

THE GOSPEL SICKLE

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

VOL. 3.

BATTLE CREEK, MICHIGAN, MAY 1, 1888.

No. 9.

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, R. F. COTTRELL,

G. W. AMADON, AND G. W. MORSE.

For Terms, - - - See Last Page.

Notes and 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.

NO SHEAVES.

It was the joyous time of harvest;
The ripe and golden grain
Was bowing 'neath the sickle,
And lading high the wain;
The brown and stalwart reapers
Their glistening sickles swung,
And rosy maids were gleaming
The standing sheaves among.

A maiden, pale and slender,
Came, with the rest, to glean;
Her garb was coarse and homely,
And humble was her mien;
She gleaned among the briars
And stones beside the wall,
Searching for wheat-stalks scattered,
By careless hands let fall.

But when the master saw her,
"Glean here no more," he said;
"For hands like thine there waiteth
Another work instead.
Bring from the bubbling fountain
The water cool and sweet,
To refresh the thirsty reapers,
And bathe their weary feet."

Then meekly bowed the maiden
Unto the master's will,
And through that day so tedious
Fulfilled her mission still.
And when the sunset shadows
Were lengthening o'er the plain,
The reapers and the gleaners
Brought back their store of grain.

The maiden's cheeks were flushing;
With weary step and slow
She came, and sighing, whispered,
"No sheaves have I to show."
Then spake the master kindly,
"Thou hast not toiled in vain,
Though in thine arms thou bearest
No sheaves of golden grain."

"Without thee these had fainted
Beneath the burning sun,
Who now return rejoicing
In all their labor done.
Grieve not because thou bringest
Naught from thy toil away;
For, at the hour of reckoning,
Thou shalt receive as they."

Full many are the toilers,
In life's great harvest-field,
Cheering the busy reapers
While they their sickles wield;
Full many, sad, faint-hearted,
Bring, at the close of day,
Nothing, from all their labor,
But weariness away,—

Nothing but sunburnt faces,
Garments besprent and torn,
Hands wounded with the briars,
And weary feet and worn.
Lord of the harvest, comfort
The humble ones, we pray,
Who toil beside the reapers,
Yet bring no sheaves away.

—Heathen Woman's Friend.

"How long does it take to be converted?" said a young man to his father.

"How long," said his father, "does it take the judge to discharge the prisoner when the jury have brought in the verdict 'Not guilty'?"

"Only a minute."

"When a sinner is convinced that he is a sinner, and is sorry for it; when he desires forgiveness and deliverance from sin, and believes that Christ is able and willing to save him, he can be discharged by the Judge. It does not take God a long time to discharge a penitent soul from the condemnation and power of sin."

In general terms, saving faith is that which prompts us to the performance of duties included in the acceptance of the conditions of the plan of salvation. If one's belief in the conditions of the plan of salvation is sufficiently strong to cause him to move forward in the fulfillment of those conditions, he has saving faith; and it commences at the same time that he begins to perform those duties. The young man who inquired of Christ what he should do that he might have eternal life, was told to "keep the commandments." Matt. 19:16, 17. The moral law of God takes cognizance of our thoughts, words, and actions; hence in our endeavors to keep that law, we will strive to have our lives conform to it. In all causes of failure, we have the privilege of repenting and seeking forgiveness through the merits of Christ. The faith or belief that prompts us thus to endeavor to conform our lives to the law of God, and seek for the benefits of the great remedial system provided by the gospel plan of salvation for our failures so to do, is saving faith.

REGARDING the nature of the "everlasting fire" of Matt. 25:41, into which the wicked shall be cast, an exchange gives the following interpretation, which we regard as the only correct one:—

"The fire which doomed the cities of the plain is called 'eternal fire.' Jude 7. Yet it is not now burning. Then when the wicked, at the last day, shall be driven away into 'everlasting fire' (Matt. 25:41), we need not conclude that the fire will never cease to burn. But must it not continue to burn forever, if it is not quenched?—Not by any means. The fire that consumed Sodom and Gomorrah was not quenched, and as a consequence it turned them into ashes. If it had been quenched, they would not have been turned completely to ashes, but some ruins would have been left standing. Well, we read that the wicked shall be burned up root and branch, and that 'they shall be ashes.' Mal. 4:1, 3. Now when a thing has been reduced to ashes, what becomes of the fire that did the work?—It goes out for lack of combustible material to feed upon. So it was with the 'eternal fire' that destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah; so it will be with the 'everlasting fire' that shall destroy those who are found wicked at the last day; and from that fire will come forth the renewed earth, purified from the curse, and restored to its Edenic beauty."

As enterprising travelers are visiting and exploring every country on earth, discovering new sources of information, and unearthing long-buried monuments which testify in no uncertain tones of the history, customs, and religions of the past, it appears more and more clearly that all the leading features of the Roman Catholic ritual are copied pure and simple from the forms of ancient heathen worship. Catholicism is simply paganism re-christened and called Christian. In a new universal history, we find this testimony concerning the resemblance existing between Catholicism and Buddhism:—

"The first Roman Catholic missionaries who met the Buddhist priests, were struck with wonder at the

many resemblances between the customs of Buddhism and those of Roman Catholicism, and thought that Satan had been mocking their sacred rites. Father Bury, a Portuguese missionary, on beholding Chinese bonzes tonsured, using rosaries, praying in an unknown language, and kneeling before images, exclaimed in astonishment: "There is not a piece of dress, not a sacerdotal function, not a ceremony of the court of Rome, which the Devil has not copied in this country!"

Poor dupe! When he beheld these things in a pagan religion, which he ought to have known antedated by many centuries that of Rome, he should have exclaimed: "There is not a piece of dress, not a sacerdotal function, not a ceremony, invented by the Devil and perpetuated for ages in the heathen world, which he has not also foisted into the religion of Rome, and made us believe they were Christian!" And then he should have renounced the whole mass of heathenish rubbish.

WITH great assurance it is asserted by some that the idea of the immortality of the soul, the uninterrupted and eternal conscious existence of all men, is a universal sentiment of the human mind; and that this all-prevailing instinct born in the human breast, is an unanswerable testimony to its own truthfulness. This assurance is not well founded; for it everywhere crops out in ancient history, that although the doctrine of the immortality of the soul first appears in paganism, and upon it are founded many of its hideous religious features, the belief was largely confined to the common people, the ignorant and superstitious classes, and not to the intelligent and educated among them, by whom it was secretly, and sometimes publicly, denied.

Merivale ("Conversion of the Roman Empire," p. 24) records a memorable utterance made by Cæsar on this question, on a memorable occasion. The occasion was the assembling of the Roman Senate, Dec. 5, 63 B. C., for the trial of Cataline and his followers; and the place of meeting was the great Temple of Concord, in the city of Rome. The senate was the minister of the civil government, and of the state religion, and among the senators were men of the highest political renown, warriors, legislators, patriots and demagogues, leaders and orators. "Never, then," says Mr. M., "were the civil and the religious character of the senate more conspicuously represented, than when it met in the Temple of Concord, to deliberate on the punishment due to the greatest of crimes, political and religious, the sacrilegious treason of Cataline and his followers." He then introduces the words of Cæsar, as follows:—

"It was on such an occasion, then, on such a spot, in such an assembly, that Cæsar pronounced the words which have been doubtless faithfully reported to us, by no mean contemporary authority,—the words which have ever since been marked and held in remembrance as the manifesto of Roman unbelief on the subject of future existence.

"'In pain and misery,' he said, 'death is the release from all suffering itself; death dissolves all the ills of mortality. Beyond it is no place either for pain or pleasure. Wherefore,' such was his argument, 'keep these criminals alive, to suffer a fitting penalty; after death there is no more punishment for sin, neither is there any reward for virtue.' Cæsar himself, the chief pontiff, the highest functionary of the state religion, the chosen interpreter of divine things, to the national conscience, declared peremptorily that there is no such thing as retribution beyond the grave, no future state of consciousness, no immortality of the soul."

Now read the first paragraph of this item, and say if it is not well taken.

Doctrinal Articles.

"Speak thou the things which become sound doctrine." Titus 2:1.

THE UNDYING WORM AND THE QUENCHLESS FIRE.

BY U. SMITH.

MARK 9:43, 44: "And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."

Twice our Lord repeats this solemn sentence against the wicked, "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Verses 46, 48. These passages are relied on with as much assurance, perhaps, as any, to prove the eternal misery of the reprobate. If this language had never been used by any of the inspired writers of the Scriptures, till it was thus used in the New Testament, it might be urged with some degree of plausibility, as an expressive imagery of eternal torment. But, even in this case, it might be replied, that fire, so far as we have any experience with it, or knowledge of its nature, invariably consumes that upon which it preys, and hence must be a symbol of complete destruction; and that the expression, as it occurs in Mark 9:44, can denote nothing less than the utter consumption of those who are cast into that fire.

But this expression was one which was well known and understood by those whom Christ was addressing. Isaiah and Jeremiah frequently use the figure of the undying worm and the quenchless fire. In their familiar Scriptures the people daily read these expressions. Let us see what idea they would derive from them. We turn to Jer. 17:27, and read: "But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath day, and not to bear a burden, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem; and it shall not be quenched."

From this text we certainly can learn the meaning that was attached to the expression, "unquenchable fire," by the Hebrew people. This fire was not to be quenched; therefore it was unquenchable. But it was to be kindled in the gates of Jerusalem, and devour the palaces thereof. It was therefore literal, natural fire. But how could a fire of this kind, thus kindled, be supposed to be a fire that would burn eternally? They certainly would not so understand it. No more should we. Moreover, this threatening of the Lord by Jeremiah was fulfilled. 2 Chron. 36:19: "And they burnt the house of God, and brake down the wall of Jerusalem, and burnt all the palaces thereof with fire, and destroyed all the goodly vessels thereof." Verse 21: "To fulfill the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah." Thus Jerusalem was burned according to Jeremiah's prediction that it should be consumed in unquenchable fire. But how long did that fire burn?—Only till it had reduced to ashes the gates and palaces on which it preyed. Unquenchable fire is therefore simply a fire that is not quenched and does not cease till it has entirely consumed that which causes or supports it. Then it dies out of itself, because there is nothing more to burn. The expression does not mean a fire that must absolutely eternally burn, and that consequently all that is cast therein to feed the flame must forever be preserved by having the portion consumed immediately renewed.

To the wicked, the threatened fire is unquenchable, because it will not be quenched, or caused to cease, till it has entirely devoured them. Ps. 37:20: "But the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away." Mal. 4:3: "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."

Ezekiel speaks of unquenchable fire in a similar manner. Eze. 20:47, 48: "Thus saith the Lord God: Behold I will kindle a fire in thee, and it shall devour every green tree in thee, and every dry tree; the flaming flame shall not be quenched, and all faces from the south to the north shall be burned therein. And all flesh shall see that I the Lord have kindled it; it shall not be quenched."

Though this is doubtless figurative language, denoting sore calamities upon a certain land called the forest of the south field, it nevertheless furnishes an instance of how the expression, "unquenchable fire," was then used and understood; for that generation

many ages ago perished, and those judgments long since ceased to exist.

Isaiah not only speaks of the unquenchable fire, but he couples with it the undying worm, the same as the language in Mark. Isa. 66:24: "And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched, and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh."

This is undoubtedly the language from which the expression in Mark is borrowed; but a moment's examination of it will show that the worm is not the remorse of a guilty conscience, but that, like the fire, it is something external to, and distinct from, the objects upon which it preys; and moreover, that those upon whom it feeds are not the living, but the dead; it is the "carcasses" of the men that have transgressed against the Lord. In Isa. 14:11 and 51:8 the prophet again speaks of the worm as an agent of destruction, but it is always in connection with death. It is thus evident that the terms employed by our Lord in describing the doom of the wicked would convey to the minds of his hearers the very opposite of the idea of eternal life in misery.

There is other evidence, though no other is necessary, to show that the idea which would be conveyed, and which the language was designed to convey, to their minds, was that of complete extinction of being, an utter consumption by external elements of destruction. The word translated "hell" in the passage under consideration is *ge-enna*. It is better to enter into life maimed, than to go, in full possession of all our members and faculties, into *ge-enna*. Did those to whom Christ spoke know anything about this place, and what kind of a fate awaited those who were cast therein? A vivid picture of the place of torment to which our Lord refers was in constant operation before their eyes, near by Jerusalem.

Greenfield defines the word thus: "Γέεννα (Heb. גֵּהֶנְנָה), Gehenna, the valley of Hinnom, south of Jerusalem, once celebrated for the horrid worship of Moloch, and afterward polluted with every species of filth, as well as the carcasses of animals and dead bodies of malefactors; to consume which, in order to avert the pestilence which such a mass of corruption would occasion, constant fires were kept burning."

Such was the fire of Gehenna; not a fire into which people were cast to be kept alive and tortured, but one into which they were cast to be consumed; not one which was designed to prey upon living beings, but upon the carcasses of animals and the dead bodies of malefactors. Hence we can see the consistency of associating the fire and the worm together. Whatever portion of the dead body the fire failed to consume, the worm would soon seize upon and devour. If a person had been condemned to be cast alive into this place, as the wicked will be cast into their Gehenna, what would have been his hope of escape? If the fire could have been speedily quenched before it had taken his life, and the worms which consumed what the fire left, could have been destroyed, he might have had some hope of coming out alive; but if this could not be done, he would know of a surety that his life would soon become extinct, and then even his lifeless remains would be utterly consumed by these agents of destruction.

This was the scene to which Christ pointed his hearers to represent the doom that awaits the wicked; in order that, as they gazed upon the work of complete destruction going on in the valley of Hinnom,—the worms devouring what the flames spared,—they might learn that in the future Gehenna which awaited them, no part of their being would be exempt from utter and complete destruction, one agent of death completing what another failed to accomplish.

As the definition of the word *ge-enna* throws great light on the meaning of this text, so the definition of another term used is equally to the point. The words for "unquenchable fire" are *pūr asbeston*; and this word, *asbeston*, primarily means simply "unquenchable," that is, not caused to cease by any external means: the idea of *eternal* is a theological definition which has been attached to it. Ancient writers used it in this sense. Homer, in the Iliad, xvi, 123, 294, speaks of the Trojans' hurling "unquenchable fire" upon the Grecian ships, though but one of them was burnt by it. And Eusebius, who was a learned Greek, employs the same expression in two instances in recounting the martyrdom of Christians. Cronion and Julian, after being tortured in various ways, were consumed in an "unquenchable fire" (*puri asbesto*). The same is also said of Epimachus and Alexander. "The *pūr asbeston*," says Wetstein, "denotes such a fire as cannot be extinguished before it has consumed and destroyed all."

Such is the evident meaning of this passage, and the sense in which it must have been understood at that time. Yet commentators, eighteen hundred years this side of that time, presume to turn this whole representation upside down, and give to the terms a meaning exactly opposite to that which they were intended to convey. That sense alone can be the correct one in which they were first spoken, and concerning which there can be no question.

There is another text often urged to prove the eternal conscious misery of the wicked. It is one in which fire is mentioned as the instrument used for the punishment of the wicked; and this fire, being called eternal, is understood in the same sense as the unquenchable fire of Mark 9:43. It may therefore properly be examined in this connection. Jude 7: "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire."

This text, when rightly understood, will, we think, like that in Mark 9, be found to convey a meaning exactly the opposite of that popularly given to it. The first great error in the interpretation of this text, lies, as we view it, in a wrong application of the tense employed. It is claimed that the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, having been destroyed, were committed to the flames of hell, where they are now (present tense) suffering the vengeance of that eternal fire. But a moment's glance at the text will show that it is the example set forth, and not the suffering, that is in the present tense. There are other facts mentioned in close connection with the suffering; thus, "giving themselves over to fornication," "going after strange flesh," "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." If one of these expressions denotes something that is now going on, the others also denote the same. If they are now suffering the fire, they are now giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh; for all these declarations are used together of those cities. But no one will claim that the Sodomites are now taking the course here described; neither, then, can it be claimed that they are now suffering the pain of fire.

The sense of the passage appears very evidently to be this: The Sodomites, giving themselves up to their wicked practices, and as a consequence, suffering an eternal overthrow by fire rained down upon them from heaven, are thus set forth as an example to the ungodly of all coming ages, of the overthrow they will also experience if they follow the same course.

Peter speaks of the same event as an example to the wicked, and tells what effect that fire had upon the cities of the plain. It did not preserve them in the midst of the flame in unceasing torture, but turned them into ashes. He says (2 Peter 2:6): "And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly." This language is too plain to need comment. How are the Sodomites made an example?—By being overthrown and turned into ashes for their open and presumptuous sins. It is God saying to the wicked of all coming time, Behold how your sins shall be visited upon you, unless you repent.

But those fires are not now burning. Seek out the site of those ancient and abandoned cities, and the brackish waters of the Dead Sea will be found rolling their sluggish waves over the spot where once they stood. Those fires are therefore called eternal, because their effects are eternal, or age-lasting. They never have recovered, nor will they ever recover while the world stands, from that terrible overthrow.

And thus this text is very much to the purpose on the question before us; for it declares that the punishment of Sodom is an exact pattern of the future punishment of the wicked; hence that punishment will not be eternal life in the fiery flame, but an utter consumption, even as Sodom was consumed, by its resistless vengeance.

FACTS AND INFERENCES REGARDING THE EXISTENCE OF GOD'S LAW PREVIOUS TO ITS BEING GIVEN AT SINAI.

BY A. C. SPIOER.

1. *Fact*: Before the transgression in Eden, the representatives of the race were placed on probation, or trial, and were held responsible for rectitude of conduct, subject to God's government and providence, with a law, or system of laws, whose sanctions were everlasting life as the reward for obedience, and death as the penalty for disobedience. *Inference*: Therefore moral law, or a system of moral laws, to guide

the conduct of man in the development of moral character, was seen by God to be essential to man in his state of innocence and before his fall by sin, the same as since his sin.

2. *Fact*: The Sabbath institution and the marriage institution were made for man before his fall by sin. It appears also that the Sabbath institution was just as definitely and especially given to man then and there in Eden by God, as was the marriage institution. Though upon the first of these institutions is based the fourth commandment of the decalogue as subsequently given from Mount Sinai in language adapted to the then existing conditions and relations, and upon the second is based the seventh commandment, yet these institutions do neither of them derive their sacredness from the decalogue; but the fourth commandment guards and protects the sacredness of the Sabbath institution, while the seventh guarantees that of the marriage institution. *Inference*: Law being essential to regulate and govern the conduct of man in his relations to his Maker and to his fellow-man in a state of innocence (as seen), as well as in a state of sin; and as, in a righteous government, where and when the reason for a law exists, there and then that law must be, therefore the whole law must have been given in Eden.

3. *Fact*: God's government, from the nature of his character, must have been, from the first, a government administered in justice and righteousness. *Inference*: Therefore, the law regulating and protecting the Sabbath, and the law regulating and guarding marriage (which institutions must have been essential to man from the first or they would not have been given), essentially as subsequently engraved on the tablets of stone, must have been given to Adam before the fall by sin, and to his immediate posterity after the transgression.

4. *Fact*: These two institutions and their regulating and protecting laws were no more essential to man to regulate and govern him in his relations to his Creator and his fellow-man, either before or after he had sinned, than each of the other precepts of the decalogue. All ten precepts of the moral code were and are essential to provide for all relations and all duties, and to secure all rights and all rectitude; and any code less inclusive than the decalogue, would have been, and would now be, incomplete and imperfect as a rule for the development of moral character, and as a law for the government of a moral life and a moral community. *Inference*: Therefore, the other eight precepts of the decalogue must also have been given to man at first in Eden, to guard from the beginning all the sacred interests which they are respectively designed and adapted to secure and protect.

5. *Fact*: From the creation of man God has been accustomed to hold him responsible for rectitude of conduct and a strictly moral life, and in all times and places to reward the obedient and punish the disobedient. To this fact all the ancients, obedient and disobedient, equally bear testimony. That sanctions by rewards and punishments have been administered to man by God, either directly by special providences, or by general laws, is a universally attested and universally known and acknowledged fact. But rewards and punishments were and are sanctions of law. And these sanctions, as administered anciently and from the beginning, were general in character and of universal application, and were evidently designed to enforce and secure general and universal moral rectitude of life. No one was exempt from their application. *Inference*: Law, then, or a system of laws, must have existed then and there at and from the very first existence of man, which these sanctions were designed to enforce; and it must have been general and universal in character.

6. *Fact*: These sanctions—rewards for obedience and punishments for disobedience—were from the first existence of man in Eden, and before the fall, as far as revealed, and ever after the sin of the race, of the same uniform nature and character, substantially, as since the incorporation of the decalogue on Mount Sinai. *Inference*: Therefore the law or system of laws to which were attached these appropriate and enforcing sanctions, must have been substantially the same as the decalogue.

7. *Fact*: Adam and Eve, at and from the very first, were held responsible for moral rectitude of conduct, as were all their immediate and remote posterity subsequently. They were promptly punished for their first disobedience, as their posterity were ever punished for disobedience subsequently. But it would ever have been unjust and contrary to the known character of God and of his providences and government, to have held man responsible to law and to have punished him for a violation of a law of which

he was ignorant, which had never been published, of which he had never had nor could have any knowledge. Enlightenment—knowledge—is essential to moral action, and hence to moral responsibility. *Inference*: Therefore, the moral law must have been taught to man before his fall, and must have been proclaimed to all thereafter who were held responsible thereto, and must have been known by all those, as a people, in all ages, who transgressed the same and were punished therefor, as well as by those who obeyed and were rewarded.

8. *Fact*: Cain and Abel offered sacrifices to God, and Abel's sacrifice was more acceptable than Cain's, because it was of the firstlings of the flock and required the shedding of typical blood. On descending from the ark after the flood had subsided (Gen. 8:20, 21), "Noah builded an altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt-offerings on the altar," which the Lord approved. Would any of these, unaided and untaught of God, have been led to offer such sacrifices?—Certainly not. And would any of them, untaught of God, have been able to understand that those offerings were typical of the great sacrifice of the Son of God upon the cross, for sin, and that blood was to be shed as typical of Christ's blood to be shed four thousand or two thousand years thereafter? And would Noah, untaught of God, have been led to make the distinction between the clean and the unclean of beasts and of fowls that he did, and just in accordance with the law of sacrifices and ceremonies, as afterward given by God?—Manifestly he would not. Abraham was directly instructed by God, afterward, to make offerings to him just in agreement with the Mosaic ceremonial ritual, which Abraham did. Gen. 15:9, 10. And in Gen. 22 we have the memorable account of the grand trial of Abraham's sublime faith and obedience, in his obeying God's command to offer his only and greatly beloved son Isaac a sacrifice to God.

9. Again, note this fact: The law of sacrifices and ceremonies is based directly upon the moral law of the decalogue, and is designed to honor and enforce the moral law, by providing types of the great atonement for sin in the violation of that moral law. Now, is it reasonable to suppose that the ancients, including Cain, Abel, Noah, and Abraham, were so definitely and carefully instructed in the ceremonial law of sacrifices (and we will here include the law of circumcision as the token of the covenant with Abraham), which was secondary and based on the moral law as primary (and designed to aid, for a limited time only, in securing obedience to said moral law and conformity therewith, as well as to keep alive faith in a promised atonement for sin), and were yet left ignorant of, and uninstructed in, the primary moral law—the decalogue?—By no means. *Inference*: It is therefore again inferred that the moral law, substantially as engraven on the tables of stone and delivered from Mount Sinai, was not only promulgated, entire, in Eden before the fall, but immediately after the first transgression of man, and was carefully taught to those ancient people, and a knowledge thereof transmitted from generation to generation down through all those centuries to the day of its repetition and formal re-announcement from Mount Sinai; for that knowledge must have been essential to, and co-extensive with, man's responsibility to the law, which responsibility everywhere appears.

The Christian Life.

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

THE RIGHTS OF HOME.

OUR homes have certain rights, of which, by a strange inconsistency in this age of fierce clamor for rights, individual and universal, they are often defrauded. In the first place, they have a right to us. Not only to our presence in the household room or at the dinner table, but to our presence as an influence within them. Everybody is aware of that dual quality of the mind which gives it a sort of double aspect, and makes it quite possible for a person to be in two places at a time, apparently. For example, Mr. Jones has returned from business, it being five in the afternoon. His coat and hat are hanging in the hall; he has put on the dressing-gown, and slippers carefully laid out for him by his wife, and he is sitting in his easy chair listlessly holding the evening paper. "Hush, children, father is tired," whispers Mrs. Jones as the little ones make a noise in their play, and she casts a

compassionate glance at the tired face. It would not be so tired if Mr. Jones himself were there. The fact is, that for the time being he is really absent, within calling distance it is true, but so far as his true self is concerned, he is in the stock exchange. The things that occupied him at noon, occupy him now; he hears a babel of voices, and sees anxious, flurried faces, and only when the bell rings for tea, rouses with a start and a coming-back feeling to the fact that he is in his own parlor.

Hundreds of men do this every day. They have no time to get acquainted with their children. They see, in a general way, that they are clean and wholesome looking; they pay quarterly school bills, and they grudge no expense in the matter of shoes and overcoats. They dimly remember that they once courted their wives, and said tender things in pleasant parlors, where the cheerful gas-light shed its glow, or on moonlight evenings under rustling leaves. The time for that has quite gone by, and they would feel as bashful as a school-boy reciting a piece were they to essay a compliment now to the lady at the other end of the table. They have forgotten that home has its inalienable rights, and among them first and chiefest, the right to their personal presence. Nothing rests a man or woman who has been busy about one set of things, better than a total change of employment or feeling. A nap on the lounge is all very well; but, after a half-hour of it, if the most tired man will shake off dull sleep, and have a romp with the children, or a game of bo-peep with the baby, he will be rested much more thoroughly than if he drowse away the whole evening, as too many business men do.

Our homes have a right to cheerfulness. There is no skeleton at the least worse than a gloomy temper. We have known households which were always under an eclipse, because some one member chose to consider herself a continual martyr. It was not a slip of the pen that made use of the feminine pronoun there; for, we say it with all deference to the gentle sex, women are given to the sulks far more generally than men. A man flames up, and is done with it, if he happens to have an irascible temper; but a woman nurses her wrath to keep it warm, and it smoulders away like a fire that means to be a long time going out. Now, neither men nor women belonging to a family have a right, however they enjoy it themselves, to wear long faces and injured looks and funeral aspects in the privacy of their domestic circle. Be cross, if you please, anywhere else, but at home be cheerful, patient, and considerate.

Our homes have another right, too, which is sometimes lost sight of. They are our castles, of course; but, unlike the castles of the Middle Ages, they are not surrounded by moats, and approached by drawbridge and portcullis. They have only a thin door between themselves and the outer world, and it is well that the magnetic tide of communication between the world and them should not be interrupted. To this end, let them be flooded with good reading. There is no extravagance in taking several newspapers, in having new books, and in buying pictures and chromos. When these shall be thought necessities, and some of our present so-called necessities in the way of dress and food shall be called luxuries, our homes will be perceptibly elevated.—*Sel.*

A REAL man is a rare man. Most men are as much like other men, and as little like themselves, as they can be. Only now and then does a man appear to be himself, or wish to be himself; and such a man is always a man of mark, is always a man worthy of remark, is always, in fact, a remarkable man; for a remarkable man is simply as the term implies, a man worthy of a second note,—a man worthy of being marked and remarked. Indeed, a man who is worthy of respect, or who is of respectable ability, is simply, according to the etymology of the words *respect* and *respectable*, a man who will bear looking at more than once,—a man whose character calls for more than a passing glance; hence it may be said that a man of respectable ability is a remarkable man. It is well worth any man's while to be himself at his own best, even though he must differ from all his fellows in his standard of character and of conduct in order to be at his own best; for that individuality in itself will make him a man who commands respect by his remarkable personality. Yet it is not an easy thing for any man to be himself at his best. It is a very simple thing, but it is not an easy thing, to have one's own standard in little matters and in larger, and to adhere to that standard at the risk of being all by one's self, in one's social circle, in one's community, or, if need be, in all the world. But he who will not do this, can hardly be a remarkable person, even though he deems himself respectable.—*S. S. Times.*



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

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., MAY 1, 1888.

A HOUSE DIVIDED AGAINST ITSELF.

IN an article in the *Christian Statesman* of Oct. 21, 1886, appeared two paragraphs that do not well harmonize. The article was published, as the writer says, "to show why most people believe that the Sabbath was changed to the first day." The first reason is stated thus:—

"This change was prophesied of in Eze. 43:27. 'And when these days are expired, it shall be, that upon the eighth day, and so forward, the priests shall make your burnt-offerings upon the altar, and your peace-offerings; and I will accept you, saith the Lord.'"

We will grant, for argument's sake, that this prophecy is what the *Statesman* claims; viz., that it prophesies a change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. It follows that on and after the time when this change should take effect, those people who were previously observing the seventh day of the week should observe the new day which is spoken of in the text as the "eighth day." It is claimed, but by what right we will not now stop to discuss, that this "eighth day" would be the first day of the week. We will grant that claim for the time being. Now, according to the further claims of our opponents, it was the Jews, and the Jews only, who were under obligations to keep the seventh-day Sabbath so long as it was binding; and by the wording of the prophecy before quoted, it is evident that the ministrations of this so-called "eighth-day" Sabbath were to be performed by the very same persons who had previously performed the ministrations of the seventh-day Sabbath. The words are, "Upon the eighth day, and so forward, the priests shall make your burnt-offerings upon the altar." No mention is made of a new order of officials for this new order of Sabbaths, but the continued service of the same officials who ministered under the previous system.

Thus we are forced to the conclusion that if the former, or seventh-day, Sabbath was a Jewish institution, the new one, said to be prophesied of in Eze. 43:27, is equally so. There is no intimation in the text that this new institution was designed for the Gentiles or any other people besides those who had previously observed the former.

Now we are prepared to consider another point made by the *Statesman* in its endeavors to show why most people believe the Sabbath was changed. It is this:—

"Paul says in Col. 2:16, that we are not bound to observe any of the Jewish sabbaths; therefore the first-day Sabbath must be binding."

But hold! According to the *Statesman's* own reasoning, this first-day Sabbath must be a Jewish institution; and here we find the position taken that "we are not bound to observe any of the Jewish sabbaths." Thus is the structure that was first erected, swept out of the way by a succeeding argument. By what logic the *Statesman* arrives at the conclusion last stated, we cannot comprehend. Since it was first proved that the first-day Sabbath must be a Jewish institution, it would seem that the natural sequence would be this: "Paul says that we are not bound to observe any of the Jewish sabbaths; therefore the first day of the week cannot be binding, because it is a Jewish sabbath."

But no; the *Statesman* reaches no such conclusion. By the use of some remarkable powers of reasoning, it makes out that the first-day Sabbath is a Jewish institution; then it proves that we are not bound to observe Jewish sabbaths, and from this concludes that the first-day Sabbath is binding! And these are fair samples of the reasons "why most people believe that the Sabbath was changed to the first day," taking the *Christian Statesman* as authority. We have long believed those reasons to be fallacious and self-contradictory, but hardly expected to see so prominent a champion of the first-day Sabbath as our contemporary before quoted, present so conclusive proof that such is the case.

G. W. M.

"CALL TO REMEMBRANCE THE FORMER DAYS."

EVER since the year 1840, the name "Adventist" has been known to the world as designating one who believes that the second advent of the Lord Jesus Christ to this world, is near at hand.

The agitation of this question, though commencing some years before, began to attract wide-spread public attention at the time above mentioned, and was soon nicknamed "Millerism," from the chief leader in the movement, Mr. William Miller, of Low Hampton, N. Y. Multitudes are still living who retain personal remembrances of the movement, and all others of ordinary information have more or less knowledge of it.

The idea generally entertained in the world at large is that that movement proved an utter failure; and many query on what ground any one can now call himself an "Adventist," and especially on what ground a denomination calling themselves "Seventh-day Adventists," whose work has now far outgrown in its proportions the original movement, base their views. To answer this inquiry it will be necessary to call the reader's attention to one or two theological points involved in the question.

The Adventists of 1844 expected that the end of the world would come in that year, because they held that certain prophecies would then transpire, which they believed reached to the coming of the Lord. Chief among these was the prophecy of Dan. 8:13, 14, which reads: "Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." On this they reasoned as follows:—

1. These days being used in symbolic prophecy, are symbolic days, denoting "years," according to the rule expressly stated in Num. 14:34; Eze. 4:6. The vision therefore covers a period of 2300 years.

2. These years date from the going forth of a commandment to restore and rebuild Jerusalem (Dan. 9:25), which decree went forth in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, king of Persia (Ezra 7:8), B. C. 457 (margin). They would therefore terminate in A. D. 1844.

3. The "sanctuary" which is then to be cleansed, is this earth.

4. This earth is to be "cleansed" by fire; for Peter says that it is reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. 2 Peter 3:7.

5. This destruction by fire is to be at the second coming of Christ; for he is to be revealed "in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." 2 Thess. 1:7, 8; and many other texts.

From these premises the conclusion seemed inevitable, that when the 2300 years ended in 1844, the Lord would come; and so, fixing their minds on what they considered the equivalent event to the one mentioned in the prophecy, but in their estimation the more important event, they fixed the day on which the 2300 years would end, as the day on which the Lord would come, and made their proclamation accordingly.

But the day passed by and no Saviour appeared. Suspended between hope and fear, and waiting till every plausible allowance for possible inaccuracies of reckoning and variations of time, was exhausted, it became at length apparent that a great mistake had been made, and that the mistake must be on one or both of the following points: either, first, the period of the 2300 days did not end at that time, and they had made a mistake in supposing that they would terminate in that year; or, secondly, the cleansing of the sanctuary was not to be the burning of the earth at the second coming of Christ, and hence they had made a mistake, even though the day had been correctly fixed, in expecting such an event at that time. While there was a possibility that they had made a mistake on both these points, it was certain that they had made a mistake on one of them; and either one would be sufficient to account for the fact that the Lord did not then appear.

A movement which had enlisted the whole interest, and thrilled with enthusiastic hope the hearts, of thousands upon thousands, was not to be abandoned, especially by its more conservative and sincere adherents, without earnest thought and reflection. The

whole field of evidence was therefore carefully re-surveyed. It soon became apparent that two methods were being adopted to account for the fact that the Lord did not come when he was expected, and to explain the consequent disappointment.

One class, at one rash bound, jumped to the conclusion that they had made a mistake in the time, and that the prophetic periods had not expired. This was, of course, to abandon the whole previous movement, with all its accompanying manifestations of God's power and the abundant evidence of his blessing, as in no sense the work of the Lord or the fulfillment of prophecy; for if the time was wrong, everything was wrong.

Another class, impressed with the fact that God had given too much evidence of his connection with the movement to allow them to abandon it as not his work, carefully reviewed the evidence on every point. The result with them was a clearer conviction of the strength and harmony of the argument on chronology. They saw no ground to change their views upon the reckoning of the time, but felt more convinced than ever that the 2300 days were correctly applied, and that they terminated at the time appointed in 1844. Thus they became satisfied that the error lay in their previous views of the subject of the sanctuary and its cleansing, and that they had made a mistake in supposing that the earth would be burned at the end of the 2300 days, because the prophecy said that then "the sanctuary" should "be cleansed."

The difference between this view and the former, as related to the preceding movement, is at once apparent. For whereas that necessarily gave up the whole Advent movement up to that time, this involved no such necessity, inasmuch as, if the time was correctly reckoned, it could be asserted on the authority of the prophecy, that some great event did take place then, even if men were unable to understand what it was; and God might, for some wise purpose, have suffered his people to fall into a mistake in regard to the event then to take place, even as he suffered the disciples, under the eye of Christ himself, to escort the Saviour into Jerusalem with shout and song, under the supposition that he was going to a throne, whereas in fact he was only going to a cross.

Those who adopt the method last mentioned of explaining the disappointment in 1844, are the ones now known as "Seventh-day Adventists;" and a few words more relative to the explanation they offer of the past mistake, their present position on chronology, and the introduction among them of the practice of observing the seventh day as the Sabbath, will complete the scope of this article.

It will readily be seen that the positions, as set forth above, held respectively by the Seventh-day Adventists and those who by way of distinction may be denominated "First-day" or "No-day" Adventists, must place a marked difference between the two classes as respects chronology. For the First-day Adventists, believing that the prophetic periods were given to make known the very time of Christ's coming, and that those days have not yet ended, are logically bound to discover the true reckoning, and fix a day for Christ to come, or else fall back upon the absurd position that all that is said in the Bible about prophetic time is so much of revelation unrevealed. Unwilling to do this, they have busied their brains ever since 1844, in trying to solve the puzzle how to re-adjust the prophetic periods, and fix upon a new time for Christ to come. From their wriggling and squirming under this dilemma, has arisen in these later years all the fantastic time-setting which has very naturally disgusted the world, and, worse than this, has brought a stigma of reproach upon all prophetic study whatever.

On the other hand, Seventh-day Adventists set no time. They never have done it; and the very foundation of their faith forbids it. The world and the churches, mixing us up with the other class, often refer to us as setting times for the Lord to come; and this is perhaps not so much to be wondered at as yet. But it is strange that any one, knowing the facts in the case, should manifest such a reckless disregard of those facts as to contend deliberately, and undertake formally to prove, that Seventh-day Adventists have set times for the Lord to come, and that our claim to the contrary is consequently false. We know of only one person who has attempted to do this. The argument runs thus: "Some of those who were in the '44 movement are now Seventh-day Adventists; and while in that former movement they believed in the time that was then set for the Lord to come; there-

fore Seventh-day Adventists do set times for the Lord to come."

Isn't that profound reasoning! On the same ground we can prove that the Baptists believe in, and practice, sprinkling for baptism. Thus: "Some who are now Baptists, were formerly Methodists; and while Methodists they believed in, and practiced, sprinkling for baptism; therefore Baptists practice sprinkling for baptism!"

The reasoning in this case is precisely the same as in the other, and every whit as legitimate. The facts are that when persons leave the Methodist Church and join the Baptists, they discover the error of calling sprinkling baptism, and are immersed; and so in the other case, before any of the persons referred to became Seventh-day Adventists, though they could not change the reckoning, they learned the error of supposing that any prophetic period reaches to the coming of the Lord, and discovered the mistake they had made in the event then to occur, and took their stand accordingly.

The truth which they discovered as an explanation of the disappointment, and which entered as a fundamental principle into their new faith, utterly precluded the idea of ever setting a time for the coming of the Lord. The sanctuary which was to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days, they learned was the sanctuary of the new covenant in heaven, the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man; and the cleansing of that sanctuary is the final ministration of our great High Priest in the most holy place, to make the atonement, and to remove therefrom the sins of the people. The beginning of that work is fixed by the period of the 2300 days; but its termination is not revealed. We only know that it is an indefinite but comparatively brief work, following the end of all the prophetic periods; and the time while we are waiting for its termination, is the period of "the patience of the saints." Rev. 14:12. No man, therefore, could set a time for the Lord to come, and still be a Seventh-day Adventist; for to set a time would be to abandon the faith which had made him such.

On two independent lines the Sabbath truth has come among us: First, the example of a Seventh-day Baptist sister, Mrs. Rachel D. Preston, who removed from New York to Washington, N. H., called the attention of a body of Adventists in that place, as early as the latter part of 1844, to the claims of the fourth commandment upon us as a part of the law of God. Second, light on the subject of the sanctuary opened before this people the door of the inner apartment of the temple in heaven, wherein is seen the ark of God's testament. Rev. 11:19. As soon as this fact came out that there is a sanctuary, with its most holy place, and an ark, in heaven, it was evident that God's law must be there, and that the law deposited in the ark in the typical sanctuary here on earth, must have been a transcript, word for word, letter for letter, of that law in the sanctuary in heaven. This establishes the seventh-day Sabbath beyond any possibility of overthrow. No man can give up the Sabbath without surrendering all the evidence and light and truth on the subject of the sanctuary. Hence, although a man may keep the Sabbath on other evidence and other grounds, independently of these considerations drawn from the subject of the sanctuary, it is nevertheless a fact that this subject adds greatly to the clearness, beauty, and power of the Sabbath truth. And it is this connection of the Sabbath truth with the fulfillment of prophecy that gives it a vitality and aggressive force at the present day which it has not possessed for ages in the past.

All Adventists in 1844 had light and truth far in advance of the religious world around them; and why did God honor the Seventh-day Adventists in leading them forward unto these additional truths of the sanctuary, Sabbath, messages, etc.? We believe it was because they honored him in not giving up the great Advent movement of the past in which he had worked with such power and manifested so much of his Holy Spirit. These facts they prized too highly to be driven from them by the perplexity of a temporary disappointment. They believed that God had been in the movement, and that in due time he would make all plain. And this he has done; and he has also done more. He has led them on to success. He has enlarged their borders and multiplied their numbers. He has guided their counsels and prospered their enterprises, till they are doing tenfold more than all other Sabbatarians and Adventists in the world combined. The secret is, they have been willing to accept truths which reach to the hiding-place of

power; truths to which belong "the eternal years of God;" truths which will shine on in their blessedness, majesty, and glory, when the battlements of all opposing errors shall have crumbled into everlasting decay.

These truths, the times, the events visibly looming up before us in the near-coming years, call upon us not only to renew, but to enlarge immensely, our zeal and consecration, lest the work be taken from us and committed to other hands. Oh that every believer, young and old, far and near, could so realize the love of Christ which has called us to this work, with all its glorious possibilities, that they could exclaim, and not only exclaim but feel, and not only feel, but give it in their lives a practical exemplification,—

"Love so amazing, so divine,
Demands my life, my soul, my all."

U. S.

SCRIPTURE METHOD OF RECKONING THE DAY.

The purpose of the previous articles on this subject has been to maintain the following propositions:—

1. That one design of the Creator regarding the sun, moon, and stars, was and is that they should serve the dwellers upon this earth as time-pieces, to indicate to them the beginning, progress, and completion of the earth's revolutions, each of which revolutions measures off a period of time denominated a "day."
2. That upon all portions of the globe, at all times of the year, it is possible to determine the beginning, progress, and close of the days with accuracy, by consulting the heavenly bodies, in accordance with the expressed purpose of the Creator.
3. That upon all portions of the globe where practicable, God designed that the days should be reckoned from "even unto even"—a period of darkness succeeded by one of light.
4. That "even," when used to denote the beginning of the twenty-four-hour day, is at sunset.
5. That Christ and his disciples so reckoned the day.

Consideration will now be given to a few texts that it is thought by some are difficult to harmonize with some of the above propositions.

Neh. 13:19: "And it came to pass, that when the gates of Jerusalem began to be dark before the Sabbath, I commanded that the gates should be shut, and charged that they should not be opened till after the Sabbath."

It is thought that this text intimates that the Sabbath did not begin until after the darkness came on. But the text does not say, "when it began to be dark at Jerusalem," but "when the gates of Jerusalem began to be dark." The gates of Jerusalem were placed under wide and high walls, and darkness would approach there before it did elsewhere. It is easy to conceive that the shadows might become quite deep in the gates of the city, particularly in some localities, even before the sun should set. This consideration is sufficient to show that the text furnishes no objection to the position taken, but rather sustains it.

Calmet, in his Bible Dictionary, art. Sabbath, thus states the ancient Jewish method of beginning the Sabbath: "About half an hour before the sunset work is quitted, and the Sabbath is supposed to be begun." Of the close of the Sabbath he speaks thus: "When night comes, and they can discern in the heaven three stars of moderate magnitude, then the Sabbath is ended, and they may return to their ordinary employments."

Another correspondent cites Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:1, 2, 9; Luke 24:1; and John 20:1, 19, and wants to know how they can be harmonized with the practice of reckoning the Sabbath from sunset to sunset. We will quote the texts, that they may all be before the reader together:—

"In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulcher." Matt. 28:1.

"And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning, the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulcher at the rising of the sun. . . . Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene." Mark 16:1, 2, 9.

"Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher bringing the spices which they had prepared." Luke 24:1. "The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulcher, and

seeth the stone taken away from the sepulcher." "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst." John 20:1, 19.

Dr. Albert Barnes, in his "Notes," gives the following very clear explanation of these texts, as regards the time of the visit of the women to the sepulcher:—

"In the end of the Sabbath. The word end here means the same as after the Sabbath; i. e., after the Sabbath was fully completed, or finished, and may be expressed in this manner: 'In the night following the Sabbath (for the Sabbath closed at sunset), as it began to dawn,' etc. As it began to dawn toward the first day of the week. The word dawn is not of necessity in the original. The word there (as in the original) properly means, as the first day approached, or drew on, without specifying the precise time. Mark says that it was after 'the Sabbath was past, and very early in the morning, at the rising of the sun;' i. e., not that the sun was risen, but that it was about to rise, or at the early break of day. Luke says that it was very early; in the (Greek) deep twilight, or when there was scarcely any light. John says it was 'very early, while it was yet dark;' that is, it was not yet full daylight, or the sun had not yet risen. The time when they came, therefore, was at the break of day, when the sun was about to rise, but while it was yet so dark as to render objects obscure, or not distinctly visible."

Dr. Adam Clarke, in his well-known Commentary, has this to say on Matt. 28:1:—

"In the end of the Sabbath. *Opse de sabbatōn.* After the end of the week: this is the translation given by several eminent critics; and in this way the word *opse* is used by the most eminent Greek writers. . . . In general, the Jews divided their natural day, which consisted of twenty-four hours, into day and night. Their artificial day began at the rising, and ended at the setting, of the sun; all the rest of the time, from the setting to the rising of the sun, they termed night; hence the same word, in the Hebrew, signifies both evening and night. Gen. 1:5; Mark 6:47. Matthew has employed the word in this extensive sense here, pointing out the latter part of the Jewish night, that which immediately preceded the rising of the sun, and not the first part, which we call the evening. The transaction mentioned here evidently took place early on the morning of the third day after our Lord's crucifixion,—what is called our Sunday morning, or first day of the week."

Other authorities, bearing the same or similar testimony, might be cited; but these are sufficient to show that the statements of the evangelists, regarding the time of the visit to the sepulcher, do not antagonize the position heretofore taken that the days were reckoned from sunset to sunset; neither do they furnish any foundation for the claim that any other method was in use at the time of the occurrence related; or at the time when the evangelists wrote. It is evident that when Matthew used the expression "as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week," he had reference to the light portion of the first day of the week.

It remains to consider John 20:19: "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week," etc. The question arises, If Christ rose from the dead early in the morning of the first day of the week, how could he meet with his disciples in the evening of the same day, if the day closed at sunset?

This leads us to consider the meaning of the word evening in a broader sense than has heretofore been given to it in these articles. Webster defines evening thus: "The latter part and close of the day, and the beginning of darkness, or night; properly, the decline or fall of the day, or of the sun."

The Bible Dictionary of Cassell, Petter, and Galpin, published in London, gives the following definition:—

"Even, Evening. The after part of the day, from noon to night. It was probably divided into two portions called the two evenings, the exact limits of which are much disputed; perhaps from twelve to three P. M., and from three to six P. M., though some say from three to six and from six to nine P. M."

Thus we see that the term evening has three significations; viz., (1.) the entire dark portion of the twenty-four-hour day, as in the expression "the evening and the morning were the first day;" (2.) a definite point of time, as in the expression "from even unto even, shall ye celebrate your Sabbaths;" and (3.) a period of time, more or less indefinite in duration, extending from noon onward, possibly to nine o'clock.

In view of what has been established as the Scriptural mode of reckoning the days, and the mode always in use among the Jews; and in view of the different significations given to the term evening, it will not be difficult to understand the expression used by John in designating the time when Christ met with his disciples upon the day of his resurrection. Had the meeting occurred any time between noon and sunset, or at the time of sunset, the expression "the same day at evening" would be admissible, and not in the least conflict with the method of reckoning the days from sunset to sunset.

It is not presumed that in the consideration that has been given in these articles to the subject in hand, it has been exhaustively treated; much more might be said, and many other portions of Scripture considered, which would be found to sustain the positions taken. We are not aware of any intimations of Scripture that can be construed as indicating any other method as Scriptural, than the one we have endeavored to maintain.

It is hoped that the effort may not prove fruitless in enabling the reader to satisfactorily settle in his own mind what constitutes the Scriptural method of reckoning the days, and that in the observance of the Sabbath he will conscientiously conform to that method.

G. W. M.

IMPORTANT TESTIMONY FROM EMINENT AUTHORITY CONCERNING THE LAW AND THE BIBLE.

[THE scriptural foundation upon which the Seventh-day Adventist Church is built, viz., "the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus," is not new, and should not now be peculiar, as the following testimony will show. CHAS. L. BOYD.]

"All doctrine that casteth a mist on these two, to shadow and hide them, I mean the law of God and mercy of Christ, that resist you with all your power. Moreover, I take God to witness to my conscience, that I desire of God to myself in this world no more than that without which I cannot keep his laws."—*William Tyndale, translator of the Scriptures, burned at the stake for his faith, in the town of Vilvorden, Eng., 1536.*

"Give me understanding, that I may learn thy commandments." "O, how love I thy law! it is my meditation all the day. Thou through thy commandments hast made me wiser than mine enemies; for they are ever with me."—*David, king and psalmist of Israel.*

"For Adam's breaking of God's precepts we had all been lost, if Christ had not redeemed us again; and as Adam broke the precepts, and was driven out of Paradise, so we, if we break God's commandments, shall have damnation, if we do not repent and ask mercy. I never preached wittingly or willingly anything against God's holy word, or contrary to the true faith; but have always, for my little learning, set forth the honor of God, and the right obedience to his law."—*William Jerome and Thomas Gerreard, burned at the stake at Smithfield, London, 1527.*

"Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man."—*Solomon, king of Israel, B. C. 977.*

"First, and chiefly, since I came to this realm I taught nothing but the commandments of God, the twelve articles of the creed, and the Lord's prayer in the mother tongue. I never taught anything against the Scriptures, which I shall by the grace of God make manifest this day, being ready to suffer death for it." "When Messiah comes, he shall restore all things, and he shall not abrogate the law, which was given to our forefathers, as ye do."—*George Wishart, put to death for his faith and teaching, A. D. 1527.*

"And it shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us."—*Moses, prophet of God, and type of Christ, who died on Mount Nebo, B. C. 1451.*

"I stand not to mine own opinion, I take God to witness, but only to the Scriptures of God, and that all those who stand here can witness with me, and nothing but the Scriptures."—*John Neuman, burned at the stake for his faith and teaching, at Saffron, Walden, Aug. 31, 1555.*

"To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."—*Isaiah, prophet of God, B. C. 742.*

"So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty."—*James, apostle of Jesus Christ, martyr for the faith about A. D. 63.*

"Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good."—*Paul, apostle of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, who suffered martyrdom about A. D. 64.*

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from

the law, till all be fulfilled." "Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition." "But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."—*Jesus, the Son of God, crucified A. D. 31.*

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

We are inclined to think that the American pulpit is lacking in this, that it has not laid down to the people with sufficient emphasis the true definitions of wealth; it has not put the divine limitations upon the use and ownership of means; it has not sufficiently defined the rights of property, and of those who have no property. Our impression is that we ministers have preached the religion of forgiveness too much and the religion of righteousness too little. We have an idea that we need to have a religion of the day of judgment a little more than we have. We have an idea that we have preached forgiveness of sin in such a way as to make it appear so easy that men have accommodated their lives to the doctrine; they have gone on and sinned and sinned, and we have even fortified them in their sin by telling them they could be forgiven any time they wanted to be; that all they had to do was to kneel down and pray for it. How does it strike you, reader?

If this is true, brethren, then it is time for us to turn the wheel about and head the ship in another direction. If men have got the idea that there is exhaustless mercy in heaven, with so little care in its outgoings that a man can pray to-day and sin to-morrow, and, by another prayer, be as good as if he had not sinned, then we had better preach something else. If there has gotten into our prayer-meetings a habit of gush, a perverted sentiment, what you may call sentimentalism, so that religion is conceived of by our young people as simply "coming to Jesus" rather than doing "bottom" righteousness, rather than being honest in trade and regardful of others' rights, then we had better change our preaching, and our prayer-meeting folks had better change their manner of praying and exhorting; for we know that religion, when analyzed down to the last analysis, has but one crystal drop, and we can see clear through that drop, and it spells out this word, *obey*.

Let our pulpits henceforth insist that God must be obeyed. If the people wish to know what religion is, they should be told that religion is obeying God,—not God up in heaven somewhere, as you vainly picture him, but God written in human statutes, so far as they are just; God written in human legislation, so far as it is wise; God written organically in the fibers of your stomach and the muscles of your legs and arms; God written in the beauty of the world, in the voice of human rights, in the progress of man, as truly as in the pages of the Bible. This great universal God, whose great law of righteousness is written everywhere and in everything, must be obeyed; and when man has obeyed, then he has become one with him.—*Golden Rule.*

DON'T BE TOO SENSITIVE.

THERE are people—yes, many people—always looking out for slights. They cannot carry on the daily intercourse of the family without finding that some offense is designed. They are as touchy as hair-triggers. If they meet an acquaintance who happens to be preoccupied with business, they attribute his distraction in some mode personal to themselves, and take umbrage accordingly. They blame others for the results of their own irritability. Indigestion makes them see impertinence in every one with whom they come in contact. Innocent persons who never dreamed of giving offense, are astonished to find some unfortunate word or momentary taciturnity mistaken for an insult.

To say the least, the habit is unfortunate. It is far wiser to take the more charitable view of our fellow-beings, and not suppose that a slight is intended unless the neglect is open and direct. After all, too, life takes its hue in a great measure from the color of our own mind. If we are frank and generous, the world will treat us kindly; if, on the contrary, we are suspicious, men learn to be cold and cautious toward us. Let a person get the reputation of being "touchy," and everybody is under restraint, and in this way the chances of an imaginary offense are vastly increased.—*Sel.*

Temperance Outlook.

A TERRIBLE INDICTMENT.

THE report of the Cook County (Ill.) Grand Jury for the month of March contained some startling charges against the saloon. With a German citizen as foreman, these men declared the liquor traffic in Chicago responsible for all the murders brought under their notice. They indict the saloon as a crime factory, and show it in its true and fearful light; but mark the remedy proposed. The liquor traffic, they say, is a wholesale murderer; therefore let us increase the license and *legalize it forever!*

The following are the words of the Grand Jury:—

"Our investigation of the murder cases has impressed us to the degree that we deem it our official duty to call the attention of the court to the following facts, in the hope that it may have some little effect on future legislation regarding the liquor traffic: We find that in every case of murder or manslaughter (except one), the cause leading to the crime came direct from the saloon. Furthermore, it came not from the higher and better class of saloons, but from those in the poorer and lower portions of our city, and consequently from the lower grade of saloons. It seems to us that a long step toward solving this problem is a uniform license of \$1,000, payable annually, in advance, to be exacted of all saloon-keepers."

The present tax on saloons in Chicago is \$500 per year. The Cook County Grand Jury suggests that this tax be doubled, in order that the low saloons may be weeded out and the commission of crime reduced. It hardly seems possible that any sensible man can honestly think such a plan would be effectual in accomplishing the results aimed at. The theory itself is very weak, and the practical working of the system a bare-faced failure. Nebraska has a uniform saloon license of \$1,000. Who believes that any man in Nebraska is deprived of drink, or that there is any less crime caused by the traffic because of the high-license fee? In order to pay this tax and make due profits, the saloon-keeper adopts a system of adulteration, and deals out poison which is more active and deadly than even the pure liquor. Does this result of a one-thousand-dollar license tend to reduce crime?

The so-called "higher and better class of saloons" have no use nor place for that man who ceases to drink moderately and becomes obnoxiously excessive in the practice. He must graduate in the "low" saloon, and pass through it to his inheritance of woe. So long as the "respectable saloons" exist, the "doggeries" will have a place with them; for, deprive the former of their sluice-way and emptying place, and they cease to have even an appearance of respectability. The "respectable saloon" and the "doggerie" are Siamese twins—not to be separated by any license legislation. A blow from the broad-axe of prohibition, and that instrument in the hands of men who will strike to insure death, and the evil dies.—*A. K. Ebey, in Free Methodist.*

A STRONG LETTER FROM NEAL DOW.

HON. NEAL DOW, the father of the Maine prohibition law, makes the following truthful and very convincing statements:—

"1. Without regard to the opinion of Peter E. Iler, the great Nebraska distiller, I do not see how any intelligent and sincere friend of temperance can assume any other attitude toward license of any sort, high or low, than that of a conscientious and unwavering opposition.

"2. No license law, whether high or low, can have any possible tendency to diminish the volume of the liquor traffic. Irrespective of the amount of the fee required for a license, the demand for liquors, however large, always has been and always must be supplied, and 'free rum' can do no more than that.

"3. High-license legislation will certainly postpone the advent of prohibition. It was invented by unscrupulous politicians expressly for that purpose, and was at first and is now earnestly commended to the liquor trade as temporarily, if not permanently, a sure defense against it. Its authors and advocates at first exhorted temperance men to accept it as a compromise, and a 'long step toward prohibition.' But they have recently thrown off all disguise, and now oppose prohibition as 'unstatesmanlike, unphilosophical, and uneconomical,' and advocate license to the saloons as the permanent policy of the country,

to which the Republican and Democratic parties are irrevocably committed. There is no more justification of the policy of license to the liquor traffic than there would be of that of license to any other crime; and every argument employed in urging the former will logically apply with equal force to the latter.

"4. There can be no mistaking the effect of such legislation upon the conscience of the country; it is, and must be, to deaden and debauch it. In my long acquaintance with the world and experience with men, I have not found the numbers of them large who will judge every case submitted to them upon its merits, irrespective of prejudice, interest, appetite, and passion.

"High license tempts the tax-payer, even if an honest man in common life, to condone the tremendous sin, shame, and crime of the liquor traffic, in consideration of its relief to him of a considerable part of a public burden. Such men keep each other in countenance in supporting a policy which they think favorable to their pockets, though it gives legal warrant, support, protection, and approval to an evil of infinite mischief to the country. That it clouds the understanding and deadens the conscience is seen in the fact that it is largely supported by pulpit and press, though it was devised as a paltry dodge by unscrupulous trading politicians."

Notes from the Field.

"The field is the world."

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:—

ILLINOIS.—Eld. A. O. Tait reports eight new believers at Springfield.

MISSOURI.—The church at Harrisonville has recently received six accessions to its membership.

LOUISIANA.—Eld. Gibbs gives encouraging reports of the work at various points in this State.

TEXAS.—Twelve converts reported at Whitney, where a series of meetings has been held by W. A. McCutchen.

ALABAMA.—A company of believers reported at Athens; a series of meetings is in progress in Choctaw County.

NEW YORK.—Revival efforts at Lincklaen Center and Jeddo resulted in the conversion of several souls at each place.

CENTRAL EUROPE.—H. P. Holsler gives an encouraging report of the sale of denominational publications in Basel and other portions of Switzerland.

PENNSYLVANIA.—D. A. Ball reports a company of ten believers and a Sabbath-school of sixteen members at Knox, as the results of meetings held at that place.

NORTH CAROLINA.—Eld. Rees reports encouraging meetings held with the believers at Valley Crucis and Mc Bride's Mill; seven were added to the church at the latter place.

NEBRASKA.—A church of twelve members has recently been organized at Bloomington, and one of nine members at Sett; several new Sabbath-schools are also reported.

WEST VIRGINIA.—The special meetings that have been held at Amos have resulted in a company of twenty believers, who have commenced the erection of a house of worship.

INDIANA.—Special meetings with the churches at Akron and New London resulted in increasing the membership of both; a new church was dedicated at Barber's Mills, April 1.

GEORGIA.—O. C. Godsmark reports a goodly number of converts at Reynolds, as the result of a series of meetings, and the organization of a Sabbath-school of twenty-five members.

IOWA.—Two new members were recently added to the church at Fontanelle; a church of sixteen members has been organized at Sharps; baptism was administered to two converts at Riverton.

MICHIGAN.—A series of meetings held at Wheeler resulted in a company of fifteen believers and the organization of a Sabbath-school of twenty-five members; fourteen believers baptized at Battle Creek, and added to the church.

MINNESOTA.—Meetings held near Lyle have thus far resulted in seven converts, and the organization of a Sabbath-school of thirty-two members; H. F. Phelps reports revival meetings with the churches at Sauk Center and West Union.

ARKANSAS.—A church of thirteen members has been organized at Hinesville, and about as many more will probably soon join; a church of twelve members has also been organized in Boone County, and one of eleven members at Brentwood.

COLORADO.—Eld. E. H. Gates reports a company of believers at Berthoud, who will soon be ready for church organization; profitable meetings have recently been held with the friends at Hillsborough, Greeley, Silver Cliff, Longmont, and Denver.

KANSAS.—W. W. Stebbins reports revival meetings with the believers at five different points, the results being encouraging; seventeen canvassers and colporters have recently gone out from the denominational school at Lehigh, to engage in public labor.

AUSTRALIA.—Tent-meetings at Carlton, one of the suburbs of Melbourne, resulted in a company of twenty-seven believers; tent-meetings are now in progress at Clifton Hill; many items of interest are related regarding the progress of the work in Australia.

DAKOTA.—Encouraging meetings were recently held with the church at Cresbard; a church of seventeen members has been organized at St. Lawrence, also a Sabbath-school; Eld. Ellis reports sixteen believers at Grand Meadow, and a Sabbath-school of nineteen members, as the result of labors at that place.

CALIFORNIA.—The first camp-meeting of the season was held at Selma, March 22 to April 1, and was largely attended and generally very successful; sixteen converts were baptized at this meeting; the church at Fresno has recently subscribed \$31,000 for building a church, school-house, and mission house.

ENGLAND.—The London training-school is proving successful, and the workers are meeting with much favor in their efforts to spread the truth in that great city; already thirteen worthy persons, including one curate in the Church of England, have embraced the faith, and many others are greatly interested; several additional converts reported at Hull; ten believers were recently baptized at Wellingborough, and a church organization perfected.

The Theological World.

ENCROACHMENTS OF ROME.

A LEADING clergyman stated not long since in the presence of a few friends, that the Protestants would be astounded if they knew how many Presbyterians and Protestant (?) Episcopalians of wealth were apostatizing to Rome in the great metropolis.

The pope has his propagandists in Rome to seek after opulent Protestants from the United States while sojourning in the Imperial City, and to pay them the most delicate attentions. The wily pontiff himself grants them a ready audience, and the result is, they become enamored of the papacy. These would-be Protestants were reckoned among the crowd who presented President Cleveland's jubilee gift, and who fondly conveyed the idea to the papal autocrat that this was an expression of the loyalty and affection of the citizens of the United States.

These Protestants(?) return to New York, and endeavor in every possible way to reciprocate the hospitalities of the pope. Many of the hierarchy of New York and other cities have ready access to these Protestant homes, and are entertained most sumptuously; and when the pope sends his emissaries to this country, New York Protestants vie with each other in lavishing upon them the most regal attentions.

Jesuitism, whose watchword is "eternal vigilance," is ever on the alert, and by her subtle representatives is undermining many a Protestant home by stealing away the children. One of their most successful methods is by marriage. They are drawing the lines closely, and former laxity is giving way to the strongest rigidity. No papist is allowed to marry a Protestant unless he becomes a pervert. This is more severely applied where wealth is involved on the side of the Protestant. When a marriage occurs, the hierarchy makes it an occasion to flaunt popery in the faces of Protestants who are present. They then invest the hideousness of popery with such dazzling attractiveness that the "scarlet woman," in her disguises, becomes so overwhelmingly delusive that not a few superficial Protestants, if not swept off their foundations, have had a more tolerant spirit infused into their natures, and henceforth evince no antagonism to popery. This is a great acquisition, and paves the way for greater conquests.

The number of *mesalliances*, Protestant heiresses with papists, during the last ten years in New York, many of them with vast fortunes in their own right, are perfectly startling, and the wealth carried over to the papacy is enormous.

Last week in New York, the daily press of the city described a marriage in glowing colors. A Presbyterian family allowed Archbishop Corrigan to come into their home and debauch it, by setting up a popish altar in the front drawing-room, for the purpose of

marrying their daughter to a papist. A large number of distinguished people were present, of various denominations, some nothingarians and some politicians of eminence. In looking over the list of guests, we were gratified to note not a single Protestant clergyman present.

In such a service the Jesuitical archbishop puts a side of the Romish Church forward which is least repulsive to the sensitive Protestant, just as Cardinal Gibbons, through temporizing politicians, was allowed to occupy the leading place in the Centennial of the Constitution of the United States, and played his part well.

These services, like the dropping of the water upon the rock, wear away our true perceptions of the papacy, so that in some directions it is now regarded as most intolerant unless Romanism is put upon the same level with Protestantism.

Unless this spirit is neutralized soon, and Protestants wake up to the wiles of popery, this Republic will find itself inextricably in the grip of one of the most demoralizing systems that ever defiled this fair earth.—*Episcopal Recorder.*

MORE CATHOLIC PROTESTANTS.

THE editor of the New York *Evangelist*, Dr. Field, is a defender of Catholicism. He thinks that the disposition to stand aloof from Catholics is "most mischievous to the church and country." He says:—

"The late President Hitchcock often said to us, when we discussed the dangers to society from socialists and communists, that we might yet come to look upon the Roman Catholic Church as the most conservative power in the country, if, by its influence over the Irish, it should keep them from running into the excesses by which so many of the French and Germans were carried away. It is conservative also in preserving the name of Christendom against the great flood of infidelity which is sweeping over the land. Here is a tremendous power exercised by the Roman Catholic Church over millions of our countrymen, and it is the height of folly and fanaticism to alienate it from us by standing always in an attitude of antagonism. Protestants as we are by inheritance and by conviction, yet we cannot deny that Roman Catholics may be good citizens, and useful members of society, and that many of them are humble and devout Christians,—a fact which it is a sin against Christ not to recognize."

And an Episcopalian clergyman of Central New York writes thus to Dr. Field:—

"I do want to thank you for what you say about the treatment of Roman Catholics. How vastly better than infidelity is that church, and what a check it is to the same! Surely God is in it."

Thus the evidence increases, to show that Protestantism is getting to be simply a *name*, with no meaning whatever. Such men as we have just quoted from have no right to the name *Protestant*, since they have ceased to protest. Two questions are sufficient to prove this: 1. Was the Reformation a mistake? was the Catholic Church all right, and Luther and his fellow-reformers all wrong? 2. Has the Catholic Church changed one item in principle since that time? Both these questions must be answered in the negative. Then those who apologize for the papacy now, would have opposed Luther and his work if they had lived in his day. If those who oppose Catholicism to-day are bigots, then Wickliffe, and Huss, and Jerome, and Luther, and Melancthon, and Zwingle, and others like them, were also bigots. Is the professed Protestant world ready to take this position concerning these men?

We do not antagonize Catholics as individuals, but Catholicism as a system. But these men from whom we have quoted, seem to think that to deny that Catholicism is a part of the Christian church, is to deny that any Catholics may be good citizens, or that there may be persons within its pale who, to the best of their knowledge, are followers of Christ. There are thousands of honest people in that anti-Christian church, many of whom we have faith to believe will yet have their eyes opened to its true character, and will leave it. Just so there are many honest infidels who will yet accept the gospel. The same thing may also be said of many heathen. But because there are infidels and heathen who honestly desire to do right, and who do as nearly right as they know how, shall we laud infidelity and paganism?

The fact is, and we have abundant evidence to prove it, that there is not in the whole world a more potent factor in the manufacture of infidels than the Roman Catholic Church. Not only so, but by its teachings it opens the flood-gates of vice and immorality, and almost puts a premium on licentiousness. Yet it hoodwinks sleepy Protestants by making much of the *image* of Jesus Christ, and by a profession of regard for the marriage relation. While we have not an unkind feeling for any Catholic in the world, we are glad to be known, as the *Catholic Sentinel* puts it, as "a foe to the Catholic Church and the Jesuits."—*Signs of the Times.*

THE GOSPEL SICKLE.

Battle Creek, Mich., May 1, 1888.

The second article in the editorial department of this issue will prove interesting, giving, as it does, some facts regarding the rise of Seventh-day Adventists.

There will be a Seventh-day Adventist camp-meeting at Emporia, Kansas, May 22-29. The dates for camp-meetings in several other States have been fixed, but the places are not yet selected.

There are many influences operating in this country calculated to bring about a virtual union of church and state. The most prominent of these is the National Reform movement. The question is receiving considerable attention in various parts of the country, and is being discussed pro and con. As presenting a concise and correct statement of the comparative provinces of the church and the state, we give elsewhere an interesting article on the subject. Read and reflect.

With this issue is closed the series of "Historical Readings on Sunday-Keeping." Those who have followed the articles through have no doubt observed, some perhaps with regret, and others with satisfaction, that the history of the rise and progress of Sunday observance shows it to have been entirely without divine authority or sanction, in fact, that it is purely of human origin and support. The only purpose we have in thus presenting the facts in the case regarding the true nature of the Sunday-Sabbath, is that our readers may know the character of that institution and be led to more fully investigate the claims of God's true Sabbath—the seventh day of the week. We would not take a man's faith from him without giving him a better one.

REV. 1: 10 AND THE FIRST-DAY SABBATH.

A CORRESPONDENT writes that a certain minister, in a sermon in support of the first-day Sabbath, stated that in Rev. 1: 10, where John says, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day," the term used in the Greek for the word *Lord* is an entirely new one, found in only one other instance; viz., 1 Cor. 11: 20. From this circumstance, the aforesaid minister argues that a new institution is referred to, which must be the first-day Sabbath.

What is said about the new term for the word *Lord* in those texts, is true. The word in the Greek is *Kuriakos*. It is also true that its use in 1 Cor. 11: 20 is to designate an institution that originated in the Christian dispensation; viz., the Lord's supper. But before concluding that the use of this word in Rev. 1: 10 proves the establishment and existence of the first-day Sabbath, a few points should be considered:—

1. The institution of the Lord's supper is very minutely recorded, as to place, time, manner, and purpose. Such being the case, we may expect to find it referred to afterward, unaccompanied by an explanation of its origin, or a repetition of previously stated facts. When we do find it thus referred to, and by a term not before used, no query arises as to what is meant.

2. No such record exists of the institution of the so-called Christian Sabbath—meaning the first day of the week—or of its being given the title "Lord's day." Hence when we come to the instance in Rev. 1: 10, where the word *day* is used in connection with this new term (*Kuriakos*), it is jumping at conclusions to claim it as meaning the first-day Sabbath. The reasoning by which such a conclusion is reached is like this: (1.) The use of the word *Kuriakos* in 1 Cor. 11: 20, is to designate a new institution (the Lord's supper), which had its origin in the Christian dispensation. (2.) The use of the same word in Rev. 1: 10, in connection with the word *day*, is also to designate a new institution, which had its origin in the Christian dispensation. (3.) That new institution is the Christian Sabbath. (4.) The first day of the week was chosen for this new institution. (5.) Therefore the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath. While the first step in this series is correct, the others are all wrong, and do not follow as a necessary consequence, as any person of ordinary intelligence must admit. The first statement is susceptible of positive proof: the others are nothing but inferences, unsup-

ported by anything that bears the slightest semblance to evidence.

3. That different writers, at different dates, should use different terms to name the same institution, need not be thought improbable. The word *pentecost* is found only in the New Testament, and yet all admit that it refers to an institution that had its origin in the Mosaic dispensation. This word and the circumstance of its first use in the New Testament, can just as reasonably be taken to prove the origin of that institution in the Christian dispensation, as can the circumstance of the use of the word *Kuriakos* in Rev. 1: 10 be taken to prove the origin of the first-day Sabbath. The same argument applies in both cases.

HISTORICAL READING ON SUNDAY-KEEPING.—NO. 11.

BY ISAAC MORRISON

Do Protestants admit that there is no divine command from Christ or the apostles to change the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week?

"There is not on record any divine command issued 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."—*Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, by B. B. Edwards, art. Sabbath.

Do they admit that it cannot be proved by the New Testament that Christ or his apostles ever actually observed the first day of the week?

Wm. Smith, LL. D., after examining all the texts supposed to have reference to Sunday-keeping, says: "Taken separately, perhaps, or even all together, these passages seem scarcely adequate to prove that the dedication of the first day of the week to the purpose afore mentioned was a matter of apostolic institution, or even of apostolic practice."—*Dictionary of the Bible*, art. Lord's Day.

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 apostolic institution of the Lord's day, or even the actual observance of it."—Art. Sabbath.

Do they admit that there is no authority in the New Testament for keeping the first day of the week as the Sabbath instead of the seventh day?

"The current notion that Christ and his apostles authoritatively substituted the first day of the week for the seventh, is absolutely without authority in the New Testament."—*Lyman Abbott*, in the *Christian Union* of Jan. 19, 1882.

Do they admit that the first day of the week was not set apart to be kept as the Sabbath in the days of the apostles?

"Was the first day of the week 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."—*Alexander Campbell*, in a lecture in *Bethany College*, 1843. Quoted in *Proclamation and Reformer*, Cincinnati.

Do they admit that Sunday-keeping is only an institution originated by man?

"The festival Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance; and it was far from the intention of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect,—far from them and from the early apostolic church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday."—*Neander's Church History*, translated by H. J. Rose, p. 168.

How does the National Encyclopedia sum up the evidence for Sunday-keeping?

"It has been held by many eminent divines that there is not sufficient evidence in the New Testament for such an institution; that the change of the day from the seventh to the first day of the week is an insuperable difficulty."—Art. Sabbath.

CHURCH AND STATE.

WHENCE has come about in modern history the great doctrine of the separation of the church and the state, for the purification of religion and the security of civil freedom?

This is the central question before us, and we are prepared to consider the relation of the church toward the realm of secularity as embodied in the institutions of the family, the school, the civil community, and the state. We must first inquire for the characteristic distinctions of the church and the state. The final object of the church is holiness, the assumption by man of the form of the divine; the final object of the state is the production of justice, the form of freedom. The negative of holiness is defined as sin; the negative of justice is defined as crime.

Sin and crime furnish the two categories with which these institutions, the church and the state, respectively deal. Let us note the consequences of confounding them. If the state undertakes to perform the functions of the church, it will deal with crimes in their character of sin as well as in their character of injustice. If the church, on the other hand,

usurps the functions of the state, it will attempt to carry sin over into the category of crime, and punish it by temporal penalties. For the church or the state to attempt to perform each other's functions, is to destroy the functions of each. A crime, or breach of justice, is a deed of the individual which the state by its judicial acts returns on the individual. The state furnishes a measure for crime, and punishes each criminal according to his deserts. The judicial mind is a measuring mind, a retributive mind, because trained in the forms of justice which sees to it that every man's deed shall be returned to him to bless him, or to curse him with pain. Now, a sin is a breach of the law of holiness, a lapse out of the likeness to the divine form, and as such it utterly refuses to be measured. It is infinite death to lapse out of the form of the divine. A sin cannot be atoned for by any finite punishment, but only (as Revelation teaches) by a divine act of sacrifice. The church cannot decree a finite measure of penance for sin; therefore it can only pronounce eternal doom on the sinner unless he repents. Religion says that the sinner must repent and return to holiness, and then his sin has been forgiven. The church meets sincere repentance with unreserved forgiveness.

It would destroy the state to attempt to treat crimes as sins, and forgive them in case of repentance. It would impose on the judiciary the business of going behind the overt act to the disposition or frame of mind within the depths of personality. But so long as the deed is not uttered in the act, it does not belong to society, but only to the individual and to God. No human institution can go behind the overt act and attempt to deal absolutely with the substance of man's spiritual freedom.

If the church attempts to administer civil functions, it falls into the habit of weighing sin in finite scales, and by and by it comes to indulging mortal sin for the sake of mere secular penances, and even for money paid in advance. If a noble ecclesiastic attempts to reform the civil magistracy under a theocracy, he is apt to fall into the use of the severe code of Draco, who punished all crimes with death; or else, in the careful weighing of the deed in order to avoid just penalties, the church official comes to lose his sense of the enormity of sin.

Sin and crime must not be confounded, nor must the same deed be treated as crime and sin by the same authority. Look at it as a crime, and it is capable of measured retribution. The law does not pursue the murderer beyond the gallows. He has expiated his crime with his life. But the slightest sin, even if it is no crime at all, as for example the anger of a man against his brother, an anger which does not utter itself in the form of violent deeds, but is pent up in the heart,—such non-criminal sin will banish the soul forever from heaven, unless it is made naught by sincere repentance.

The divine and secular must be separately organized as institutions; but this does not imply that they may be organized in antagonism. It is the nature of Christianity to encourage independence of church control on the part of all other institutions when they are once in harmony with its divine ideal. For it is the principle of Christianity in its innermost essence to teach the nature of God as one of infinite grace,—a God who sacrifices himself that imperfection may have the opportunity to put on the divine form of holiness and enjoy independent personality forever, always growing from more to more in intellect and will. The form of holiness is simply the form in which the individual may grow in personality without ever contradicting and annulling his true being.

What we here see in these general terms to be the relation of the church to the state is also the relation of the church to the secular, specifically, in all details.—*Extract from an address by W. T. Harris, LL. D. before the Boston "Congregational Club."*

If Christians meet on the rock Christ as Christians, they will be happy with each other; but if on the sands of disputation, they raise a troublesome dust.

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.