

# The Signs of the Times.

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

VOLUME 5.

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA, FIFTH-DAY, JANUARY 23, 1879.

NUMBER 4.

## The Signs of the Times.

ISSUED WEEKLY BY THE  
Pacific Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association.

TERMS: Two DOLLARS a year in advance for a volume of 48 numbers.

Office, Twelfth and Castro Streets.  
Address, SIGNS OF THE TIMES, Oakland, Cal.

### "Silence Is Golden."

It is sweet, warm rain, in silence dropping,  
That sinks with refreshing power;  
Not the wind-born storm nor the rising torrent  
Which breaks the tender flower.

It is the keen, quick lightning, sharp and silent,  
That splinters, scratches and kills;  
Not the huge bellowing of the noisy thunder,  
Echoing among the hills.

It is the still, small voice, whose silent pleading  
Persuades the deepest heart;  
Not the loud speech, the hoarse and vulgar jargon,  
The rude stentorian art.

The mightier forces in the world around us  
We never hear nor see;  
The shallow brooklet, pent among its eddies,  
Babbles unceasingly.

The stars march on in their eternal courses,  
Uttering no voice or sound;  
The rushing meteor flies—explodes in ether,  
Falls hissing to the ground.

The human soul whose grasp is widest, grandest  
Of things in heaven and earth,  
Discovers not its royal truths and treasures  
In noisy hours of mirth. —Sel.

## General Articles.

### The Scripture Doctrine of a Future Life.—No. 2.

BY ELDER D. M. CANRIGHT.

LET us now examine the Bible upon this important question of man's nature. About six thousand years ago, the living God created this planet, and fitted it up with most wonderful beauty. He made the dry land, the bodies of water, the green grass, the beautiful and fragrant flowers, and the waving trees. He made the fresh air, and lit up the whole earth with the shining sun. He then peopled the waters with the fish, the air with the beautiful birds, and the dry land with the various animals. When this was done, it is said that the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy. Job 38:7. Indeed, the Bible refers to this work as one of the grandest achievements of almighty power and wisdom. Now what was the object of the Creator in this sublime work? The Bible plainly tells us that he made this planet for the abode of man, and all there is upon it for his use and comfort. Thus we read: "The heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's, but the earth hath he given to the children of men." Psa. 115:16. The earth, then, was made for man. Once more I read: "For thus saith the Lord that created the heavens; God himself that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited." Isa. 45:18. Yes, the Lord formed the earth to be inhabited by man.

Hence, we read again that everything on the earth was placed under man's rule. The psalmist says, "What is man that thou art mindful of him?" "Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet; all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas." Psa. 8:4-8. This is very plain. "Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands," hence "thou hast put all things under his feet." Turning back to the account of creation, in Genesis, we find it plainly stated that the object for which God created man was that he should dwell upon the earth, and have dominion over it and over everything in the earth. Thus we read: "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness. And let them have dominion over

the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth." Gen. 1:26. Here we learn that man was made in the image of his Creator, that is, made as his representative on the earth; then he was given dominion over all the earth.

Man, then, was made of the earth, made upon the earth, made to rule over the earth. From the crown of his head to the sole of his feet, he is perfectly adapted to living on this planet. The sunshine, the air, the water, the fruit, the animals around him, the minerals—everything, he finds useful and enjoyable to himself.

Evidently, then, man was made for this planet and for no other. The angels were made for heaven and not for earth. They are fitted for that sphere. If God had made man to live in heaven, he would have created him there, not here. The Lord fitted the fish for the sea, the birds for the air, the beasts for the field. He made everything just where it should remain. So with man. He is not a heavenly being. God never designed him for such. Other beings dwell there, but the earth is man's home. Hence we find that God immediately commanded them to multiply and fill the earth with their species. Gen. 1:28. Then the Lord fitted up a beautiful home for man, and provided him the tree of life to perpetuate his life as long as he should be obedient. See Gen. 2:8-17.

#### MAN CREATED MORTAL.

We invite the reader's attention to what the Bible says of man's composition at his creation. The Pentateuch contains the only history we have of mankind for twenty-five hundred years after the creation. Aside from the fact that it is an inspired record, it must be considered by far the most important history ever written. It contains an account of the creation of man, his trial, failure, and consequent death. But we shall find it entirely silent in regard to the immortality of the soul.

We read of man's creation as follows: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Gen. 2:7. The reader will notice that the man was made of the dust of the ground. The Lord did not simply make a body of dust, and put a man into it, but the man was formed of the ground. "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground." Then he gave him the breath of life, and that same man, made of the dust, became a living soul,—a living creature. It does not say that man became an immortal soul, nor that he put a soul into him; but the organized dust became a living soul.

The simple fact is that God organized of the dust a complete man, perfect in every part. Then he gave life to this man, and he began to think, and act, a living person. Thus the Jewish translation of the original Hebrew reads as follows: "And the Lord God formed the man of dust from the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being." Not one word or hint about immortality is found here.

Then it is said that the Lord planted a garden where he put the man. In this garden was every tree pleasant to the sight and good for food. Two noted trees were placed there. One was the tree of life; the other bore the forbidden fruit. "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Gen. 2:16-17.

Notice that the man has free access to every tree of the garden except one,—the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

Then he did have free access to the tree of life; and no doubt he partook of its fruit. We are told that man would live just as long as he ate of the tree of life. Gen. 3:22-24. The same fact is implied in the previous quotation. In the day he ate of the forbidden fruit, he was to die. On the other hand, of course he would not die till he dis-

obeyed God. If he had not eaten of the forbidden fruit for a thousand years, the day of his death would not have come for a thousand years. If he had not eaten of it for ten thousand years, he would not have died for that length of time. If he had never eaten of it, the day of his death would never have come. He would have had continued access to the tree of life. Thus we see plainly that man's immortality was not in himself, but in the fruits of the tree of life. This it was which was to perpetuate his life and ward off disease. This simple fact is unanswerable proof that man had no immortality in his own nature.

Let us look carefully at what took place when man did sin. Hear the Lord's explanation of what he meant when he said, "Thou shalt surely die," "And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also, and thistles shall it bring forth unto thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." Gen. 3:17-19. Here then is the penalty of Adam's transgression. The earth is cursed so that it brings forth thorns and thistles. All nature is arrayed against him. He is to earn his bread by hard, wearing labor.

Further down we read thus: "And the Lord God said, Behold the man is become as one of us to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever; therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubim, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life." Gen. 3:22-24.

As soon as Adam became a sinner, God cut off his access to the tree of life. Why did he do this? The Lord himself stated the reason,—lest he eat of the tree of life, and live forever. Thus it is very evident the source of Adam's immortal life was in the tree and not in himself. As soon as he was cut off from that, he became a mortal, dying man. To all intents and purposes, from that day he began to die. And so the Lord says, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." This is plain, simple language, which a child can understand. All there was of Adam went back to the dust whence he was taken. There was no conscious Adam left to go off somewhere else. Hence, a little farther on we read, "And all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years; and he died." Gen. 5:5.

Thus death came upon all our race. Shut away from the tree of life, they have been but perishing men and women ever since. They come up, and flourish a moment, and go down into dust.

But the Lord has graciously promised a resurrection from the dead through Jesus Christ. Then those who have been righteous will be made immortal, and again have right to the tree of life.

The Bible everywhere represents man as on probation for life. The language of Moses to ancient Israel is but the key note of the whole Bible on this subject. He says: "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life, and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live." Deut. 30:19. I have set before you life and death, therefore choose life. The great boon of life is that for which we are now to struggle. Therefore man is spoken of as being mortal. "Shall mortal man be more just than God?" Job 4:17. Man then is mortal. But do you say this is the body? Well then the body is the man, for it is the man that is mortal. Once more I read; "But man dieth, and wasteth away." Job 14:10. Notice particularly, that it is man that dies, not simply the

house that he lives in, the lump of clay; but it is the man that dies.

"But is not the soul immortal? It cannot be that the soul can die!" So says theology. But listen to the word of God. "Behold all souls are mine: as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall die." Ezek. 18:4. Yes, the soul that sinneth, it shall die. Then the soul itself dies. It therefore must be mortal, for that which is immortal cannot die.

Coming into the New Testament we find the same doctrine taught there, even more prominently. "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. What is the grand object of the death of Christ? It is very plainly stated; namely, that men should not perish, but have everlasting life. Reader, men are in danger of perishing, and the important thing with them is to gain a life that will last forever. This is what is offered through the gospel. So again we read: "The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6:23. Here we have the same simple doctrine clearly stated. What is the wages of sin? Answer, death. What is the gift of God? Answer again, eternal life; and this comes through Jesus Christ. In harmony with this, John says: "And this is the record that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." 1 John 5:11, 12. Through Jesus Christ, then, the believer will obtain eternal life; but it is just as absolutely true that he that does not have the Son has not life.

Once more John says: "Ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." 1 John 3:15. This is very positive. No murderer hath eternal life. But have we not been taught that even the murderer will live eternally in the lake of fire? Then, reader, if he lives eternally, tell me why he does not have eternal life? It does not say eternal happiness, but eternal life. As long as a man is alive he is not dead. If the sinner lives through all eternity, then he certainly has eternal life. The greatest boon which the Creator can possibly bestow upon any creature is the gift of life. But there is only one being in all the universe to whom the Father has granted to have life in himself, and that is the Son of God. Thus we read: "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." John 5:26.

Reader, how then can it be said that every one, even the vilest sinner has life in himself? The Scriptures plainly contradict this. That inestimable boon of an endless life is not lightly bestowed upon any one by the Creator. But it has been given to Christ, and through him by faith and a righteous life, we may obtain it. Says Paul: "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6:23. Hence he is called the prince of life or the author of life. Acts 3:15. He is the only fountain of life to fallen man.

We invite the reader carefully to study the sixth chapter of John upon this subject. We will here quote a few verses. Notice all the way through that it is life which Jesus has come to give. "For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." John 6:33. This life the believer is to receive only at the resurrection. "And this is the will of him that sent me that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day." Verse 40.

"This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven: If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." Verses 50, 51.

"As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." Verse 57.

To exhaust this subject we should have to

(Continued on page 27.)

## THE GREAT CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN CHRIST AND HIS ANGELS AND SATAN  
AND HIS ANGELS.CHAPTER THREE—CONCLUDED.  
THE FALL OF SATAN.

BY MRS. E. G. WHITE.

ADAM quite well understood that his companion had transgressed the only prohibition laid upon them as a test of their fidelity and love. Eve reasoned that the serpent said they should not surely die, and his words must be true, for she felt no signs of God's displeasure, but a pleasant influence, as she imagined the angels felt. Adam regretted that Eve had left his side; but now the deed was done. He must be separated from her whose society he had loved so well. How could he have it thus? His love for Eve was strong, and in utter discouragement he resolved to share her fate. He reasoned that Eve was a part of himself; and if she must die, he would die with her; for he could not bear the thought of separation from her. He did not think that God, who had created him a living, beautiful form out of the dust of the ground, and had given him Eve to be his companion, could supply her place. After all, might not the words of this wise serpent be correct? Eve was before him, just as lovely and beautiful, and apparently as innocent, as before this act of disobedience. She expressed greater, higher love for him than before her disobedience, as the effect of the fruit she had eaten. He saw in her no signs of death. She had told him of the happy influence of the fruit, of her ardent love for him, and he decided to brave the consequences. He seized the fruit and quickly ate it, and, like Eve, felt not immediately its ill effects.

Eve had thought herself capable of deciding between right and wrong. The flattering hope of entering a higher state of knowledge had led her to think that the serpent was her especial friend, possessing a great interest in her welfare. If she had sought her husband, and they had related to their Maker the words of the serpent, they would have been delivered at once from his artful temptation.

God instructed our first parents in regard to the tree of knowledge, and they were fully informed relative to the fall of Satan, and the danger of listening to his suggestions. God did not deprive them of the power of eating the forbidden fruit. He left them as free moral agents to believe his word, obey his commandments and live, or believe the tempter, disobey and perish. They both ate, and the great wisdom they obtained was the knowledge of sin, and a sense of guilt. The Lord would not have them investigate the fruit of the tree of knowledge, for then they would be exposed to Satan masked. He knew that they would be perfectly safe if they touched not the fruit.

Our first parents chose to believe the words, as they thought, of a serpent; yet he had given them no tokens of his love. He had done nothing for their happiness and benefit; while God had given them everything that was good for food, and pleasant to the sight. Everywhere the eye might rest was abundance and beauty; yet Eve was deceived by the serpent, to think that there was something withheld which would make them wise, even as God. Instead of believing and confiding in their Creator, she basely distrusted his goodness, and cherished the words of Satan.

After Adam's transgression he at first imagined himself rising to a new and higher existence. But soon the thought of his transgression terrified him. The air, that had been of a mild and even temperature, seemed to chill the guilty pair. They had a sense of sin, and felt a dread of the future, a sense of want, a nakedness of soul. The sweet love and peace seemed removed from them, and in their place a want of something came over them that they had never experienced before. They then for the first turned their attention to the external. They had not been clothed, but were draped in light as were the heavenly angels. This light which had enshrouded

them departed. To relieve the sense of nakedness which they realized, their attention was directed to seek a covering for their forms; for how could they meet the eye of God and angels unclothed?

Their crime is now before them in its true light. Their transgression of God's express command assumes a clearer character. Adam censured Eve's folly in leaving his side, and being deceived by the serpent; but they both flattered themselves that God, who had given them everything to make them happy, might yet excuse their disobedience, because of his great love to them, and that their punishment would not be so dreadful after all.

Satan exulted in his success. He had tempted the woman to distrust God, to question his wisdom, and to seek to penetrate his all-wise plans. And through her he had also caused the overthrow of Adam, who, in consequence of his love for Eve, disobeyed the command of God, and fell with her.

The news of man's fall spread through Heaven—every harp was hushed. The angels cast their crowns from their heads in sorrow. All Heaven was in agitation. The angels were grieved at the base ingratitude of man, in return for the rich blessings which God had bestowed upon him. A council was held to see what must be done with the guilty pair. The angels feared that they would put forth the hand, and eat of the tree of life, and thus perpetuate a life of sin.

The Lord visited Adam and Eve, and made known to them the consequence of their disobedience. And as they hear God's majestic approach, they seek to hide themselves from inspection of him whom they delighted, while in their innocence and holiness, to meet. "And the Lord God called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where art thou? And he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid because I was naked, and I hid myself. And he said, Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat?" This question was asked by the Lord, not because he needed information, but for the conviction of the guilty pair. Adam acknowledged his transgression, not because he was penitent for his great disobedience, but to cast reflection upon God. "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat." The woman was then addressed: "What is this that thou hast done?" Eve answered, "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat." The Lord then addressed the serpent; "Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." As the serpent had been exalted above the beasts of the field, he should be degraded beneath them all, and be detested by man, inasmuch as he was the medium through which Satan acted. "And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground."

God cursed the ground because of the sin of Adam and Eve in eating of the tree of knowledge, and declared, "In sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life." He had apportioned them the good, but withheld the evil. Now he declares that they shall eat of it, that is, they shall be acquainted with evil, all the days of their life.

The race from that time forward was to be afflicted by Satan's temptations. A life of perpetual toil and anxiety was appointed unto Adam, instead of the happy, cheerful labor which he had hitherto enjoyed. They should be subject to disappointment, grief, and pain, and finally come to dissolution. They were made of the dust of the earth, and unto dust should they return.

Adam and Eve were informed that they must lose their Eden home. They had yielded to Satan's deception, and believed that God would lie. By their transgression they had opened a way for Satan to gain access to them more readily, and it was not safe for them to remain in the garden of Eden, lest in their state of sin they gain access to the tree of life, and perpetuate a life of sin. They entreated to be permitted to remain, although they acknowledged that they had forfeited all right to blissful Eden. They promised that they would, in the future yield implicit obedience to God. They were informed that in their fall from innocence to guilt, they had gained no strength, but great weakness. They had not preserved their integrity while they were in a state of holy, happy innocence, and they would have far less strength to remain true and loyal in a state of conscious guilt. At these words the unhappy pair were filled with keenest anguish and remorse. They now realized that the penalty of sin was death.

It was Satan's studied plan that Adam and Eve should disobey God, receive his frown, and then partake of the tree of life, that they might perpetuate a life of sin. But holy angels were immediately commissioned to guard the way to the tree of life. Around these angels flashed beams of light on every side, which had the appearance of glittering swords.

Many regard the punishment of Adam's transgression as too severe a penalty for so small a sin. The enemy of all righteousness has blinded the eyes of sinners, so that sin does not appear sinful. Their standard of what constitutes sin is vastly different from God's standard. Should those who regard Adam's sin as a matter of very small consequence look a little deeper, they would see the great mercy of God in giving Adam the smallest possible test. It could scarcely be called a self-denial on his part to refrain from partaking of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, for he already had everything necessary to supply his wants. A compassionate God gave no severe test, no strong temptation that would tax human endurance beyond the power to resist. The fruit itself was harmless. If God had not forbidden Adam and Eve to partake of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, their action in taking it would not have been sinful. Up to the moment of God's prohibition, Adam might have eaten of the fruit of that tree without realizing any harm. But after God had said, Thou shalt not eat, the act became a crime of great magnitude. Adam had disobeyed God. In this was his sin. The very fact that Adam's trial was small, made his sin exceeding great. God tested him in that which was least, to prove him; and with the prohibition he stated that the punishment consequent upon his disobedience would be death. If Adam could not bear this smallest of tests to prove his loyalty, he surely could not have endured a stronger trial had he been taken into closer relationship with God, to bear higher responsibilities. He evidenced that God could not trust him; should he be exposed to Satan's more determined attacks, he would signally fail.

God created man in his own image, after his likeness, free from sin, and with organs well developed. The earth was to be populated with intelligent beings who were only a little lower than the angels. But God would first prove the holy pair, and test their obedience; for he would not have a world filled with beings who would disregard his laws. Adam did the worst thing he could do under the circumstances. In doing that which God had expressly forbidden he set his will against the will of God, thus waging war with his requirements. The pen of inspiration has with accuracy traced the history of our first parents' sin and fall, that all generations may be warned not to follow Adam's example, in the slightest disregard of God's requirements. Had the test been in regard to larger matters, men might have excused the sin of disobedience in what they call smaller things. But God made the test with Adam upon things that

are least, to show man that the slightest disobedience to his requirements is sin in every sense of the word. God, the Governor of the universe, has made all things subject to law; things apparently insignificant, and things of the greatest magnitude, are all governed by laws adapted to their natures. Nothing that God has made has been forgotten or left to blind chance. To man, as being endowed with reasoning powers and conscience, God's moral law is given to control his actions. Man is not compelled to obey. He may defy God's law, as did Adam, and take the fearful consequences; or by living in harmony with that law he may reap the rewards of obedience.

Ministers of our time give from their pulpits license to sin, in saying to the sinner, that the law of God is not binding upon man, and that it is impossible for him to keep it. It was then impossible for Adam to keep God's law, and why should the punishment of transgression have fallen upon him? The very fact that disobedience to God in one of the smallest requirements brought such woe to our world shows that any disregard of his law will surely be followed by the penalty, which is death. Ministers who make war upon the law of God, are gathering in their garments the blood of souls. They are working in harmony with the great rebel.

## Work While It is Called To-day.

THE Rev. Joseph Cook, of Boston, at his recent lecture related the following incident, which is worthy the attention of many Christians in our churches. Mr. Cook said:—

"There is a story now in circulation in New York city concerning the younger Tyng, to the effect that his habit of making all the members of his church work, is occasionally distasteful to individuals among them. Not long ago a rich gentleman called upon Dr. Tyng in his study and told this valiant servant of reform that he wished to pay his church dues, and to have a good pew, but that he did not care to be put down on any committee, and that he was especially averse to having his wife and daughters sent into the slums to visit the poor and degraded. 'Yes,' said Dr. Tyng, 'I see what you want, but you have come to the wrong place. Just around the corner is what you are looking for. There is the church of Heavenly Rest.'"

In this world of sin and misery, of men perishing daily for want of knowledge; unsaved men near at hand, and in distant lands; who is there surveying a harvest-field so wide in which so few laborers are at work, can think of rest until the Lord of the harvest summons him to his reward?

## Christ All-Sufficient.

A CONVERTED Romanist thus related his experience at the Bowery meeting, New York: "I was brought up a strict Catholic, and found it easy work to pray to the Virgin Mary and the saints in my times of trouble. Every thing seemed to be going smoothly, until one day, I heard two men, entire strangers to me, talking about the death of an acquaintance. Their remarks led me to think very seriously about the eternal world, and to ask myself the question, 'Where am I to spend eternity?' The question became an all-absorbing one, and I could not get rid of it. In God's great mercy the light of his truth dawned upon me, and I saw the one only way of peace through simple faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Then I saw the uselessness of the superstitious mummeries of the Romish Church, that I had thought so much of before, and united with a church where Christ is preached as an all-sufficient Saviour, who can so fully meet all our need that no appeal has to be made to any other for help."

LITTLE faults become great in our eyes, in proportion as the pure light of God increases in us; just as the sun, in rising, reveals the true dimensions of objects which were dimly and confusedly discerned during the night.

(Continued from first page.)

quote a good share of the Bible. It is the grand theme of all the inspired writers. Man is a mortal, perishing worm of the dust. Christ holds out to him the offer of eternal life. Those who reject this will utterly perish.

Let us look back a moment at the Scriptural use of the words immortal and immortality. To hear theologians talk, you would suppose that the Bible is full of these terms. But the fact is that the word "immortal" occurs but once in the Bible, and then it is applied to God himself. "Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever." 1 Tim. 1: 17. This is the only place where the word is used, and here it is applied to the eternal Creator. Now look at the use of the word immortality. It occurs five times, as follows: First, Paul says, speaking of the Father, "who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto." 1 Tim. 6: 16. Notice how plainly it is said that God only hath immortality. How, then, can you affirm that every man has it.

Secondly, we read that Christ, "hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." 2 Tim. 1: 10. Immortality is brought to light through the gospel, not through nature, philosophy, or heathen tradition.

Thirdly, speaking of God, Paul says, "Who will render to every man according to his deeds; to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life." Rom. 2: 6, 7. How could a statement be plainer? In order to have immortality we must patiently seek for it. But why urge men to seek for that which they already have? The fact that the inspired apostle urges men to seek for immortality, is proof that he knew that men do not have immortality, but are in dying need of it.

Fourthly, we are to obtain immortality at the resurrection: "Behold, I show you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." 1 Cor. 15: 51-54. This is very plain and unmistakable. When the last trump shall sound, the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and then this mortal shall put on immortality. We will sum up upon this point in the words of another:—

"First, The apostle Paul is the only writer in the whole Bible, who makes use of the word *immortal* or *immortality*.

"Second, He never applies it to sinners.

"Third, He never applies it to either righteous or wicked in this world.

"Fourth, He never applies it to men's souls at all, either before or after death.

"Fifth, He speaks of it as an attribute of the King eternal. 1 Tim. 1: 17.

"Sixth, He declares that He is the only possessor of it. 1 Tim. 1: 17.

"Seventh, He presents it as an object which men are to seek after by patient continuance in well doing. Rom. 2: 7.

"Eighth, He speaks of it as revealed or brought to light [not in heathen philosophy, but] in the gospel of the Son of God. 2 Tim. 1: 10.

"Ninth, He defines the period when it shall be 'put on' by the saints of God, and fixes it at the resurrection, when Christ who is our Life, shall appear. 1 Cor. 15: 52-54.

"Tenth, Therefore he never taught the immortality of the soul, as it is now taught; and hence, when he declared that sinners should be destroyed, or perish, or die, or be burned, or devoured by fire, he did so without any 'mental reservations' or 'theological definitions.' In other words, he said what he meant and meant what he said.—*Pauline Theology*, p. 34.

Thus we find that the dogma of the immortality of the soul is not taught in the Bible. D. M. CANRIGHT.

Bowling Green, O., Jan. 6.

A Godly Life.

Rest not in a mere rational conviction of the truth of the gospel, but reduce your faith to practice. Embrace the gospel as well as assent to its truth. If Christianity is true, it is the most important concern in the world. Avail yourselves of its precious invitations. Obey its salutary precepts and escape from the dangers of which it gives you warning.—*Ladies' Repository*.

The Sabbath Not Jewish.

BY URIAH SMITH.\*

SINCE then the sacred institution stands, Old as the world and broad as all its lands, Since made when Time's great circuit first begun, 'Twill last, of course, as long as time shall run. Since made for him, the Father of mankind, For all his offspring, 'twas, of course, designed. Absurd to think such institution given— Link most divine, connecting earth with heaven, A sacred chain, joining, in due degree, Man with his God, time with eternity; Given for the good of all who dwell below, Designed o'er all its blessings to bestow— Absurd to think that it was destined, then, For but a portion of the race of men; Or to be pinioned by the bounds of space, Or revered only by a single race! Say, you who claim, and speak as though you knew, That it was given only for the Jew, Were our first parents Jews? If so, then how Are not all earth's great nations Jewish now? Or if long years successive rolled away, Ere national divisions held their sway, And ere the Jews arose, who were to know What blessings from the holy Sabbath flow, For whom alone it was designed, you say— Why made so long before 'twas needed, pray?

History of Sunday-Keeping.

SYLVESTER was the bishop of Rome while Constantine was emperor. How faithfully he acted his part in transforming the festival of the sun into a Christian institution is seen in that, by his apostolic authority, he changed the name of the day, giving it the imposing title of *Lord's day*. To Constantine and to Sylvester, therefore, the advocates of first-day observance are greatly indebted. The one elevated it as a heathen festival to the throne of the empire, making it a day of rest from most kinds of business; the other changed it into a Christian institution, giving it the dignified appellation of *Lord's day*. It is not a sufficient reason for denying that Pope Sylvester, not far from A. D. 325, authoritatively conferred on Sunday the name of *Lord's day*, to say that one of the fathers as early as A. D. 200, calls the day by that name, and that some seven different writers, between A. D. 200 and A. D. 325, viz., Tertulian, Origen, Cyprian, Anatolius, Commodianus, Victorinus, and Peter of Alexandria, can be adduced, who give this name to Sunday.

No one of these fathers ever claims for this title any apostolic authority; and it has been already shown that they could not have believed the day to be the *Lord's day* by divine appointment. So far, therefore, is the use of this term by these persons as a name for Sunday from conflicting with the statement that Sylvester, by his apostolic authority, established this name as the rightful title of that day, that it shows the act of Sylvester to be exactly suited to the circumstances of the case. Indeed, Nicephorus asserts that Constantine, who considered himself quite as much the head of the church as was the pope, "directed that the day which the Jews considered the first day of the week, and which the Greeks dedicated to the sun, should be called the *Lord's day*." The circumstances of the case render the statement of Lucius and Nicephorus in the highest degree probable. They certainly do not indicate that the pope would deem such act on his part unnecessary. Take a recent event in papal history as an illustration of this case. Only a few years since, Pius IX. decreed that the virgin Mary was born without sin. This had long been asserted by many distinguished writers in the papal church, but it lacked authority as a dogma of that church until the pope, A. D. 1854, gave it his official sanction. It was the work of Constantine and of Sylvester in the early part of the fourth century to establish the festival of the sun, to be a day of rest, by the authority of the empire, and to render it a Christian institution by the authority of St. Peter.

The following from Dr. Heylyn, a distinguished member of the Church of England, is worthy of particular attention. In most forcible language, he traces the steps by which the Sunday festival arose to power, contrasting it in this respect with the ancient Sabbath of the Lord; and then, with equal truth and candor, he acknowledges that, as the festival of Sunday was set up by the emperor and the church, the same power can take it down whenever it sees fit. Thus he says:—

"Thus do we see upon what grounds the *Lord's day* stands; on *custom first*, and *voluntary* consecration of it to religious meetings; that *custom*, countenanced by the authority of the church of God, which *tacitly* approved the same; and *finally confirmed and ratified by Christian princes* throughout their empires. And as the day for rest from

\*From "A Word for the Sabbath" for sale at the Office of THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

labors and restraint from business upon that day, [it] received its greatest strength from the supreme magistrate as long as he retained that power which to him belongs; as after, from the canons and decrees of councils, the decretals of popes and orders of particular prelates, when the sole managing of ecclesiastical affairs was committed to them.

"I hope it was not so with the former Sabbath, which neither took original from custom, that people being not so forward to give God a day; nor required any countenance or authority from the kings of Israel to confirm and ratify it. The Lord had spoken the word, that he would have one day in seven, precisely the seventh day from the world's creation, to be a day of rest unto all his people; which said there was no more to do but gladly to submit and obey his pleasure.

But thus it was not done in our present business. The Lord's day had no such command that it should be sanctified, but was left plainly to God's people to pitch on this, or any other, for the public use. And being taken up amongst them and made a day of meeting in the congregation for religious exercises; yet for three hundred years there was neither law to bind them to it, nor any rest from labor or from worldly business required upon it.

"And when it seemed good unto Christian princes, the nursing fathers of God's church, to lay restraints upon their people, yet at the first they were not general; but only thus that certain men in certain places should lay aside their ordinary and daily works, to attend God's service in the church; those whose employments were most toilsome and most repugnant to the true nature of a Sabbath, being allowed to follow and pursue their labors because most necessary to the commonwealth.

"And in the following times, when as the prince and prelate, in their several places endeavored to restrain them from that also, which formerly they had permitted, and interdicted almost all kinds of bodily labor upon that day; it was not brought about without much struggling and an opposition of the people; more than a thousand years being past, after Christ's ascension, before the Lord's day had attained that state in which now it standeth. And being brought into that state, wherein now it stands, it doth not stand so firmly and on such sure grounds, but that those powers which raised it up may take it lower if they please, yea take it quite away as unto the time, and settle it on any other day as to them seems best."

Constantine's edict marks a signal change in the history of the Sunday festival. Dr. Heylyn thus testifies:—

"Hitherto have we spoken of the *Lord's day* as taken up by the common consent of the church; not instituted or established by any text of Scripture, or edict of emperor, or decree of council. . . . In that which followeth, we shall find both emperors and councils very frequent in ordering things about this day and the service of it."

After his professed conversion to Christianity, Constantine still further exerted his power in behalf of the venerable day of the sun, now happily transformed into the *Lord's day*, by the apostolic authority of the Roman bishop. Heylyn thus testifies:—

"So natural a power it is in a Christian prince to order things about religion, that he not only took upon him to command the day, but also to prescribe the service."

The influence of Constantine powerfully contributed to the aid of those church leaders who were intent upon bringing the forms of pagan worship into the Christian church. Gibbon thus places upon record the motives of these men, and the result of their action:—

"The most respectable bishops had persuaded themselves that the ignorant rustics would more cheerfully renounce the superstition of paganism, if they found some resemblance, some compensation, in the bosom of Christianity. The religion of Constantine achieved in less than a century, the final conquest of the Roman Empire; but the victors themselves were insensibly subdued by the arts of their vanquished rivals."

The body of nominal Christians, which resulted from this strange union of pagan rites with Christian worship, arrogated to itself the title of Catholic church, while the true people of God, who resisted these dangerous innovations, were branded as heretics, and cast out of the church. It is not strange that the Sabbath should lose ground in such a body, in its struggle with its rival, the festival of the sun. Indeed, after a brief period, the history of the Sabbath will be found only in the almost obliterated records of those whom the Catholic church cast out and stigmatized as heretics. Of the Sabbath in Constantine's time, Heylyn says:—

"As for the Saturday, that retained its

wanted credit in the eastern churches, little inferior to the Lord's day, if not plainly equal; not as a Sabbath, think not so; but as a day designed unto sacred meetings."

There is no doubt that, after the great flood of worldliness which entered the church at the time of Constantine's pretended conversion, and after all that was done by himself and by Sylvester in behalf of Sunday, the observance of the Sabbath became, with many, only a nominal thing. But the action of the council of Laodicea, to which we shall presently come, proves conclusively that the Sabbath was still observed, not simply as a festival, as Heylyn would have it, but as a day of abstinence from labor, as enjoined in the commandment. The work of Constantine, however, marks an epoch in the history of the Sabbath and of Sunday. Constantine was hostile to the Sabbath, and his influence told powerfully against it with all those who sought worldly advancement. The historian Eusebius was the special friend and eulogist of Constantine. This fact should not be overlooked in weighing his testimony concerning the Sabbath. He speaks of it as follows:—

"They [the patriarchs] did not, therefore, regard circumcision, nor observe the Sabbath, nor do we; neither do we abstain from certain foods, nor regard other injunctions, which Moses subsequently delivered to be observed in types and symbols, because such things as these do not belong to Christians."

This testimony shows precisely the views of Constantine and the imperial party relative to the Sabbath. But it does not give the views of Christians as a whole; for we have seen that the Sabbath had been extensively retained up to this point, and we shall soon have occasion to quote other historians, the cotemporaries and successors of Eusebius, who record its continued observance. Constantine exerted a controlling influence in the church, and was determined to "have nothing in common with that most hostile rabble of the Jews." Happy would it have been had his aversion been directed against the festivals of the heathen rather than against the Sabbath of the Lord.

Before Constantine's time, there is no trace of the doctrine of the change of the Sabbath. On the contrary, we have decisive evidence that Sunday was a day on which ordinary labor was considered lawful and proper. But Constantine, while yet a heathen, commanded that every kind of business excepting agriculture should be laid aside on that day. His law designated the day as a heathen festival, which it actually was. But within four years after its enactment, Constantine had become, not merely a professed convert to the Christian religion, but, in many respects, practically the head of the church, as the course of things at the council of Nice plainly showed. His heathen Sunday law, being unrevoked, was thenceforward enforced in behalf of that day as a Christian festival. This law gave to the Sunday festival, for the first time, something of a Sabbatic character. It was now a rest-day from most kinds of business by the law of the Roman Empire. God's rest-day was thenceforward more in the way than ever before.

But now we come to a fact of remarkable interest. The way having been prepared, as we have just seen, for the doctrine of the change of the Sabbath, and the circumstances of the case demanding its production, it was at this very point brought forward for the first time. Eusebius, the special friend and flatterer of Constantine, was the man who first put forth this doctrine. In his "Commentary on the Psalms," he makes the following statement on Psalm 92 respecting the change of the Sabbath:—

"Wherefore as they [the Jews] rejected it [the Sabbath law] the Word [Christ], by the new covenant, TRANSLATED and TRANSFERRED the feast of the Sabbath to the morning light, and gave us the symbol of true rest, viz., the saving Lord's day, the first [day] of the light, in which the Saviour of the world, after all his labors among men, obtained the victory over death, and passed the portals of heaven, having achieved a work superior to the six-days' creation."

"On this day, which is the first [day] of light and of the true Sun, we assemble, after an interval of six days, and celebrate holy and spiritual Sabbaths, even all nations redeemed by him throughout the world, and do these things according to the spiritual law, which were decreed for the priests to do on the Sabbath."

"And all things whatsoever that it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these we have transferred to the Lord's day, as more appropriately belonging to it, because it has a precedence and is first in rank, and more honorable than the Jewish Sabbath."—*J. N. A., in Sabbath History*.

## The Signs of the Times.

"Can ye not discern the signs of the times?"

OAKLAND, CAL., FIFTH-DAY, JAN. 23, 1879.

JAMES WHITE,  
J. N. ANDREWS,  
URIAH SMITH, } EDITORS.

J. H. WAGGONER - - - - - RESIDENT EDITOR.

### "Is It Peace?"

THE question asked through Ezekiel the prophet,—“Watchman, what of the night?” has so often been used that all are familiar with the sound; but there has never been a time when it possessed more interest than at the present. This generation has been assiduously taught to expect a time of universal peace; and religious teachers are mainly responsible for the expectation, because they have professed to forecast such a future for the nations, from the prophecies of the Scriptures. We firmly believe they have misapprehended the Scriptures; but it is not our purpose to review this field at present. What is the prospect, viewing it from the position of the nations of the earth?

The Berlin Conference was held in the interest of peace. We have no assurance, judging from subsequent actions, that peace was the primary object of those who took part in that conference. For a long time there has been preparations made, on a most extensive scale, or a war, which all expected, and to which all looked forward with fear. But during the sessions of the conference, England was taking steps to strengthen herself on the territory upon which they were deliberating, and Russia, taking liberty from this action on the part of her rival in the acquisition of territory, has abated very little of her efforts to maintain all the advantage which she has gained in the war with Turkey.

The conference at Berlin was quickly followed by a declaration of war by England against Afghanistan. There was no sufficient cause for this war; no reason can be assigned for it except that which is found in the restless ambition of England's Premier. It was heartily denounced by the best men in the nation, and was likely to be condemned by Parliament. But before action could be taken her puny adversary was overwhelmed, and the people were silenced by the boasts of “a glorious victory.” No one could think of resigning what was gained in fighting, and so the oppressive spirit of power goes unrebuked.

But forebodings of evil will not be quieted by this triumph over a weak nation which had not provoked the assault. The *Methodist Recorder*, of London, says:—

“The war between England and Afghanistan, already begun, is one involving questions which Russia can hardly fail to make the pretext for hostile attitude toward Great Britain. The British possessions in India have hitherto been protected by natural lines, the mountain ranges; the subjects of the Empress have been measurably loyal, with a disposition to accept the western civilization. The conflict with Afghanistan, while in itself of minor importance, will probably disturb the peace of the Indies, expose the frontier to foreign invasions, and ultimately bring into the controversy the Czar and his mighty armies of the North. This in turn would make new complications with other nations, supposed to have been quieted by the Berlin treaty, and lead to a general disturbance in the East.”

The Queen shares in the apprehension expressed in the above extract. The *Whitehall Review*, speaking of the failing health of her Majesty, attributes it largely to the prospect of a terrible war into which England is like to be soon plunged. It says:—

“It is not many days since her Majesty expressed her despair as to the possibility of our avoiding a conflict with Russia, and the bare probability of so colossal a calamity to England and to Europe filled her with horror and apprehension. The lady who guides the destinies of this vast empire is not one of those morally-facile people who can contemplate the awful responsibility of warfare with a light heart. On the contrary, ever since this interminable Eastern problem began to perplex the statesmanship of Europe she has labored in season and out of season for peace. The likelihood of her noble effort being foiled has caused this illustrious personage poignant regret.”

Hers is not merely the fear of an overwrought imagination. The most prudent statesmen regard it much in the same light, if they are not equally sensitive and depressed with the prospect. The *London Standard*, speaking of the revolutionary spirit in Europe, says:—

“We invite our readers to take a candid survey of the political condition and social opinions of continental Europe, and we are convinced that if they do so they will be satisfied that the allusion made to the period of 1848 by Herr Sonnemann in his reply to Prince de Bismarck in the German reichstag was far from irrelevant or inopportune. We are divided from that memorable date by thirty years, a period which is usually considered equivalent to a generation in the history of men and communities. Yet will any one have the courage to assert that the opinions, aspirations, and projects, which for a time emptied Europe of half its thrones, and seemed likely to revolutionize the organizations of society, have been abandoned, or that the horizon is free from the threatening theories which then gathered to a head and burst upon governments unprepared to withstand them? No doubt the ruling powers are better armed than they were then to resist insurrection against their authority. They remember what occurred at that date, and they are not likely to trust themselves a second time to the chapter of accidents. But opinions that do not change, and ambitions that are not abandoned, never fail to find at length opportunities for their assertion, and we hold it to be morally certain that, if what are generally known as revolutionary opinions are not extirpated by conviction, all the precaution in life will not prevent them from being translated into action, even if only as a passing experiment. Europe, it is idle to deny, is more completely permeated with the doctrines of discontent than at any former period, and one of the worst and most alarming of the phenomena it produces is to be seen in the fact that statesmen of so much experience, penetration, and resource as Prince de Bismarck can discover no better expedient for remedying it than repression and defiance. Prince de Bismarck says that more victims may yet fall before the barrel of the assassin, but that they will fall martyrs for God and fatherland. Herr Sonnemann retorts upon him, with perfect propriety, that he is personally averse from appeals to violence; but if it needs must come to fighting he and his will know how to fight, and that he will esteem it an honor to perish on the battlefield.”

It is idle to look for safety in the organization of the armies. The uprising in 1848 was by parties almost entirely unorganized, and they have profited by experience and the preparations on the part of the governments, and are now organized and armed; while, as the *Standard* says, the spirit of discontent is more wide spread than it was at that time.

Even in Russia, where obedience to authority has always been implicit and unquestioning, the same spirit of revolution is manifesting itself. In the same article the *Standard* says:—

“The ancient reverence for the occupant of the throne, which was the one conspicuous feature of Russian society is on the wane. ‘It is to the czardom,’ the people of Russia are told by one of these secretly circulated prints, ‘that we owe all our misfortunes. It has made us slaves, depriving us of all moral dignity, and degrading us to the condition of an enervated people, without individuality or liberal aspirations. If we wish to recover our rights we must expel the Romanoffs, and exterminate root and branch the system they have introduced.’ No doubt these are the phrases of exceedingly raw revolutionists, but they indicate that precise condition of mind which leads to desperate action.”

Russia's intentions on India have been hardly concealed. A lengthy article in a St. Petersburg paper, the *Golos*, foreshadowed her policy; but the article was promptly seized by the police, and suppressed. In that article the *Golos* said:—

“It is thus made manifest that, under such circumstances, our movements cannot end with our acquisitions and present aggrandizements, even though it displease the English. We have not yet arrived at the natural limits of our power in Asia. We have not yet subordinated to our influence all those conflicting elements of populations whose independence has been so damaging to the interests of Russia.”

The *Golos* disclaims the idea of mere ambition on the part of Russia in her designs on the East, but what besides ambition can so coolly menace feeble nations, because their independence is damaging to Russian interests?

It also cites the words of English statesmen, showing that they are awake to the danger of her interests in Asia; and further says:—

“These facts, we believe, are sufficient to show that the safety of the East Indian Empire is by no means guaranteed. The discontent of the inhabitants of the country might easily be spread by a new revolution.”

When we consider that this article was written several years before the late war between Russia and Turkey, and that it pointed out Afghanistan as the most probable point at which England's Indian interests might be menaced, we are at no loss to find a reason for the recent movements of England.

While the governments of Europe are troubled so greatly with the Communists, it is significant that the Pope has sent proposals and recommended a plan for them to unite in suppressing the dangerous element. It would be no small honor, and might be productive of no mean results, to the Pontiff, if he could take the lead in a united movement of those governments. It would give him a prestige which he has not enjoyed for years past.

When we come to the subject of Communism, we approach the interests and dangers of our country also. A writer in the *Banner of Light*, speaking of the effort to establish the Christian religion by legal enforcements, says:—

“Modern infidels have active brains, persuasive tongues, educated pens; they have long and full purses, often; they have proud spirits; they have a sense of justice; they have immense and increasing numbers; millions of them have the ballot; hundreds of thousands of them understand the use of arms, the tactics of armies. Let *Christian Statesmen* beware! before they allow themselves to be further put in the wrong by the machinations of sanctimonious hypocrites, or the violence of ignorant zealots. Tens of thousands of firm hands will, if driven to it to save freedom, seize their arms and give Christian politics such a universal overthrow and awful burial as will abolish the greatest and last obstacle to genuine Republicanism and pure Democracy forever.”

This is not merely the raving or idle threat of an enthusiast. It was written more than two years before the late outbreak which so suddenly stopped travel and traffic, and destroyed so much property. The spirit of lawlessness is loose in the land. Prof. Hitchcock, of Union Theological Seminary, in a lecture on Communism, recently said:—

“Communism is in the air. Section is poisoned against section, class against class, interest against interest. The poorer West and South are incited to despoil the richer East. Farmer, manufacturer, and merchant, natural enemies. Long continued commercial distress, instead of being recognized as a common calamity in Europe as well as here, with special reasons for it on our side in the great war that saved the Union, is fiercely denounced as the crime of a class.”

Every reader knows that it is impossible, within reasonable limits, to give even a tithe of the evidence existing that the nations are on the eve of a mighty struggle. And what is to follow? Is it a time of peace for those same nations? Not at all. This dispensation closes up in war,—even “the battle of the great day.” Rev. 16. The stone which becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth, first utterly destroys all the kingdoms before it. Dan. 2. All the kingdoms which are upon the face of the whole earth shall fall and rise no more, because of the sword which is sent among them. Jer. 25. The nations are angry, and the wrath of God is ready to fall upon a wicked world, when the kingdoms of the world are given to Christ. Rev. 11 and Psa. 2.

The future of the nations, lying in wickedness—yes, increasing in wickedness—is only gloomy. The “little flock” who watch “the signs of the times” in the light of the “sure word of prophecy,” will receive the kingdom. “Blessed is he that watcheth.”

### Without Excuse.

WE are drawing near to the day of God. The decisions of eternity are upon us. The Master standeth at the door. The day of the Lord is not an uncertain object in the dim and distant future; but it is, to him who reads aright the page of prophecy and history, a vivid reality, even now throwing the beams of its approaching glory and the light of its consuming fires upon a slumbering world. It comes not without a numerous array of precursors and heralds; yet it will come to many suddenly and unexpectedly. With what real and unfeigned surprise will multitudes awake to their condition, as the terrible realities of this coming day burst upon them. So different from what they expected! So contrary to all their plans! So fatal to all that they had hoped for or believed! What astonishment, what amazement, what terror, will seize them! At once they find themselves in the unrelaxing grasp of eternity, its irrevocable decisions upon them, and they

among the lost! And how many, in the agony of their despair, will put the question to their own souls, Why should I be found in this condition? And what would be their reply to such a question? Should the Judge of all meet them with the solemn inquiry why they had not made preparation for that day, what answer would they return? What excuse would they render?

Would they say, Lord, this day of all days, this day which forever concludes all human history, this decisive day for all the human race, should have been clearly set forth in thy holy word? The answer would be, It was thus set forth. From Genesis to Revelation, that word was full of it. That solemn moment which should close probation and bring its terrible retribution to the ungodly, and its glorious reward to the righteous, was everywhere kept in view, with warnings and exhortations to all the race to prepare for its solemn scenes. Bibles were in your hands, and you could have read them for yourselves. Would they not thus stand speechless and condemned?

Would they say that signs should have been given of so momentous an event, some strange phenomena in nature to mark the approach of the end? The answer would be, Such signs were given. The sun was to be darkened, the moon withdraw her shining, the stars fall from heaven, and strange sights appear above, and strange convulsions be felt below. And ere probation closed, while yet you could have escaped the coming wrath, the land was full of Bibles containing these predictions, and full of histories recording their fulfillment. Did you care to trouble yourselves to compare the two? And again they would stand speechless and condemned.

Would they say that the state of the world, moral and political, which was to mark the last days, should have been clearly described? The answer would come, It was so described. It was declared in the word of God that iniquity would abound, that evil men and seducers would wax worse and worse, that the nations would be angry, that there would be wars and rumors of wars, and that there would be distress of nations, with perplexity. And in your own days every paper groaned with a record of these things, and all the land was startled at the fearful spectacle which the world presented. Did you not see it, and wonder? And why did you not read its import aright? Would they not again stand speechless and condemned?

Would they say again that the history of nations, and the course of empire, in consecutive order, down to the end, should have been given, that the world might know when the last nations were on the stage of action, at the end of whose history the kingdom of God should be set up? Again the answer would be, Such information was given in the prophetic word. Beginning six hundred years before Christ, step by step, kingdom by kingdom, event by event, the student of prophecy is brought down even to the closing scenes of trouble, the dashing of all the nations to pieces, and the standing up of Michael for the deliverance of his people. And you saw the last kingdoms of earth in a condition such that even human foresight scarcely failed to discern the very day of their dissolution. Did you take the trouble to inquire what was to follow? And again they would stand without answer and without excuse.

Would they say further that messengers, divinely sent, should have given warning of the approach of the great and dreadful day? that the proclamation should have been made through all the land when that day was near? The answer would be again, Such proclamation was made. The world heard; the honest, humble seekers after truth believed; and scoffers everywhere raised the inquiry, Where is the promise of his coming?

Thus their last excuse fails them; for what could they say more? Speechless and condemned they stand throughout.

And, reader, so far as the evidences of the near coming of Christ are concerned, they stand to-day just as set forth above. The declarations of God's word, the signs in the natural world, the state of the nations, the moral condition of mankind, and the proclamation of the coming of the day of wrath, the last message of mercy, are all before us. And the eyes of all the world are now watching for the final destruction of those powers at the termination of whose career the Bible places the opening of the day of God. Look at the papacy and the Ottoman power. The prophet declared that as we reached the last days, the dominion of the little horn, the papacy, should be consumed and destroyed unto the end. And what has been the leading feature of its history for the past fifty years? An-

swer: The falling away, one after another, of its strong supports. And what has recently been witnessed? The most sudden and tremendous revolution in Europe that has perhaps ever transpired in the world's history, the overthrow of France, the last prop of the pope's temporal power. And now his temporal dominion is taken entirely away, nevermore, says the king of Italy, to be restored to him again. This is an event which takes place in close connection with the end. At the same time we hear him uttering those great words (papal infallibility), of which the prophet speaks, words which he utters in close connection with his destruction by devouring fire, that the prophet says that both the utterance of the great words and the destruction in the burning flame were to occur almost at one and the same time.

Equally startling is the aspect of affairs in the Ottoman Empire. That power we understand to be symbolized by the great river Euphrates, in Rev. 9:14, and 16:12. When it meets its final overthrow, the sixth of the seven last plagues will be falling upon the world; for it is at that time, according to the last of the references just given, that that river is to be clean dried up. But the Ottoman or Turkish Empire is tottering to its fall. Its speedy overthrow is on all hands expected. Russia first announced her intention to disregard the stipulations of the treaty of 1856. That treaty restricted, among other things, the warlike operations of Russia in the Black Sea. Her announcement was therefore simply a declaration that she was about to restore her armaments in those waters and on their shores; and this was regarded as tantamount to a declaration of war with Turkey; for it was evidently for the purpose of making a conquest of Turkish possessions in Europe, long coveted by Russia, that this move was made. Full soon the war came, and found Turkey in no condition to resist her powerful foe of the North. It is well known that, ever since the summer of 1840, when the Ottoman Empire fell, that power has been sustained by the influence and arms of other nations. She had not resources of her own to meet the emergency. And the nations which she hoped and expected would, from inclination or obligation, come to her rescue, were either crippled by recent wars, or in fear of those to come. Turkey therefore, was left of them to be despoiled of her possessions and hopelessly crippled in her resources, ready to fall whenever her overthrow can best serve the purposes of her stronger neighbors.

Such is the present condition of two great powers, to say nothing of others, the history of which brings us to the end of all things. No observer can fail to see their doom approaching. But who takes the trouble to acquaint himself with what the word of God declares is to follow these events?

And to the thoughtful reader, we put the questions, What more evidence could God have given of these things than he has given? What other kinds of evidence could be given, or in what respect could that which is given be more full? And if these things are so, and you come to the Judgment unconcerned and unprepared, will you not be without excuse? U. S.

The Two Covenants.

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord; but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord, for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." Jer. 31:31-34.

The first covenant was made with the people of Israel at the time of their departure out of Egypt. This covenant no longer exists. The new covenant long since took its place. But a very serious error prevails in the minds of many persons respecting the points of difference between these two covenants. The old covenant was made with the Hebrew people. For this reason, whatever entered into it is supposed to be Jewish. Thus the law of God is summarily set aside as Jewish; and thus might the God of Israel himself be discarded as a Jewish God. But the new covenant is held up to our admiration, because it is, as they say, not made with the Jews, but with the Gentiles. The old covenant belonged to the Jews, and with it we have no concern; the new covenant is made with the Gentiles, and we, as Gentiles, are interested in it.

How can men thus carelessly read the Scriptures? The language of inspiration is very ex-

PLICIT in stating that the new covenant is made with the same people that were the subjects of the old covenant. Thus Jeremiah, speaking in the name of the Lord, says: "I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah." And he further alludes to the fact that the new covenant is made with the Hebrew people when he adds: "Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt." And yet again he identifies the Hebrew people when he says: "This shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel." And Paul quotes at length, in Hebrews 8, this entire statement of Jeremiah respecting the old and new covenants being severally made with the Hebrew people. And, as if this were not enough, he makes a statement in Rom. 9:4, 5, that exactly meets the case. Thus he says of the Hebrews: "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever." Thus it appears that everything valuable God has given to the world through the instrumentality, or by the means, of the Hebrew people. Those who choose to do so can venture to despise the law of God because given to the Jews, and to reject Christ because he came of the Jews. But one thing they cannot do; they cannot say, "We accept the new covenant because it pertains to the Gentiles, whereas the first covenant, and the law, etc., pertained to the Jews." No such distinction can be drawn. Both the covenants pertain to the Hebrew people, according to the explicit statement of Paul; and both are said by Jeremiah and Paul, or rather by the Spirit of inspiration speaking through them, to be made with Judah and Israel.

The fact being thus clearly established that the two covenants are both made with the Hebrews, it becomes a matter of interest to inquire into the reason of this thing. Why did God thus honor one nation and pass by all others? Undoubtedly there was a sufficient reason for this action, and that reason we shall find fully laid open to our view in the Bible. The first thing which Paul has enumerated as pertaining to the Hebrews, is "the adoption;" and if we can understand why God adopted this family, we shall readily understand why all the other things which he has named should also pertain to this people.

Know, then, that God did not adopt the family of Abraham as his first action in behalf of mankind. He attempted thus to make his own the family of the first man, Adam, the common head and father of the human race. But at the end of the antediluvian age, only eight persons remained upon the earth who feared the God of heaven. There was no alternative with him but to witness the extinction of piety in the earth, or else, by an awful lesson of judgment, to destroy every wicked man from the earth. And for this reason came the deluge. And now one family alone remains—the family of Noah, who is the second head of the human race. And this family, thus instructed in divine truth, and thus warned by God's terrible judgments, might all have been, if they would, the heritage of the Almighty. But when men began again to multiply upon the earth, they did not like to retain God in their knowledge. They forgot God. They plunged into sin. They united under Nimrod to build Babel. As they set God at defiance, he placed his curse upon them by confounding their language. Gen. 10 and 11. In the fourth century after the flood, only a handful of godly persons remained. Abraham, in the midst of this dense moral darkness, for even his immediate ancestors were idolaters (Josh. 24:2), was so pre-eminent in virtue that he was called the friend of God. James 2:23. God said that he knew Abraham, that he would command his children and his household after him, and that they would keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment. Gen. 18:19. God had pledged himself at the time Noah and his family came forth from the ark, never again to drown the world. Gen. 9:15.

But he must do something to save this one faithful family from ruin, and, by means of them, to preserve in the earth some degree of true piety, and to retain among men a body of faithful worshipers. To do this, he adopts this family of Abraham, his friend, and separates them by circumcision and the rites of the ceremonial law, from all the rest of mankind. Thus Abraham became the third grand father of mankind. Not the father of the whole race, like Adam and Noah respectively; but the father of the people of God. This was the adoption.

He gave up the rest of mankind to idolatry and atheism, not because he was willing that they should perish, but because they would not hearken to his voice. Yet, though he thus adopted this one family, he did not so reject the rest of mankind that he did not make provision for any of them to be received among the Hebrew people if they would become circumcised and unite with the Hebrews in his service and worship. The adoption was just, and right, and necessary. By means of it God preserved his knowledge and his worship in the earth.

The Hebrew people being thus adopted, and by means of circumcision set apart from the rest of the world, found to their great profit that, though they were separated from the world, they were united to Him who made the heavens and the earth. They had the Lord for their God. They had much advantage "every way;" the adoption, the glory, the two covenants, the giving of the law, the service of God, the promises, the fathers, and the Messiah. And yet Paul says their chief advantage was that the oracles of God were committed to them. Rom. 3:1, 2. It is not best to scorn the law of God because committed to the Hebrews. It is not best to despise the new covenant, as Jewish, because, like the old covenant, it is made with Israel. Nor is it best to reject Jesus as the Messiah, because he comes of that despised race; and, finally, it is not best to have some other God besides the God of Israel. Our God, indeed, bears that title; because he was for long ages worshiped by the Hebrews only, and by the Gentiles almost not at all. Yet that is not his fault, but ours. And so of all the sacred things committed to the Israelites. They were not Jewish, or Hebraic, but divine. In fact, we must have a part in these precious treasures which God gave to this people, for their preservation through the long period of Gentile darkness. They are of equal value to us, and we must share in them. "Salvation," said our Lord to the woman of Samaria, "is of the Jews." John 4:22.

The opening work in the establishment of the new covenant must, at least, be as early as the closing hours of the life of Christ. In the last memorable evening of his life, as he was about to be betrayed into the hands of the Jewish rulers, our Lord gave the cup, representing thereby his own blood, into the hands of his disciples, saying as he did it: "This cup is the new testament [covenant] in my blood, which is shed for you." Luke 22:20. Here is the first mention of the new covenant by our Lord. It is evident that the shedding of his blood, and the pouring out of his soul unto death, was that which should give validity to the covenant. Isa. 53; Heb. 9. The opening event, therefore, in the ratification of the new testament, or covenant, was on that memorable night in which the Saviour was betrayed, when he, the mediator of the new covenant on the one part, and the eleven apostles on the other part, as the representatives of the people of God, entered into solemn contract with each other. He, by giving them the cup representing his own blood, pledged himself to die for them; they, by accepting it, thus pledged themselves to accept of salvation through his blood, and to fulfill the conditions connected therewith.

Indeed, we must date the preliminary acts in the establishment of the new covenant, from the opening of Christ's ministry. Our Lord began to preach at the close of Daniel's sixtieth week. Compare Dan. 9:25; Mark 1:14, 15. The remaining, or seventieth week, he was to employ in confirming the covenant with many; and in the midst of the week, he caused the sacrifice and oblation to cease, by being offered himself upon the cross, as their great anti-type. Heb. 10:5-10. We must, therefore, assign the ministry of Christ to the introductory work of establishing the new covenant, or new testament. His preaching was a public announcement of its principles. He assigned to the law of God its just place. He laid down the keeping of the commandments as the condition of eternal life. Matt. 5:17-19; 19:16-19. He revealed the ground of pardon, viz: the sacrifice of his own life. Matt. 20:28. He also stated in distinct terms the conditions on which that sacrifice could benefit men; viz: faith and repentance. John 7:24; Mark 1:15. We cannot, therefore, deny that the ministry of Christ was the opening work in the establishing of the new covenant. J. N. A.

RESOLUTION which springs from Christian principle, and is fortified by it, is fearless as well as unremitting. It is conclusive of good purposes and the pledge of their being executed effectively in noble sentiments and worthy deeds.

Church Building in Oakland.

THE new Congregational church in Oakland was dedicated Jan. 21. It is the largest church building in the city, covering the entire front on Clay Street, from 12th to 13th. It corners on 13th diagonally across the street from the Seventh-day Adventist house. Its cost is about \$100,000. No expense has seemingly been spared to make it attractive. Five churches now worship in that immediate vicinity; the Congregationalist and Free Presbyterian on 13th street, west of the Seventh-day Adventist. The Methodist and Central Baptist, on 14th street. The Baptists meet in Central Hall. Though the Adventist house is smaller than the others, it loses nothing by comparison with its larger neighbors; it is neat and simple in style, and a credit to the people who have struggled so hard to build it and keep it up.

The Advent Doctrine.

THE doctrine of the advent is being pretty well advertised. Even its enemies will not let it rest, and the people are becoming aware of its importance. A writer in the New York Evangelist, signing himself "Westminster," because, we suppose, he considers himself the defender of the "Confession," insists that it is heresy to believe in the second advent near, and that all who so believe, or who deny the hope of the conversion of the world, shall be disciplined as heretical, and excommunicated! But the Evangelist corrects his error in the following style:—

"Let it be clearly understood, that the real objection made to Premillennial views, is not against their interpretation of the prophetic Scriptures on the fact and nature of the Millennium; but against making 'the great crisis' to be expected the second advent." Say these modern interpreters of the Standards, the world must first be converted before Christ will come. Do our Standards teach this? Luther pronounced this notion 'a falsehood forged by Satan, and a delusion.' Nor is it found in the Standards of any of the churches of the Reformation.

Calvin, who repudiates a Millennium, says:—"The Scriptures uniformly command us to look forward with eager expectation to the coming of Christ," and commenting on Matt. 24:30, he says "There is no reason, why any person should expect the conversion of the world."

"John Knox in his letter to the faithful in London, on the Redeemer's advent, asks 'Has not the Lord Jesus carried up our flesh into heaven? and shall he not return? We know he shall return, and that with expedition.' And does not our Confession teach that Christ's second coming is always to be watched for, and because it is always imminent? (33, 3). In the 'Directory for Worship' of the Church in Scotland, whose Standards are the same as ours, ministers are taught to pray for 'the fall of Antichrist, and the hastening of the second coming of our Lord, and for a watching for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.'"

Quoting the Bible.

ONE of the most groundless and silly objections that our opponents raise to the work of our ministers in presenting the present truth relates to the manner in which we quote the Scriptures. Our ministers always use a great deal of scripture in their sermons, and this they should do; but in doing so they quote a verse here, two or three there, and perhaps a few verses in another place. Our opponents say this is not a fair way to quote the Bible, and they very foolishly affirm that we should read the whole chapter if we quote any of it.

Of course we can retort the same upon them, for the popular minister seldom takes more than one verse for a whole sermon, and if they have an occasion to preach against us, they take one text here, another there, skipping hither and thither, just as we do, only they do less of it, and frequently very clumsily because they are not used to it. But the real answer to this groundless objection is found in the fact that Christ and the apostles frequently quoted the Scriptures as we do. For an example of this, turn to Romans 15:9-12. Here we have in the ninth verse first a quotation from Ps. 18:49; next we have a quotation of a verse in Deut. 32:43. Then follows a quotation of the verse from Ps. 117:1; then comes another quotation from Isaiah 11:10.

Here are four quotations from four different places in the Old Testament, and all this in the space of four short verses. This is just as we Adventist preachers do. Turning again to Romans 10:15-21 we have about as many quotations as there are verses here, and each quotation is simply a verse or part of a verse from one book and a verse or part of one from another book. Scriptures of this kind can be found all through the New Testament so that when our opponents raise this objection they are only scoffing against the holy apostles.

D. M. CANRIGHT.

## The Home Circle.

## Tired Mothers.

A LITTLE elbow leans upon your knee—  
Your tired knee that has so much to bear—  
A child's dear eyes are looking lovingly  
From underneath a thatch of tangled hair.  
Perhaps you do not feel the velvet touch  
Of warm, moist fingers holding yours so tight;  
You do not prize the blessings overmuch—  
You almost are too tired to pray to-night.

But it is blessedness! A year ago  
I did not see this as I do to-day—  
We are so dull and thankless, and too slow  
To catch the sunshine as it slips away.  
And now it seems surpassing strange to me  
That while I wore the badge of motherhood  
I did not kiss more oft and tenderly  
The child that brought me only good.

And if, some night, when you sit down to rest,  
You miss the elbow on your tired knee—  
This restless curly head from off your breast,  
This lisping tongue that chatters constantly;  
If from your own the dimpled hands had slipped,  
And ne'er would nestle in your palm again,  
If the white feet into the grave had tripped—  
I could not blame you for your heartache then.

I wonder that some mothers ever fret  
At their precious darling clinging to their gown;  
Or that the footprints when the days are wet,  
Are ever black enough to make them frown.  
If I could find a little muddy hoot  
Or cap, or jacket on my chamber floor—  
If I could kiss a rosy, restless foot,  
And hear it patter in my house once more;

If I could mend a broken cart to-day,  
To-morrow make a kite to reach the sky,  
There is no woman in God's world could say  
She was more blissfully content than I!  
But ah! the dainty pillow next my own  
Is never ruffled by a shining head!  
My singing birdling from its nest has flown—  
The little boy I used to kiss is—dead. —Sel.

## A Mother's Discipline.

ONE evening in March, at a late hour, I sat sorting, cutting and sewing, a pile of unsightly carpet-rags. This was the last of many burdensome and tedious jobs I had stunted myself to finish during the winter, and here March was at hand, and this distasteful work just fairly commenced. I was weary in body, and worn in spirit, with my early and late toiling, but I resolved that spring should not far advance till my work—at least the heaviest part of it—was off my hands, according to my plans.

The next day, however, my rags were banished to an out-of-the-way place in a promiscuous heap, for Maddie, the older of my two little girls, was quite sick, and lay moaning in the arm-chair. My hired help just then got sick, too, and had returned to her home, and I was left alone to attend to my child, whose malady grew more serious hourly, and with a large washing on my hands which had been put to soak over night.

None, save those who have passed through the ordeal, may know the heart-sinking, the weariness and dreariness of the days and nights that followed, as our little one grew steadily worse, until we thought she was going from us forever. Much sickness prevailing at that season in the community, my good, kind husband, unable to procure other help, took upon himself my care and work, that I might devote myself entirely to Maddie. Thus baby Amy was decoyed from the sick-room, where her prattle could not be endured, to see "papa" peel potatoes, set table, and prepare coffee.

But fainter and fainter grew my heart, as day and night our darling sufferer lay battling with the fierce disease, until her body could nowhere bear the softest handling without a cry of pain. I tried to pray, but I only repined. I could not even weep, though my heart seemed crushing beneath the stroke of her anguish. I thought since life was so fraught with sorrow and agony, I could not be thankful for my own, or for my children's.

The disease had reached its climax now, and though I lay by her side trying to soothe her with pet names and endearing words, she heeded it not, for she was delirious, and called pitifully to me: "Mamma, Amy is out in the snow, I must go after her." "Mamma, I can't tie her shoe." "Amy has my dishes." "O mamma, take them away, she will break them!" "See, ma, the horses will kick her." "Do, mamma, give me my doll, Amy is spoiling her."

During these ravings she would frequently attempt to rise, and then fall back with a moan. Then I remembered, in the heat and hurry of my work, the many burdens I had unconsciously placed upon my little six-year-old Maddie. This was present with her now; and the little incidents, at the time so trifling to me, so grievous to her, came back to me with many self-upbraidings, and her words were stinging arrows to my accusing conscience.

Truly, how many times her playthings had been devoted to the little destructive fingers of her baby sister, that I might, without interruption, compass my self-imposed tasks, and gratify my ambition to accomplish just so much. How many steps she had taken to save time for me and amuse Amy. Had they not both played in a cold room while I was too busy to note the fact, till they returned to me with blue hands and watery eyes, and I knew they were chilled through and through? Had they not, time and again, been turned off with a cold, unsatisfying lunch, instead of a carefully prepared dinner for childhood's appreciative appetite, that I might gain more opportunity to exhaust my strength and patience over some tedious piece of tucking, raffing or trimming to adorn their apparel, and make them still more attractive to the eye of pride?

All this, and much more, in that dark hour I saw as exceedingly wrong; and I saw myself, whom I had before thought a tender, loving mother, "weighed in the balance and found wanting." I was a negligent, undutiful mother, unmindful of my child's best interests; and now God, whom I had complained of as "encompassing himself with a dark cloud, that our prayers should not pass through," seemed speaking to me through these circumstances of my life, and saying to me: "If I spare her, will you do your duty now?" I promised heartily, "I will, I will." More painful to me than the loss of the dear one was the thought of my neglect.

Slowly she began to recover; and the first time she was lifted without that heart-wringing cry, my heart overflowed with joy, my eyes with tears. The first time she knelt with us around the family altar, and the first time she sat in her usual place at the table, the smiles broke on my lips, while tears ran down my face. Oh, we were not sparing of pet names then; and Maddie learned at last how inexpressibly dear she was to us. I had time then to prepare dainty food for her returning appetite. Her toys were no longer subject to the imperious will of her baby sister. Indeed, in many things they seemed to change places; and we might have been in danger of overdoing, had not Amy seemed to realize the situation, and quite naturally fell into our habit of tender concern for "poor sister." I had time now with patience and gentleness to correct the naughty habits formed, to teach Maddie not only a form of prayer, but its meaning. I thought I was the happiest woman in the world when she assumed her usual plays, and the music of her childish glee was unchecked, for it did not jar on disordered nerves or a discordant spirit.

One time early in her sickness she seemed depressed, and I said: "O darling, mother would let you run and play all you wished if you were only well."

She seemed thoughtful, but very sober, and finally said, while every word was to me a wound long in healing: "I am afraid ma, you will tell a lie."

"What!" said I, "ma tell a lie! Did my little girl ever know her ma to lie?"

She shook her head, but seemed unable to think I could allow her to run and play as she had often attempted to, noisily.

I was careful to see that my promise was fulfilled to the letter. But, oh, how many times during her sickness I feared I should never have cause to restrain those little feet, busy hands, and that prattling tongue more.

Now, for the sake of my family's comfort and welfare, I live and labor; but not as before. While I have time for every duty, I have none for needless ornament, or unseasonable work at midnight hours or before the dawn of day. If friends come in and find me cutting paper cats, or helping dress the children's dolls, when buttons come off, and strings fail and knot, I am serene, though my morning's work is not yet all done. They are serene and happy, too. Why should they not be so, where loving, cheerful sacrifice is the order of the day, instead of driving care?—*L. P. in Arthur's Home Magazine.*

## Religion at Home.

It is a painful thought that the prevalence of impiety and infidelity must, to a great extent, be attributed to the defective exhibition of religion in so many of those who, according to their profession, ought to be the salt of the earth, the light of the world. The world is not what it might be, because so few Christians are what they ought to be. It is not that they do not shine on the Sabbath—that they are not devout worshippers in the sanctuary—that they are not the encouragers and supporters of works of faith and labors of love; but that they do not shine at home—that the dove-like spirit, the lamb-like behavior of the lowly Jesus is not apparent in

the shop, in the counting-house, the warehouse, and the parlor. There is a preaching of the truth, a proclaiming of the excellency of the knowledge of Christ besides that which is listened to from the pulpit; and there is an eloquence without words, which, though it may not fire, yet enters deep into the soul of man—it is the preaching and the eloquence of Christian conduct. Every Christian, then, whether male or female, can preach the gospel; the humblest, the poorest, the most illiterate and obscure can do this; and daily and hourly preached it must be, if Christianity is to be presented in her beauty and brightness, and to allure, influence, and subdue the godless multitudes around us.

Religion, without a practical exhibition of it, is a mere nonentity, or at best but as a sapless tree, neither beautiful nor useful. There should be a striking contrast between a religious and worldly family—between those recognized as the followers of the Lord and those who live according to the flesh. The contrast should be as apparent, if not as striking, as is seen when we cast our eye on the cheerless and barren heath, and then on the verdant and flowery mead. The description given of believers and unbelievers in the Bible is very marked and forcible: the one is dead, the other alive; the one is darkness, the other is light in the Lord; the one is a forgiven child going to its Father's house, the other a rebel going his own way to perdition.

We readily know with whom we are in the family of unbelievers; a word from the lip, a book on the shelf, a picture on the wall, tell us pretty correctly that here God dwells not. But is the reverse of this true? Do we always as easily know when we are in the dwelling of the faithful? The children of this world do, by almost every word and work, plainly manifest that they are of the earth, earthy; do the disciples of Christ as manifestly evince that they are of heaven, heavenly? Those who serve in the families of the latter should, when departing from it, be able to say, "It was good for us to live there." Alas! how often has a different testimony been borne! There was the form of religion, but little of its reality; the words of prayer were heard, but the kind word of counsel and persuasion was music which seldom fell upon the ear; there was decorum and propriety of manners, but not much of the dissolving and dove-like spirit of Jesus; the voice of praise was heard, but too often the voice chiding, accompanied with severe looks and darkened brows.

Happily this is far from being true of every home; but is it not true of some? We speak that which we know, and testify that which we have seen. Oh! that it were not so, and that every Christian home were one of peace and love, like that of Bethany! then would Jesus come in spirit and abide there, and many would be constrained to exclaim, "How goodly are thy tents, O Israel!" Friends, remember that ye have a Master in heaven, whose all-searching eye is ever upon you. There are also other eyes upon you—the eyes of your unconverted servants, and the eyes of the world. They mark your character as it is daily exhibited in the retirement of your home and in the walks of busy life, and upon the holy traits of your character depend, to an extent beyond what you may imagine, the glory of God, the honor of his cause, and the salvation of men.—*Christian Witness.*

## Reports from the Field.

BRO. C. L. BOYD reports one baptism at Waco, Neb.

BRO. GEO. B. STARR, Albion, Neb., says:—Nine are now keeping the Sabbath, some of whom are already trying to win others.

## Hanford, Tulare Co.

BRO. WOOD has commenced a series of meetings here with encouraging prospects.

## Colusa County.

BRO. J. D. RICE opened meetings at Willows, Colusa Co., and at last accounts was having full houses.

## Michigan.

WE closed our labors at Douglas, Dec. 17. These brethren are of good courage. Less than three years ago, the church was organized with eleven members; they now number thirty-five. Through the labors of Brn. Jones and Daniels the past summer, quite a number have united with them; these new friends are zealous for the truth. All readily promised to pay the tithes and to help carry forward the missionary work. One was received into the church at this meeting.

H. M. KENYON.  
M. S. BURNHAM.

December 31,

## Nevada.

ST. CLAIR.—Closed meetings here Jan. 5. Wrongs, that had long troubled this church, were confessed, and all promised to take a higher stand for the observance of present truth. Several quit their tobacco, etc., and a spirit of harmony seemed to pervade the last meetings. We look for a brighter day for this church.

RENO.—Jan. 11 and 12, met with this church. The ordinances were celebrated for the first time in the State of Nevada by Seventh-day Adventists. Organized a church of seven members. W. E. Fricke was ordained elder, and W. E. Hand deacon, and C. M. Kinny was elected church clerk. We leave them greatly encouraged.

GENOA.—Have obtained the free use of the county court-house, and will begin a series of sermons on present truth here this evening. Pray for us. B. A. STEPHENS.

January 15, 1879.

## Temperance Colony, Fresno Co., Cal.

BRO. MORTON remained here after Bro. Wood left, to carry on the work. The interest has been good, and the result good. Nine more have commenced to keep the Sabbath, and have signed the church covenant, and as many more have since promised to do so.

## Mansfield, Minn.

I CAME to Mansfield Dec. 9. Two weeks afterwards I was joined by Bro. Ells, whose timely help for a few days was appreciated by all. A few here were trying to live out the truth; now eighteen good souls have covenanted to obey God. I am now laboring in a school-house about six miles from Mansfield. January 8. A. H. VANKIRK.

## East Norwalk, Ohio.

UP to the present we have spoken twelve times in East Norwalk. The extreme cold weather has broken up our meeting twice, as our house is poor and could not be made comfortable. Bro. Wm. Beebe had held six meetings here before I came, with a fair interest. He assists me much by way of opening meetings, visiting, etc. Three persons have decided to obey the truth. We hope for others who are already convinced.

H. A. ST. JOHN.

January 8, 1879.

## Newark, Ohio.

WE have just closed a three weeks' meeting at Newark. The brethren had completed a meeting-house, 28x46, eighteen-foot posts. As they are few and mostly poor, it required a great effort; however, they have a good little meeting-house. There was a debt on it of about \$600; subscriptions were raised to the amount of about \$500. Our wealthy brethren near this church should help them some upon it. Five or six embraced the Sabbath. Several of the children made a start in the Christian life. Seven adult persons united with the church.

We lately met with the church at Springfield, in their new hall. Three united with the church. All are in harmony.

In Dunkirk four have embraced the Sabbath within the past month.

D. M. CANRIGHT.

## Ward, Wilson Co., Kan.

I HAVE held meetings in Ward nearly three weeks, and the interest is great. People gather an hour before meeting time, and by the hour for service all the standing room is filled. Last week I preached ten times and filled up the days with visiting. Thus far, this is one of the most interesting meetings I have ever held.

Have sold some publications. An encouraging feature here is, that hardly any one uses tobacco, and several who knew nothing of our faith are living out the health reform.

December 30.

L. D. SANTEE.

## Elivon, Kansas.

I CLOSED up my labors at Elivon last night, just four weeks after reaching the place. A church of twenty-two members was organized, and an elder was ordained. Two others were received as candidates for baptism.

Last Sabbath was a good day. Notwithstanding the unusually cold weather, seven were baptized. Bro. Cook remarked, "Just nine years ago yesterday occurred the first baptism in Kansas by Seventh-day Adventists." Hundreds have since been baptized in this noble field.

Bro. Enoch remains to teach some to read the Bible in French. He expects one of the new converts will soon help him in another field. Two of the French brethren purpose spending one year at our college, to prepare for the ministry. Others should follow their example.

D. T. BOURDEAU.



