hardly one in a dozen of the Seventh-day Adventists who had learned of the Supreme Court decision. How, then, could the National Reformers know that we were greatly agitated by it? Ah! they know that that decision does the very thing that we have been all this time saying would be done. They know that that decision brings the very thing which we have been all this time saying would come. They know that this makes and sets up the very thing which we have been looking for. And knowing this, they naturally expect us to be agitated by it; knowing this, they know that we ought to be agitated by it. When they see this thing done, they know that that means what we have been talking about. When they see these things come to pass that we have been talking about, they know that that means what the third angel's message has been warning against. They know that strikes at us. They know that the very thing has come which we have been saying would come. Now when they know it, and are so prompt to declare it, ought not we to know it and be just as prompt to declare it?

Again: I ask, Are the Seventh-day Adventists agitated over it? if not, is it not time that they were? I do not mean to be agitated in any such way as to be shown in flighty or scared demonstrations, but in a solemn seeking of God, keeping pace with the message, drinking deeply of the true spirit of the message, studying God's word, his warnings, and instructions, and showing to others the light and truth which we ourselves have received.

(Concluded next week.)

June 21, 1892

"The Sermon. The Late Decision of the Supreme Court, and the Image of the Beast. (Concluded.)" *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 69, 25 , pp. 385-387.

BY ELDER A. T. JONES

(Battle Creek, Mich.)

(Concluded).

YET I know that some still ask, "Must not there be an amendment to the Constitution?" and, "Have we not taken the position that there is to be an amendment to the Constitution?" We have preached that there *might* be an amendment to the Constitution, and that a strong effort was being made to secure such an amendment. We have said that that is a way in which it *might* be done. But I never supposed for a moment that any one had ever taken the position that that is the way in which it *must* be done—that it must be done that way or not at all, or that that is the precise way in which the image of the beast would be made. we all know that it could be done that way; but I never supposed any one would fix upon that as just the way in which it would be done.

It was to call your attention to this very point that I said what I did here in the early part of March. From the drift of things which were then already in sight, I said to you that an amendment was not essential, and that we were not to look definitely for that; but that the danger was that it would be slipped in by the courts without any sign of an amendment at all. And this is precisely what was then being done, or rather had been done only a few days before, though none knew it.

There is another point worthy of consideration here: We need never expect that Satan will do his work so openly and plainly that everybody will know that it is he who is working. Are you not well enough acquainted with his devices to know that? Then ought we not to know that to accomplish his purpose in this, he would not employ means so open and palpable that everybody in the United States would be able to see it, and recognize his hand in it?—Indeed, we ought. The papacy was not made that way; and we need not expect that the image will be made that way. Everything that was ever done, every step that was ever taken in the making of the papacy, was by silent encroachment, by stealthy, underhanded means, by imposing itself upon the government and people before they were aware of it, or even suspected it. Thus was the papacy made, and we need not expect that the image will be made in any other way. No! The great mass of the people will be deceived by appearances and pretensions, until they find themselves in the very grasp of the evil thing. The question that concerns us is, Shall we to whom God has given the light and truth upon this very thing—shall we be deceived by it? or shall we be able to detect it?

There stands the *fact*; that by the supreme legal authority of this government, there has been established in favor of Protestantism all that was ever required by any government in favor of the papacy. Then is not that an image of the papacy? This being the fact, is it not now, this very hour, the calling and the work of every one who knows of the third angel's message, so to deliver that message as to awake the people to what stands before them, and to lead them to escape the ruin that speedily comes as a consequence of this fact?

That union of Church and State which made the papacy, utterly ruined the government which made it. It completely ruined the Roman empire. And so surely will the ruin of this nation come of this evil thing here. And not only this, but as this nation, as it was made, and as it has formerly been, has been a light and an example to the world, so when the order is reversed, and it becomes the agent of cruelty, oppression, and persecution, it will also be in this an example to the world; and the ruin of the nation carries with it the ruin of the world. As the example of this nation in freedom and liberality has tended to carry the world away from the papacy, just so its example in oppression and persecution will have the tendency to swing back the world into sympathy and alliance with the papacy. And thus will the papacy be lifted to the highest place that it ever stood in the world. And so will be fulfilled the prophecy: "And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."

And what is it that makes it sure that our names shall ever be found in the book of life?—The third angel's message, and that alone. For this message goes

forth in this the great day of atonement, and here is the word: "He that overcometh, the same shall be clothed in white raiment; and *I will not blot out his name* our of the book of life." The third angel's message brings to every one the security that the name of every one who receives it will be retained in the Lamb's book of life; while every one who receives it not will be left to worship the beast and his image, and to fall in the fearful ruin that comes upon all the world.

Then I ask you again, Is it not time that the people who see these things and know them, were preparing for what is coming, for what is in this evil step, and for what is bound to come out of it? Is it not time? We have been talking of these things all these years, and now when the time has come that it stands right before our doors, and when the very thing has been pointed out for these forty years has come, showing that the coming of Christ is right at the doors, are you glad to know that it is so? or are you afraid that it is so?

Here are a few extracts I wish to read and call your attention to. This was sent to me by the General Conference Committee to be used in the camp-meetings; and perhaps I might as well begin the use of it right here. This first extract is addressed primarily to "brethren in responsible positions," but it speaks afterward to "brethren in responsible positions," but it speaks afterward to brethren in all positions:—

Brethren in responsible positions, you are in danger. I lift my voice in warning. Beware! Unless you watch, and keep your garments unspotted from the world, Satan will stand as your captain. It is no time now to hide your colors, no time to turn traitor, when the battle presses sore. It is no time to lay down or hide our weapons, and give Satan the advantage in the warfare. Watchmen on the walls of Zion must be wide awake. Call to your fellow-watchmen in no sleepy terms, "The morning cometh, and also the night." If no response is made, then know that the watchman is unfaithful. It is no time now to relax our efforts, to become tame and spiritless; no time to hide our light under a bushel; to speak smooth things, to prophesy deceit. No, no; there is no place for sleepy watchmen on the walls of Zion. Every power is to be employed wholly and entirely for God. Maintain your allegiance, bearing testimony for God and for truth. Be not turned aside by any suggestions the world may make. We can make no compromise. There is a living issue before us, which will be of vital importance to the remnant people of God, to the very close of this earth's history; for eternal interests are here involved. We are to look constantly to the Lord Jesus Christ, the Captain of our salvation. All that Jesus did on the earth, was done with an eye single to the glory of his Father. He says, "As the Father gave me commandment, even so I do." "This commandment have I received of my Father." In all he did, he was working out the will of his Father, so that his life on earth was a manifestation of the divine perfection. The union of divinity with humanity in Christ, was to reveal to us God's purpose

to bring men into the closest connection with himself. We cannot possibly be happy without him.

The original apostasy began in a disbelief and denial

386

of the truth. We are to fix the eye of faith steadfastly upon Jesus. When the days come, as they surely will, in which the law of God is made void, the zeal of the true and loyal should rise with the emergency, and should be the more warm and decided, and their testimony should be the more positive and unflinching. But we are to do nothing in a defiant spirit, and we shall not if our hearts are fully surrendered to God.

Now is the time for God's people to take up the duties that lie next them. Be faithful in the little things; for on the right performance of these hang great results. Do not leave the work which needs to be done, because it appears to your judgment to be small and inconsiderable. Make up every waste place, repair the breaches as fast as they occur. Let no differences or dissensions exist in the church. Let all go to work to help some one who needs help. There is a cause for the great weakness in our churches, and that cause is hard to remove. It is self. Men have none too much will, but they must have it wholly sanctified to God. They need to fall on the Rock and be broken. Self must be crucified in every one who shall enter the gates of the city of God. The fierce spirit which rises up in the hearts of some in the church when anything does not please them, is the spirit of Satan, and not the spirit of Christ. Is it not fully time that we return to our first love, and be at peace among ourselves?

There are those who have prided themselves on their great caution in receiving "new light," as they term it; but they are blinded by the enemy, and cannot discern the works and ways of God. Light, precious light, comes from heaven, and they array themselves against it. What next? These very ones will accept messages that God has not sent, and thus will become even dangerous to the cause of God because they set up false standards. Men who might be of great use if they would learn of Christ and go on from light to greater light, are in some things positive hindrances, forever on the point of questioning, wasting much precious time, and contributing nothing to the spiritual elevation of the church. They excite doubt and fear. They misdirect minds, leading them to accept of suggestions that are not safe. They cannot see afar off, they cannot discern the conclusion of the matter. Their moral force is squandered upon trifles; they view an atom as a world, and a world as an atom.

Many have trusted and gloried in the wisdom of men far more than in Christ and the precious, sanctifying truth for this time. They need the heavenly anointing, that they may comprehend what is

light and truth. They thank God that they are confined to no narrow groove, but they do not see the breadth and far-reaching extent of the principles of truth, and are not enlightened by the Spirit of God as to heaven's large liberality. They admire man-made inventions and discoveries, but they are walking in the sparks of their own kindling, diverging farther and farther from the genuine principles of Christian action, ordained to make men wise unto salvation. They strive to extend the gospel, but separate from it the very marrow, the life. They say, "Let the light shine;" but cover it so that it shall not shine in clear rays on the very subjects that they need to understand. Some exhaust the fervor of their zeal on plans that cannot be carried out without peril to the church.

At this time the church should not be diverted from the main object of vital interest, to things that will not bring health and courage, faith and power. They must see, and by their actions testify, that the gospel is aggressive. But the light which is given to shine brighter and brighter unto the perfect day, burns dimly. The church no longer sends out the clear, bright rays of light amid the moral darkness that is enveloping the world as a funeral pall. The light of many does not burn or shine. They are moral icebergs.

Watchmen on the walls of Zion are to be vigilant, and sleep not day nor night. But if they have not received the message from the lips of Christ, their trumpets will give an uncertain sound. Brethren, God calls upon you, both ministers and laymen, to listen to his voice speaking to you in his word. Let his truth be received into the heart, that you may be spiritualized by its living, sanctifying power. Then let the distinct message for this time be sent from watchman to watchman on the walls of Zion.

This is a time of general departure from truth and righteousness, and now we must build the old waste places, and with interested effort, labor to raise up the foundation of many generations. "Thou shalt be called, The repairer of the breach, The restorer of paths to dwell in. If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." "Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law; fear ye not the reproach of men, neither be ye afraid of their revilings. For the moth shall eat them up like a garment, and the worm shall eat them like wool: but my righteousness shall be forever, and my salvation from generation to generation. Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the Lord; awake, as in the ancient days, in the generations of old."

Here is a message that came directly from New Zealand. I received it only yesterday. I am glad that it came; for it speaks concerning us right now. It is an extract from a testimony to Australasia:—

Just prior to His leaving His disciples for the heavenly courts, Jesus encouraged them with the promise of the Holy Spirit. This promise belongs as much to us as it did to them, and yet how rarely it is presented before the people, and its reception spoken of in the church. In consequence of this silence upon this most important theme, what promise do we know less about by its practical fulfillment than this rich promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit, whereby efficiency is to be given to all our spiritual labor? The promise of the Holy Spirit is casually brought into our discourses, is incidentally touched upon, and that is all. Prophecies have been dwelt upon, doctrines have been expounded; but that which is essential to the church in order that they may grow in spiritual strength and efficiency, in order that the preaching may carry conviction with it, and souls be converted to God, has been largely left out of ministerial effort.

This subject has been set aside, as if some time in the future would be given to its consideration. Other blessings and privileges have been presented before the people until a desire has been awakened in the church for the attainment of the blessing promised of God; but the impression concerning the Holy Spirit has been that this gift is not for the church now, but that at some time in the future it would be necessary for the church to receive it. This promised blessing, if claimed by faith, would bring all other blessings in its train, and it is to be given liberally to the people of God. Through the cunning devices of the enemy the minds of God's people seem to be incapable of comprehending and appropriating the promises of God. They seem to think that only the scantiest showers of grace are to fall upon the thirsty soul.

The people of God have accustomed themselves to think that they must rely upon their own efforts, that little help is to be received from heaven; and the result is that they have little light to communicate to other souls who are dying in error and darkness. The church has long been contented with little of the blessing of God; they have not felt the need of reaching up to the exalted privileges purchased for them at infinite cost. Their spiritual strength has been feeble, their experience of a dwarfed and crippled character, and they are disqualified for the work the Lord would have them to do. They are not able to present the great and glorious truths of God's holy word that would convict and convert souls through the agency of the Holy Spirit. The power of God awaits their demand and reception. A harvest of joy will be reaped by those who sow the holy seeds of truth. "He that goeth forth and

weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him."

Will you receive that? I know of my own knowledge that it is nothing but the unbelief of our own people that keeps back the loud cry of the third angel's message to-day. I know of my own knowledge that it is nothing but the unbelief of our own people that keeps back the power of God in its manifestations, in its wondrous power among God's people to-day. I have seen where there were floods of God's precious light, all except the merest glimmering, kept back from a whole institute by the unbelief of three or four. It was in mercy to the unbelieving that it was withheld. They were so unbelieving that if God had poured in floods of light, it would have destroyed them. Failing to receive and appreciate the light that was already before them, a flood of light would have overwhelmed them. In mercy to them he waits a little longer.

But, brethren, he will not wait much longer. He is doing so now for all those who linger and hold back, with whom he is waiting and longing and pleading that they receive it: but that will not last much longer. The world is ready: everything is ready but our own people. O! put away your unbelief. Put away your questioning and your doubting, for heaven's sake and for your own soul's sake. Believe the message that God sends to you day by day.

Now Jesus cleansed the temple twice. What does that mean? This will show you what it means:—

When Satan is now working with his lying wonders, the time has come foretold in the Revelation, when the mighty angel that shall lighten the earth with his glory, will proclaim the fall of Babylon, and call upon God's people to forsake her.

Has that time come? I turn and read from another page:—

Satan is now working with all his insinuating, deceiving power, to lead men away from the work of the third angel's message, which is to be proclaimed with mighty power.

Now mark it. When Satan is working with his lying wonders, the time *has* come, foretold in the Revelation; then the mighty angel will proclaim the fall of Babylon, and call upon God's people to forsake her. But that angel is to descend with his "great power" before the voice is heard calling out of Babylon. And *now* he is descending. That power is for God's people who will take it, but unbelief will never take it. Let your faith reach up for it.

This it is said is the second cry of that second angel, and the two cries of that second angel correspond with the two cleansings of the temple—the first cry of the second angel to the first cleansing of the temple, and the second cry of the second angel to the second cleansing of the temple. And this second cleansing was almost the last act of Christ's earthly ministry. Now what does that mean but that this is almost the last act of his heavenly ministry? Then we have reached almost the last act of Christ's work in the heavenly sanctuary, preparing the people in the heavenly sanctuary, preparing the people to stand when he comes. Is that what we see in it? That is what the Spirit of God tells us *is* in it. Brethren, will you receive it?

The Lord has presented before me that those who have been in any measure blinded by the enemy, and who have not fully recovered themselves from the snare of Satan, will be in peril because they cannot discern the light from heaven, and will be inclined to accept a falsehood. This will affect the whole tenor of their thoughts, their decisions, their propositions, their counsels. The evidences that God has given are no evidence to them, because they have blinded their own eyes by choosing darkness rather than light. Then they will originate something they call light, which the Lord calls sparks of their own kindling, by which they will direct their steps. The Lord declares, "Who is among you that feareth the Lord, that obeyeth the voice of his servant, that walketh in darkness, and hath no light? Let him, trust in the name of the Lord, and stay upon his God. Behold, all ye that kindle a fire, that compass yourselves about with sparks; walk in the light of your fire, and in the sparks that ye have kindled. This shall ye have at mine hand; ye shall lie down in sorrow." Jesus said, "For judgment I am come unto this world, that they which see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind." "I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness." "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day."

By many, the words which the Lord sent, will be rejected, and the words that man may speak will be received as light and truth. Human wisdom will lead away from self-denial, from consecration, and will devise many things that tend to make of no effect God's messages. We cannot with any safety rely upon men who are not in close connection with God. They accept the opinions of men, but cannot discern the voice of the True Shepherd, and their influence will lead many astray, though evidence is piled upon evidence before their eyes, testifying to the truth that God's people should have for this time. The truth is calculated to turn men to Christ, to quicken their energies, subduing and softening their hearts, and inspiring them with zeal and devotion and love to God. *The Sabbath truth must in no case be covered up.* We must let it appear in plain contrast with error.

As the end approaches, the testimonies of God's servants will become more decided and more powerful, flashing the light of truth upon the systems of error and oppression that have so long held the supremacy. The Lord has sent us messages for this time to establish Christianity upon an eternal basis, and all who believe the present truth must stand, not in their own wisdom, but in God, and raise up the foundation of many generations; and they will be registered in the books of heaven as repairers of the breach, the restorers of paths to dwell in. We are to maintain the truth because

it is truth, in face of the bitterest opposition. God is at work upon human minds; it is not man alone that is working. *The great illuminating power is from Christ*; the brightness of his example is to be kept before the people in every discourse.

Place yourselves in the divine current, where you can receive the heavenly inspiration, *for you may have it*; then point the weary, the heavy-laden, the poor, the broken-hearted, perplexed soul to Jesus, the Source of all spiritual strength. Be faithful minute-men to show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light. Tell it with pen and voice, that Jesus lives to make intercession for us. Time is passing; the end is near. We must work while it is day. You can unite with the great Master-Worker; we can follow the self-denying Redeemer through his pil-

387

grimage of matchless love on earth. Jesus came to magnify the law and make it honorable. He died to exalt the law of God, testifying of its changeless character; and as we proclaim God's law, we may look unto Jesus, and be comforted with the assurance, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." *The same Jesus* that walked with his disciples, that taught them upon earth, that toiled and suffered in his human nature, *is with us in his divine power. He is at our right hand to help us in every emergency.* Let us lift up Jesus, and reveal the Bible foundation for our faith.

I am deeply exercised in mind in reference to the low standard of piety among our people. And when I think of the woes passed on Capernaum, I think of how much heavier will come the condemnation upon those who know the truth and have not walked according to the truth, but in the sparks of their own kindling. In the night seasons I am addressing the people in a very solemn manner, beseeching them to ask their own consciences, What am I? Am I a Christian, or am I not? Is my heart renewed? Has the transforming grace of God molded my character? Are my sins repented of? Are they confessed? Are they forgiven? Am I one with Christ as he is one with the Father? Do I hate what I once loved? Do I now love what I once hated? Do I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus? Do I feel I am the purchased possession of Jesus Christ, and that every hour I must consecrate myself to his service?

We are standing upon the threshold of great and solemn events. The whole earth is to be lightened with the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the channels of the great deep.

I am glad of it. I am glad God says it is coming. I am glad to know it is coming. I am glad to be able to thank God that he gives me sight, that I may see it.

Prophecies are being fulfilled, and stormy times are before us. Old controversies which have apparently been hushed for a long time will be revived, and new controversies will spring up; new and

old will commingle, and this will take place *right early*. The angels are holding the four winds, that they shall not blow, until the specified work of warning is given to the world; but the storm is gathering, the clouds are loading, ready to burst upon the world, and to many it will be as a thief in the night.

Will it be that way to you? Are you looking for it? Are you watching, waiting, ready? Or are you sleeping, and unprepared?

Many smiled and would not believe it when we told them, twenty and thirty ago, that the Sunday would be urged upon all the world, and a law be made to compel its observance, and force conscience. We see it being fulfilled. All that God has said of the future will surely come to pass; not one thing will fail of all that he has spoken. Protestantism *is now* reaching hands across the gulf to clasp hands with the papacy, and a confederacy *is being formed* to trample out of sight the Sabbath of the fourth commandment.

Will you let it go out of sight? When the law comes, requiring you to keep Sunday, will you do it? Some say, "If we do not keep it, and if we do not shut up our office and stop business, they will take away our business entirely. All we have to do is to shut our office or shop, and do no work." Yes, of course that is all; but that is everything. Will you sell your Lord for the value of your business? Have you not known all these years that it would be so that no man can buy or sell who does not keep Sunday? Are you going to deny it now?

And the man of sin, who at the instigation of Satan instituted the spurious Sabbath—this child of papacy will be exalted to take the place of God.

All heaven is represented to me as watching the unfolding of events. A crisis is to be revealed in the great and prolonged controversy in the government of God on earth. Something great and decisive is to take place, and *that right early*.

Twice in that short testimony we find it saying it will be done, and that right early. What does that mean? Does it not mean what it says? When God speaks to you and to me and says these things are before our eyes, and that these things are going to come right early, and then repeats it, it means that the thing is established and will shortly come to pass.

If any delay, the character of God and his throne will be compromised. The armory of heaven is open; all the universe of God and its equipments *are* ready. One word has justice to speak, and there will be terrific representations upon the earth, of the wrath of God. There will be voices and thunderings and lightnings and earthquakes and universal desolation. Every movement in the universe of heaven is to prepare the world for the great crisis.

Intensity is taking possession of every earthly element; and as a people who have had great light and wonderful knowledge, many of them are represented by the five sleeping virgins with their lamps, but no oil in their vessels; cold, senseless, with a feeble, waning piety. While a new life is being diffused and is springing up from beneath and taking fast hold of all Satan's agencies, preparatory to

the last great conflict and struggle, *a new light and life and power is descending from on high.*

It is descending from on high. And while Satan is working from beneath, God is working from on high. While intensity is taking hold of all Satan's plans, what is gracing your life in the service of God, brethren? Is it not time intensity was taking hold of that? Is it not time we were looking about us to see what God is doing?

A new light and life and power is descending from on high, and *taking possession of God's people who are not dead, as many now are, in trespasses and sins.*

Yes, sir, it is descending, thank the Lord. It is taking possession of those who forsake their sins. O! will you let it *take and keep* possession of you?

The people who will now *see what is soon to come upon us by what is being transacted before us*, will no longer trust in human inventions, but will feel that the Holy Spirit must be recognized, received, presented before the people, that they may content for the glory of God, and work everywhere in the byways and highways of life, for the saving of the souls of their fellow-men.

Do you know what is coming, by what you see? The people who do see will no longer depend upon themselves.

This blessed hope of the second appearing of Christ needs to be presented often to the people, with its solemn realities; looking for the soon appearing of our Lord Jesus to come in his glory, will lead to the regarding of earthly things as emptiness and nothingness.

I know some argue, "Well, if Christ is coming so soon, and if all these things are so near, what are we going to do with our institutions,—our Sanitarium, publishing houses, colleges, etc.?—Why, we are going to run them to their fullest capacity, of course, till the last day possible, *and build more of them* besides, and run them all for all we and they are worth. Because, as men get hold of the idea that Christ is coming, they will trust God with their possessions. Yes, the day is actually coming, when even Seventh-day Adventists will have so much confidence in the Lord that they will not be afraid to trust him.

But still, in spite of all these evidences, there will be those who, not knowing whether his coming is near or far, will say, "We must put our money into lands. We will speculate and make more money. Then when the proper time comes, we will put it all into the cause." Yes, you will—not; because that time for which you are looking will not come in the way in which you are looking for it, and you will not put your money in the cause. You will not see till it is too late.

These institutions are going to do the work the Lord intends for them to do. And because time is so short, we need more institutions and more means. And as the time is so short, when the people understand it, they will receive the power of God and the Spirit of God which come down from heaven, and this will so unite them to the Lord that they will trust the Lord with their means.

Well, now what are you going to do? That is the question. New light and life and power are descending upon the people. Who will have it? Will you have it?

God said in 1885 this word:—

The spirit which characterized that wonderful meeting on the day of Pentecost is waiting to manifest its power upon the men who are now standing between the living and the dead as ambassadors for God.

In 1885 that spirit which Christ promised to his followers, was waiting to be given to his people. How much longer will he have to wait before you will open the door and let him come in? When he does come in, he will sup with you, and you with him. That means work—to sup with him in his sufferings. The time of suffering is near; and do not forget that as Jesus abides with us, so he also suffers with us. When the time does come that he will suffer with us, Christ will work for us mightily.

O! let him come in. He is a blessed companion; he is a joyful companion; he is our support. Let him come in; let him give you good cheer; let him give you brightness and joy, to give to those who have it not. He will give it; for he has it. "My peace I give unto you." Joy cometh in the morning, and he says, "Rejoice evermore." "The morning cometh; also the night." Which will you have? Which will you have?

August 2, 1892

"The Sermon. The Gospel: What It Is, and Its Work as Opposed to the Mystery of Iniquity" *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 69, 31 , pp. 481-483.

BY ELDER A. T. JONES

TEXT: "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen." Matt. 28:18-20.

That which they were to teach all nations is spoken of by Mark as "the gospel," going into all the world and preaching the gospel to every creature. He that believes not shall be damned. But according to Luke, the Saviour said unto them, "Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." Luke 24:49. Then in Acts 1:5-8:—

"For ye have been baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence. When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power. But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."

All these verses are essential for us to know the full force of the commission which the Lord gave his disciples at that time. They were to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, teaching that to all nations; and yet they were not to go until they were endued with power from on high. It would have been useless for them to go until that time; because the gospel is itself the power of God unto salvation, and the preaching of the gospel is the preaching of the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes. And for them to go for the thinking to preach the power of God when they themselves were not acquainted with that power, would have been simply to preach empty words; it would not have been the gospel, because the gospel is the power of God. This is what the Lord himself has called it, the power of God unto salvation. And to preach that gospel, I say again, is to preach the power of God. Any professed preaching of that gospel, which is not the preaching of *the power of God*, is not the preaching of the gospel of God at all, it is not the preaching of the gospel of Christ. It may be preaching *about* the gospel, or it may be preaching another gospel; but it is not the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Therefore he would not have them go at all to say anything about this, to attempt to preach it, until they were endued with the power of that gospel itself, the power of God, the power from on high. Then when they should receive power, the Holy Ghost coming upon them,— then he said they should bear witness in Jerusalem, in Judea, in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth.

In the first chapter of 1 Corinthians, beginning with the 17th verse, is Paul's record of his connection with this gospel, and what he was called to preach: "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect." Then with Paul the preaching of the gospel was the preaching of the cross of Christ. Next verse: "For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved, it is the power of God." Then the preaching of the gospel is the preaching of the cross of Christ, and *that* is the preaching of the power of God; for *Christ* is *the power of God*, as he says in a further verse, and the wisdom of God. So I read on:—

"For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom: but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness."

The Greeks sought after wisdom, and the Lord sent them that which they counted only foolishness. The Jews required a sign, and the Lord gave them that which they turned only into a stumbling-block. The Greeks sought after wisdom, and God gave it; but they would not take it, for they counted it only foolishness. The Jews required a sign, and God gave it; but they would not receive it because it came not just as they wanted; therefore they turned it into a stumbling-block, and got no good out of it. "The Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom; but we preach Christ crucified" "unto them which are called, both Jews

and Greeks, *Christ the power of God*, and the wisdom of God. Because the foolishness of God is stronger than men."

Now notice, "We preach Christ crucified." Unto them who are called, Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God. That is what men are sent to preach; because that is the gospel. And the weakness of God is stronger than men, and the foolishness of God is wiser than men. But notice, they were not sent to preach *weakness*; they were sent to preach *power*, even the power of God, and they preached it. But even if they had been sent to preach the weakness of God, it would have been stronger than anything men can do or know. Then the thing for men to do is to accept it when God sends it,—accept it; for even though it be counted the weakness of God, it is stronger than anything men can get hold of, or create anyway.

Then they sought after wisdom, and the Lord sent them wisdom; he sent them Christ, the wisdom of God. He sent them his own wisdom, the wisdom of God himself; but they counted it foolishness. Yet even though they did, they should have accepted it, for the foolishness of God was wiser than anything they knew or could know otherwise. Then when God sends a message, no difference how we view it, we are to accept it. When God sends a message, men are to accept it, even though we count it weakness; for it is stronger than anything men give. It comes from God, it will not hurt anybody. Even though it be counted foolishness, that has nothing to do with it; accept it. Not that it is foolishness on God's part, but men may count it foolishness. Well, as it came from God, it is wiser than anything man ever got hold of, or ever could. Then I say again, when God sends a message, no difference how men view it, or what they think it is, it is their duty to accept of it; and then they will find out it is something different than they thought it was; because the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men.

"Not man wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called; but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise: and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty."

He has chosen the weak things of the world to confound those that are mighty, because the weakness of this world can have the power of God; and that will bring to naught the things of the mighty, and confound the things of the world. "And things which are despised hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are, *that no flesh should glory in his presence.*"

"For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." That is all any one can know who preaches the gospel,—Jesus Christ, and him crucified. That is the whole story; that is all the gospel; that is all there is of God. "And I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling. And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."

Now, any faith that stands in the wisdom of men will fail. Any faith that rests upon the power of argument will fail. Every faith will fail but that which rests upon the power of God, and stands in the power of God. Now, when the power of God

is received, when our faith stands upon that, and in that, then the argument will always come with it; there will be

482

an argument that is stronger than all things else. But the argument is derived from the power, and not the power from the argument. Therefore, any faith that stands in the strength of argument and the power of theoretical demonstration, will never stand the test that will be brought upon those who are to enter the kingdom of God.

In the field of morals, in the realm of spiritual things, knowledge is not power. There is just the difference between heathenism and Christianity always. In heathenism with its chiefest theories, those of Socrates and all the rest of their philosophers, all they believed they needed to know to be virtuous was virtue. To *know* the good, was all that was necessary in order to do good. To know the pure, was all that was necessary in order to be pure. And they laid down first-rate precepts, and gave excellent instruction in the matter of purity, in the matter of right doing,—ethics,—and in all these things, but they themselves did not do the things which they taught to be right and good; and they could not do it; because, although they had the knowledge, they had not the power.

Every man on earth knows that the statement is true, that *in the field of morals knowledge is not power*; because every man in this world *knows* better than he *does*, and always did know better than he did. He knows better than he is able to do; and always did know better than he was able to do. These philosophers and these wise men knew better than they were able to do; and they taught a great deal better than they did; and I say again, every man in the world knows better than he is able to himself to do, and without Christ, all of his life is made up of efforts and failures to do the good that he knows. Paul describes all men as they are in themselves when he says: "To will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not." A man says he will do better, then does his best and fails; and it always will be so until he finds that power which comes from beyond himself, the power of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ.

It is not knowledge that men want primarily; it is power. Now Christ is that power; the gospel reveals it, and the preaching of the gospel makes it known. But yet the excellency of Christ to men is that he brings not only power, but *also*, knowledge far beyond anything man can ever otherwise know. Christ is not only the power of God, but he is the wisdom of God. God gives wisdom beyond anything man can know, and power in equal measure with the wisdom. God gives power beyond anything man could ever do, and wisdom in equal measure with power. And all is in Christ, the gift of God to men, and in him dwellth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. Therefore I say that any faith which stands in the power of argument, and in the wisdom of man; or believes a certain thing because somebody else believes it; or does a certain thing because somebody else does it,—that is worth nothing at all. Our faith must stand in power alone. And Christ is the power of God. Christ and him crucified; this is the power of God, and the wisdom of God; this is the gospel. The preaching of this is the preaching of the gospel, *and nothing else is*. Therefore our faith must stand not in the wisdom

of men or the power of argument, but in Christ and him crucified. This is the power of God, this is the gospel.

Not I want to call attention to another point, which indeed is the main one in the talk this morning, and that is another statement of what the gospel is. Christ sent Paul to preach the gospel, and Paul tells us in his letter to the Galatians, that Christ did with him just what he did with the twelve at Jerusalem because he started them to preach the gospel. He commissioned them to preach the gospel; but before they attempted it, they were to be endued with power from on high, and that power from on high was the Holy Ghost. Here we find Paul's experience before he could preach the gospel. "It pleased God. . . to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen." Gal. 1:15, 16. In Acts 26:17, 18 we find the Saviour's commission to Paul as told by Paul himself afterward: "Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me."

That is what Christ sent Paul to preach to the children of men, and the Gentiles especially. Paul says when it pleased God to send him to preach Christ, it pleased God to *reveal his Son* in him, *that he might* preach him unto the Gentiles. Before Christ could send Paul to preach, he, too, must be endued with power from on high. Christ must be revealed in him as the power of God and the wisdom of God; then Paul could preach *him*, and not simply preach *about* him. It is not enough to preach *about* Christ, but preach *Christ*. It is not enough to preach *about* the gospel, but preach *the gospel*.

Before Christ could send Paul or any of the rest, *He* must be revealed *in* those who were to preach Him. When Christ is revealed in a man as the power of God and the wisdom of God, that man then is made, and has become, a minister of Christ. He then can minister Christ to men. But if Christ is not revealed in a man as the power of God and the wisdom of God, then that man cannot minister Christ, because he has not Christ. For he who has him not cannot minister *him*. The office of the minister of Christ is to be able to take Christ to men, and have him reach the people in such a way that they can receive *him*, and have *him revealed in them*. This is the ministry of the gospel. The gospel being the power of God, this is ministering the power of God.

Here is another passage in which Paul tells of this:—

"If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven; whereof I Paul am made a minister; . . . whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for you, to fulfill the word of God; even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints: to whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; *which is Christ in you*, the hope of glory." Col. 1:23-27.

He was sent to preach the gospel; he was made a minister of the gospel, a preacher of the mystery of God; and that mystery of God is, as he says, "*Christ in you*, the hope of glory." Then the preaching of the gospel is the preaching of

Christ *in men*, the hope of glory. The minister of the gospel is the minister of Christ *in men*, the hope of glory. It is still, and forever, the preaching of God in Christ, manifest in the flesh—the incarnation. For "every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come *in* the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God."

But further, I call attention to that expression, "The mystery of God." I read in Eph. 3:3 and onward: "How that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery; . . . which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men." That mystery, as he says in the other verse, is "Christ in you, the hope of glory." Now he says: By revelation God made known to me that mystery, and it pleased God to reveal his Son in me. "The gospel which I preach is not after man. For I neither received it of man; neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." Not alone the revelation which Christ *gives*; it is that and more. It is the revelation of Jesus Christ himself, as he was revealed *in Paul*, and as he is revealed *in men*, the hope of glory. And this is how Paul received the gospel—by the revelation of Jesus Christ, not only *to* him, but *in* him.

This is enough to show that the gospel is the mystery of God; that the preaching of the gospel is the preaching of the mystery of God; and that the preaching of the mystery of God is the preaching of Christ in men. This is the revelation of the mystery of God. This is the gospel that the apostles preached, and this is the only true gospel.

Here is another point. I have read in these verses not only that the gospel is Christ in men, and the power of God, and the mystery of God, but that *it has been hid from ages* and generations, and was then revealed in a way in which it had never been known before. Now, the gospel was made known to men from Adam down, and they had a measure of the knowledge of the gospel. But when Christ himself came, and revealed God in himself, to the children of men,—it was never revealed and understood before as it was revealed and understood at that time. Then it came in a fullness that was never known before. And when the apostles were sent forth to preach it as it then was revealed, they preached it in a fullness and a clearness in which it was never preached before.

So Paul write again in Eph. 3:8, 9: "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.*" Then from the beginning of the world unto the apostles' day, this mystery had been hid from the world and from men *in a measure*, and as it was then revealed and preached, not only to these men, but in them and by them. Read these verses over—Eph. 3:3, 5, 8, 9; Col. 1:25-27—with this point in mind.

Then the apostles were sent to preach this gospel, to preach this mystery that had been hid from ages and generations. It was hid before; now it is made known to all men, for the obedience of faith. God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, "which is Christ in you, the hope of glory." That is the mystery that has been hid from ages and generations, and which God would now make known unto the Gentiles and to all men. Read Matt. 14:16, 17: "But blessed are your eyes, for they see: and your ears, for they hear.

For verily I say unto you, That many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them."

Then by the ministry of the apostles there was made known that which had been hid from ages and from generations, and that thing was the mystery of God. And by the preaching of the gospel, says the word, he would now make known to his saints what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles. And that mystery "is *Christ in you*, the hope of glory." Though it had been hid from ages and generations in the past, now the Lord breaks off the veil, brings it forth, and by the mouth of the apostles, in the preaching of the gospel, spreads it before all nations for the obedience of faith. (Read Rom. 16:26, 27.) This is the gospel; and the preaching of this is the preaching of the gospel.

Now from this let us start into another field. I want you to think closely now, if you have not done so up to this point; and the more so, if you have done so. The gospel is the mystery of God, isn't it? The mystery of God is the gospel. The preaching of the gospel, the unsearchable riches of Christ, is the making known to men what is the fellowship of this mystery. In the preaching of the gospel, God is revealing the riches of the glory of that mystery among the Gentiles, and that is Christ in men, the hope of glory. In former ages this mystery had not been made known unto the sons of men, as it was now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets. And though hidden from ages and generations, when the apostles were sent forth to preach, endured with power from on high, to reveal the mystery of God, that was the breaking off of the veil that had covered this mystery through all these ages; and it

483

was broken off that all nations might see and know and understand and turn to the Lord, and get acquainted with God as he was revealed in Jesus Christ, by having Jesus Christ revealed in themselves.

That was sent forth to be preached to all the world, to be preached to every creature. It was so preached. Before the men had all died to whom that gospel was committed in the beginning, it had been preached in all the world. And while it was being preached, and before Paul had died, who had written so much about it, he wrote these words: "*The MYSTERY OF INIQUITY doth already work.*"

What was Paul preaching?—The mystery of God. What was already working?—The mystery of *iniquity*. That mystery of iniquity would oppose and exalt itself "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." Then there was another mystery to be revealed. The mystery of God was revealed; the mystery of iniquity was also to be revealed.

The mystery of iniquity was revealed. That mystery of iniquity rose up and hid the mystery of God which had been revealed. That mystery of iniquity was the papacy in all its workings; and the beginning of its working was there when Paul wrote that word; it was working then. He could see it. While the apostles were preaching the mystery of God, they could see the other mystery coming.

That other mystery did come; it was revealed; it stood before the world, professing to be Christianity; professing to be the representative of God to the

world; professing to be the religion of Christ in the world; professing to be the mystery of God. Attention was called to that as Christianity, whereas there was no Christianity about it at all. God declared it to be "the mystery of iniquity;" "Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." And it was only hiding the mystery of God again from ages and from generations.

But thanks be to God! it was not to hide the mystery of God from *all* ages and generations. When the mystery of iniquity should have fully revealed itself, again the veil would be broken off, and the mystery of God would again be revealed. For I read: "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."

This everlasting gospel is the mystery of God which is again to be preached unto me; and that mystery is "Christ in you, the hope of glory." And that is the preaching that is *now* to go to the world, in the glorious threefold message which makes up the third angel's message. And now is the time when the gospel, the mystery of God, is to be preached and revealed in a power, a majesty, and a glory such as has never been known except in the time of the apostles, if it does not even surpass that. The power of the mystery of iniquity being broken off, the mystery of God is to be brought again before the world in *all* its glory; for I read that "in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God *should be finished.*" Rev. 10:7. "And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen. . . . 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. . . . Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:8-12.

Now mark the connection. There goes forth the angel with the everlasting gospel to preach. That everlasting gospel is the mystery of God, and the preaching of it the preaching of Christ in men the hope of glory, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. This gospel is rejected, and there is the falling away spoken of as "Babylon is fallen, is fallen." Then out of that falling away comes that against which the third angel warns.

Now, what brought the mystery of iniquity?—The falling away from the mystery of God; for says Paul: "That day shall not come except *there come a falling away first*, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition." And the mystery of iniquity is the beast, the papacy. When the mystery of iniquity has run its course, then comes the word of God announcing an angel flying in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel, the mystery of God, to preach to all the world, to every creature. Then from this also there comes a falling away, and out of that falling away there comes that against which the third angel warns,—the image of the beast, the image of the papacy.

As out of that first falling away there came the mystery of iniquity, the beast, so out of the second falling away there comes the image of the mystery of iniquity, the image of the beast. Just as certain as the preaching of the gospel by the apostles was the preaching of the mystery of God, Christ in men, the hope of glory; just so certainly the second preaching of the gospel is the preaching of the same mystery of God, the same power of God, and the same wisdom of God, to make known the same Christ in men, the hope of glory. Then as certainly as out of that falling away there came the mystery of iniquity, the beast, the papacy; so certainly out of this falling away there comes the image of the mystery, the image of the beast, the image of the papacy. The two things are alike from beginning to end. And now the third angel's message—this threefold message—warns against the whole evil combination of the beast and his image. This threefold message has been more than forty years in the world. This little leaflet from which I have read before gives an excellent statement of this, as follows:—

"The revelator says: 'I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power, and the earth was lightened with his glory. And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen.' *This is the same message* that was given by the second angel,—Babylon is fallen. . . . When Jesus began his public ministry he cleansed the temple from its sacrilegious profanations. Almost the last act of his public ministry was to cleanse the temple again. *So in the last work* for the warning of the world, *two distinct calls* are to be made to the churches—*the second angel's message*, and the voice heard from heaven, 'Come out of her, my people, . . . for her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities.'"

In 1840-1844, the first angel began his work. This message was rejected, and in 1844 the second angel's message announced the fall: "Babylon is fallen;" and out of that falling away there comes the image of the mystery of iniquity, the image of the beast; and the third angel's message is the warning against the worship of the beast *and his image*.

As the beginning of this was in 1844, *then began the time* when the mystery of iniquity was to be broken off, and the mystery of God once more to stand forth in all its glory in the world. But Ezekiel and the Laodicean message show that there was to be a time of dearth. But now even that time of dearth is past, *and the times of refreshing* have come from the presence of the Lord, and soon he will send Jesus.

Therefore, *now is the time* when that everlasting gospel, the mystery of God, is to be preached in all its fullness, which means Christ in men in all his completeness. And as the Sabbath of the Lord, in the fullness of its meaning, is but the sign of what Christ in all his completeness is to those who believe in him; so when Christ in all his completeness is formed and found in us, there will stand the Sabbath as the witness, the sign, *the seal* of the blessed consummation.

And so this threefold message, revealing in its fullness the mystery of God, which is Christ in men, the hope of glory, thus puts upon the people of God the

seal of the living God, and saves them from the evil and the ruin of the mystery of iniquity, the beast and his image, his mark, and the number of his name.

(Concluded next week.)

August 9, 1892

"The Sermon. The Gospel: What It Is, and Its Work as Opposed to the Mystery of Iniquity. (Concluded.)" *The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald* 69, 32 , pp. 497-499.

BY ELDER A. T. JONES

(Concluded).

NOW let us take our bearings again, that we may fairly enter upon the examination of another point. Out of that first falling away came the mystery of iniquity. And as that mystery of iniquity was the papacy, and is the papacy, it is important for us to know how that thing came in, just what place it occupied there, when it appeared, and how it appeared. As the apostle says, there was a falling away. Self-exaltation of the bishopric and all kinds of different amusements and ceremonies were adopted, also the taking up with the heathen philosophy and science, in order to facilitate the conversion of the heathen. These men had forsaken the mystery of God, had left the power of God behind; and when they found that they had lost the power of God, and could not influence men any longer to yield obedience to God, then they sought the power of earthly governments, by which they would compel men to yield obedience to the church.

In Constantine's time there was the working of this power; this apostate church, this formation of the mystery of iniquity, doing its utmost to secure control of the civil power and compel men to conform to the dogmas and the discipline of this apostate form of religion, which called itself Christianity. Now I want to call your attention to a few facts in connection with that. For just then there came in a series of events, a series of steps, that are worth considering now by every one who would know how to detect the rise of the image of the mystery of iniquity.

In the beginning of the fourth century there was in the Roman empire a powerful ecclesiastical organization, the leaders and managers of which were "only anxious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves."—*Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History, book 8, chap. 1*. While "it was the hope of every bishop in the empire to make politics a branch of theology," "it was the aim of Constantine to make theology a branch of politics." In an intrigue therefore with Constantine, they succeeded in bartering to him their influence and power in theology for his in politics. As one of the very first-fruits of this, Constantine was established in the rulership of one half of the Roman empire. Jointly with Licinius, he then issued the Edict of Milan, reversing the persecuting edicts of Diocletian, and granting "liberty and full freedom to the Christians to observe their own mode of worship;" granting "likewise to the Christians and to

all, the free choice to follow that mode of worship which they may wish;" "that each may have the privilege to select and to worship whatsoever divinity he pleases;" and commanding that the churches and the church property which had been confiscated by Diocletian, should be restored to "the whole body of Christians," "and to each conventicler respectively."—*Id.*, book 10, chap. 5.

This was all just and proper enough, and innocent enough, in itself and on its face, *if that had been all there was to it*. But behind it there lay the *ecclesiastical organization*, ambitious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for itself, and that religio-political intrigue which had been entered into to feed and satisfy this ambition. This ecclesiastical organization likewise claimed to be the legitimate and only true representative and depository of Christianity in the world,—it was the Catholic Church. And no sooner had the Edict of Milan ordered the restoration of property *to the Christians*, than it was seized upon and made an issue by which to secure the imperial recognition and the legal establishment of *the Catholic Church*.

The rule had long before been established that all who did not agree with the bishops of the Catholic Church were necessarily heretics, and not Christians at all; it was now claimed by the Catholic Church that therefore none such were entitled to any benefit from the edict restoring property *to the Christians*. In other words, the Catholic Church disputed the right of any others than Catholics to receive property or money under the Edict of Milan, by disputing their right to the title of Christians. And by this issue the Catholic Church forced an imperial decision as to who were Christians. And under the circumstances, by the power and influence which she held, and by what she had already done in behalf of Constantine, it was a foregone conclusion, if not the concerted plan, that this decision would be in favor of the Catholic Church. Consequently, Constantine's edict to the proconsul contained these words:—

"It is our will that when thou shalt receive this epistle, if any of those things belonging to *the Catholic Church* of the Christians in the several cities or other places, are now possessed either by the decurions or any others, these thou shalt cause immediately to be restored to their churches. Since we have previously determined, that whatsoever *these same churches* before possessed should be restored to them."

That was not what was said at all. It was not "the Catholic Church" to which the edict said the property was to be restored; it was to Christians alone, to "the whole body of Christians." But, mark you, just as quick as that was said, the Catholic Church made a turn upon that word "Christian," and forced a decision by the imperial authority as to who were the Christians intended. And as she had given him her influence in politics, he did not dare to say otherwise; because if he should, she would swing her influence over to Licinius or some other one, and he would become emperor. She had political power in her hands, and she used it.

Nor was it enough that the emperor should decide that all these favors were for "the Catholic Church of the Christians." Immediately there were two parties claiming to be the Catholic Church. Therefore, the emperor was obliged next to decide *which was the Catholic Church*. This question was immediately raised and

disputed, and in consequence an edict was drawn from Constantine, addressed to the same proconsul (of the province of Africa), in which were these words:—

"It is my will that these men, within the province intrusted to those in the Catholic Church *over which Cecilianus presides*, who give their services to this holy religion, and whom they commonly call clergy, shall be held totally free and exempt from all public offices," etc.

The party over which Cecilianus presided in Africa was the party which was in communion with the bishop of Rome. The other party then drew up a long series of charges against Cecilianus, and sent them to the emperor with a petition that he would have the case examined by the bishops of Gaul. Constantine was in Gaul at the time; but instead of having the bishops of Gaul examine into the case alone, he commissioned three of them to go to Rome and sit with the bishop of Rome in council, to decide the case. To the bishop of Rome Constantine sent a letter, with copies of all the charges and complaints which had been lodged with him, and in this letter to the bishop of Rome, with other things, he said this:—

"Since it neither escaped your diligence, that I show such regard for the holy Catholic Church, that *I wish you*, upon the whole, *to leave no room for schism or division.*"

This council of course confirmed the emperor's word that *the Catholic Church* in Africa, was indeed *the one over which Cecilianus presided*. And as this was the one which was in communion with the bishop of Rome, it followed that the Catholic Church was the one over which the bishops of Rome presided. The other party appealed from this decision, and petitioned that another and larger council be called to examine the question. Another council was called, com-

498

posed of almost all the bishops of Constantine's dominions. This council likewise confirmed the emperor's word and the decision of the former council. Then the opposing party appealed from the decision of the council to the emperor himself. After hearing this appeal, he sustained the action of the councils, and re-affirmed his original decision. Then the opposing party rejected not only the decisions of the councils, but the decision of the emperor himself.

Then Constantine addressed a letter to Cecilianus, bestowing more favors upon what he now called "*the legitimate and most holy Catholic religion*," and empowering him to use the civil power to compel the opposing party, the Donatists, to submit. This portion of his letter is in the following words:—

"CONSTANTINE AUGUST TO CECILIANUS, BISHOP OF CARTHAGE: As we have determined that in all the provinces of Africa, Numblia, and Mauritania, something should be granted to certain ministers of *the legitimate and most holy Catholic religion* to defray these expenses, I have given letters to Ursus, the most illustrious lieutenant-governor of Africa, and have communicated to him, that he shall provide to pay to your authority, three thousand dollars [about one hundred thousand dollars]

"And as I have ascertained that *some men*, who are of no settled min, *wished to diver the people from the most Holy Catholic*

Church, by a certain pernicious adulteration, I wish thee to understand that I have given, both to the proconsul Anulinus and to Patricius, vicar-general of the prefects, when present the following injunctions: that, among all the rest, they should particularly pay the necessary attention to this, nor should by any means tolerate that this should be overlooked. Wherefore, if thou seest any of these men persevering in this madness, thou shalt, without any hesitancy, proceed to the aforesaid judges, and report it to them, that they may animadvert upon them, as I commanded them, when present."

Thus, no sooner was it decided what was "*the legitimate and most holy Catholic Church,*" than the civil power was definitely placed at the disposal of this church, with positive instructions to use this power in compelling conformity to the new imperial religion. Persecution was begun at once. The Donatist bishops were driven out, and Constantine commanded that their churches should be delivered to the Catholic party. Nor was this done at all peacefully. "Each party recriminated on the other: but neither denies the barbarous scenes of massacre and license which devastated the African cities. The Donatists boasted of their martyrs; and the cruelties of the Catholic party rest on their own admission; they deny not, they proudly vindicate, their barbarities: 'Is the vengeance of God to be defrauded of its victims?' they cried."—*Milman, "History of Christianity," book 3, chap. 1, par. 5 from the end.*

And the government, by becoming a partisan, had lost the power to keep the peace. The civil power, by becoming a party to religious controversy, had lost the power to prevent civil violence between religious factions. The civil government was subordinated to the church, and was only a tool of the church.

Nor was this thing long in coming. It all occurred in *less than four years*. The Edict of Milan was issued in the month of March, A.D. 313. Before that month expired, the decision was rendered that the imperial favors were for the Catholic Church. In the summer of 314 sat the second council on the same question. And in 316 the decree was sent to Cecilianus, empowering him to distribute the money to the ministers of "*the legitimate and most holy Catholic religion,*" and to use the civil power to force the Donatists to submit to the decision of the councils and the emperor.

The Edict of Milan, March, 313, named "*the whole body of Christians*" as the beneficiaries without any qualification or any sectarian designation. Before the expiration of that month the provisions of the edict were confined to "*the Catholic Church of the Christians*" alone. In the autumn of the same year when the emperor wrote to the bishop of Rome, appointing the first council, he defined the established church as "*the holy Catholic Church.*" The following summer, 314, when he called the second council, he referred to the doctrine of the Catholic Church as embodying the "*most holy religion.*" And when it had been decided which party represented this "*most holy religion,*" then in 316 his letter and commission to Cecilianus defined it as "*the legitimate and most holy Catholic religion.*"

Nor was this all. While this was going on, also about the year 314, the first edict in favor of Sunday was issued, though it was blended with Friday. It ordered

that on Friday and Sunday "no judicial or other business should be transacted, but that God should be served with prayers and supplications;" and in 321 Friday observance was dropped, and Sunday alone was exalted by the famous Sunday-rest law of Constantine, all in furtherance of the ambition of the ecclesiastics to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves.⁷¹

Now there was another thing. When the Catholic Church had forced this decision in favor of itself in the matter of imperial favors, and the getting of property into their hands, then it sprung right back to the other part of that edict, and held Constantine to this point: that as it was the Catholic Church in the latter part of that edict, then it was certainly the Catholic Church in the first part of the edict. And that came in direct order, and in this way: In 323 by the direct and officious aid of the Catholic Church, Constantine succeeded in defeating Licinius and making himself sole emperor. No sooner was this accomplished than the "*religious liberty*" assured to "the Christians" by the Edict of Milan, like the provisions of the same edict restoring confiscated property to the Christians, was by a public and express edict *limited to Catholics alone*. This portion of that decree runs as follows:—

"VICTORY CONSTANTINUS MAXIMUS AUGUSTUS TO THE HERETICS: Understand now by this present statute, ye Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Paulians, ye who are called Cataphrygians, and all ye who devise and support heresies by means of your private assemblies, with what a tissue of falsehood and vanity, with what destructive and venomous errors, your doctrines are inseparably interwoven; so that through you the healthy soul is stricken with disease, and the living becomes the prey of everlasting death. . . .

"Forasmuch, then, as it is no longer possible to bear with your pernicious errors, we give warning by this present statute that none of you henceforth presume to assemble yourselves together. We have directed, accordingly, that you be deprived of all the houses in which you are accustomed to hold your assemblies: and our care in this respect extends so far as to forbid the holding of your superstitious and senseless meetings, not in public merely, but in any private house or place whatsoever. *Let those of you, therefore, who are desirous of embracing the true and pure religion, take the far better course of entering the Catholic Church*, and uniting with it in holy fellowship, whereby you will be enabled to arrive at the knowledge of the truth. . . .

"It is an object worthy of that prosperity which we enjoy through the favor of God, to endeavor to bring back those who in time past were living in the hope of future blessing, from all irregularity and error, to the right path, from darkness to light, from vanity to truths, from death to salvation. And in order that this remedy may be applied with effectual power, we have commanded (as before said) that you be positively deprived of every gathering point for your superstitious meetings: I mean all the houses of prayer (if such be

worthy of the name) which belong to heretics, *and that those be made over without delay to the Catholic Church*; that any other places be confiscated to the public service, and no facility whatever be left for any future gathering; in order that from this day forward none of your unlawful assemblies may presume to appear in any public or private place. Let this edict be made public.

Thus in *less than eleven years*, from the issuing of the Edict of Milan, the Catholic Church stood in full and exclusive possession of the authority of the empire, both in the rights of property and the right to worship, under the profession of Christianity; and with a specific and direct commission to use that power and authority to compel the submission of "heretics." Thus *was made* the papacy,—the beast of Rev. 13:1-10; and all that ever came in its career from that day to this, has been but the natural and inevitable outgrowth of the power and prerogatives which were then possessed and claimed by the Catholic Church.

And it all came from the Edict of Milan, bestowing governmental favors upon "the Christians." No man can fairly deny that in the Edict of Milan and the religio-political intrigue that lay behind it, there was contained the whole papacy. No man can successfully deny that the Edict of Milan, though appearing innocent enough upon its face, contained the whole papacy: or that the things that followed in the ten years up to 323, which we have sketched, were anything else than the logical and inevitable development of the evil that lay wrapped up in that. All this came out of that edict, and nothing came out of it that was not in it. Nothing *could* come out of it that was not in it.

Now I call your attention to the thought again, that all of that, the whole papacy, and every step from that day forward, came out of that edict in favor of Christianity. Didn't it? now when the Supreme Court of the United States has issued a decree in favor of Christianity, what is coming out of that? What is in it?

What was in that edict of Constantine's in favor of Christianity?—The beast, the whole papacy from that day to this. Then what is in this decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in favor of Christianity as the religion of this nation?—The image of the beast, the image of the papacy, from this day and forward for all that will ever come. That is what is in it.

Just as certainly as that edict of Constantine in favor of Christianity there, produced the papacy with all that it is; just so certainly this decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in favor of the Christian religion here, as the religion of this nation, has in it the image of the beast, and will produce all that the prophecy has in it, or ever tells about. All this will come out of this decision, just as certainly as all that came out of that edict.

Disputes will arise here as to what Christianity is indeed, just as they arose there. Disputes will arise, I know not precisely in what form; it may be between Catholicism and Protestantism, or it may be between the different sects of Protestantism. But these disputes will certainly come. I know not how soon; but just as certainly as that decree of the Supreme Court of the United States that this is a Christian nation has been made, just so certainly a disagreement will arise one of these days, and the Supreme Court or some one else will have to

decide who are Christians, and what class of Christians it is that is meant in that decision. That will have to come. And it will come.

Here is the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, and this whole ecclesiastical combination who have been working for this for these twenty-nine years. Will they stand silent and do nothing? Is there not here to-day an ecclesiastical organization anxious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for itself, just as there was then to raise a like dispute?

Then can any one doubt, or fail to see, that under the circumstances and in the condition of the times, in view of the position the church occupied at that time, just as certainly as that edict of Constantine in favor of Christianity as the religion of the Roman empire brought the papacy, and out of that came all that the papacy ever was, just so certainly under the like circumstances and the like conditions of church ambition, out of this Supreme Court decision making Christianity the religion of this nation,—just so certainly in this is the image of the beast, and out of it will come everything that the prophecy ever tells about.

We are not the only ones able to see these things. That was one of the things that was held in mind when this government was made. Before making the national Constitution, there was a movement in Virginia to establish the Christian religion—not the Catholic nor the Protestant, but "the Christian religion;" that is all. Let me read to you what James Madison saw in that:—

"Who does not see that the same authority can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish with the same ease, any particular *sect of Christians* in exclusion of all other sects?"

499

Constantine favored Christianity at the first, just as a whole—"the whole body of Christians." And then he established a particular sect, the "Catholic Church of the Christians," just as easily as he did the first. Just so certain as the Supreme Court of the United States has established Christianity as the religion of this nation, in exclusion of all other religion of this nation, in exclusion of all other religions, just so certain will it, or some other power, have to establish one particular sect in exclusion of all other sects. The Supreme Court hints at Protestantism; but if that is it, somebody will have to decide which sect of Protestantism it is. I do not know who will decide it: whether the Supreme Court, or Congress, or by national election campaign, I cannot say: but it will be decided in some way. It is bound to come. Thus says the Spirit of prophesy:—

"Old controversies which have apparently been hushed for a long time will be revived, and new controversies will spring up; new and old will commingle, and this will take place right early."

As I said before, while that was coming on its way here to be instruction to us, saying that that would take place right early, this thing was being done by the Supreme Court of the United States, which takes the first step toward raising these controversies, old and new, both old and new commingling, and this taking place right early. What is it that is before our eyes then? what is it that is before our faces? Is there anything there? All these things are in this decision.

Madison and those of his time knew just as certainly as they knew anything, that if Christianity was established as the State religion of Virginia, there must be a particular sect established, and everybody else be oppressed. Not only that, but he saw this:—

"Instead of holding forth an asylum to the persecuted, it is itself a signal of persecution."

Now mark: they held this position: they had experienced this in their day. We have had some of it too in our day. They saw in the mere proposition to make Christianity the established religion of Virginia, "a signal of persecution." Just as certain as the proposition to make Christianity the established religion of the State of Virginia was the signal of persecution in that State, just so certainly this Supreme Court decision *making* Christianity the religion of this nation, is a signal of persecution through all the nation. But I read again from Madison's remonstrance against that:—

"Distant as it may be in its present form from the Inquisition, it differs from it only in degree."

In that proposition to establish "the Christian religion" in Virginia, *they* saw the Inquisition. What do *we* see in the actual establishment of the same religion by the Supreme Court of the United States? Again I read:—

"The one is the first step, the other is the last, in the career of intolerance." ⁸²

That is what they saw, the makers of this Republic, when an attempt was made to establish "the Christian religion" as the State religion. What does this people see in this decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, which establishes "the Christian religion" as the national religion? Just as certainly as that back there was a signal of persecution, and persecution throughout the State, just so certain is this a signal of persecution, and persecution through all the nation. Just so certainly as that had in it the Inquisition, just so certain this has in it the same thing.

And just as certain as that edict of Constantine back there, had in it the papacy, just so certain this has in it all that the image of the papacy is or will be. Controversies arose back there as to what was Christianity, and this brought the establishment of the Catholic Church and persecution of all kinds: soon the next step was made, compelling them all to become Catholics—heretics to join the Catholic Church and hand over their property to the Catholic Church.

There arose still another difficulty and dispute as to what was the true Catholic *doctrine*, and this brought the Council of Nice, which established Trinitarianism as the true Catholic doctrine. This was soon followed by an emperor who, by a council, established Arianism as the true Catholic doctrine. This was soon followed by another emperor who, by a council, re-established Trinitarianism as the true Catholic doctrine. Thus one ruler and council decided one way, and another decided another way, as to what was the true Catholic religion. And thus it went on, controversy after controversy of all kinds, until the bishop of Rome was made the fountain of faith by earthly governments and human power, instead of the word of God through the Lord Jesus Christ, the

power of God. Thus the mystery of iniquity hid and supplanted for ages the mystery of God.

Now, then, old controversies will be revived. Some of these controversies will rise right up again, as to what is the real true Christianity, Catholicism or Protestantism, Trinitarianism or Unitarianism, Calvinism or Arianism. These old controversies will be revived, which have apparently been hushed for a long time. These disputes will arise over hair-splitting theories that have no truth in them. They will dispute over these things. Atoms will be worlds, and worlds will be atoms; and these atoms that they will turn into worlds will be simply senseless disputes by which they can obtain control of the civil power, to force those who oppose them, and do not believe as they do, to act as *they* think or believe. "Old controversies will spring up," and here are new controversies: revelations of false science, evolution, probation after death, etc. "New and old will commingle, and THIS WILL TAKE PALCE RIGHT EARLY." Do you not believe it? Do you believe it? Is it not *time* to believe it, brethren? Well, then, I hope you will.

¹ Synopsis of a sermon delivered in the Tabernacle, at Battle Creek, Mich., March 9, 1889.

² The second in the series of Sunday evening sermons on the commandments, delivered at the Tabernacle, Battle Creek, Mich., March 10, 1889.

³ The third of the series of sermons on the ten commandments, delivered in the Tabernacle, Battle Creek, Mich., Sabbath, March 16, 1889, being a continuation of the sermon of Sunday, March 10.

⁴ Sermon preached in the Tabernacle at Battle Creek, May 14, 1892. Reported for REVIEW by W. E. HOWELL.

⁵ Just here, look at "The Two Republics," pp. 282-296.

⁶ Second sermon preached in the Tabernacle at Battle Creek, May 21, 1892. Reported for REVIEW by W. E. HOWELL.

⁷ Since this sermon was preached, Congress has enacted a Sunday law, closing the World's Fair that day. Thus and now the parallel is complete, and the likeness perfect. [See "Testimony No. 33," p. 240.] All that remains now is for those who have so long been grasping for the power, to go ahead in the use of the power which they now have. All the quotations in this sermon will be found in "The Two Republics."

⁸ See "Two Republics," pp. 688, 690.