

# THE GOSPEL SICKLE

"THRUST IN THY SICKLE AND REAP, - - - FOR THE HARVEST OF THE EARTH IS RIPE." Rev. 14:15.

VOL. I.

BATTLE CREEK, MICHIGAN, AUGUST 1, 1886.

No. 13.

THE GOSPEL SICKLE,  
IS PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY FOR THE  
INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY SOCIETY,  
By the Review and Herald Publishing Association,  
Battle Creek, Michigan.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:

URIAH SMITH, GEO. I. BUTLER, W. H. LITTLEJOHN,  
D. M. CANRIGHT, AND R. F. COTTRELL.

For Terms, - - - See Last Page.

NAOMI'S QUESTION TO RUTH.

"Where hast thou gleaned to-day?"  
'T is a voice of the olden time,  
Awakening echoes from far away,  
To surge in a solemn chime.

"Where hast thou gleaned to-day?"  
Bring the searching question home;  
The distant hills are growing gray  
In the gathering night shade's gloom.

"Where hast thou gleaned to-day?"  
The harvest indeed is great;  
The Lord of the harvest pray,  
The fields for the gleaners wait.

"Where hast thou gleaned to-day?"  
Hast thou followed those who reap?  
Or do the fields by thy delay  
Their scattered stalks still keep?

"Where hast thou gleaned to-day?"  
Hast thou sat with folded hands,  
Or idly loitered by the way,  
Aloof from the reaper bands?

The fields stretch far and wide,  
And, before we kneel to pray,  
May we ask at each eventide,  
"Where have I gleaned to-day?"

—Whitting Bancroft.

## Notes & Comments.

**NOTICE.**—Parties receiving this Paper, not having subscribed for it, may know that it is sent to them by the courtesy of some friend. Do not hesitate to take it from the Office, for none will be called upon to pay for any numbers they have not ordered. We invite candid attention to the Contents of the Paper, and when you have read it, please hand it to a Friend or Neighbor.

MEMORY is a God-given faculty, and its preservation may be, will be, one of the effectual ways of glorifying him. By forgetfulness, we are shorn of a necessary element of strength. We cannot repent of sins that are forgotten, and sins unrepented of stand recorded against us. We cannot perform all the duties that devolve upon us as faithful stewards if we have a habit of forgetting half of them. We cannot do acceptable work without that which God has especially designed to help us in performing it, and which only awaits our demand upon it.

OLD DR. BEECHER, in his "Conflict of Ages," in speaking of the popular theory of eternal punishment, said: "It involves God, his whole administration, and his eternal kingdom in the deepest dishonor that the mind of man or angel can conceive. The human mind cannot be held back from abhorring such a theory, except by the most unnatural violence to its divinely inspired convictions of right." In just the same way have many others reasoned, as well as Dr. Beecher. No wonder that even the little child, when told by its mother of an eternally burning hell, said, "I wish I had never been born!" Thank Heaven that so revolting a sentiment is purely human and wholly unscriptural. The great and godly Dr. Vinet once observed that "even now, after eighteen centuries of gospel light, we are probably involved in some enormous error, of which Christianity will, at some future time, make us ashamed." The doctrine of eternal woe is just such an "enormous error;" and many thoughtful persons are beginning to be ashamed of it.

THE primary cause of our mistakes is unbelief. Had Eve believed God's word,—"Thou shalt surely die,"—she would not have eaten of the forbidden fruit, and thus brought the curse upon all mankind. From this evil spirit of unbelief arise ignorance, pride, self-righteousness, and other sinful states of mind which render us unwilling, and hence, unable to discern God's guidance. Thus we fall into sin. How many of us have said, with Peter, "Though all men shall be offended because of Thee, yet will I never be offended," and then, turning away, have denied our Lord and Master, and gone out and "wept bitterly"! In our fancied strength, we have neglected to "put on the whole armor of God;" we have forgotten the words of Christ, "Without me ye can do nothing." John 15:5.

As the different Protestant churches have been courting the favor of the world, false charity has blinded their eyes. They do not see but what it is right in some things to believe good of evil; and as a sure result, they will finally go on to believe evil of that which is good. Instead of standing in noble defense of the faith once delivered to the saints, they are now, as it were, apologizing to Rome for their uncharitable opinion of her, begging pardon for their bigotry. Like Israel of old, the Protestant church is now going down to Egypt for help. In the movements now in progress in this country to secure for the institutions and usages of the church the support of the State, Protestants are following in the steps of papists. Even more, they are opening wide the door for popery to regain in Protestant America the prestige and supremacy which she has lost in the Old World. And that which gives the greatest significance to this movement is the fact that the principal object contemplated is the enforcement by law of Sunday observance—a custom which originated with Rome, and which she boastfully claims as the one great sign of her spiritual authority. Rome watches the movements of Protestants in this direction with great complacency.

"CHARITY," says Paul, "suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; . . . is not puffed up; seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things." Charity is defined as "supreme love," and without this love we become as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. We cannot bear the fruits that are produced by the true Spirit of God, except we have this abiding principle in our hearts. We must forget self in the desire to do good to others; for we are assured that in heaven none will think of self, nor seek his own pleasure; but all from pure, genuine love will seek to promote the happiness of others. "God positively enjoins upon all his followers a duty to bless others with their influence and means, and to do all in their power to elevate the thoughts and affections of those who come within their influence."

TWO RESURRECTIONS—The word of God declares very explicitly that there will be two resurrections, and that they will be 1,000 years apart. See Rev. 20:5, 6. The first is the resurrection of the righteous; and the second, the resurrection of the wicked. But notwithstanding this explicit statement, nearly the whole orthodox fraternity who believe in any literal resurrection, hold that the good and bad will all be awakened simultaneously. Will such please note one important fact: In all instances in the Bible where the resurrection of both classes is mentioned, in the same connection, the resurrection of the righteous is always mentioned FIRST; so that the entire course and current of the Scripture statement seems to imply a special and prior resurrection of the people of God.

THERE is not the slightest jot or tittle of evidence in all the word of God, from Genesis to Revelation, that the great Lawgiver of the universe has ever required men to sanctify as a Sabbath the first day of the week. What he has said in the decalogue of the first day is found in these words: "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work." The first day is placed upon the same basis as the second, third, fourth, etc., or any day of the week except the Lord's Sabbath, the seventh day.

THE denial of self for the good and happiness of those around us, will be found to constitute a large share of our life record in heaven; while even here we feel a degree of satisfaction obtained in no other way. Love is the ruling element in heaven. It was this that caused the sacrifice of the Son of God for us. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends," and "if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another."

COTTON MATHER, born 1662, was one of the eminent pastors of New England. He was author of three hundred and eighty-two different works, and was one of the most distinguished and learned clergymen of his day. More than a score of his publications relate to the second coming of Christ, and things pertaining to the end. Of the New Earth this eminent minister said:—

"The conflagration described by the oracles of God in strong terms, and which we are warned of by the mouth of all the prophets—this conflagration will be at the second coming of the Lord. To make the Petrine conflagration [see 2 Peter, chap. 3] signify no more than the laying of Jerusalem and her daughters in ashes, and to make the new heavens and the new earth signify no more than the church state of the gospel,—these are shameful hallucinations."

Thus wrote the celebrated old New England pastor of a subject which is so terribly befogged at the present day. In another work, describing the last days, he spoke thus:—

"When our Lord shall come, he will find the world almost void of true and lively faith (especially of faith in his coming); and when he shall descend with his heavenly banners and angels, what else will he find, almost, but the whole church, as it were, a dead carcass, miserably putrified with the spirit, and manners and endearments of this world."

Such a ringing testimony should have great weight with the professors of this world-loving and pleasure-seeking age.

GOD tests and proves our love by the little occurrences of life. It is these that make up the sum of life's happiness, and it is their neglect that adds to our wretchedness. The two great principles, "love to God" and "love to man," are the embodiment of all that constitutes man's happiness, either in this world or the one to come; and if we expect to enjoy heavenly society in the earth made new, we must be governed by heavenly principles here. Every act of our lives affects others for good or evil; hence the necessity of being actuated by the proper motives.

THEY shall "perish." Here is another word, the very strongest that can be found to denote utter destruction, used in a multitude of instances to denote the end of the wicked. "Let the wicked perish at the presence of God." Ps. 68:2. "But the wicked shall perish." Ps. 37:20. "Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish." Acts 13:41. "He that speaketh lies shall perish." Prov. 19:9. "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." Luke 13:3. "Shall utterly perish in their own corruption." 2 Pet. 2:12. This is just what we believe and teach.

## DOCTRINAL.

"Speak thou the things which become sound doctrine." Titus 2:7.

## THE NEW COVENANT.

## HOW THE GENTILES CAME IN.

BY D. M. CANRIGHT.

As we have seen, the seventh-day Sabbath was not only kept by Christ, but it was taught by him; hence, whoever accepts the new covenant taught by Christ, accepts the seventh-day Sabbath and the law of God. After the death of Christ, the twelve apostles confined their labors wholly to the Jews for almost three years and a half, or to the end of the one week. This brought them down to A. D. 34, to the end of the seventy weeks of Dan. 9. Then the gospel was to go to the Gentiles, and so it did, as we have seen.

Now, how are these Gentiles to come in and partake of the new covenant, which was made solely with the house of Israel and the house of Judah? The answer is simple: They could come in by renouncing their Gentile habits, putting away their heathen Gods and other sins; by coming out from the world and accepting Jesus Christ as their Saviour, and the terms of the new covenant which he had enjoined upon Israel.

Take a simple illustration: Here are two fields in which are two flocks of sheep. These fields are separated by a stone wall. In the first field, which we will call No. 1, there is plenty of good pasture, excellent shade, clear water, and everything the sheep can desire. We will let that pasture represent the Jews and the spiritual blessings which they enjoyed; for they had everything. Paul enumerates the blessings of this people in the following words: "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen." Rom. 9:4, 5.

Notice the spiritual blessings which he here enumerates. He says that they were "Israelites;" to them belonged "the adoption," and "the glory," and "the covenants" (notice, not "the covenant," but both "the covenants"—the old and the new), "the giving of the law," and "the service of God," and "the promises." All the promises were made to Israel. Christ belonged to them, God belonged to them, and, in fact, everything belonged to them. So true is this that Jesus said "Salvation is of the Jews." John 4:22. Thus we find the first flock of sheep in the excellent pasture. Now, in the other pasture there is almost nothing at all,—no shade, no water, no shelter,—and the poor sheep are nearly starved to death. This represents the Gentiles. Paul describes them thus: "Wherefore remember, that ye, being in times past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." Eph. 2:11, 12.

Thus the Gentiles were without Christ, without God, and without hope, without the promises, and without the covenants, strangers from God's people,—a sad condition indeed, but just the condition in which the Gentile world have placed themselves long before, by rejecting God and the law. Paul next proceeds to tell us how these Gentiles were to come in and be benefited by the new covenant in Jesus Christ. Thus he says: "But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace." Eph. 2:13-15.

The apostle here says that the middle wall of partition is broken down, so that the Gentiles could come in and be of the same body as the Jews. In the illustration, suppose we break down the stone wall between those two flocks of sheep. Will the sheep of the good pasture go into the other and starve to death?—No, but there would be a rush for the good pasture instead; and that is just what did

occur in fact. The Gentiles came in and partook of the blessings which God had given to the Jews. They accepted the God of the Jews, the Scriptures of the Jews, the Jewish Saviour, the covenant made with the Jews, and the gospel given to the Jews; in fact everything they received when they accepted Christ was Jewish. Paul expressly declares that the Gentiles received their spiritual blessings from the Jews: "For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things." Rom. 15:27.

But, says one, the sheep in that good pasture *might* come in to the other pasture if the partition was broken down. Let us see what they will find if they go there. In leaving the Jewish pasture they will have to leave God, and Christ, the Bible, the Sabbath, the new covenant,—they will be without God and without hope, without the promises, and strangers to the new covenant. This would be a poor bargain. But in order that the Gentiles may come in and be benefited by the gospel, they must accept everything which God gave unto the Jews,—the Jewish God, Saviour, Scriptures, hope, gospel, covenant, law, etc.

Talk about a covenant made with the Gentiles; talk about a Sabbath for the Gentiles; talk about a new law for the Gentiles! neither Jesus nor his apostles ever mentioned such a thing.

Paul takes an olive tree to illustrate the relation which Gentile Christians sustain to Israel. (See Rom. 11:17-24.) The olive tree represents Israel. Some branches were broken off. These were the unbelieving Jews who rejected Christ and the new covenant. Some branches from a wild olive were grafted into the old tame olive tree, to fill up the places of the rejected branches, and thus keep the original tree perfect and still growing. These wild olive branches represent the Gentile Christians who accept Jesus and the new covenant. Thus they are no longer Gentiles but have become "Israelites indeed," "Jews inwardly," "Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." Thus the converted Gentiles become a part of true Israel, and accept whatever is in the new covenant which God made "with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah." Heb. 8:8.

## THOUGHTS ON THE LAW AND SABBATH.

BY D. T. BOURDEAU.

"The law is made for the profane." 1 Tim. 1:9.

THIS is what the great apostle taught Timothy. In the previous verse he says, "We know that the law is good." He is speaking of the law of ten commandments as a condemning rule, as the means of reproving men of sin. Among the lawless characters that the law, as such, is made for, he mentions the profane. But who are profane persons?—Those who profane or treat with irreverence sacred things, among which is the holy Sabbath. Therefore, the sin of Sabbath-breaking is clearly condemned by this passage, unless it can be shown that God has removed his sanctification from it. This *he has never done*. The text before us should silence those who with an air of triumph ask why the sin of Sabbath-breaking is not condemned in the New Testament. Besides this, the law of ten commandments, which is acknowledged and enforced in the New Testament (Matt. 5:17-19; 19:17, etc.), as strongly condemns this sin as it did when Jehovah proclaimed it with a voice that shook the earth; and the example of Christ and the primitive church in keeping the Sabbath is no slight proof for those who presumptuously profane God's holy day. Luke 4:16; 23:56.

The original word *βεβηλος*, from which the word profane in this text is translated, is derived from *βηλος*, which signifies a threshold. As a threshold is open and accessible to all, and is polluted by being passed over, so the Sabbath is made common and trodden under foot by those who profane it. How proper, then, it is for the prophet Isaiah, while setting forth the necessity of a Sabbath reform, to encourage the people to take away their foot from the Sabbath, from doing their pleasure on God's holy day. Isa. 58:12, 13.

## AN IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION.

When Christ institutes a new ordinance, as, for instance, the ordinance of baptism, or that of the Lord's supper, he is careful to give instructions that are so clear that all can understand them, and to leave us his example to give force to his teachings. And the apostles in teaching and practicing the ordinances of the Saviour refer to what he did and said. Christ was baptized in Jordan, and taught his disciples to baptize, and at his ascension he commanded to baptize

as well as to teach. After that, the apostles practiced baptism, and explained its nature and object, referring to the resurrection of Christ. The Lord's supper was instituted on the memorable night on which Christ was betrayed, and that same night Christ partook of this ordinance with his disciples. And when Paul writes to the church of Corinth on this ordinance, he thus refers back to Christ as authority: "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you. That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed took bread." And he continues, repeating the words the Saviour used in instituting this ordinance. Read 1 Cor. 11; Matt. 26:3; 28; Rom. 6.

Now where do we find so clear instructions from Christ concerning the first day? We do not find in the history of his life that he ever took the first day upon his lips. Where is the example of Christ in favor of the first day as a new Sabbath? And where is the passage in which the apostles refer to Christ as authority for the establishment of a new Sabbath, or for a change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day?

## THE ROYAL LAW OF LIBERTY.

James 2:8-12: "If ye fulfill the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well. But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law. So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty."

Those who fulfill the law in question "do well," and are approved of God. This law proceeds from a high authority. It is the royal (kingly) law, the law of the great King. It is not the scripture, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," but is according to that scripture (French trans.); and this is true of the law of ten commandments, the last six precepts of which are based on equal love to our neighbor. And two of these commandments are thus quoted in this passage: "For he that said [or that law that said, margin], Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill." And he who said these things, said also in the same law, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." "For whosoever shall keep the whole law," says the apostle, "and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." Not that he has violated every precept of that law; but he has sinned against the authority that gave the law; he is a transgressor.

This is in harmony with the declaration of Christ that not one jot or tittle shall pass from the law. And we will here apply the reasoning of James to the Sabbath: "Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou violate the Sabbath, thou art become a transgressor of the law." Finally, the apostle exhorts his readers to so speak and so do as they that shall be judged by this law, which is the law of liberty because those who keep it are not under the bondage of condemnation.

## SOME OF THE SAYINGS OF FIRST-DAY ADVOCATES EXAMINED.

BY W. R. PATTERSON.

IN the GOSPEL SICKLE of April 15, the writer noticed some of the positions taken on the question of the Sabbath, in a sermon by Rev. I. L. Carter, of the M. E. Church South. He had no idea then of anything like a review of the whole discourse,—intending to notice only a few of its strongest points,—but inasmuch as the writer will soon be expelled from the church above referred to, on charge of "heresy," or "Sabbath desecration," and as I suppose the arguments herein reviewed will constitute the evidence by which the charge will be vindicated, I have thought best to examine in the light of Scripture and reason the following statements from Mr. C's discourse:—

"The Sabbath was first designed to commemorate creation, but Moses taught Israel that they were not keeping it for that purpose." He referred to Deut. 5:15. Sometimes, in our zeal to beat down some doctrine which is not in harmony with our practice, we are tempted to take almost any position, or jump at almost any conclusion which seems to answer our purpose. The position taken in the foregoing statement is no exception to the rule. But does not Mr. C. believe that the law, or precept, which enforced the Sabbath that Israel was under, is still in force, still binding?—Most assuredly. If the only

significance of the Sabbath to Israel was their deliverance from Egyptian bondage, the world would be without a Sabbath to-day; for the Church to-day could not keep the Sabbath if it had no other significance. In other words, what propriety would there be in the Church of Christ's keeping a Sabbath because the Jewish nation was delivered from bondage on that day? If the reader will turn to Lev. 19:35-37, he will find the same reason given by Inspiration for observing all of God's "statutes" and all his "judgments," which is given in Deut. 5:15 for observing the Sabbath. But would anybody claim that because God said that the delivering of Israel from Egyptian bondage constituted a reason why they should "do no unrighteousness," should "have just weights," etc., and keep all his "statutes and judgments," that therefore the Church under the Christian dispensation was under no obligations to do the things here commanded? and why not?

I cannot do better, perhaps, before I leave this part of the subject, than to give a short quotation from "Andrews' History of the Sabbath" commencing on page 76. He says: "It is a singular fact that those who write against the Sabbath, uniformly quote this scripture as the original fourth commandment, while the original precept is carefully left out; yet there is the strongest evidence that this is not the original precept, for Moses rehearses these words at the end of the forty years' sojourn, whereas the original commandment was given in the third month after the departure from Egypt. (Compare Ex. 19:20 with Deut. 1.) The command itself, as here given, contains direct proof on the point. Thus it reads: 'Keep the Sabbath day to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee,' thus citing elsewhere for the original statute." Again he says: "These words [referring to Deut. 5:15] are often cited as proof that the Sabbath originated with the departure of Israel from Egypt, and that it was ordained at that time as a memorial of their deliverance from thence. But it will be observed, 1. That this text says not one word respecting the origin of the Sabbath or rest day of the Lord. 2. That the facts on this point are all given in the original fourth commandment, and are there referred to creation. 3. That there is no reason to believe that God rested on the seventh day at the time of this flight from Egypt; nor did he then bless and hallow the day. 4. That the Sabbath has nothing in it of a kind to commemorate the deliverance from Egypt, as that was a flight and this is a rest; and that flight was upon the fifteenth day of the first month, and this rest upon the seventh day of each week. Thus one would occur annually; the other, weekly. 5. But God did ordain a fitting memorial of that deliverance to be observed by the Hebrews; the passover, on the fifteenth day of the first month, in memory of God's passing over them when he smote the first-born of Egypt, and the feast of unleavened bread in memory of their flight from Egypt." See Ex. 12:13.

Again Mr. C. says: "No one can tell whether the day Israel kept was the seventh day of the week, or original creation Sabbath, or not." These words contain the acknowledgment that "the original creation Sabbath" was the "seventh day of the week;" and how such an acknowledgment can be harmonized with his position, "that the Sabbath means only the seventh part of time," is for him to say. But let us see whether the statement, that no one can tell whether the day Israel kept was the same that Jehovah rested upon and set apart at the end of creation week, is true or not. "And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Gen. 2:3. Here we find the origin of one Sabbath. There are several things which mark it as a particular day: 1. God rested upon it; therefore it is his rest day, or Sabbath. 2. It was the seventh day; and let it be remembered that seventh day is the scriptural name of Sabbath, or last day of the week; the name we apply to it—"Saturday"—being like many of the doctrines and customs of the present age, derived from paganism. 3. God blessed it and sanctified it. 4. It was the day following the sixth day of creation week. Let us now apply these tests to the Sabbath given to Israel at Sinai. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath [rest] of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work; . . . for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, . . . and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Ex. 20:8-11. 1. God speaks of this day as "the Sabbath [rest] of the Lord thy God." Could he, with any propriety, call any of the six working days his Sabbath (rest) day? 2. And

in this law to Israel (Ex. 20:8-11) the seventh day is the Sabbath. 3. The day Israel was commanded to observe is a day which God had blessed and hallowed. Ex. 20:8-11. 4. The Sabbath given to Israel refers to creation, to the day on which God rested, for its origin. Thus: "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, . . . and rested the seventh day." So we see these two days agree most perfectly, and we now feel satisfied to dismiss this objection, though other scripture and reason might be adduced to show its incorrectness.

Again: "It could not be that they could keep the seventh day from creation; it is impossible to know if they [S. D. Adventists] are keeping the Sabbath exactly the day on which creation was completed; no man can prove it." Really, it seems to us that the proof should be demanded by "the other side." The brother gets the Sabbath lost in Egyptian bondage, in the Babylonian captivity, etc.; but in our former article, we found it not only this side of both of these, but this side of the cross—I believe I might say in the Christian dispensation. In Luke 23:56 we are told by inspiration that the day before the resurrection was "the Sabbath day according to the commandment." I repeat, it is not necessary for us to prove the exactness of the day (though we do it) until some proof is adduced to support the bold postulate that "time has been lost," and so changed, etc., that no one can now "tell on what day the Sabbath comes."

Those who are really troubled about this lost time question, are referred to a pamphlet published at the office of the Review and Herald, Battle Creek, Mich., entitled, "The Lost Time Question." Price, three cents.

"Impossible to know"! Indeed! If the Sabbath has been "lost" at all, the loss has occurred since the Saviour was personally upon earth. He certainly knew if the people were keeping the wrong day, and if such had been the case, he had the best of opportunities to correct the mistake; for he often referred to the Sabbath in his teaching. He taught that he was "Lord of the Sabbath" (Mark 2:28); that it was "lawful to do good on the Sabbath day," and many other things in regard to it, but never once said anything about their not observing the right day.

It would seem, upon serious reflection, that those observing the day commanded of God, would "stand about as good chance" to "know" something about the seventh day, or Sabbath of the Bible, as modern Sunday advocates of their day. But, oh, no; "lost time" of course has not affected in the least the "venerable day of the sun."

Referring to the meeting in John 20:19, as a proof text that the first day of the week is the "Christian Sabbath," Mr. C. asserted the following: "The apostles understood this change of the Sabbath very well. The Saviour told them all about it before his crucifixion." I hardly know what reply to make to the above postulate; in fact I do not know that it is best to reply to such assertions. I respectfully refer Mr. C., and those like him, to Deut. 29:29, which reads: "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law." If the Lord did indeed instruct the apostles in reference to the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, they have certainly kept the secret well. It never became a subject of revelation. Will Mr. C. please tell us how he learned that wonderful fact? Shame on a doctrine that has to rest on such barefaced assertions.

### NEW HEAVEN AND NEW EARTH.

BY ETHAN LANPHEAR.

To what use is the new earth to be put, if the saints are forever to dwell in the heavens above, as most orthodox ministers preach at the present day? If this is so, some of the writers of the gospel have made egregious blunders. Let us turn to 2 Pet. 3:5, 6, and see what we find written: "For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished." Do we believe this? If so, let us continue: "But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of Judgment and perdition of ungodly men." Verse 7. "Against the day of Judgment and perdition"—at death, or at a future Judgment, which? Listen

to Peter's words again: "But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." Verse 8. Was this written by the inspiration of God, dear orthodox friends? If so, let us read on: "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up." Verses 9, 10. Is this so, Peter? "By the same word are kept in store," as was the destruction by the flood. "Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat. Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." Verses 11-13.

But the great day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night. The purposes of the Almighty are not to be thwarted by the adversary. God created the earth for the habitation of his children. Eden was perfect in construction; it shall be perfect when renewed. Man, created in the image of his Maker, was pronounced good. The enemy entered, bringing sin, sorrow, and death; but Christ came into the world to redeem man from the thralldom of sin and death, and will reign until he puts all his enemies under his feet: "And the Devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night to the ages of ages (Rotherham's translation). "And the sea gave up the dead that were in it, and death and hades gave up the dead that were in them; and judged were they, each one, according to their works. And death and hades were hurled into the lake of fire; this is the second death, the lake of fire. And if any one was not found written in the scroll of life, he was hurled into the lake of fire." Rev. 20:10, 13-15.

Turn to Malachi 4:1-3: "For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. But unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of Righteousness arise with healing in his wings; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall. And ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts." Turn now to Matt. 25:31: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory," etc., the separation takes place. "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom [earth] prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Verse 34. "For evil doers shall be cut off; but those that wait upon the Lord, they shall inherit the earth. For yet a little while and the wicked shall not be; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be. But the meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace." Ps. 37:9-11. "And they shall build houses, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build, and another inhabit; they shall not plant, and another eat: for as the days of a tree are the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands." Isa. 65:21, 22. "And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away. And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write; for these words are true and faithful." Rev. 21:4, 5.

Is not this enough? Could the meekest saint desire more than thus to be an heir of God and a joint heir with Jesus Christ, and thus inherit the earth renewed, and ever be with the Lord? How appropriate the prayer: "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven," etc., to them that are watching for the coming of the Lord!



"The fields are white already to harvest."—John 4:35.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., AUGUST 1, 1886.

## ANOTHER SIGN OF THE LAST-DAY.

### DECLENSION IN RELIGION.

THE word of God very plainly states that in the last days the professed people of God will be largely in a worldly, formal, backslidden condition. Thus, Christ, in describing the last days, says, "And because iniquity shall abound the love of many shall wax cold." Matt. 24:12. The "love of many," it is here stated, is to wax cold. This shows a declension in piety. Again, speaking of the same times, Jesus says, "Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Luke 18:8. This question implies very strongly that there will be a great lack of faith on the earth among professors when Christ shall come. The apostle Paul gives a fearful description of the religion of the last days: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God, having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof; from such turn away." 2 Tim. 3:1-5. It will be noticed that all the above-named sins are to be committed by those having a form of godliness. He is not speaking of what infidels and worldlings will do, but he is telling how it will be with professors of religion. They will be proud, covetous, boasters, lovers of pleasures, etc. And so we might quote many more scriptures to the same effect.

Is this true of our world now?—Most certainly it is. Look at the two hundred million Roman Catholics. All call themselves Christian; but many of them will swear, and drink, and fight, and are as devoid of religion as the veriest worldling. Look at the eighty millions of the Greek Church. Just as far from vital godliness as the Catholics. Then look at the old Lutheran and Episcopal churches, and others. The great majority of their members are as proud and fashionable and worldly as worldlings can be. Where shall we look for piety to-day? Among the four hundred million professed Christians, no one could claim more than a few, here and there, in the most pious churches. Probably the Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, and a few like these are the most pious and godly people upon the earth, among the popular churches. But how is it with a great mass of even these? Are they real Christians? Are one-half of them? No sober-minded person who reads his Bible, and studies the life of Christ, and has any proper sense of what holiness and purity and the requirements of the work of God are, will for a moment claim any more than a small percentage of any church membership, as real Christians. Let us look at a few facts:—

1. *The Way They Dress.*—The Bible expressly teaches that Christian women should dress plainly and modestly (1 Tim. 2:9, 10); yet is it not a fact that in our popular churches the most of the sisters dress just as richly, gaudily, and stylishly as the veriest worldling? If you want to see feathers and jewelry and fashion, visit the leading church members with their wives and daughters.

The *Advocate* (Methodist), published at Charlestown, Mass., says:—

"Notwithstanding the prohibition of the Methodist Discipline, it is a serious fact, and one generally to be deplored, that there is more jewelry and superfluous dress worn by the Methodists of this day than there is by any other class of religious professors in our land."

And what is true of the Methodists is equally true of the large mass of women in other churches.

2. *Where They Go.*—People show what they love most by the places they frequent. If they love the Bible, and God, and religion most, they will go where these things are loved and taught. Notice what a prominent minister says upon this subject:—

H. Mattison, D. D., appeals to his people in the following strains:—

"You Methodists who were once poor and unknown, but have grown rich and prominent in the world, have left the narrow way in which you walked twenty or thirty years ago, have ceased to attend class-meeting, seldom pray in your families or in prayer-meetings, as you once did, and are now indulging in many of the fashionable amusements of the day, such as playing chess, dominoes, billiards, and cards, dancing, and attending theaters, or allowing your children to indulge in them. . . . These things, it is said, are most common in cities and villages; and the rich and aristocratic families of the church, as some call them, lead the way, and are the most prominent and open in the practice of these follies."—*Popular Amusements*, p. 3.

No intelligent person will deny his statement, but what a sad picture this is for a pastor to draw of his own church!

3. *Festivals and Fairs.*—Paul describes these last-day professors as lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God. 2 Tim. 3:5. Just think for a moment how common and popular it is becoming for every church to indulge in feasting and festivals, in suppers, in socials, in everything that worldlings and lovers of pleasure delight in. They have them right in their churches. Pastors, elders, deacons, and members all attend, and make it a scene of festivity and merriment. Can that be pleasing to God? Is that New Testament religion? Even gambling and lotteries are countenanced right in the church of God.

Mr. Moody, at Baltimore, thus paid his compliments to "church fairs":—

"And there are your grab-bags—your grab-bags! There is too much of this. Your fairs and your bazaars won't do, and your voting, your casting of ballots for the most popular man or the most popular woman, just helping along their vanity. It grieves the Spirit; it offends God. They have got so far now that for twenty-five cents young men can come in and kiss the handsomest woman in the room. Think of this! Look at the church lotteries going on in New York. Before God, I would rather preach in any barn, or in the most miserable hovel on earth, than within the walls of a church paid for in such a way. What is the use of going to a gambling den when you can have a game of grab with a lady for a partner?"

When Jesus was here, he most severely condemned such things. He said, "Make not my Father's house an house of merchandise." John 2:16. But this is the very thing that the majority of the churches are doing to-day. What is all this feasting, and fun, and lottery, and gambling for?—Merely to make money, and to get it out of the young and giddy and worldlings. Further evidence upon this subject will be given in the next number. D. M. C.

## HISTORICAL FACTS AS TO WHEN THE SABBATH WAS CHANGED.

### CONSTANTINE'S SUNDAY LAW, A. D. 321.

"Let all the judges and town people, and the occupation of all trades rest on the venerable day of the sun; but let those who are situated in the country, freely and at full liberty attend to the business of agriculture; because it so often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn or planting vines; lest, the critical moment being let slip, men should lose the commodities granted them of Heaven."

"It was Constantine the Great who first made a law for the proper observance of Sunday; and who, according to Eusebius, appointed it should be regularly celebrated throughout the Roman Empire."—*Encyclopædia Britannica*, art. Sunday.

The "Encyclopædia Americana," art. Sabbath, says:—

"Constantine the Great made a law for the whole empire (A. D. 321), that Sunday should be kept as a day of rest in all cities and towns, but he allowed the country people to follow their work."

Alex. Campbell, in a lecture in Bethany College, 1848, said:—

"Was the first day set apart by public authority in the apostolic age?—No. By whom was it set apart, and when?—By Constantine, who lived about the beginning of the fourth century."

Of Sunday labor in the Eastern Church, Heylyn says:—

"It was near nine hundred years from our Saviour's birth, if not quite so much, before restraint of husbandry on this day had been first thought of in the East; and probably being thus restrained did find no more obedience there than it had done before in the western parts."—*Hist. Sab.*, part II., chap. 5, sec. 6.

Of Sunday labor in the Western Church, Dr. Francis White thus testifies:—

"The Catholic church for more than six hundred years after Christ, permitted labor, and gave license to many Christian people to work on the Lord's day,

at such hours as they were not commanded to be present at the public service by the precept of the Church."—*Treatise of the Sabbath Day*, pp. 217, 218.

Coleman says:—

"The observance of the Lord's day was ordered while yet the Sabbath of the Jews was continued; nor was the latter superseded until the former had acquired the same solemnity and importance, which belonged, at first, to that great day which God originally ordained and blessed. . . . But in time, after the Lord's day had been fully established, the observance of the Sabbath of the Jews was gradually discontinued, and was finally denounced as heretical."—*Anc. Christ. Exam.*, chap. 26, sec. 2.

Many other testimonials of a similar import could be given, and may be in a future number. Facts thus established, should startle the minds of the honest in heart who are laboring under the impression that the first day of the week is the Sabbath of the Lord. Friends, you are harboring a fatal delusion, and we earnestly entreat you to examine this important subject with candor.

## THE SAINTS' INHERITANCE.—3.

As proof of a future inheritance of the saints on the earth, we will notice the promise the Lord made to Abraham. St. Paul speaks of this promise as one of the firm assurances of future hope; and, because it was confirmed to Abraham by the oath of God, we may derive strong consolation from it, as it rests on "two immutable things." Heb. 6:17-19. The two immutables being the word of God, and the oath of God.

Those who say we have nothing to do with the teachings of the Old Testament, and that our instruction in divine things is to be received from the New Testament only, may think it strange that we should go so far back as to Abraham for proof on so important a question as the future inheritance of the saints. Why not go there? St. Paul says that God "preached before the gospel unto Abraham." Gal. 3:8. If the gospel was preached to him, and if we wish to grasp gospel truth in its entirety, it may be profitable for us to peruse those gospel instructions delivered to him.

In making the promise, "the Lord said unto Abraham, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever." Gen. 13:14, 15.

The Lord also made a covenant with Abraham concerning the land of promise, and when about to confirm that covenant he said to him, "Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; and also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge; and afterward they shall come out with great substance. And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age." Gen. 15:13-15.

That these promises did not relate to anything Abraham was to receive in his life-time, is evident from the words of Stephen. When speaking of the sojourn of Abraham in the land of Canaan, he says that the Lord "gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on." Acts 7:5.

It could not be simply a temporary possession of the land promised Abraham, for the Lord told him he should have it "forever," and "for an everlasting possession." Admitting that the terms "forever" and "everlasting" are sometimes used in a limited sense, we cannot so regard them in this case. The everlasting is not limited by Abraham's life-time; it is the possession that is to be everlasting. Had he received it in his life-time we should find him still on the land, for the land still exists. St. Paul says "God called him to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance." Heb. 11:8.

Of the covenant the Lord made with Abraham we read, "And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect, and I will make my covenant between me and thee." Gen. 17:1, 2. This charge given to Abraham, as we learn by the marginal reading of the text, was to "be upright, or sincere." Uprightness and sincerity can only be developed by those who, by the grace of God working in them, yield obedience to his perfect law. Ps. 19:7. That being the case, the condition of receiving the inheritance is obedience to the law of God. For proof of this compare Gen.

28:4, 5; 1 Chron. 16:15-17; Deut. 4:13; 5:22. The blessing of the covenant is stated in verse 8: "And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession."

The promise made to Abraham was renewed to Isaac. The Lord said to him, "Sojourn in this land, and I will be with thee, . . . and will give unto thy seed all these countries; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws." Gen. 26:3-5.

This promise to Abraham and Isaac was confirmed to Jacob, while sleeping at Bethel with a stone for his pillow. He had a dream of a ladder extending from earth to heaven, with angels of God ascending and descending upon it, "And, behold, the Lord stood above it, and said, I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac; the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed." Gen. 28:13.

We now inquire concerning this Abrahamic promise, Was it, as some assert, all accomplished when the children of Israel went into the land of Canaan? Was this simply a promise that Abraham should have a temporal possession of the land? If so, the promise failed; for he died "in a good old age," and the Lord "gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on." Acts 7:5. We shall not admit that he did not receive it in his life-time because God failed, on his part, to fulfill his promise; but, the promise made to him of a possession will yet be accomplished, and fully realized, in a future possession of the earth. St. Paul says that Abraham "sojourned in the land of promise as in a strange country." Heb. 11:9. It is vain for men to seek for the final accomplishment of these promises in the past, either to Abraham or his posterity. Simply a temporary possession of the land of Canaan does not meet the case; for St. Paul says that the promise to Abraham was that "he should be heir of the world." Rom. 4:13.

We may gain clearer light on the nature of the Abrahamic promise by a perusal of St. Paul's comment upon it. He says, "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." Gal. 3:16. If the seed to whom the promise was made is Christ, then the promise could not be fulfilled prior to the coming of that seed, consequently, not prior to the first advent of Christ. So we see there is no just ground for the claim that the promise to Abraham was all fulfilled when the children of Israel sojourned in the land of Canaan. What God predicted concerning their sojourn was fulfilled to that extent, that "there failed not aught of any good thing which the Lord had spoken unto the house of Israel." Josh. 21:45. But were Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob with them when they went in to possess the land?—No. "They carried up Joseph's bones." Here, then, were four generations, at least, that did not receive the land while alive, and yet the Lord said to Abraham, "I will give it [the land] to thee." To Isaac, he said, "For unto thee I will give all these countries." To Jacob, he said, "The land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it." If we give due weight to these words, we must conclude that when these promises are fulfilled, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob will be there personally, with the rest of God's people, to possess the land.

Although Christ is the seed to whom the promise was made, to the church of God has been granted the privilege of joint heirship with Christ. St. Paul says, "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise?" Gal. 3:29. Christ's children could not be said to be heirs of a promise if that promise were already fulfilled. Jews, after the flesh, are not heirs of the final inheritance in Christ simply because they are descendants of Abraham; but, as expressed by St. Paul, "So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." Gal. 3:9.

In his epistle to the Hebrews, St. Paul has an interesting testimony concerning Abraham. He says, "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out to a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. By faith he sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise; for he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." Heb.

11:8-10. This testimony shows that when Abraham was in the land he did not receive his inheritance, for he was then only an heir, and he was a stranger in a land he should after receive. Again, when he does receive the final accomplishment of the promise, he will receive a city with foundations "whose builder and maker is God." This city seems to so fully accord with the one described in the book of Revelation, chapter 21, that one would conclude that it was the new earth with the New Jerusalem upon it, that Abraham expected finally to receive.

The apostle bears a further testimony concerning these ancient worthies: "Therefore sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, so many as the stars of the sky in multitude, and as the sand which is by the sea-shore innumerable. These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth." Heb. 11:12, 13. This language can only be understood in one of two ways; either these worthies died and God never made any promise to them, or else, being heirs to certain promises, they died without receiving the fulfillment of them. The latter is the obvious meaning of the text. The objector may say, "This means they died without seeing the Saviour; the promise is respecting him." True, the promise is respecting the Saviour; he is the true seed, but in him we are promised an inheritance; with him we are to be joint heirs to the land of promise. He is the true heir, we the joint heirs. The possession will not be given until he comes. Then he is represented as saying to his people, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Matt. 25:34.

In the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, St. Paul mentions a number of worthies, and says time would fail to tell of them and the works they accomplished through faith. In conclusion he says, "And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." Heb. 11:39, 40. Did God fail to fulfill his promise because he had concluded to do better for his people than he promised Abraham? We do not so understand the text. The "better thing" is not a better inheritance, but something better than that these ancient worthies should receive the promise in their day, and others be receiving it all the way along. The Lord has provided a better plan, which is that this promise be realized when all those whom St. Paul styles us, shall have been gathered into that perfect state, as a grand result of gospel work in this world. Had this promise been realized by the ancient worthies, they would have been made perfect without us. It is to be accomplished when our perfection shall come, which will be when "we shall know as we are known," when faith is lost in sight.

The apostle states concerning this Abrahamic promise, "For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swear by himself, saying, Surely, blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee. And so, after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise. For men verily swear by the greater; and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife. Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath; that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us; which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil." Heb. 6:13-18. Would St. Paul claim that the Christian's hope was sure because God confirmed the promise with an oath unto Abraham, if that promise had no reference to the future, but had all been fulfilled in the past?—Certainly not.

When this apostle was making his address before Agrippa he made reference to the Abrahamic promise, in these words: "And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers; unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope's sake, king Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?" Acts 26:6-8. He is willing to be judged for his hope relative to the promise to the fathers. He saw that the people would inquire how Abraham, Isaac,

and Jacob could receive this promise if they were dead; so he inquires why they should think the resurrection incredible. It would be strange indeed if St. Paul should submit himself to be judged in a Roman court, liable to be condemned to death, because of a hope inspired by a promise that was all fulfilled. It is evident from this text that the apostle designed to teach that the fulfillment of this promise is beyond the resurrection. The evidence is most conclusive that the Abrahamic promise reaches to the new-earth state.

J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

A PLEA FOR LIBERTY.

The same number of the St. Louis Republican from which we give this week an article on "The Sunday Question," contains the following able discussion of the question of enforcing the Sunday law. Under the heading above given, James E. McGinnis says:—

"Permit me at the outset to disavow any hostility to the religious observance of Sunday as the Christian Sabbath, and to declare my reverence for it as an institution of the Church, and my enjoyment of it always as a day of rest and respite from labor. But I oppose attempts to enforce its observance by law, as being contrary to the true spirit of our free institutions, and beyond the legitimate field of legislation.

"The real functions of government are few and simple, and are well defined in our bill of rights, which declares 'that all persons have a natural right to life, liberty, and the enjoyment of the gains of their own industry; that to give security to these is the principal office of government;' and whenever it exceeds these duties, it becomes intermeddling, if not tyrannical, with expedients, experiments, and plans 'for the welfare of the people.' Thus we are governed too much. We have too many laws, most of them upon subjects which do not pertain to the true domain of law. Of these are all such as assume to direct what the citizen shall not himself do on Sunday above any other day.

"It is the duty of the State to protect all persons within its jurisdiction in the exercise of their religious rights; and persons who believe it is morally wrong to labor on Sunday, should be protected against being compelled by their employers to labor on that day in violation of such religious belief. But I fail to recognize any constitutional power or authority in the State to say that the employer shall not himself labor on Sunday, and that he shall not permit his servant to labor on that day. . . . Such enactments are usurpations of authority, and violative of natural right. The supporters of such laws seek to justify them upon either moral or hygienic grounds; but upon neither can they be supported, although rational, voluntary observance of Sunday may rest upon both. To place such laws upon moral grounds, is to amalgamate the functions of Church and State in a manner not permissible under our system of government; and to refer them to hygienic requirement, is to open the field to sumptuary legislation without end. It may be admitted that health is promoted by Sunday rest; so it certainly is by cleanly habits, and by temperance in eating and drinking. But no one will seriously claim that the State could rightfully compel everybody to take a bath on Sunday, or that it could establish regulations governing the times and methods of taking food and drink; and yet such regulations, upon such grounds, are no farther from the legitimate scope of legislation, than are Sunday laws upon hygienic grounds. I am aware that the constitutionality of Sunday laws has been upheld upon moral grounds by a most remarkable opinion of the supreme court of this State, delivered by the late Judge Scott (20 Mo. R. 214), which is strictly in harmony with the spirit of such laws, and is quite as un-republican and narrow as the theory which underlies them. It plainly states that this is a Christian State, with a Christian constitution, made by and for Christians, and not for 'strangers collected from all quarters of the globe, each with a religion of his own.' This un-American, anti-republican decision is not a true exposition of the law. This is not a Christian State, nor is it under a Christian constitution, but one made for Jews, Mohammedans, pagans, infidels, and Christians alike; and that this may long remain the land of perfect religious liberty is the fervent aspiration of every patriot and real lover of his kind.

"The true criterion of Sunday laws is the great rule that 'the citizen must so exercise his rights as not to invade the rights of others;' or, differently stated, 'every one has a right to do as he pleases so long as he does not interfere with any one else.' He may labor on Sunday if he chooses to do so, but he must not compel his servant to do so, nor must he labor in such a way as to interfere with the rights of others. For instance, he has no right to carry on a very noisy business close to others who may desire rest in quiet on that day, and who have a right to such quiet, subject only to the necessary noises of an urban population. And certainly he must not carry on his business, nor pursue his pleasures, in such a way as to disturb the solemn quiet of religious worship. Thus people have no right to parade the streets with brass-bands on Sunday, and especially during the hours usually devoted to congregational worship, any more than the congregations have the right to make the air of the whole city vibrant with the clangor of church bells on that day. Both are offensive to many people, and in fact the bells, separated from the traditions, romance, and sentiment which surround them, are much the greater nuisance. Subject to the limitations suggested, every man has a perfect natural right to spend Sunday just as he pleases; and any law which assumes to abridge, or in any manner interfere with, the exercise of those natural rights which one does not necessarily surrender in becoming a member of the State, is in the very nature of things unconstitutional and void, and practically declared a nullity by the customs and habits of mankind.

"Once admit the right of the State to legislate upon the subject of Sunday observance, further than for the protection of the citizen, and logically there can be no limit to the exercise of that right. Let legislation begin by providing that the citizen shall cease from labor, traffic, and travel on Sunday, and it can logically proceed to the enactment of a law that he shall go to church on Sunday, then to one that he shall aid in building the church, and so on, by easy gradation of usurpation, until it reaches the climax of pointing out by law the particular faith to which he shall subscribe, and of enforcing the mandate by imprisonment and the stake. That we have not retrograded to such a culmination is due to the free spirit of the age as opposed to the intolerance of religious bigotry.

"It is generally conceded that regular stated periods of rest are necessary, both to the mental and physical health. The recurrence of day and night presents the natural allotment of time to labor and rest; and by the customs of civilized nations, as well as by the ordinances of Christian churches, one day out of seven is set apart for rest. This is believed to be natural, and therefore right."

"Rest can only be found in change; and to the toiling millions, that rest obtained in these stated periods of repose, is the most perfect where it is sought amid conditions farthest removed from the surroundings of their daily lives. They naturally rush for, and are delighted with, a touch of that variety which is said to be the spice of life. Our Sunday laws, if enforced, would seriously interfere with this choice of change. Their procrustean requirements seek to make all men rest in the same way, which totally negatives the idea of rest to the majority of persons; for that which is rest to one is unrest to another. And the municipality should increase the facilities for the recreation and amusement of the people, so that the clerks, artisans, mechanics, and laborers of the city may find cheap, accessible, and restful occupation for their Sundays, that their enjoyment of life may be thereby greatly enhanced, and their contentment and love of country correspondingly increased."

#### TWO GOOD PRINCIPLES APPLIED.

In the *New York Independent* of June 17th, 1886, we find two statements expressing so clearly and beautifully principles having a special application to subjects that particularly interest us, that we cannot refrain from asking the reader to notice and apply them. The first is from an editorial entitled, "Who is the Lord that I Should Believe on Him," and reads as follows:—

"Every honest man first wants to know just what the truth is. For some men it is quite as convenient and pleasant not to know the truth. The truth might trouble them. It might interfere

with their business. It might lower their self-esteem. It might suggest disagreeable duties. It might even put them out of the church. But all this makes no difference to the really honest man. He asks the questions: 'Who is he?' 'What is the fact?' because he must know before he can settle what to do. What he will do, does not depend on what will sell his goods, or give him wealth or credit, but it depends on what the real facts, as God sees them and not man, show his duty to be."

If now the reader will re-peruse these words with the Sabbath question in mind, as touching the claims of the seventh day instead of the first, the application will make itself.

The next utterance is in one of the "Editorial Notes," and speaks of Christ in his position in heaven and his relation to man here. It says:—

"He acts there for man here. We have a great interest in what he did, suffered, and said while here; and we have an equal interest in what he is doing in heaven. His work in human behalf has a heavenly as well as an earthly sphere of action. He came to earth to do one part of it; and of this he said, 'It is finished,' when he died. He is now in heaven doing the other part of it. He is there the 'High Priest of our confession,' there making 'intercession' for us, there the Mediator between God and man, there our Saviour as really as when he was on earth, there the 'King of kings and Lord of lords,' there a living person, and essentially the same person that he was here, there the 'head' of the church on earth, and holding identically the same relations to men that he held when he was seen by men. It is quite as important that Christian faith should embrace what Christ is and is doing in heaven, as it is that it should embrace what he did and said when on earth. Both should be combined in the same vision. Both must be seen in order to have a true view of the Bible Christ."

While the whole of the foregoing quotation clearly sets forth the present position and personality of Christ in heaven, the declaration to which we particularly call attention is that "Christian faith should embrace what Christ is and is doing in heaven." We look upon it as one of the calamities of Christianity that this point of Christ's specific position and work in heaven, in this dispensation, upon which revelation is so clear, has been so largely overlooked or confused. And before we can mention it, many of our readers will think of the subject of the Sanctuary as one which meets every requirement in this direction. That answers the inquiries of Christian faith most fully. That shows Christ's position and work, and the *modus operandi* of the pardon and remission of sin, as nothing else does. That reveals the extent of the atonement, locates the work, and shows when the end of Christ's ministration is near. We are glad to see a recognition of the fact that Christian faith should embrace such points as these; for these all belong to what Christ "is doing in heaven."

#### ENFORCEMENT OF SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.

The following extracts from an article on Sunday Observance, in the *Christian Union* of May 27, 1886, written not by a Seventh-day Adventist, or any other observer of the seventh day, but by a zealous Sunday advocate, we commend to the thoughtful consideration of those who would enforce the observance of that day under the penalties of the civil law. The clear and straightforward manner in which the subject is handled, contrasts sharply with the sophistry and distortions of the Religious Amendmentists:—

"Sabbatarians, so called, generally insist that the observance of Sunday, to a greater or less extent, should be enforced by the pains and penalties of law. This, it seems to me, is a great mistake, being at once contrary to the spirit of Christianity and beyond the functions of the State. The religion of Christ makes its appeal solely to the hearts and consciences and reason of men. 'My kingdom,' says Jesus, 'is not of this world, else would my servants fight,' i. e., seek to propagate

it by force; and Paul says, 'The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty.' Nothing is clearer than that Jesus abjured the law of force as a means of establishing and perpetuating his religion and the institutions that might grow out of it. John the Baptist persuaded and entreated men to enter the kingdom of heaven through the door of repentance; he neither applied nor sought to apply to them the scourge of the civil law. And Jesus pursued only the same method, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps. When at length, after three centuries of experience in the divine way, the Church entered into unholy wedlock with the State, she repudiated the law of Love for the law of Force. She deluded herself, to be sure, or sought to do so, with the notion that these two laws would work harmoniously together; but the experience of centuries shows us that this was a terrible mistake. The progress of genuine Christianity has been hindered just in proportion as the Church has been dominated by the law of force; and one of the mightiest obstacles to its advancement to-day is the habit which so many Christians have formed of looking to an arm of flesh for the enforcement of religious obligations.

"We plume ourselves in this country upon the assumption that the union between Church and State has been dissolved, and Christians sometimes pay a tribute of gratitude to the statesmanship by which this dissolution was effected. But the work has been inadequately done. Laws which sprang from the old union, and the purpose of which was either wholly or primarily religious,—laws which but for that union would never have been enacted,—still remain upon our statute-books, and many Christians appear to think their repeal would unsettle the foundations of the Church, if not those of Christianity itself. Among these laws our Sunday codes must be reckoned. They were originally enacted to enforce the observance of a religious institution supposed to rest upon the revealed will of God to all nations and for all time. But when this repeal is sought upon the ground that the institution of the Sabbath pertains to 'an establishment of religion,' and therefore cannot legitimately be an object of legislation under our system, the plea is ingeniously urged, that while the State has nothing to do with it upon religious grounds, it may and ought to enforce its observance for the secular benefits it confers. This, let it be understood, is purely an after-thought, the laws having been originally enacted avowedly upon religious grounds and for religious reasons; and those who read between the lines of popular discussion can see clearly enough, through the filmy web of secular argument, that the primary motive for maintaining them is still religious. In short, there is a desire that in this respect, if in no other, religion may be permitted to draw its nourishment from the breast of the State. On every side we hear earnest and even eloquent pleas that the screws of law, as pertaining to the Sabbath, should be tightened. It is not enough for the zealous Sabbatarian that the law protects him in his right to enjoy Sunday in his own way; he longs for power to compel others to keep it in that way. And when he is reminded that it is not the duty of the State to prescribe and enforce the observance of religious institutions, he at once becomes earnest for a legally enforced Sunday for the benefit of society in general, and the working-man in particular."

"The legislature has no more right to say how or when the citizen shall rest from toil, than it has to say what he shall eat or drink, or what sort of clothes he shall wear, or how he shall divide his time between waking and sleeping. It is no doubt true that the nature of man requires periods of rest from toil, and that the disregard of this law of his being will be avenged upon him. But who is authorized to say, except for himself, under what conditions or at what times this rest shall be taken? Shall he rest one day in seven, or one day in five, or one day in ten? or shall work and rest, in due proportion, divide the hours of every day? This is a question upon which the laws of physiology furnish no absolute guide. It must be left to the citizen to decide for himself. Uniformity in this, as in many other things, is certainly desirable, but such uniformity must be voluntary, not enforced by law. So far as it can grow out of common experiences and needs, and from the free consent of all, it will be beneficent; enforced by statute, it would be a curse."—*Oliver Johnson, in Christian Union.*

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

"If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his."

THE WAY OF ESCAPE. 1 COR. 10:13.

BY N. J. BOWERS.

THERE may be noted in our Christian experience, three modes of deliverance from the trials to which we are subjected; viz., 1. The trial or difficulty is removed away; 2. We ourselves are removed away from it; 3. We are removed out of it.

1. The trial is not removed oftentimes till we come up to it face to face. The Red Sea was not divided till the people stood in its very presence. The channel of escape was not prepared before it was needed. Not until the people could proceed no farther, was the way of escape provided. So it will be more than once with us. The trial will come, and it will seem that there is no way out. We are so near we can see the dash of the waves, and hear their roar as they leap at our feet. What shall we do? retreat?—No. The command to Israel was, *Go forward*. How could they? Would God congeal the waters that they might pass over upon them? We suppose this thought never entered their minds. There was no watercraft to carry them across; there were no bridges, and to ford was out of the question. "How shall we go forward?" thought they. Ah, God knew. He would make a way to escape. He would remove the waters, and cause the people to go through the sea. And he did. So will he do for us. God will sometimes have no going over or upon or around, but through. The Jordan did not divide till the feet of the priests touched the waters. Not until the host could go not a step farther was a way provided. Trials will not remove sometimes, until we not only stand face to face with them, but until we feel their touch. The priests' feet were bathed in the wave of difficulty before it was removed. We shall sometimes feel the glow of the furnace before it is removed. We shall sometimes taste the bitter drops before the full cup will pass away. God will at times bring us into strait places that we may see the power of his salvation, and that we may know how helpless we are, and that without him we can do nothing.

2. We are taken away from our trials; that is, we escape and go on our way, but the block in the path is not removed. The dangerous Herod was not removed away from before Joseph and Mary, but they removed themselves, they went around the difficulty and escaped. Thus it is in our experience. We must at times avoid the danger, pass by it, and go on our way. The path of duty sometimes lies to the right or to the left of the siren singer of woe. There is a way to get beyond Sodom besides going through her streets. A nest of hornets and of fetid animals left undisturbed a mile away, is better wisdom than a courageous march through their midst.

3. We are delivered out of our trials. When the trial is not removed, and when we do not remove, we get into it, and then get out. The Lord sometimes does not see fit to remove the trial. It must stand as a test. It is likewise wrong to walk past our duties. Loyalty to right often brings with it the bigot, the warden, and the headsmen. Then the trouble begins. Then it is, often, that the true man or woman is delivered out of their hands. The fiery furnace and the den of lions were not removed, neither did God's faithful ones remove themselves away. They got into them both, but came out with no smell of fire on them, and with no lacerated flesh or broken bones. So at Damascus the apostle got into a place of danger, but got out safely. He and Barnabas escaped assault at Iconium, and fled away to Lystra and Derbe. So we will get into the furnace, but the pleasure of the Lord will bring us out whole. While our Heavenly Father will sometimes remove the trial, and while it is sometimes proper for us to pray for him to do so (2 Cor. 12:8, 9), it is also a blessed thing to endure. James 1:12.

If you cannot be great, be willing to serve God in things that are small.—Sel.

WHAT a depth of love and good will is expressed in the words found in Deut. 5:29: "Oh, that there were such an heart in them, that they would fear me, and keep all my commandments always, that it might be well with them, and with their children forever!" Fond hopes, so long cherished, would soon be realized. Doubt and darkness which hang like a cloud of death over the anxious soul, would be dispersed by bright rays from the Sun of Righteousness, and soon he might read his title clear to mansions in the skies.

THE FIELD.

"THE FIELD IS THE WORLD."

PROGRESS OF THE CAUSE.

Brief mention of work done and results accomplished by Seventh-day Adventists, in different parts of the field, according to reports received since our last issue:—

ARKANSAS.—Tent meeting held at Elm Springs and a company of twelve sign the covenant to "keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus."

CONNECTICUT.—Tent meeting held at Moosup, one result being several converts.

COLORADO.—J. D. Pegg reports ten conversions at Denver; tent meeting at Fort Collins results in creating considerable interest among the people with regard to the doctrines taught by S. D. Adventists; series of meetings being held at Canon City.

CANADA.—Eight converts baptized at Ayers Flat, as one result of the camp-meeting.

ENGLAND.—Elds. Lane and Durland report very interesting meetings at Kettering, and quite a number of converts.

ITALY.—A. C. Bourdeau holds meetings at different points in the Waldensian Valleys, where much interest is awakened, and a goodly number of converts reported.

IOWA.—Tent meetings held at Independence, by Elds. Porter and Wakeham; Eld. Wilson visits churches at Council Bluffs, Marshalltown, Quasqueton, and Parkersburg; several new members received at different points; tent meetings held at Winfield by Elds. C. A. and J. Washburn.

INDIANA.—Elds. Huffman and Godsmark report ten additions to the church at Homier, as one result of tent meetings; two new members added to the church at Forest Chapel; three persons receive baptism at West Liberty; meetings continued at Brimfield, with increasing interest.

KANSAS.—Tent meetings at Chetopa with encouraging results; C. W. Flaiz holds a ten days' meeting with the church at Greenleaf, which results profitably; at Severy, Eld. Bagby baptizes two converts, and at Otter Creek, twelve, and organizes a church of sixteen members; twenty-one converts reported at Hutchinson; tent meetings held at Altona give encouraging results; church of eleven members organized in Rawlins county, as one result of tent meeting; three converts baptized at Olney.

MAINE.—Tent meeting held at Portland.

MASSACHUSETTS.—Tent meeting at New Bedford.

MINNESOTA.—W. B. Hill reports five additions to the church at Good Thunder; tent meeting held at Dodge Center; several converts reported at Amor; tent meeting held at Minneapolis.

MICHIGAN.—At Stephenson, seventeen converts are baptized and added to the church; the erection of a new church commenced; fifteen additions to the church at Parkville; ten converts reported at Almena, with good prospect of more; church of thirty members organized at Tuscola; series of Sabbath-school conventions being held throughout the State, by Professors Lewis and Miller, of Battle Creek College.

MISSOURI.—Tent meeting held at Rich Hill results favorably; encouraging report from Pleasant Hill; five converts baptized near South West City, and a church of twenty members organized.

NEW YORK.—Elds. Brown and Swift hold protracted meetings at Watertown; tent meetings at Buffalo.

NEBRASKA.—Ten converts receive baptism at Greeley and unite with the church; tent meeting held at Ewing.

OHIO.—E. J. Van Horn reports six additions to the church at Columbus, also very encouraging meetings; twelve converts reported at Payne.

PENNSYLVANIA.—Elds. Raymond and Ball hold a tent meeting at Shunk; church organized at Edinboro, also one at Waterford; course of lectures given at Venango.

TEXAS.—Sabbath-school of twenty-two members organized at Arlington; series of meetings being held at Midlothian, where also the State camp-meeting will be held August 17-24.

WISCONSIN.—Seven converts receive baptism at Boydtown; tent meetings held at Richland City by W. S. Hyatt; course of lectures given at Shamrock with encouraging results.

WASHINGTON TERRITORY.—The meetings at Seattle continue, and several persons embrace the faith preached.

GENERAL.—Elds. Ings and Stagg, with their wives, embark for England, to engage in extending the work in that country.

THE THEOLOGICAL WORLD.

... New York has over thirty schools for the Chinese, several of which are connected with Presbyterian churches.

... The Japanese government has officially prohibited opposition to the efforts of missionaries to introduce Christianity.

... The little Chinese Presbyterian church of San Francisco last year gave \$91 for home missions, and \$158 to foreign missions.

... The Colored Baptists of the Northwest have sent two missionaries to the Congo field, and are showing increased interest in that mission.

... During the year 1885, two lady physicians of the M. E. Women's Foreign Missionary Society in India, and one assistant, treated 28,258 patients.

... At a public meeting recently held at Callo, Peru, it was resolved to petition the government to take immediate steps to banish the Jesuits from the country.

... An Evangelistic conference will convene at Northfield, Mass., August 4, and continue for one week. Christian workers of all denominations will attend.

... Bishop Grandine, who has had charge of the Catholic Indian mission of the Northwest Territory for the past twenty years, says that he has 15,000 Catholic Indians in his diocese.

... The new mayor of Shanghai is a native Christian. This is a significant incident, as a few years ago Chinese prejudices would not have permitted such an honor to be conferred on a Christian.

... The city authorities of Lyons, France, have resolved to rid themselves of all religious emblems as "relics of a degrading superstition." Such is the hold that infidelity has upon the people of that city.

... The Protestants of Ireland are not the insignificant minority that is popularly imagined. The Episcopalians number 600,000; the Presbyterians; 485,000, Methodists and Unitarians; 110,000, Congregationalists, Baptists, and other denominations, 60,000.

... The Presbyterian General Assembly, recently held at Minneapolis, thus defined its relation to Swedenborgianism: "In view of the great doctrinal difference between the Swedenborgians and ourselves, the Assembly regards the reception of the church members upon certificate from them as inadmissible."

... The number of students in attendance upon Mr. Moody's summer school at Mount Hermon, for the term closing August 1, has been 250, representing 90 different colleges. The school is unique, its principal aim being to fit young men for the kind of evangelical work that Mr. Moody has been so successful in.

... The Anglican paper, the *Guardian*, quotes an address to his parishioners from the rector of Copenhall, Crewe: "He tells them with pleasure that funerals may be conducted with full Catholic ceremonies. There may be six candles flanking the coffin on either side. The crucifix and incense, symbolic of prayers for the dead, may be used."

... A Philadelphia woman has given an estate and \$100,000 to establish a home for twelve aged Presbyterian ministers who do not use tobacco. The *Congregationalist* thinks it would be hard to find twelve aged Presbyterian ministers who do use tobacco. It ought not to be possible to find any ministers, whether old or young, who use tobacco.

... Reports of an authoritative character have been received of the persecution of the Roman Catholic Church in some parts of Russia. At Lublin, in Russian Poland, the Dominican Monastery has been closed, and three of the monks have been sent into the interior. The other monks were removed at night, so as to avoid any conflict with the excited populace. The only charge made against them was an excess of zeal for their faith. The presumption is that political agitation or conspiracy was suspected.

## THE GOSPEL SICKLE.

Battle Creek, Mich., August 1, 1886.

We call special attention to an article found elsewhere in this issue, entitled "A Plea for Liberty." The time is coming when all observers of the seventh day will be required to give the reasons why they object to Sunday legislation; and no one should lose any time before thoroughly studying the question that he may be able to defend intelligently the position he occupies. The SICKLE will aim to give from time to time the best arguments on this subject that can be found, for the benefit of those interested. In the article under consideration, points are well made, and we recommend all to give it a careful reading.

It will doubtless be interesting to our readers to know that the circulation of the GOSPEL SICKLE is steadily increasing, and now reaches between eleven and twelve thousand copies of each issue. A few days since an order was received from Albany, N. Y., for 1,000 copies of one number, to be used for gratuitous distribution, and in canvassing for subscribers. It is encouraging to the editors and publishers to note these evidences of liberal recognition on the part of a generous public, and causes them to feel an increased responsibility in the performance of their labors. May God abundantly bless the feeble efforts thus put forth, and many precious souls be gathered into the garner of the Lord through this agency, is our earnest prayer.

A few weeks since, we gave an account of the arrest and imprisonment, at Boston, of H. L. Hastings, for reading the Bible in public, on Boston Common. We now have occasion to record another incident that furnishes a sad comment on the boasted religious liberty of this country. On the 9th of July, at Springdale, Ark., J. A. Armstrong was arrested on charge of having violated the law of that State which forbids labor on Sunday. He is a firm and conscientious believer in the sanctity of the seventh-day Sabbath, and had consistently observed that day. On Sunday, he was quietly attending to his business, with no desire to molest any one, but with a desire to obey that part of the command that says, "Six days shalt thou labor." The trial resulted in his conviction, and the imposing of a fine. This he very naturally refused to pay, and was consequently sent to jail, where he shared the filthy and exceedingly uncomfortable apartments in common with criminals of various characters. Before going to the jail, Bro. Armstrong, in company with his family—a wife and two daughters—and several near friends, had a season of prayer, the sheriff of the county being present with them. He was then taken to his place of confinement. Think of a sincere, devoted Christian gentleman being incarcerated in a loathsome prison pen, in company with thieves and other vile criminals, and all because he conscientiously observes the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, according to the fourth command of God's law, and labors on the first day! In that same community are hundreds of people who use Sunday for business, sport, or other secular purposes, but they are not molested, while this quiet, inoffensive Christian suffers at the hands of evil, designing men, who thus use the law of the State to support their iniquitous proceeding. Every lover of true liberty should hang his head in shame that such abominable laws disgrace the statute books of any State in this Union.

## RUSSIA AGAIN MOVING.

The prospect of trouble in the East again becomes prominent from a change of attitude on the part of Russia. The *Christian Weekly* of July 17, 1886, says:—

"Uneasy Russia seems now ready again to disturb the peace of Europe and Asia. It never loses sight of its two darling objects, to secure Constantinople and to gain a foot-hold in India. It has notified the powers that Batoum, on the Black Sea, in Turkey in Asia, and not in its own territory, is no longer a free port, as the Berlin treaty appointed, claiming that the large petroleum trade makes it unprofitable to continue it open longer. It has now a powerful fleet on the Black Sea by which it can transport its troops to Asiatic territory for an advance on Herat and India when it wishes. It is also making threatening movements on Turkey, and there is a prospect of another outbreak in Eastern Europe."

This is precisely the move made by Russia in 1870

with reference to the treaty at the conclusion of the Crimean war in 1856. That is, it coolly informed the Powers that it would no longer be bound by the stipulations of the treaty of Paris, as it now notifies them that it will no longer be held by the treaty of Berlin. The former step was followed by an advance against Turkey; this latter will be followed by a movement in the same direction. This is what it means. The *Weekly* recognizes the fact that Constantinople is one of the objective points of Russia's rapacity and ambition. The Powers might just as well cease making any more treaties with such a nation, but when it moves, and as often as it moves, stop it if they can and if they want to. But the time is not far distant when they will not want to if they are able, or will not be able if they want to; for prophecy declares that the Turkish power will come to its end with none to help it. And at that time shall Michael, the great Prince, ascend his throne of everlasting dominion. Speed the day, will be the prayer of every true believer.

## CANDID ADMISSIONS.

FROM

Sunday Observers and Writers Concerning the First Day Of the Week.

"Admissions in favor of truth from the ranks of its enemies, constitute the highest kind of evidence."—PRES. MAHAN.

SIR WM. DOMVILLE says: "Centuries of the Christian era passed away before the Sunday was observed as a Sabbath. History does not furnish us with a single proof or indication that it was at any time so observed previous to the Sabbatical edict of Constantine, in A. D. 321."—*Examination of the Six Texts*, p. 291.

At a "Ministers' Alliance" held in Sedalia, Mo., Feb. 25, 1884, a Mr. Fuller cited the fact that there was in reality no divine legislation establishing the Christian Sabbath.—*Sabbath Sentinel*, March, 1884.

The Encyclopedia Britannica, after calling attention to the usual scriptural arguments, says: "Still it must be owned that these passages are not sufficient to prove the apostolical institution of the Lord's day, or even the actual observance of it."—*Art. Sabbath*.

The M. E. Theological Compendium, p. 103, edition of 1865, says: "It is true, there is no positive command for infant baptism, . . . nor is there any for keeping holy the first day of the week."

Richard Watson, in his Theological Dictionary, says: "Now there is not on record any divine command to the apostles to change the Sabbath from the day on which it was held by the Jews to the first day of the week."

Dr. Fallows says: "The New Testament is silent about a change of days. The apostles doubtless observed the same Sabbath before and after the resurrection of our Lord, as would be very natural."

Robert Hall, D. D., says: But to "commemorate the resurrection of Christ by the religious observance of any day, we have no express command in all the Scriptures." And again, there is not "a particle of Scripture law."

Confession of the Swiss Church: "The observance of the Lord's day is founded not on any commandment of Christ."

Hear Prof. Burgess: "Can we find the text in the Bible enjoining the observance of this day?—No!"

Now hear the Rev. Dr. Barnes: "No precept for it is found in the New Testament."

The Townsend *Herald* says: "It must be admitted, too, that no statute can be altered or repealed by any power inferior to that which enacted it. . . . You may search from Genesis to Revelation for a command or injunction to this effect [first-day observance], but you will search in vain."

## PREACHING THE BIBLE.

VERY many people find fault with our method of preaching because we read so much Scripture in our discourses. Nothing but taking a sentence for a text and talking far from it, telling anecdotes, etc., seems to them like preaching. This style of harangue, for it is not worthy to be called by the name of sermon, is more popular in America than in the old countries. The following is from an account of a discourse by Dr. Parker, of London:—

"The sermon was one of a series of Sunday evening discourses, in which he was expounding the book of Nehemiah. The expository style being so much more commonly used in Great Britain than by American preachers, this seemed a peculiarly favorable

time to study it at its best. Especially were we glad to hear him in it as Dr. Parker himself spoke with much enthusiasm of the necessity of feeding the people with 'great masses of Scripture,' and with some contempt of the opposite method of taking a mere pinch of Scripture words with which to flavor a very copious dilution of human speculation. Solid gospel meat seemed to him much better than the poor water-gruel some ministers offer, on whose surface a text may float which has no vital connection with it."

That is an excellent picture of the modern essay style which is called sermonizing—"a mere pinch of Scripture words with which to flavor a very copious dilution of human speculation." And frequently popular ministers will talk on some passing event, or some political movement, quoting a text of Scripture so that it may be called preaching, the text however, having no possible relation to the matter of discourse. When Paul preached, he "reasoned out the Scriptures." Perhaps we have not done ourselves and our cause justice in styling our discourses "Bible lectures." They are generally expository sermons, and people should be led to look upon them in that light. There is something in a name, and we should recognize it. As long as we call an expository discourse a lecture, we are fastening on the minds of the people the idea that an essay with a "mere pinch of Scripture" to preface it is real preaching. Let us lead the people to respect, as a sermon an argument of discourse which brings out and enforces Bible truth.—J. H. W., in *Signs of the Times*.

## Condensed List of Books and Tracts.

## BOUND BOOKS.

Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation . . . . .	\$ 3.40
Nature and Destiny of Man . . . . .	1.50
History of the Sabbath . . . . .	1.25
Thoughts on Daniel (separate volume) . . . . .	1.25
Thoughts on the Revelation . . . . .	1.25
The Atonement . . . . .	1.00
The Coming Conflict . . . . .	1.00
Great Controversy, 4 vols., each . . . . .	1.00
History of the Doctrine of the Soul . . . . .	1.00
Life of William Miller . . . . .	1.00
The Sanctuary and 2300 Days . . . . .	1.00
Synopsis of Present Truth . . . . .	1.00
The Marvel of Nations . . . . .	1.00
The Bible from Heaven . . . . .	.80
Life of Joseph Bates . . . . .	.80
Facts for the Times . . . . .	.50
The Soul and the Resurrection . . . . .	.75
Sketches from the Life of Paul . . . . .	.75
Sabbath Readings, 4 vols., each . . . . .	.60
Poem on the Sabbath . . . . .	.30

## IN PAPER COVERS.

The Life of Christ and his Apostles, (8 pamphlets) . . . . .	.90
Our Faith and Hope . . . . .	.25
Thoughts on Baptism . . . . .	.25
Ministration of Angels . . . . .	.20
Modern Spiritualism . . . . .	.20
Refutation of the Age to Come . . . . .	.20
Miraculous Powers . . . . .	.15
Three Messages of Rev. 14 . . . . .	.15
The Holy Spirit . . . . .	.15
Appeal to the Baptists . . . . .	.10
Christ in the Old Testament . . . . .	.10
Hope of the Gospel . . . . .	.10
Inheritance of the Saints . . . . .	.10
Matthew 24 . . . . .	.10
Matter and Spirit . . . . .	.10
Position and Work of the True People of God . . . . .	.10
Redeemer and Redeemed . . . . .	.10
Sanctification . . . . .	.10
The Seven Trumpets . . . . .	.10
Sunday Seventh-day Examined . . . . .	.10
The Tithing System . . . . .	.10
Truth Found . . . . .	.10
Vindication of the True Sabbath . . . . .	.10

The foregoing will be mailed, post-paid, on receipt of price. FULL CATALOGUES of all our publications in English, German, Danish, Swedish, French, Dutch, and Italian sent GRATIS on application with stamp.

The Association has 45 different works in Danish-Norwegian, 24 in Swedish, 31 in German, 15 in French, and several tracts in Holland.

Address, REVIEW & HERALD, Battle Creek, Mich.;  
Or, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, California.

## THE GOSPEL SICKLE,

AN EIGHT-PAGE SEMI-MONTHLY JOURNAL,

Devoted to important Bible doctrines which are especially applicable to the present time,—the Second Coming of Christ, the Nature of Man, the Signs of the Times, Law of God, Plan of Salvation, State of the Dead, and other questions of general interest.

Price, per year, post-paid, . . . . . 50 cts.  
In Clubs of 10 or more, to separate addresses, 40 cts.  
In Clubs of 100 to one address, . . . . . 35 cts.

Address, REVIEW & HERALD,  
Battle Creek, Mich.