

The Present Truth, Vol. 3 (1887)

July 21, 1887

"Manner of Christ's Coming" *The Present Truth* 3, 14.

E. J. Waggoner

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

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

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

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

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

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

It is not denied that Christ has at different times in the world's history met and conversed with certain of his devoted followers, nor that he is ever present with his people by his Spirit; but nothing of this kind can be referred to in the texts under consideration.

It would, however, be manifestly inconsistent to refer to any one of these times as the second coming of Christ. One of them has no precedence over another. But there was one time when he was here in person, when he talked with thousands; and was seen by thousands more. At that time there was probably no nation on earth that did not know of him and his mighty works; and there has been no nation since then that

212

has not heard of that wonderful event. Now at that time he said he was coming "*again*," and Paul, speaking of that first advent and its object, said that he would come the "*second time*." Consistency, therefore, would demand that his second coming be also personal and visible, and no less conspicuous, nor less widely known than his first. And this we are positively told shall be the case: "Behold he cometh with clouds; and *every eye shall see him*, and they also which pierced him." Rev. 1:7.

Again we read: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." Matt. 16:27. Those who place the second coming of Christ at death, or at conversion, must have a very faint conception of the glory of the Father. When the Lord came down on Sinai, "the whole mount quaked greatly" (Ex. 19:18); and when the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle, even Moses was not able to enter. See Ex. 40:34, 35. The glory of a single angel, at the resurrection of Jesus, caused the Roman guard to fall as dead men. Matt. 28:4. What then will be the manifestation when he comes in his own glory, and that of the Father, and all the holy angels? This glory which will attend Christ's coming is thus described: "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence: a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him." Ps. 50:3. Paul says that when Christ comes he will be "revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire." 2 Thess. 1:7, 8. That this glory will be seen by all is proved by Rev. 1:7, already quoted, and by the words of our Saviour in Matt. 24:27: "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Any one who has seen the lightning flash across the sky in sheets so intensely bright that even the closed eyelid could not wholly shut out the impression, can appreciate to a faint degree the terror of that day. Of the effects of that glory, we learn in 2 Thess. 2:8: "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." The fire that David says shall "devour before him," is the glory of his presence.

Nothing further is needed to prove that the coming of the Lord will be nothing like the quiet of a death-bed scene, or the hour when an individual gives his heart to God. There are, however, a host of other texts on this point, no less strong than these already quoted. Two only will be given to show how literal and personal that coming is. The first is Acts 1:9-11: "And when he had spoken these things, *while they beheld*, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? *this same Jesus*, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." The second is 1 Thess. 4:16: "For *the Lord himself* shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the *trump of God*: and the dead in Christ shall rise first."

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

"How will my heart endure
The terrors of that day,
When earth and heaven, before the Judge,
Astonished, shrink away?"
E. J. WAGGONER.

September 22, 1887

"Eternal Life" *The Present Truth* 3, 18.

E. J. Waggoner

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

Our reading of the Bible has also shown us that the resurrection is a "living *again*," which implies a previous cessation of life between death and the resurrection; for a man cannot "live again" unless he has once ceased to live. And since there is no resurrection until the Lord comes, it follows that if he were

not to come there would be no life for his people. There can be no escape from this conclusion; we will verify it by the declaration of Scripture.

There are no words of the Bible more familiar to the Christian, or more clear to him than these words of Christ to Nicodemus: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten

276

Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." The love of God to man is beyond all human comprehension. Even the angels, we are told (1 Pet. 1:12), desire to look into and understand the mystery of the plan of salvation. But none but God himself can comprehend the love that prompted that vast scheme. To all eternity it will be the wonder of both saints and angels. Human hearts know something of love, and some can perhaps imagine the anguish they would feel if called upon to give up an only child to suffer cruel torture and an ignominious death. But the love of an infinite God must be as much greater than that felt by mortals, as God himself is greater than man. Yet he gave his only begotten Son,-the one by whom all things were made, whom angels worship with reverence equal to that which they yield to God-that men might have eternal life. Then certainly men do not have eternal life, or, what is the same thing, immortality, by nature.

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

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

What then is *eternal* life? Simply eternal existence. Then it is eternal existence that is brought within man's reach by the sacrifice of Christ. We do not say that the redeemed will not enjoy perfect happiness, but that is not the primary thing that is given to the overcomer. The happiness of the redeemed is a secondary matter, growing out of the circumstances in which they are placed. That happiness should be the lot of men who spend an eternity in the presence of God and of Christ where nothing can happen to annoy, is a natural consequence. Unending existence, then, is what is promised to those who believe in the Son of God.

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

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

Eternal life is the grand object for which man was created. This present life is a period of probation, in which we are proved, to see if we would know how to use so great a boon. If we desire eternal life earnestly enough to comply with the conditions, it will at the last day be bestowed upon us; but if we squander this life, and dishonour God, what encouragement will he have to extend our life to all eternity? He will not do it. And since those who disobey God never get beyond this probationary state, the anteroom, as it were, of life, it can be truly said that they do not see life. How it is that they who have Christ have eternal life (John 3:16), will be considered in a future time.

E. J. WAGGONER.

October 6, 1887

"Numerical Designation' of the Sabbath Commandment" *The Present Truth* 3, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

In an article recently quoted from the *Friend*, was the statement that the agitation of the Sabbath question tends to turn men's thoughts "away from the proper observance of the day, to the very subordinate question of its numerical designation." In that sentence the writer expressed a very popular idea, one which we regard as a grave error; namely, that the "numerical designation" of the day is a minor affair in Sabbath observance. It seems to be the general idea that the main question concerning the Sabbath is, *How* should it be kept? and not, *When* should it be kept? We consider both questions highly important, but think their order should be reversed.

While it is impossible to say that one of two things is more important than the other when both are absolutely essential, we may readily determine which of them must first be considered. We have therefore no hesitation in saying that the "numerical designation" of the day is the first thing of importance in considering the question of Sabbath observance. If a man is told, "You ought to keep the Sabbath day," the first question he would ask, if he knew nothing at all about the subject would be, "What is the Sabbath day."

Now if we read the commandment we shall find that this is indeed the first point considered. "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

We see that in the commandment the Sabbath is introduced as an institution already well known. Then the first thing after the command proper, which is contained in the first clause, is the "numerical designation" of the day. "Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." So important did the Lord regard the "numerical designation" of the day, that he fixed that the very first thing. Then come directions for the proper observance of the day. "In it thou shalt not do any work." That is, any of *thy* work, which must be performed in the preceding six days.

There are but seven days in a week, and the first day is the one commonly called Sunday. Every calendar and dictionary bears witness to this. More than this, the chief and, indeed, the only reason given for Sunday observance is that it commemorates the resurrection of Christ. But the resurrection of Christ was on the first day of the week; and thus Sunday observers everywhere and always record their belief that Sunday is the first day of the week. To deny that fact would be to overthrow their only argument for Sunday observance. But just as surely as Sunday is the first day of the week, Saturday is the seventh day. Well, the Lord says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." If the "numerical designation" of the day is a matter of minor importance, will our friends please explain the fourth commandment?

We repeat that before we can consider the "proper observance of the day" of the Sabbath, it is absolutely necessary that we determine what particular day of the week the Sabbath is. For no matter how strictly we observe a day, abstaining

from our own labour on it, and devoting its hours to the worship of God, that cannot constitute "proper observance of the Sabbath," if the day itself is not the Sabbath. This fact seems so self-evident as to make argument useless. Moreover, if the rest and worship mentioned above be upon some one of the six days which God has devoted to labour, then that rest is not a proper observance of that day. We do not say that Sunday or Monday or any other day of the week may not be used, on occasions for religious worship, but we do say that for a regular practice, the only "proper observance" of Sunday, as well as of the five days following, is labour, and the only "proper observance of the Sabbath" is rest and worship on the seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday. And this we say "by the word of the Lord." See Ex. 16:22-30; 20:8-11; Luke 23:54-56.

E. J. WAGGONER.

November 3, 1887

"Condemned and Justified" *The Present Truth* 3, 21.

E. J. Waggoner

No one who contemplates the breadth of the law, and believes the inspired statement that it is perfect—the righteousness of God—can feel disposed to deny that statement of the wise man, that to fear God and keep his commandments is the whole duty of man. Obedience to a perfect law must produce a perfect character, and perfection is all that can be required of anybody.

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

To understand this verse we must take it in its connection. But first, to the verse itself. Why can no flesh be justified in the sight of God by the deeds of the law? The last clause of the verse gives the answer: "For by the law is the knowledge of sin." Well, why does the fact that the law gives the knowledge of sin make it impossible for any one to be justified by it? Read from the ninth verse onward, and you will see. Paul says: "We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." This he has done in the first and second chapters. "As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." Rom. 3:10-12. After particularizing somewhat on this point, the apostle says: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." Verse 19. Then follows the conclusion, "*Therefore* by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin."

Now we can see the force of Paul's conclusion. Since the law gives us the knowledge of sin, by pointing it out, it

324

condemns the whole world, for there is no man that has not sinned; all the world are guilty before God. And this is a sufficient reason why no one can be justified by the law. The law that justifies a criminal is a bad law; but the law of God is "holy, and just, and good;" it will not justify a sinner.

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

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

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

The position, then, thus far, is this: To keep the commandments is the whole duty of man; it is only by keeping them that we can have eternal life. But no man has kept them, neither can any man show a perfect record in this respect. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Rom. 3:23. How, then, it may well be asked, can any one be saved? How can we become justified? The answer comes: "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is

in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Rom. 3:24-26.

Christ was sinless; the law was in his heart. As the Son of God his life was worth more than those of all created beings, whether in heaven or on earth. He saw the hopeless condition of the world, and came "to seek and to save that which was lost." Luke 19:10. To do this he took upon himself our nature (Heb. 2:16, 17); and on him was laid "the iniquity of us all." Isa. 53:6. In order to save us, he had to come where we were, or, in other words, he had to take the position of a lost sinner. Thus the apostle says: "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin." 2 Cor. 5:21. It was this fact that caused him such anguish in the garden. He felt that the sins upon him were shutting him away from God. It was this that caused him, when hanging on the cross, to utter that cry of bitter agony, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" It was not physical pain that crushed the life out of the Saviour of the world, but the load of sin which he bore. "The wages of sin is death." Rom. 6:23. Sin will cause the death of every one who is not freed from it, for "sin when it is finished, bringeth forth death." James 1:15. And because Christ was "numbered with the transgressors," he suffered the penalty of transgression.

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

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

E. J. WAGGONER.

December 15, 1887

"The Support of the Poor" *The Present Truth* 3, 24.

E. J. Waggoner

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

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

Now when we read in Num. 18:21, "And thou shalt not let any of thy seed pass through the fire to Molech, neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God: I am the Lord," we are forced to the conclusion that the tithe of spoken of in Deut. 14 and 20 is not the same as that which was devoted to the Levites on account of their service in the sanctuary, for the stranger could not by any possibility be counted as one of the Levites. We can harmonize the two Scriptures only on the ground that the tithe which the people themselves, together with "the Levites, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow," were to eat, was a *second tithe*, taken after the tithe for the Levites had been given them. This view of the question is taken by all commentators of whom we have any knowledge. And there are some who claim that every third year a third tithe was collected. We quote a few testimonies:-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

E. J. WAGGONER.