
FACTS FOR THE TIMES

Scanned and prepared by Maranatha Media
www.maranathamedia.com

FACTS FOR THE TIMES

CONTAINING

HISTORICAL EXTRACTS, CANDID ADMISSIONS, AND
IMPORTANT TESTIMONY FROM EMINENT
AUTHORS, ANCIENT AND MODERN

ON THE

LEADING TOPICS OF THE SCRIPTURES AND
SIGNS OF THE TIMES

NEW YORK
G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
1893

"Admissions in favor of truth, from the ranks of its enemies, constitute the highest kind of evidence."—*Pres. Asa Mahan.*

Fourth Edition, Revised to 1893

REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING CO.,
BATTLE CREEK, MICHIGAN
1893

PREFACE.

THIS volume is designed to furnish the reader with a compilation of facts and other important testimony not elsewhere accessible in so compact a form, bearing upon important Bible subjects, which vitally concern the people of our time.

While "the Bible, and the Bible alone," is the "only unerring rule of faith and practice," it is often profitable to ascertain what views concerning its teaching have been entertained by men of piety and learning. This is especially timely when religious doctrines are being taught which are considered by some as new and strange, but which are in reality the original teachings of the Scriptures, and have had the sanction of many of the most eminent and devoted students of the word of God in ages past.

Within the last fifty years great changes of religious belief have taken place among theological teachers and Christian denominations. Many views which were once considered important truths are now questioned or openly rejected, while other doctrines, which are thought to be new and strange are found to have been considered the true and well established doctrines of the word, by the wisest and best teachers of former times.

The extracts contained in this work cover a wide range of subjects of deep interest to the general reader, but especially valuable to those who wish to make a study of the topics to which the extracts herein contained have reference.

Remarkable fulfillments of prophecy, interesting comments upon different texts of Scripture from the ablest critics, past and present, striking occurrences of natural phenomena, important facts in the development of our own

country, statistics concerning population, intemperance, war, crime, and the present condition of the religious, political, and physical worlds are among the subjects treated by the various authors quoted.

We regard the study of the Scriptures in general, and of prophecy, which is now so much neglected, in particular, as of great importance at the present time; and it is confidently hoped that what is herein presented will greatly help the student in arriving at correct conclusions. We commend the example of the noble Bereans of old, of whom it is written that they "searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so," to all into whose hands this book may fall. That it may be instrumental in enlightening and benefiting many minds, is the sincere desire of those who now commend it to the careful consideration of a candid and inquiring public.

PUBLISHERS.

Battle Creek, Mich., March, 1893.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE.
THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.....	13
Their Great Importance.....	13
It is an Inspired Book.....	13
The Use of the Bible.....	14
Principles of Interpretation.....	15
Catholics Admit the Protestant Bible to be Reliable.....	18
The Old Testament Scriptures still in Force.....	18
Tradition against the Bible.....	21
How the Early Church was Corrupted.....	21
The Early Fathers Unreliable.....	22
The Way Errors are still Perpetuated.....	24
How Tradition should be Treated.....	25

CHAPTER II.

THE PROPHEPIC SYMBOLS.....	27
The Object of Prophecy.....	27
The Metallic Image.....	28
The Head of Gold.....	29
The Breast and Arms of Silver.....	29
The Sides of Brass.....	30
The Iron and Clay of the Image.....	30
The Four Great Beasts.....	31
The Lion.....	32
The Bear.....	32
The Leopard.....	33
The Nondescript Beast.....	33
The Ten Horns.....	34
The Four Heads.....	35
The Little Horn.....	35
The Character of the Papacy.....	36

Catholicism Similar to Paganism.....	38
Catholic Hatred of the Bible.....	42
Catholic Hatred of Protestants and Protestant Institutions.....	43
The Prophetic Periods... ..	44
The Rise of the Papacy.....	45
The Continuance of the Papacy.....	46
Blasphemous Character of the Papacy.....	47
Its Persecuting Power.....	48
The Fall of the Papacy.....	51
The Present Condition of the Papacy.....	54
Has Thought to Change God's Law.....	55
The Chronology of the 2300 Days.....	56
CHAPTER III.	
THE INCREASE OF KNOWLEDGE.....	59
What the Pilgrim Fathers Looked For.....	62
CHAPTER IV.	
THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.....	64
Signs in the Sun.....	65
The Darkening of the Moon.....	69
The Falling Stars.....	70
Frequency of Earthquakes.....	72
Cyclones.....	75
Disturbances at Sea.....	79
The World Getting Old.....	80
Failure in Crops.....	81
CHAPTER V.	
THE SECOND ADVENT.....	83
CHAPTER VI.	
THE THREE MESSAGES.....	86
The First Angel's Message.....	87
The Second Angel's Message.....	87
Babylon's Fall.....	90
Some Ministers Preach for Hire.....	94
The Tendency of the Church.....	95
The Third Angel's Message.....	96

CHAPTER VII.

THE LAW OF GOD.....	98
Duration of Laws, and Effect of Repeals.....	101
The Moral Law Distinct from the Ritual or Ceremonial Law.....	102
The Immutability of the Moral Law.....	104
The Abolition of the Moral Law Impossible.....	105

CHAPTER VIII.

THE SABBATH OF THE LORD.....	109
It was Sanctified by God.....	109
It was Sanctified at Creation.....	110
It is a Memorial of God's Creative Power.....	113
The Origin of the Week.....	115
The Days of Creation Week.....	116
Commencement of the Day.....	120
Names of the Days of the Week.....	122
The Sabbath was Observed before Commanded from Sinai.....	124
It was Recognized by Other Nations besides Israelites.....	125
Its Binding Obligation upon Christians.....	126
It was Observed by Christians Long after Christ.....	128
No Bible Authority for a Change to the First Day.....	129

CHAPTER IX.

SUN WORSHIP.....	132
How Sunday Received its Name.....	132
Sun Worship among the Israelites.....	133
Sun Worship among the Egyptians.....	134
Sun Worship among the Romans.....	135

CHAPTER X.

HOW SUNDAY TOOK THE PLACE OF THE SABBATH.....	137
The Character of Constantine.....	138
The Design of Constantine's Sunday Edict.....	142
The Work of the Council of Nice.....	144

CHAPTER XI.

THE SABBATH DURING THE DARK AGES.....	147
The Waldenses.....	147
The Abyssinians.....	148
Sabbath-keepers during the Reformation.....	149

CHAPTER XII.

THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.....	151
Its Place in Prophecy.....	151
Manner of Its Rise.....	152
Its Wonderful Development.....	154
The Telegraph and Telephone.....	155
Nature of the Work of the Two-horned Beast Power.....	157
Early Manifestations of Intolerance and the Development of the Image.....	163
The Blair Sunday-rest Bill.....	167
The Sunday-law Petition.....	172
The Object.....	173
Another Bold Step.....	175
Bid for Catholic Support.....	183
Later Developments.....	185
The Decision of the Supreme Court of the United States of Feb. 29, 1892.....	185
What National Reformers Think of It.....	186
Sunday Bill for the District of Columbia.....	188
Sunday Ice Bill for the District.....	189
To Prohibit Sunday Opening of Expositions.....	190
Proviso Conditioning Government Appropriation on Sunday Closing of the Fair.....	190
The Senate Conditioned the Entire Appropriation on Sun- day Closing.....	192
This Became a Law.....	194
This Enactment Religious Legislation.....	194
Secured under Religious Pressure.....	195
The Constitution Barred Out.....	198
They Feel Their Power.....	199
Church and State United in the United States.....	200
Aims of the Papacy.....	201
Extent of the Movement.....	204
A Sketch of the New England Theocracy.....	205
Excuses for Sunday Laws.....	209
The Civil Sabbath Fraud; or Religious Legislation in Disguise.....	213
Sunday Laws Religious.....	219
Exemption Clauses.....	220

How Sunday Laws Operate.....	226
Limits of Obedience to Civil Government.....	233
A False Charge.....	239
The Speaking of the Image.....	241
The Death Decree.....	242
Religion in the Public Schools.....	244
Papists Getting the Advantage.....	261

CHAPTER XIII.

THE MILLENNIUM.....	267
The Early Advocates.....	267
The Declarations of Eminent Men.....	269
The Religions of the World Classified.....	270
The Increase of Crime.....	274
Preparations for War.....	275

CHAPTER XIV.

BAPTISM.....	278
How Early Teachers Understood the Subject.....	278
Comments of Later Scholars.....	279

CHAPTER XV.

THE NATURE OF MAN.....	280
Origin of the Natural Immortality Theory.....	282
Greeks and Romans Learned it from the Egyptians.....	283

CHAPTER XVI.

THE ORDINANCE OF HUMILITY.....	284
--------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XVII.

BIBLE PLAN OF SUPPORTING THE MINISTRY.....	286
--	-----

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE WORLD'S CURSE.....	289
Intemperance in the United States of America.....	289
Intemperance in Great Britain.....	291
Intemperance in Other Countries.....	292

CHAPTER XIX.

SCRIPTURE CRITICISMS..... 294

APPENDIX A.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES..... 307

APPENDIX B.

SUPREME COURT DECISION OF FEB. 29, 1892..... 319



FACTS FOR THE TIMES.

CHAPTER I.

THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

THEIR GREAT IMPORTANCE.

WE are told by the Author of the Sacred Volume, that he has magnified his word above all his name. Ps. 138 : 2. Then with what reverence should we open its pages ; with what earnestness should we study it. Coming, as it does, from the Author of all good, and containing his thoughts and mind, we may well expect to find within its pages all the necessary principles of culture and civilization, which, if planted in the human heart, will produce the fruit of joy, peace, and everlasting life. In the language of another, it has been truthfully said : —

“Well may it be styled the Book of books. No veneration of it can be too high, no attachment to it too deep, no attention to it too extensive.”—*Pulpit Cyclopaedia*, p. 16, ed. of 1872.

IT IS AN INSPIRED BOOK.

This is clearly stated by the Scriptures themselves. Thus : —

“All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” 2 Tim. 3 : 16, 17.

“The prevailing doctrine is that though error may be shown in the acts, and even in the oral utterances of the apostles, it cannot

have entered their written deliverances: that though the apostles were not infallible as men, they were made infallible as writers. . . . Never before has this doctrine in its purely scientific aspect been criticised so freely as now; and yet never before has the Bible stood so high in the reverence of the world as it stands at the present time."—*N. Y. Independent*, Nov. 18, 1880.

"Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Peter 1:21.

"This view secures the Scriptures from all error, both as to the subjects spoken and the manner of expressing them. A uniformity of style and manner in the different writers was by no means essential to this kind of inspiration, which is called *plenary*, that is, *full*. The peculiar style of each writer, instead of being removed, was probably enriched and appropriated to his own design by the Holy Spirit."—*Theological Compend*, p. 16., ed. of 1839.

"The revelation man requires, God can supply. The Scriptures appear to contain such a revelation—a revelation worthy of their divine Author, and meeting all the moral exigencies of mankind."—*Pulpit Cyclopædia*, p. 12.

THE USE OF THE BIBLE.

"Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." Ps. 119:105.

It matters not how dark may be one's moral surroundings, the word of God is able to reveal to him a path of light, and point out every obstacle in the way, that he may avoid them, and be able to keep in the "royal path of life." Thus Dr. Adam Clark, in his "*Clavis Biblica*" says:—

"From this word all doctrines must be derived and proved; and from it every man must learn his duty to God, to his neighbor, and to himself."—*Principles of Christian Religion*, par. 31.

"I use the Scriptures, not as an arsenal to be resorted to only for arms and weapons, . . . but as a matchless temple, where I delight to contemplate the beauty, the symmetry, and the magnificence of the structure; and to increase my awe and excite my devotion to the Deity there preached and adored."—*Boyle's Style of Scripture*, 3d Obj., 8.

"Especially make the Bible your study. Many get wisdom by books; but wisdom toward God is to be gotten out of God's book, and that by digging. Most men do but walk over the surface of it, and pick up here and there a flower; a few dig into it. Read other books to help you to read that book. Fetch your sermons from thence; the Volume of Inspiration is a full fountain, always overflowing, and has always something new."—*Matthew Henry*.

"An intimate acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures is a secure haven, and an impregnable bulwark, and an immovable tower, and imperishable glory, and impenetrable armor, and unfading joy, and perpetual delight, and whatever other excellence can be uttered."—*Chrysostom*.

"Hast thou ever heard
Of such a book? The author, God himself,
The subject, God and man, salvation, life
And death—eternal life, eternal death—
Dread words! whose meaning has no end, no bound.
Most wondrous book! bright candle of the Lord!"
—*Pollock's Course of Time*, p. 56.

Study it carefully,
Think of it prayerfully,
Deep in thy heart let its pure precepts dwell.
Slight not its history,
Ponder its mystery,
None can e'er prize it too fondly or well.
Accept the glad tidings,
The warnings and chidings,
Found in this volume of heavenly lore;
With faith that's unfeeling,
And love all-prevailing,
Trust in its promise of life evermore.
With fervent devotion
And thankful emotion,
Hear the blest welcome, respond to its call;
Life's purest oblation,
The heart's adoration,
Give to the Saviour, who died for us all.
May this message of love
From the Tribune above,
To all nations and kindreds be given,
'Till the ransomed shall raise—
Joyous anthems of praise—
Hallelujah! on earth and in heaven.

PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION.

"Whoso readeth, let him understand." Matt. 24:15.
"No prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation [impulse]." 2 Peter 1:20. That is, no prophecy is to be interpreted by one's own knowledge, or invention, which would be the offspring of calculation or conjecture. In other words, no interpretation of prophecy is to be made by the mere private impulse of one's own mind. No one unaided (relying on his

own private judgment), is competent to give an exposition of prophecy. Its meaning should be ascertained by "comparing spiritual things with spiritual." 1 Cor. 2 : 13.

"The allegorical sense is commonly uncertain, and by no means safe to build our faith upon; for it usually depends on human opinion and conjecture only. . . . Therefore Origen, Jerome, and similar of the Fathers are to be avoided, with the whole of that Alexandrian school, which formerly abounded in this species of interpretation. For, later writers unhappily following their too-much-praised and prevailing example, it has come to pass that men make just what they please of the Scriptures, until some accommodate the word of God to the most extravagant absurdities."—*Luther's Annotations on Deut., chap. 1, p. 55.*

This was the cause of all the great errors which crept into the early Church. Speaking of those who propagated these errors, Mosheim says :—

"They all attributed a double sense to the words of Scripture; the one obvious and literal, the other hidden and mysterious, which lay concealed, as it were, under the veil of the outward letter. The former they treated with the utmost neglect, and turned the whole force of their genius and application to unfold the latter; or, in other words, they were more studious to darken the Scriptures with their idle fictions than to investigate their true and natural sense."—*Church History, cent. 2, chap. 3, par. 5.*

"There is, in fact, but one and the same method of interpretation common to all books, whatever be their subject. And the same grammatical principles and precepts ought to be the common guide in the interpretation of all. . . . Theologians are right, therefore, when they affirm the literal sense, or that which is derived from the knowledge of words, to be the only true one; for that mystical sense, which indeed is incorrectly called a sense, belongs altogether to the thing, and not to the words."—*Prof. J. A. Ernesti, in Biblical Repertory, vol. 3, pp. 125, 131.*

"Without all controversy, the literal meaning is that which God would have first understood. By not attending to this, heresies, false doctrines, and errors of all kinds have been propagated and multiplied in the world. Remember you are called, not only to explain the things of God, but also the words of God. The meaning of the thing is found in the word."—*Dr. Clarke, in Coke's Preachers' Manual, p. 86.*

"All ingenious and unprejudiced persons will grant me this position, that there is no method of removing difficulties more secure than that of an accurate interpretation derived from the words of the

texts themselves, and from their true and legitimate meaning, and depending upon no hypothesis."—*Rosenmuller, quoted in Cox's Immanuel Enthroned, p. 70.*

"Let the Christian reader's first object always be to find out the literal meaning of the word of God; for this, and this alone, is the whole foundation of faith and of Christian theology. It is the very substance of Christianity."—*Martin Luther, quoted in Milner's History, vol. 5, p. 460.*

"Even metaphors and parables prove nothing; they only illustrate, and are never allowed to be produced in support of any doctrine. This is a maxim in theology to which all polemic divines are obliged to bow."—*Coke's Preachers' Manual, p. 90.*

"The Spirit of God does not communicate to the mind of even a teachable, obedient, and devout Christian, any doctrine or meaning of Scripture which is not contained already in Scripture itself. He makes men wise up to what is written, but not beyond it. When Christ opened the understanding of his apostles, it was 'that they might understand the Scriptures.'"—*Dr. Joseph Angus, in Bible Hand-Book, p. 178.*

The Bible has been given in language adapted to the wants of those for whose use it was intended, and must therefore be understood, in all cases except where figures and symbols are known to be used, in exactly the same way that such expressions would be received if found in any other book. Concerning the use of language, Prof. C. E. Stowe, in his excellent work, "History of the Books of the Bible," has the following :—

"The Bible is not given to us in any celestial or superhuman language. If it had been, it would have been of no use to us; for every book intended for men must be given to them in the language of men. But every human language is of necessity, and from the very nature of the case, an imperfect language. No human language has exactly one word and only one for each distinct idea. In every known language, the same word is used to indicate different things, and different words are used to indicate the same thing. In every human language each word has more than one meaning, and each thing has generally more than one name. The boy is learning his letters; the merchant is writing his letters; Dr. Johnson was a man of letters. In these three sentences the same word, *letters*, is used to designate three perfectly distinct and most widely divergent things; yet nobody mistakes, or nobody need mistake; for the connection in each case shows the meaning. . . . In the first stanza of Grey's Ode on Spring, there are no less than eight words used in their figurative instead of their literal sense. Yet who mistakes?

“Lo, where the *rosy-bosomed* Hours,
 Fair Venus' train, appear,
 Disclose the *long-expecting* flowers,
 And *wake* the *purple* year:
 The attic warbler *pours* her throat
 Responsive to the cuckoo's note,
 The untaught harmony of spring;
 While *whispering* pleasures as they fly,
 Cool zephyrs through the clear-blue sky
 Their gathered fragrance *fling*.”

“In all these cases men can mistake if they choose. . . . All this is as true of the Bible as of any other book, and no more so.”
 — Pages 15–17.

CATHOLICS ADMIT THE PROTESTANT BIBLE TO BE RELIABLE.

The eminent Archbishop Hendric, in the introduction to his translation of the New Testament, alludes to the Protestant version as follows:—

“In adopting occasionally the words and phrases of the Protestant version, I have followed the example of others who have from time to time revised the Rheinish translation. It is not to be regretted that while we point to errors that need correction, we acknowledge excellencies which we are free to imitate, thus diminishing the asperity of censure by the tribute which we willingly render to literary merit.”

Bishop Doyle, one of the ablest of Roman Catholic prelates, when asked before a committee of the House of Lords, whether he considered the authorized version of the Scriptures of that character which would warrant them being called the gospel of the Devil, he replied:—

“I have said before, God forbid that I should so consider it; for, though it has many errors, I consider it as one of the noblest works, and one of the ablest translations, that has ever been produced.”

THE OLD TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES STILL IN FORCE.

“For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope.” Rom. 15:4.

The fact that our Saviour mentioned the cases of Sodom and Gomorrah as examples to be shunned

(Matt. 10:15), is evidence that he desired his followers to read the Old Testament, since the history of those cities is not repeated in the New Testament. His reference, also, to Jonah and Nineveh (Matt. 12:41) is so brief that we could never receive much benefit from it, unless their history in the Old Testament could be read.

Much of the prophecy of Daniel has its fulfillment in the Christian age, and some of it in the present generation. It were folly to say that any portion of the Bible has lost its force before it has met its fulfillment; for then how would that portion become of any benefit to the generation to whom it was alone directed, and to whom only it was possible for it to be of any advantage? In that case, the early Church would not have known when to flee from Judea and Jerusalem, as directed (Matt. 24:15, 16), and would consequently have been involved in the destruction of that city.

We are told by the Lord to “Remember Lot's wife.” Luke 17:32. But the only knowledge to be obtained concerning her is through the Old Testament Scriptures. These words of the Saviour are, then, a virtual command to read the Old Testament. Why should we not do so, since the great apostle to the Gentiles has said that these Scriptures are able to make us “wise unto salvation,” through faith in the Lord Jesus? 2 Tim. 3:15. The Scriptures referred to in this case were those which Timothy, then a minister of the gospel, had known *from a child*. These were none other than the Old Testament Scriptures.

The apostle James exhorts all to take the prophets as an example of suffering and patience. James 5:10. It is plain that this cannot be done without reading the account of those sufferings which is found in the Old Testament. In short, no part of the Old Testament can be safely rejected; for in it are the foundations of the New Testament. The rejection, therefore, of the Old Testament necessarily leads to the rejection of the New, since the latter ratifies in the fullest manner the historical statements, enactments,

and religious institutions of the former, and founds its work of redemption on them.

"You have a good many people saying, 'I don't believe in the Old Testament; I believe in the New.' My friends, they are inseparable. A scarlet thread runs through the two, and binds them together."—*D. L. Moody, in Sermons, Addresses, and Prayers, p. 154.*

"The Bible, or the Old and New Testaments in Hebrew and Greek, contains a full and perfect revelation of God and his will, adapted to man as he now is."—*A. Campbell's Christian System, p. 15.*

"The New Testament is not to supercede the Old, but to be its complement. So Jesus, says, . . . I am come not to silence the Old Testament, but to show its divine original, by adding to it that which is its complement, its perfection, and its fullness—the New Testament."—*Cummings's Scripture Readings, pp. 35, 36.*

"Seeing the same language runs through the whole, and is set in such a variety of lights that one part is well adapted to illustrate another, . . . it follows that to understand the sense of the Spirit in the New, it is essentially necessary that we understand its sense in the Old Testament."—*Dr. A. Clarke, in Preface to Book of Romans.*

"We take the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, as the foundation of all Christian union and communion."—*A. Campbell's Christian System, p. 12.*

"By eight hundred and eighty-nine quotations and allusions to the Old Testament in the pages of the New, the two portions of the Bible are so interwoven that they become like the two sides of a twofold carpet. If we cut the threads of one side, we have destroyed the other also. If the Old Testament records are not reliable, neither are the words of Christ who confirmed them."—*Wilbur F. Crafts, in Must The Old Testament Go? p. 39.*

"We cannot agree with those who say that 'there is a radical difference between the Old Testament and the New in their ethical standpoints, that of the Old Testament being exterior, the New, interior; the Old Testament dealing with conduct, the New, with character; one prescribing rules, the other, principles; the first regulating the life, the second breathing into the soul a new spirit.' In these words truth is sacrificed to antithesis. Moses most emphatically declared that obedience to God's law required not only external morality, but also *love*. 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind;' and the key-texts of the poetic books of the Bible are, 'Create in me a clean heart, . . . and renew a right spirit within me,' and, 'Thou desirest truth in the inward parts.' . . . The Old Testament as well as the New continually puts religion into these three words,—Love, Trust, and Obey."—*Ibid, pp. 79, 80.*

TRADITION AGAINST THE BIBLE.

"Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition?" Matt. 15:3.

"Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition." Verse 6.

"Traditions were laws, or precepts of men, which they [the Jews] said had been handed down by word of mouth from past generations. . . . They were often treated as of more authority than the laws of God."—*Note on Matt. 15:2, in American Tract Society's New Testament.*

"From being transcribers and exponents of the law, they [the Jews] supplied, after the captivity, the place of the prophets and the inspired oracles, which had ceased, and from them arose those glosses and interpretations which our Lord rebukes under the term of traditions."—*Oxford S. S. Teacher's Bible, art, Jewish Sects and Parties.*

"The Talmuds are two in number, and consist of two parts, namely, the Mishna and the Gemara, which were committed to writing by Rabbi Jehudah, surnamed Hakkadosh, or the Holy, about the middle of the second century. On this there are extant two commentaries by the Jews, called Gemara, that is, perfection; namely, that of Jerusalem, which was compiled in the third or fourth century, and that of Babylon, compiled in the sixth century. When the Mishna, or text, and the Gemara, or commentary, accompany each other, they are called the Talmuds, and accordingly as the Jewish or Babylonish commentary accompanies the Mishna, it is called the Jewish or Babylonish Talmud."—*Horne's Introduction, vol. 1, sec. 3.*

HOW THE EARLY CHURCH WAS CORRUPTED.

In an address to the elders of the church at Ephesus, the apostle Paul said:—

"Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Acts 20:28-30.

As to how corruption came into the early Church, we are told that—

“When the apostles were dead, then the Church was gradually spotted and corrupted, as in her doctrine, so also in her worship, an infinity of ceremonies by degrees insensibly sliding in.”—*Hegesippus, book 3, chap. 32.*

“From Adrian [A. D. 117] to Justinian, . . . few institutions either human or divine, were permitted to stand on their former basis.”—*Gibbon's Rome, chap. 44, par. 7.*

“Toward the latter end of the second century, most of the churches assumed a new form, the first simplicity disappeared; and insensibly, as the old disciples retired to their graves, their children, along with new converts, both Jews and Gentiles, came forward and new-modeled the cause.”—*Robinson's History of Baptism, book 2, chap. 1, sec. 1.*

“Clement of Alexandria is almost the only extant writer of the early ages who adheres to common sense and apostolic Christianity, through and through.”—*Anti-Christ Exposed, pp. 104, 113.*

THE EARLY FATHERS UNRELIABLE.

“The fact that deadly falsehoods were circulated in the Church by some men, and believed by multitudes, is itself a most important historic truth; and to suppress such a truth, instead of being a merit, is a fault which should rather crimson the cheek and set on fire the conscience of a modest and honest historian. It is itself but a tacit repetition of the crime of pious frauds which so deeply stained, not only heathen morality, but the early though not the primitive character of the Church.”—*Ralph Emerson, D. D., in Bibliotheca Sacra, May, 1844.*

“The testimony of good and wise men is entitled to high consideration. But we do not ultimately and securely settle a point which they profess to believe, until we have ascertained the grounds on which they believe. The same principles of evidence are common to them and to ourselves; if, therefore, they have believed on just principles, we must be capable of perceiving these.”—*Tappan's Logic, p. 33.*

The celebrated John Dailié of Paris, in his work on the “Right Use of the Fathers,” says of their writings:—

“There is so great a confusion in the most part of these books of which we speak, that it is a very difficult thing truly to discover who were their authors, and what is their meaning and sense. The first difficulty proceeds from the infinite number of forged books, which are falsely attributed to the ancient Fathers; the same having also happened in all kinds of learning and sciences; insomuch that the learned at this day are sufficiently puzzled to discover, both in philosophy and humanity, which are forged and supposititious pieces, and which are true and legitimate. But this abuse has not existed anywhere more grossly, and taken to itself more liberty, than in the ecclesiastical writers.”—*p. 33.*

“But suppose that you have, by long and judicious investigation, separated the true and genuine writings of the Fathers from the spurious and forged; there would yet rest upon you a second task, the result of which is likely to prove much more doubtful, and more replete with difficulty, than the former. For it would behoove you, in the next place, in reading over those authors which you acknowledge as legitimate, to distinguish what is the author's own, and what has been foisted in by another hand; and also to restore to your author whatsoever either by time or fraud has been taken away, and to take out of him whatsoever has been added by either of these two. Otherwise you will never be able to assure yourself that you have discovered, out of these books, what the true and proper meaning and sense of your author has been; considering the great alterations that in various ways they may have suffered at different times.”—*Ibid, pp. 55, 56.*

Concerning the value of the productions of the Fathers, Dupin, a celebrated Roman Catholic historian, says:—

“It is a surprising thing to consider how many spurious books we find in antiquity; nay, even in the first ages of the Church.”

Of these early writings Dr. A. Clarke says:—

“But of these we may safely say that there is not a truth in the most orthodox creed that cannot be proved by their authority; nor a heresy that has disgraced the Romish Church that may not challenge them as its abettors. In points of doctrine, *their authority is with me nothing. The word of God alone contains my creed.* On a number of points I can go to the Greek and Latin Fathers of the Church to know what they believed, and what the people of their respective communions believed; but after all this, I must return to God's word to know what he would have me to believe.”—*Comments on Proverbs 8.*

Martin Luther confirms the above by the following terse statement:—

“When God's word is by the *Fathers* expounded, construed, and glossed, then, in my judgment, it is even as when one strains milk through a coal-sack, which must needs spoil and make the milk black. God's word of itself is pure, clean, bright, and clear; but through the doctrines, books, and writings of the Fathers, it is darkened, falsified, and spoiled.”—*Table Talk, p. 228.*

Speaking of the Fathers in his “History of Interpretation,” Archdeacon Farrar says:—

“There are but few of them whose pages are not rife with errors, — errors of method, errors of fact, errors of history, of grammar,

and even of doctrine. This is the language of simple truth, not of slighting disparagement."—*Pages 162, 139.*

Just how this corruption of the truth was brought about is well stated by Dr. Cox. He says:—

"In the early ages of the Church, the writings of the Fathers were corrupted without scruple, to serve the purposes of contending sects. The truth is, that the practice of vitiating these holy writings, and even of forging whole treatises and letters, detracts materially from the value of all that has come down to us as the productions of the Fathers."—*Cox's Literature, etc., vol. 1, p. 123.*

Neander also says:—

"The writings of the so-called Apostolic Fathers have unhappily, for the most part, come down to us in a condition very little worthy of confidence, partly because under the name of these men, so highly venerated in the Church, writings were early forged for the purpose of giving authority to particular opinions or principles; and partly because their own writings which were extant, became interpolated in subservience to a Jewish hierarchical interest, which aimed to crush the free spirit of the gospel."—*History of the Christian Religion and Church, vol. 1, p. 657.*

With the foregoing facts before us, it is not wonderful that in due time there should follow so many soul-destroying doctrines as were later developed in the Catholic Church. The *Chronological Anzeiger* of Reyner, gives the following sketch of the introduction of many of the foolish practices of the Roman Church:—

"The use of holy water was introduced in the year 120; penance, in 157; monks appeared in 348; the Latin mass, in 391; extreme unction, in 550; purgatory, in 593; the invocation of Mary and the saints, in 715; kissing the feet of the pope, in 809; the canonization of saints and the beatification of the blessed, in 893; blessing bells, in 1000; the celibacy of priests, in 1015; indulgences, in 1119; dispensations, in 1200; the elevation of the host, in 1200; the inquisition, in 1204; oral confession, in 1215; the immaculate conception, in 1860; infallibility, in 1870."

THE WAY ERRORS ARE STILL PERPETUATED.

Says Alexander Campbell:—

"No one need ask, Why, then, so early introduced and so long in practice, and why believed by so many great, and learned, and excellent men? Ah me! what profane tenets, what fatal aberrations

from the sacred Scriptures may not be maintained and defended in this way! . . . If great, and learned, and reverend names can authenticate tradition, silence demurs, and satisfy weak consciences, there is not an error in popery nor an imagination in the ramblings of monkish fanaticism and religious buffoonery that may not be favorably regarded, and cherished with a profound and worshipful respect. But we have not so learned Christ."—*Christian Baptism, p. 246.*

This matter was set forth by Rev. Lyman Abbott in this way:—

"There are many instances in which the Biblical commentators appear to have derived their ideas respecting Scripture teaching from previous scholars in the same field; the same thought is often traceable from generation to generation, from ancient Father to English divine, and thence to our latest Sunday-school commentary. And sometimes, just as counterfeit bills pass unquestioned because they are well worn, erroneous interpretations pass current in the Christian Church, without ever being subjected to a careful scrutiny; because each new student takes it for granted that the student who has preceded him, and from whom he receives the interpretation, has done this work of investigation, and he only needs to report the results."—*Christian Union.*

Another writer speaks thus:—

"Many of our religious teachers, who are set for the defense of the truth, rely more upon the authority of tradition than upon the word of God to justify their positions, and enforce the doctrines they teach; and so they hand down their interpretations from one generation to another. Indeed it has already come to pass that in some of our great organic Church bodies, a man is regarded as heretical or sound according as he agrees or disagrees with the book of the Church, which is not the *book of God*, but, like the Mishna of the Jews, is a digest of the traditions of the elders, and of the interpretations they have decided to put upon the Scriptures. And when a man is tried for heresy, he is tried by their church-book, and not allowed to appeal to the word of God."—*The Life Everlasting, pp. 100, 101.*

HOW TRADITIONS SHOULD BE TREATED.

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." 1 Thess. 5:21.

The theory advocated by some that because the Church has taught certain doctrines for many generations, they must therefore be true, meets the rebuke it deserves in the following:—

“To have been a thousand years wrong, will not make us right for one single hour! or else the pagans should have kept to their creed.”—*D'Aubigne's Reformation, book 8, chap. 14, par. 14.*

“An error is not the better for being common, nor truth the worse for having lain neglected; and if it were put to vote anywhere in the world, I doubt, as things are managed, whether truth would have the majority, at least while the authority of men, and not the examination of things, must be its measure.”—*Locke's Essay on Human Understanding, book 4, chap. 3, sec. 6, note. (Appendix No. IX.)*

“The antiquity of an opinion, if that be not founded on a revelation from God, is no evidence of its truth; for there are many ungodly opinions which are more than a thousand years old. And as to great men and great names, we find them enrolled and arranged on each side of all controversies.”—*Dr. A. Clarke, in Introduction to Solomon's Songs.*

“The plea of ancient tradition is the strength of popery and the weakness of Protestantism. We advocate, not ancient, but *original* Christianity. The plea of high antiquity or tradition has long been the bulwark of error. It cleaves to its beloved mother, *tradition*, hoary tradition, with an affection that increases as she becomes old and feeble. Errorists of all schools are exceedingly devout and dutiful so far as the precept, ‘Honor thy father and thy mother,’ is concerned.”—*Campbell's Christian Baptism, book 2, chap. 2, p. 233.*

“To avoid being imposed upon, we ought to treat tradition as we do a notorious and known liar, to whom we give no credit, unless what he says is confirmed to us by some person of undoubted veracity. . . . False and lying traditions are of an early date, and the greatest men have, out of a pious credulity, suffered themselves to be imposed upon by them.”—*Bower's History of the Popes, vol. 1, pp. 1, 3.*

“The Bible, I say, the Bible only, is the religion of the Protestants! Nor is it of any account in the estimation of the genuine Protestant, *how early* a doctrine originated, if it is not found in the Bible. . . . He who receives a single doctrine upon the mere authority of tradition, let him be called by what name he will, by so doing steps down from the Protestant rock, passes over the line which separates Protestantism from popery, and can give no valid reason why he should not receive all the earlier doctrines and ceremonies of Romanism upon the same authority.”—*Dowling's History of Romanism, book 2, chap. 1.*

Said Ecolampadius, the friend of Zwingle: “If we quote the Fathers, it is only to free our doctrine from the reproach of novelty, and not to support our cause by their authority.”—*D'Aubigne's History of the Reformation, Book XIII.*

Of this D'Aubigne says: “No better definition can be given of the legitimate use of the Doctors of the Church.”—*Ibid.*

CHAPTER II.

THE PROPHETIC SYMBOLS.

THE OBJECT OF PROPHECY.

“Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets.” Amos. 3:7.

A revelation is the secret of God, communicated to a prophet, not for his benefit alone, but for the use of all the world. “Those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children forever.” Deut. 29:29. When the secret of God has been made known to others through the prophet, it then becomes a prophecy, and belongs to every son of Adam as a legacy from heaven. As a prophecy, it is no longer a secret, but a revelation for man to profit by, that he may be informed regarding the future, and thus be prepared to meet any emergency which may occur in his day, that has been foretold by prophecy. For this reason, a blessing is pronounced on those who read prophecy. Rev. 1:3. See also 2 Chron. 20:20. But a blessing cannot be received in reading or hearing a matter that is not understood, because there is no light in that to the mind. It is therefore certain that prophecy is designed to be understood, that light and comfort may be received in its contemplation.

When a prophecy is demonstrated to be fulfilled, such a fact strengthens faith in God's word; for it has also been demonstrated that when the prophecy was delivered ages before its fulfillment, it had been previously known to some one, as a secret, and was revealed to man from some higher source than the mind of man. This higher source is thus revealed to be an intelli-

gence of superior order, and as such commands the respect and reverence of all who acknowledge it.

Prophecy, then, should be especially studied as that portion of God's word well calculated to light up the future before us, when it would otherwise be dark and gloomy. It is well represented as a "lamp to our feet and a light to our path." Ps. 119:105. As a lamp carried in the hand lights up the path of the traveler by night, revealing every snare and pitfall in the way, so the prophecies may be made the revealer of future events, which, if unperceived till we come upon them, would cause us to stumble in the way of life. They are truly "a light that shineth in a dark place."

"The two great ends of prophecy are, to excite expectation before the event, and then to confirm the truth by a striking and unequivocal fulfillment; and it is sufficient answer to the allegation of the obscurity of the prophecies of Scriptures, that they have abundantly accomplished those objects, among the most intelligent and investigating, as well as among the simple and unlearned in all ages."—*Watson's Dictionary, art. Prophecy.*

"Indeed, God would do nothing (especially respecting Israel) without revealing his secret purpose to his servants the prophets; who, being thus informed of what was about to come to pass, must declare it to the people, that they might take warning and act accordingly. . . . The grand outlines of the plan of divine Providence, and the events of history, to this day, and to the end of the world, were made known to the prophets of Israel and Judah."—*Dr. A. Clarke, on Amos 3:4-8.*

"Predictive prophecy is at once a part and an evidence of revelation. . . . As an evidence, fulfilled prophecy is as satisfactory as anything can be; for who can know the future except the Ruler who disposes future events?"—*Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, art. Use of Prophecy.*

"The objection which has been raised to Scripture prophecy, from its supposed obscurity, has no solid foundation. . . . It is a language which is definite and not equivocal in its meaning, and as easily mastered as the language of poetry, by attentive persons."—*Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, art. Prophecy.*

THE METALLIC IMAGE.

"This is the dream; and we will tell the interpretation thereof before the king." Dan. 2:36.

The vision of the great image as recorded in the second chapter of Daniel, gives a prophetic outline of

the rise and fall of the four principal monarchies of earth; namely, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, and Rome. The prophet in interpreting the dream expressly declared that Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom was symbolized by the head of gold, and that three other kingdoms should follow in their order, as symbolized by the breast and arms of silver, the belly and thighs of brass, and the legs of iron. But the feet and toes of the image were to be an admixture of iron and clay, showing a divided state of the last empire.

It has been well said by Mr. Horne, in the compendium of his "Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures," p. 147, that "A prophecy is demonstrated to be fulfilled when we can prove from unimpeachable authority that the event has actually taken place, precisely according to the manner in which it was foretold." History is agreed that the four kingdoms mentioned did arise, and in the order indicated by the prophecy. Commentators have gathered these evidences, and embellished their productions with statements in harmony with what history has given, as witness the following testimonies:—

THE HEAD OF GOLD.

"The Chaldean monarchy, over which Nebuchadnezzar was the only king of great renown, was represented in the vision by the head of gold."—*Scott, Dan. 2:38.*

"Daniel explains this golden head of the Babylonian empire (in which the Assyrian was now absorbed)."—*Cottage Bible, notes on Dan. 2:31-49.*

"The meaning is, that the Babylonian empire, as it existed under him, in its relation to the kingdoms which should succeed, was like the head of gold seen in the image as compared with the inferior metals."—*Albert Barnes, note on verse 38.*

THE BREAST AND ARMS OF SILVER.

"The Medo-Persian empire, which properly began under Darius the Mede, allowing him to be the same with Cyaxares, son of Astyages, and uncle to Cyrus the Great, son of Cambyses. He first fought under his uncle Cyaxares; defeated Neriglissar, king of the Assyrians, and Cræsus, king of the Lydians; and by the capture of Babylon, B. C. 538, terminated the Chaldean empire. On the death

of his uncle Cyaxares, B. C. 536, he became sole governor of the Medes and Persians, and thus established a potent empire on the ruins of that of the Chaldeans." — *Clarke, on Dan. 2.*

"The breast and the two arms of silver of the image represented that monarchy which succeeded to the Chaldean, and this was the kingdom of the Medes and Persians." — *Scott, on Dan. 2 : 39.*

"The breast and arms of silver are said to indicate a second empire, still rich and splendid, but inferior to the former, which can mean no other than the Persian or Medo-Persian empire, of which Cyrus was properly the founder." — *Cottage Bible, notes on Dan. 2 : 31-49.*

"The empire of the Medes and Persians, whose union was denoted by the breast and two arms of silver, was established on the ruins of that of the Chaldeans on the capture of Babylon by Cyrus, B. C. 538." — *Bagster.*

"The kingdom here referred to was undoubtedly the Medo-Persian, established by Cyrus." — *Barnes's Notes on Dan. 2 : 39.*

SIDES OF BRASS.

"The Macedonian, or Greek empire, founded by Alexander the Great. He subdued Greece, penetrated into Asia, took Tyre, reduced Egypt, overthrew Darius Codomannus at Arbela, Oct. 2, A. M. 3673, B. C. 331, and thus terminated the Persian monarchy. He crossed the Caucasus, and subdued Hyrcania, and penetrated India as far as the Ganges; and having conquered all the countries that lay between the Adriatic Sea and this river, the Ganges, he died A. M. 3681, B. C. 323, and after his death, his empire became divided among his generals, Cassander, Lysimachus, Ptolemy, and Seleucus." — *Clarke, on Dan. 2.*

"There can be no reasonable doubt that by this third kingdom is denoted the empire founded by Alexander the Great — the Macedonian empire." — *Barnes.*

"The third kingdom, represented by the belly and thighs of the image formed of brass, must be that of the Macedonians, or Grecians, which succeeded to the Persian monarchy." — *Scott, on Dan. 2 : 39.*

"The third empire is described by a belly (or trunk) and thighs of brass, which very appositely represent the Macedonian empire, founded by Alexander the Great; the Greeks being commonly called brazen-coated, from wearing brazen armor." — *Cottage Bible, notes on Dan. 2 : 31-49.*

THE IRON AND CLAY OF THE IMAGE.

"These verses evidently describe the Roman empire as succeeding to that of the Macedonians." — *Scott, on Dan. 2 : 40-43.*

"The fourth, or Roman empire, was represented by the legs of iron and the feet of iron mixed with clay." — *Cottage Bible.*

"The Roman empire, which conquered nearly the whole world." — *Bagster.*

"The common opinion has been, that the reference is to the Roman empire." — *Barnes.*

"This image represented the four kingdoms that should successively bear rule in the earth, and influence the affairs of the Jewish Church; by *one* image, because *all of one and the same spirit and genius*, and all more or less against the Church. It was the same power, only lodged in four several nations, the two former lying east of Judea, the two latter, west." — *Comprehensive Commentary, on Dan. 2 : 31-45.*

"The images of gold, or silver, or brass, that might serve to represent the nations or their kings, were successively broken by the iron monarchy of Rome." — *Gibbon's Rome, chap. 38, par. 43.*

THE FOUR GREAT BEASTS.

"These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth." Dan. 7 : 17.

In repeating the prophetic history of the four great monarchies with which God's ancient people were connected, under the symbol of beasts, it is evident that the design was to reveal characteristics which could not well be symbolized by the metals employed in the image. It was necessary to show these additional features in order definitely to locate the nations symbolized by the former prophecy. It may be asked, Why not have the first symbols of such a character as to show all the features necessary, and save repetition of the subject? The answer is easy. God would impress upon the Babylonian king the power of his truth. The king being a worshiper of images, nothing would so quickly and completely arrest his attention as the view of an image.

So far as that design went, the image fully met it, and the king's attention was called to the God of Daniel. But in order that future generations might have correct data from which to apply the prophecies having a fulfillment in their time, God gave line upon line, and precept upon precept, that unerring judgment might be exercised by the careful student of prophecy, while making an application of its symbols.

THE LION.

This symbol presents features of the Babylonian empire which the golden head of the image could not show. That could symbolize the magnificence of the nation, but not its power of conquest and its soaring pride. The king of beasts, mounted with the wings of an eagle, would more clearly represent those. (See Hab. 1 : 6-8.)

"The beast like a lion is the kingdom of the Babylonians; and the king of Babylon is compared to a lion (Jer. 4 : 7; Isa. 5 : 29) and is said to fly as an eagle. Jer. 48 : 40; Eze. 17 : 3, 7. The lion is considered the king of the beasts, and the eagle the king of the birds; and therefore the kingdom of Babylon, which was signified by the golden head of the great image, was the first and noblest of all the kingdoms."—*Clarke, on Dan. 7 : 4.*

"The Chaldean empire, as advanced to its summit of prosperity under Nebuchadnezzar, and as declining under Belshazzar, was intended by this beast."—*Scott, on Dan. 7 : 4.*

"The first of these beasts (like the golden head in Nebuchadnezzar's dream) evidently intends the Babylonian monarchy, and is described as a lion with eagle's wings."—*Cottage Bible.*

THE BEAR.

The unrelenting ferocity of the bears of the East was well known to the ancients. The rapacity of the Medes and Persians could be presented by no other symbol so well as by the bear. The breast and arms of silver of the image, could show the relative richness of that power as compared with Babylon, but it remained for another symbol to point out the true character of the people, which was done by a bear with three ribs in his mouth.

"This represented the kingdom of the Medes and Persians. Its emblem was 'a bear,' less noble and courageous, but more voracious and savage, than a lion."—*Scott, on Dan. 7 : 5.*

"The empire of the Medes and Persians, forming one kingdom, compared to a bear from their cruelty and thirst for blood."—*Bagster, on Dan. 7 : 1-8.*

"The second animal here named was a bear, and represents, as did the silver part of Nebuchadnezzar's image, the combined kingdom of the Medes and Persians."—*Cottage Bible, notes on Dan. 7 : 1-8.*

"It is evidently [applied] to that which succeeded the Babylonian, — the Medo-Persian."—*Barnes.*

THE LEOPARD.

A beast with a stealthy, cat-like tread appears to represent the sly cunning of the Grecians in their attacks on their enemies. This feature of their work could be shown in no other way so well. The four wings of a bird signifies the rapidity of their conquests. The four heads stood for the four divisions of the empire which took place after the death of Alexander, and were effected by his four leading generals, who each ruled over one portion of the divided realm.

"This was the Macedonian or Greek empire. . . . Alexander and his subjects are fitly compared to a leopard."—*Clarke, on Dan. 7 : 6.*

"The third beast was a leopard, with four heads, and wings of a fowl, or a bird rather; and this is understood to represent the Macedonian empire. . . . The four heads of this beast may well represent the partition of the empire after Alexander's death, under his four captains, Cassander, Lysimachus, Ptolemy, and Seleucus."—*Cottage Bible, notes on Dan. 7 : 1-8.*

"What was the kingdom here intended? Not the Persian; but that kingdom, the Græco-Macedonian, which, with the swiftness of a leopard, extended its power over those four mighty districts—Grecia, Asia Minor, Egypt, and Persia."—*Critical Commentary, on Dan. 7 : 6.*

"This bear having disappeared, the prophet saw an extraordinary leopard rise up in its stead. This was the emblem of the Grecian, or Macedonian empire, which for the time was the most renowned in the world."—*Scott, on Dan. 7 : 6.*

"The comparative nobleness of the animal, a beast of prey, the celerity of its movements, the spring or bound with which it leaps upon its prey,—all agree well with the kingdom of which Alexander was the founder."—*Barnes's Notes on Daniel, p. 296.*

THE NONDESCRIBT BEAST.

"The fourth kingdom, symbolized by the fourth beast, is accurately represented by the Roman power. . . . The truth is, that in prophecy the entire Roman dominion seems to be contemplated as one,—one mighty and formidable power, trampling down the liberties of the world, oppressing and persecuting the people of God, the true Church, and maintaining an absolute and arbitrary dominion over the souls of men,—as a mighty domination standing in the

way of the progress of truth, and keeping back the reign of the saints on the earth. In these respects the papal dominion is, and has been, but a prolongation, in another form, of the influence of heathen Rome; and the entire domination may be represented as one, and might be symbolized by the fourth beast in the vision of Daniel. When that power shall cease, we may, according to the prophecy, look for the time when the 'kingdom shall be given to the saints.'—*Barnes's Notes*, p. 122.

"This 'fourth beast' evidently accords with the legs and feet of iron, which were seen by Nebuchadnezzar in his visionary image, and which were at length divided into ten toes. . . . This was doubtless an emblem of the Roman state."—*Scott*, on *Dan.* 7 : 7.

THE TEN HORNS.

"The ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise." *Dan.* 7 : 24.

"Now it is said that this last kingdom, which we have shown, I think irresistibly, to be the Roman empire, was to be split into ten divisions; or, if the wild beast from the abyss, seen by John in Patmos, be taken, it was to have ten horns; or, if Daniel's subsequent visions be had recourse to, it was to be tenfold. We have the fact clearly predicted, that it was to be split or divided into ten kingdoms. Here is a broad prediction, of which palpable facts can alone be regarded as the fulfillment. Is it, then, matter of historic fact, as it is a matter of prophetic declaration, that this Roman empire has been divided into ten kingdoms at its fall, or decline? That this has been so, every historian will tell you. Gibbon speaks of the ten kingdoms; Muller, the German historian, alludes to the ten kingdoms of the Roman empire; and I might quote from historians innumerable, all speaking of this tenfold division, not as a prophetic announcement, but as a historical and actual fact. I ask you to notice this startling fact. You will find that in each century these ten kingdoms have always turned out of each revolution; and every attempt to make them fewer, or to make them one, has signally and historically failed."—*Cummings's Lectures on Dan.* 2 : 40-43.

"In process of time, it [Rome] was divided into ten kingdoms. These are indeed reckoned up in several ways by different writers, according to the date assigned to the enumeration; but in general it is clear that the principal kingdoms in Europe at this day sprang from them, and comprise them."

"It is, however, certain that the Roman empire was divided into ten kingdoms; and though they might be sometimes more and sometimes fewer, yet they were still known by the name of the ten kingdoms of the Western empire."—*Scott*, on *Dan.* 7 : 7.

"They have been there for twelve hundred and sixty years. If several have had their names changed according to the caprice of him who conquered, this change of name did not destroy existence. If others have had their territorial limits changed, the nation was

still there. If others have fallen while successors were forming in their room, the ten horns were still there."—*Nelson on Infidelity*, p. 376.

"The Roman empire, as such, had ceased, and the power was distributed into a large number of comparatively petty sovereignties, well represented at this period by the ten horns on the head of the beast. Even the Romanists themselves admit that the Roman empire was, by means of the incursions of the Northern nations, dismembered into ten kingdoms."—*Barnes's Notes on Daniel*, p. 322.

"At certain long subsequent epochs of note, notwithstanding many intervening revolutions and changes in Western Europe, the number ten will be found to have been observed on from time to time, as that of the Western Roman or papal kingdoms."—*Horc Apoc.*, vol. 3., p. 130.

THE FOUR HEADS.

"A league was now formed against Antigonus and Demetrius, by Ptolemy and Seleucus, in which they were joined by Cassander, the son of Antipater, and Lysimachus; the former, governor of Macedonia, and the latter of Thrace. The battle of Ipsus, in Phrygia, decided the contest. Antigonus was killed, Demetrius fled with the shattered remains of his army, and the conquerors made a partition of their dominions. Ptolemy, in addition to Egypt and Lybia, had Arabia, Coelosyria, and Palestine; Cassander had Macedonia and Greece. The share of Lysimachus was Thrace, Bithynia, and some other provinces beyond the Hellespont. Seleucus had all the rest of Asia, to the river Indus."—*Tyler's Universal History*, book 2, chap. 4, last par.

THE LITTLE HORN.

"I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots." *Dan.* 7 : 8.

"While the prophet was considering these ten horns, he saw 'another little horn' springing up among them. This evidently points out the power of the church and bishop of Rome."—*Scott*, on *Dan.* 7 : 8.

"The most remarkable was the little horn, which rose after the others, and is by Protestant commentators (and we think with good reason) explained of the ecclesiastical dominion of the pope or bishop of Rome."—*Cottage Bible*, notes on *Dan.* 7 : 1-8

"On the removal of the imperial seat from Rome to Constantinople, the restraint on the ambition of the man of sin was removed, and the Roman bishop shot up into a great temporal prince."—*Cummings's Apocalyptic Sketches*, p. 462.

"It is a remarkable fact that the popes to this day wear a triple crown,—a fact that exists in regard to no other monarchs. . . .

The papacy [is] well represented by the 'little horn.' . . . In fact, this one power absorbed into itself three of these sovereignties."—*Barnes's Notes on Daniel*, p. 327.

"We must, then, look for the development of the 'little horn' this side of A. D. 483. About that time, in fact, there was a pretentious power, seeking acknowledgement of its claims. As early as the beginning of the sixth century the bishops of Rome had become powerful enough to exert considerable of that influence at the imperial court which ere long exalted them to a station where they could command the kings of the earth. There was only one hinderance to their supremacy,—the opposition of the Arian powers to the doctrines of the Catholics, especially to that of the Trinity. These opposing powers were rooted up, the Heruli in 493, the Vandals in 534, and the Ostrogoths in 538."—*Student's Gibbon*, pp. 309-319.

38 "In 533, Justinian entered upon his Vandal and Gothic wars. Wishing to secure the influence of the pope and the Catholic party, he issued that memorable decree which was to constitute the pope the head of all the churches, and from the carrying out of which, in 538 [when the last of the three Arian horns was plucked up], the period of papal supremacy is to be dated. And whoever will read the history of the African campaign, 533-534, and the Italian campaign, 534-538, will notice that the Catholics everywhere hailed as deliverers the army of Belisarius, the general of Justinian."—*Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation*, p. 136.

"The celebrated letter of Justinian to the pope in the year 533, not only recognizing all previous privileges, but enlarging them, and entitling the pope and his church to many immunities and rights, which afterward gave origin to the pretensions displayed in the canon law."—*Gavazzi's Lectures*, p. 66.

It is clearly evident, therefore, that just as soon as the last opposition to the papacy was removed, it became firmly seated by the famous decree of Justinian,—that the bishop of Rome should be recognized as the head of the universal Church and the corrector of heretics. The year 538 A. D. may be set down, then, as the time when the papacy became an established power.

THE CHARACTER OF THE PAPACY.

"He shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings." Dan. 7:24.

"Over these magistrates, however, the popes extended an absolute control and jurisdiction, and became soon the temporal sovereigns of Italy. As the spiritual head of the Church, and the representatives and successors of St. Peter, the jurisdiction claimed

Blasphemy 0.47

by these ambitious men was not confined to the kingdom of Italy. They held forth as the consequence of being the vicars of Christ upon earth, that they were vested with a supreme jurisdiction in matters ecclesiastical, in all the Christian kingdoms of the earth. . . . That it belonged to the pope alone to call the general councils, and that the canons or regulations of these councils were of much higher authority than any civil laws."—*Tytler's Universal History*, vol. 2, pp. 92, 93.

"Frederick First, surnamed Barbarossa, a prince of great talents and high spirit, was summoned to go to Rome to receive the imperial crown from Adrian IV. . . . The ceremonial required that when the pope came out to meet him, the emperor should prostrate himself on the ground, kiss his feet, hold the stirrup of his horse while he mounted, and lead him by the bridle for nine paces. Frederick refused at first these humiliating marks of submission. The cardinals looked upon it as the signal of a civil war, and betook themselves to flight; but Frederick was reasoned into compliance with a ceremony which he was determined to hold for nothing more than a piece of form."—*Tytler's Universal History*, vol. 2, pp. 129, 130.

The ten were purely political kingdoms. This one was to be different from all those. It was a religious power, and exercising civil authority in the name of Christianity. 47

"This evidently points out the papal supremacy, in every respect diverse from the former, which, from small beginnings, thrust itself up among the ten kingdoms, till at length it successively eradicated three of them."—*Bagster, in Cottage Bible*.

"The pope calls himself 'the vicar of Christ.' Leo X blasphemously styled himself 'The lion of the tribe of Judah.' Leo XII allowed himself to be called 'The Lord our God.' Pope Martin V called himself the 'most holy and most happy, who is the arbiter of heaven and the lord of the earth, the successor of St. Peter, the anointed of the Lord, the master of the universe, the father of kings, the light of the world.'"

Augustinus Triumphus, a popish author, said:—

"The very doubt whether the council be greater than the pope is absurd, because it involves the contradiction that the supreme pontiff is not supreme. *He cannot err, he cannot be deceived.* It must be conceived concerning him that *he knows all things.*"

This blasphemy was solemnly indorsed by the cardinals and bishops of the Catholic Church, in the Ecumenical Council of 1870, which declared the pope to be infallible.

The following is a portion of the infallibility dogma as translated by Hon. W. E. Gladstone, in the "Vatican Council," p. 201: —

"All the faithful of Christ must believe that the holy apostolical see and the Roman pontiff possesses the primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, and is true vicar of Christ, and head of the whole Church, and father and teacher of all Christians; and that full power was given to him in blessed Peter to rule, feed, and govern the universal Church by Jesus Christ our Lord."

"They have assumed infallibility, which belongs only to God. They profess to forgive sins, which belongs only to God. They profess to open and shut heaven, which belongs only to God. They profess to be higher than all the kings of the earth, which belongs only to God. . . . And they go against God, when they give indulgences for sin. This is the worst of all blasphemies."—*A. Clarke, on Dan. 7 : 25.*

In its catechism it has expunged the greater part of the second commandment, in order to establish the adoration of images, dividing the tenth to complete the number ten. It has also abolished the fourth commandment (as far as its power extends) by substituting the first day of the week for the seventh. (See Catholic Catechisms; also "Plain Talk about the Protestantism of To-day," p. 213; "The Catholic Christian Instructed," chap. 23; "A Sure Way to Find out the True Religion," pp. 95, 96.)

CATHOLICISM SIMILAR TO PAGANISM.

Catholicism originated through the blending of pagan rites with those of Christianity. The great falling away spoken of by Paul in 2 Thess. 2 : 3, commenced shortly after the death of that apostle. Dr. Killen, in the preface to his "Ancient Church," says: —

"In the interval between the days of the apostles and the conversion of Constantine, the Christian commonwealth changed its aspect. The bishop of Rome—a personage unknown to the writers of the New Testament—meanwhile rose into prominence, and at length took precedence of all other churchmen. Rites and ceremonies, of which neither Paul nor Peter ever heard, crept silently into use, and then claimed the rank of divine institutions. Officers, for whom the primitive disciples could have found no place, and titles which

to them would have been altogether unintelligible, began to challenge attention, and to be named apostolic."

When Constantine came upon the stage of action, he accepted Christianity as he found it, without renouncing his pagan theories, and from this confusion of Christian doctrines with pagan superstitions, the papacy was in due time developed. Church historians relate how that in the fourth century, the conformity of the Church to pagan practices so increased that the simplicity of Christian worship had been almost wholly lost sight of. From the institutions of public worship of that time one would pronounce the prevailing religion, Christianized paganism. Upon this point Rev. James Wharey (Presbyterian), in his "Church History," pp. 22, 23, says: —

"Long established opinions are seldom entirely eradicated, and old habits, with which we have been brought up, are not likely to be totally renounced. Sometimes the teachers of religion were too indulgent to those prejudices; and in order that the gospel might be less offensive, tolerated in their new converts, opinions and practices little consistent with it. . . . From these sources, therefore, we shall find springing up many of the errors and heresies that deformed the beauty and marred the peace of the Church, during the first three or four centuries. Some of them were Jewish, but most of them of heathen origin; and all proceeded from the same source, a fondness for old opinions and practices, and a disposition to yield as far as possible to these Jewish and heathen prejudices, and thus in a good degree, to remove the offense of the cross. Indeed we shall find, that when Christianity became the established religion of the Roman empire, and took the place of paganism, it assumed, in a great degree, the forms and rites of paganism, and participated in no small measure of its spirit also. Christianity as it existed in the dark ages, might be termed, without much impropriety of language, *baptized paganism*."

Even now there stands at the right of the transept in St. Peter's at Rome, an old pagan bronze statue of Jupiter, the head and upper part of which were so changed as to make a passable statue of the apostle Peter. The toe of this brazen image has been partly worn away by the pressure of the lips of the faithful in the act of kissing it.

Madame De Stael, a devout Catholic, apologizes

for this copying after pagan Rome, in the following words :—

“We shame not in pagan trophies which art has hallowed. The wonders of genius always awaken holy feelings in the soul, and we pay homage to Christianity in tribute to all the best works that other faiths have inspired.”

In calling attention to this feature of Catholicism, Dr. Dowling says :—

“The gods of the Pantheon turned into popish saints. The noblest heathen temple now remaining in the world is the Pantheon, or Rotunda, which, as the inscription over the portico informs us, having been impiously dedicated of old by Agrippa to Jove and all the gods, was piously re-consecrated by Pope Boniface IV about A. D. 610 to the Blessed Virgin and all the saints.”—*History of Romanism, book 2, chap. 6, p. 124.*

As to how the coalition of paganism and Christianity was effected, the celebrated Gavazzi remarks :—

“When Christianity was imposed by Constantine on his pagan subjects, paganism introduced itself into the church of Christ. Before, the choice of religion was free; but after he had made some laws, especially one denying service in his army save to Christians, the profession of Christianity became almost an obligation. Commands and magistracies were obtainable only through the portals of this new faith; it was embraced by multitudes, but with what fervor or what motive?—A mercenary motive and a worse than languid fervor. . . . A pagan flood flowing into the Church carried with it its customs, practices, and idols. . . . The greater part of Constantine's pagan subjects, while in appearance Christians, remained in substance pagans, especially worshipping in secret their idols. But the Church did not prevent the sin. . . . The Church was then too weak to resist the abuses brought in by the inundation of paganism; further, it was no longer the upright and severe Church of Christ; becoming vain of having many millions of adherents, it did not closely examine their faith.”—*Gavazzi's Lectures, p. 290.*

Upon the condition of the Church in the fourth century, Wharey says :—

“Christianity had now become popular, and a large proportion, perhaps a large majority, of those who embraced it, only assumed the name, received the rite of baptism, and conformed to some of the external ceremonies of the Church, while at heart and in moral character they were as much heathen as they were before. Error

and corruption now came in upon the Church like a flood.”—*Wharey's Church History, p. 54.*

This is the way the case is stated by the great historian, Archibald Bower :—

“Truly, this whole business of the pope is nothing but the resurrection and reconstruction of the old pagan Pontifex Maximus, with some large additions and modifications of worldly and sensuous splendor. It is the custom and the mythic gorgeousness of genuine old heathenism, absurdly baptized and lifted, like a pageant of glorious worldliness, high in the air.”—*History of the Popes, vol. 3, pp. 434, 435.*

“I have sufficiently made good what I undertook to prove: an exact conformity, or uniformity rather, of worship between popery and paganism; for since, as I have shown above, we see the present people of Rome worshipping in the same temples, at the same altars, sometimes the same images, and always with the same ceremonies, as the old Romans, they must have more charity as well as skill in distinguishing than I pretend to have, who can absolve them from the same superstition and idolatry, of which we condemn their pagan ancestors.”—*Dr. Middleton's Letters from Rome, p. 280.*

Gibbon, writing of the state of the Catholic Church in the fourth century, bears this testimony :—

“As the objects of religion were gradually reduced to the standard of the imagination, the rites and ceremonies were introduced that seemed most powerfully to affect the senses of the vulgar. . . . The ministers of the Catholic Church imitated the profane model, which they were impatient to destroy. The most respectable bishops had persuaded themselves that the ignorant rustics would more cheerfully renounce the superstitions of paganism, if they found some compensation in the bosom of Christianity.”—*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, chap. 28, par. 16.*

The same author says that—

“The worship of images had stolen into the Church by insensible degrees, and each petty step was pleasing to the superstitious mind, as productive of comfort and innocent of sin. But in the beginning of the eighth century, in the full magnitude of the abuse, the more timorous Greeks were awakened by an apprehension that, under the mask of Christianity, they had restored the religion of their fathers. They heard with grief and impatience the name of idolaters—the incessant charge of the Jews and Mohammedans, who derived from the law and the Koran an immortal hatred to graven images and all relative worship.”—*Ibid, chap. 49, par. 4.*

Concerning the practice of image-worship by the Catholics, Dr. Priestly testifies :—

"Jerome, who answered Vigilantius, did not deny the practice, or that it was borrowed from the pagans; but he defended it. 'That,' says he, 'was done to idols, and was then to be detested; but this is done to martyrs, and is therefore to be received.'"—*Corruptions of Christianity, vol. 1, p. 324.*

It is thus plainly established that the innovations of the early Church, in opposition to which Protestantism arose, came in through human policy alone. They were introduced to conciliate the prejudices of the pagans against Christianity. In fact, this is so stated by Catholic authors themselves. Thus, Polydore Virgil, a celebrated historian of that communion, says:—

"The Church has taken many customs from the religion of the Romans and other pagans, but has rendered them better, and employed them to a better purpose."—*Pol. Virg., lib. 5, chap. 1.*

Baronius, the great champion of popery, in chapter thirty-six of the Annals, admits the following:—

"It is permitted the Church to use, for purposes of piety, the ceremonies which the pagans used for purposes of impiety in a superstitious religion, after having first expiated them by consecration, to the end that the devil might receive a greater affront from employing in honor of Jesus Christ that which his enemy had destined for his own service. In many things there is a conformity between popery and paganism. That many things have been laudably(?) translated from Gentile superstition into the Christian religion, hath been demonstrated by many examples and the authority of Fathers. And what wonder if the most holy bishops have granted that the ancient customs of Gentiles should be introduced into the worship of the true God, from which it seemed impossible to take off many, though converted to Christianity."

HATRED OF THE BIBLE.

"About one hundred and seventy years before Christ, Antiochus caused all the copies of the Jewish Scriptures to be burnt. Three hundred and three years afterward, Diocletian, by an edict, ordered all Scriptures to be committed to the flames; and Eusebius, the historian, tells us he saw large heaps of them burning in the market place. Nor has this spirit ever failed to show itself. The Bible has, all along its course, had to struggle against opposition, visible and latent, artful and violent. It has had to contend with the prevalence of error, the tyranny of passion, and the cruelty of persecution. Numerous foes have risen up against it—pagans, who have aimed to destroy it, and papists who have striven to monopolize it."—*The Book Opened, pp. 14, 15.*

"We have been truly shocked at this most crafty device, Bible societies, by which the very foundations of religion are undermined. We have deliberated upon the measures proper to be adopted by our pontifical authority, in order to remedy and abolish this pestilence, as far as possible,—this defilement of the faith so imminently dangerous to souls. It becomes episcopal duty, that you first of all expose the wickedness of this nefarious scheme. It is evident from experience that the holy Scriptures when circulated in the vulgar tongue, have through the temerity of many produced more harm than benefit. Warn the people entrusted to your care, that they fall not into the snare prepared for their everlasting ruin."—*Pope Pius VII, in Letter to Primate of Poland, June 26, 1816.*

"As another instance of intolerance of popery, and its determined hatred to the Bible in the vulgar tongue, may be mentioned an occurrence more recent, by which the feelings of Protestant Americans were outraged; namely, the public burning of Bibles, which took place no longer ago than Oct. 27, 1842, at Champlain, a village in the State of New York. Tesmon, who was a prominent man in all the movements, brought out from the house of the resident priest, which is near the church, as many Bibles as he could carry in his arms at three times, and placed them in a pile in the yard, and then set fire to them, and burned them to ashes.

"The president of the Bible society, in company with Mr. Hubbell, waited upon the priests, and requested that, inasmuch as the Bibles had been given by benevolent societies, they should be returned to the donors, and not destroyed; to which the Jesuit priest, perhaps with less cunning than usually belongs to his order, coolly replied, that they had burned all they had received, and intended to burn all they could get."—*Dowling's History of Romanism, book 9, chap. 2, par. 15.*

"Moreover, we confirm and renew the decrees recited above, delivered in former times by apostolic authority, against the publication, distribution, reading, and possession of books of the Holy Scriptures translated into the vulgar tongue."—*Bull of Pope Pius IX, May 8, 1884.*

"The Protestant Bible is only a false skin, in which infidelity and revolution wrap themselves."—*Plain Talk about Protestantism of To-day, part 2, prop. 15, p. 125.*

CATHOLIC HATRED OF PROTESTANTS AND PROTESTANT INSTITUTIONS.

"The Protestant, whether he believes it or not, is an infidel in germ, and the infidel is a Protestant in full bloom. Infidelity exists in Protestantism as the oak exists in the acorn, as the consequence is in the premise."—*Plain Talk, part 3, prop. 18, p. 243.*

"The Protestant is bound to be liberal to Catholics, but Catholics cannot be liberal toward any party that rejects the Church, and

must hold them to be enemies of God; not on his own private judgment, but on the infallible authority of the Church of Christ."—*New York Tablet, September 7, 1872.*

In a leading article in the *Catholic World*, September, 1871, entitled, "The Reformation not Conservative," the writer entirely repudiates, and that with indignation, "the Protestant principle" underlying the United States Constitution, because he considers it *Jacobinism*. Referring to this government, he says:—

"We do not accept it, or hold it to be any government at all, or as capable of performing any of the proper functions of government; and if it continues to be interpreted by the revolutionary principle of Protestantism, it is sure to fail—to lose itself either in the supremacy of the mob or in military despotism; and doom us, like unhappy France, to alternate between, with the mob uppermost to-day, and the despot to-morrow. Protestantism, like the heathen barbarisms which Catholicity subduces, lacks the element of order, because it rejects authority (the authority of the pope), and is necessarily incompetent to maintain real liberty or civilized society."

The following is from *The Rambler*, a Catholic paper of London:—

"Religious liberty, in the sense of a liberty possessed by every man to choose his religion, is one of the most wicked delusions ever foisted upon this age by the father of all deceit. The very name of liberty—except in a sense of permission to do certain definite acts—ought to be banished from the domain of religion. It is neither more nor less than falsehood. No man has a right to choose his religion. None but an atheist can uphold the principles of religious liberty. Shall I foster that damnable doctrine? that Socinianism, and Calvinism, and Anglicanism, and Judaism? Are not every one of them mortal sins, like murder and adultery? Shall I hold out hopes to my erring Protestant brother, that I will not meddle with his creed if he will not meddle with mine? Shall I tempt him to forget that he has no more right to his religious views than he has to my purse, to my house, or to my life blood? No; Catholicism is the most intolerant of creeds. It is intolerance itself." Quoted by Rev. Josiah Strong, in *Our Country*, p. 48.

THE PROPHETIC PERIODS.

"I have appointed thee each day for a year." Eze. 4:6.

As beasts are used to symbolize kingdoms in the Bible, so days are there made symbols of years. This is evident from the fact that when the angel predicted to

Daniel the time of Messiah's advent, he said, "From the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and three-score and two weeks." Dan. 9:25. The commission to restore and build Jerusalem was given to Ezra by Artaxerxes, and went into force in the fall of 457 B. C. (See Ezra 7.) But Christ was not manifested to the world as Messiah (the Anointed) until the year A. D. 27, which was at his baptism, when he was anointed such by the Holy Spirit. (See Acts 10:38; Mark 1:10, 11.) This would give 483 years between the commission intrusted to Ezra, and the appearance of Messiah. Looking for the number of days in "seven weeks, and three-score and two weeks," sixty-nine in all, we find just 483 days. In this case at least, days are symbolic of years, and we must believe that God has a uniform method of reckoning prophetic periods.

In writing of the dates of Daniel's prophecy, Dr. Adam Clarke says:—

"That concerning the advent and death of our Lord is the clearest prophecy ever delivered; though he lived nearly six hundred years before our Lord, he foretold the very year in which he should be manifested and the year in which he should be cut off."—*Clavis Biblica*, p. 29.

"So Eze. 4:6, 'I have appointed thee each day for a year,' where the prophet was symbolically to bear the iniquity of Israel as many days as they had sinned years. In this usage we find authority for interpreting days in prophecy as denoting 'years.'"—*George Bush, Prof. of Hebrew and Oriental Literature in New York City University; notes on Num. 14:34.*

"It is a singular fact that the great mass of interpreters in the English and American world have, for many years, been wont to understand the days designated in Daniel and the Apocalypse as the representatives, or symbols, of years. I have found it difficult to trace the origin of this general, I might say almost universal, custom."—*Stuart's Hints*, p. 77.

THE RISE OF THE PAPACY.

"He shall subdue three kings." Dan. 7:24.

The Heruli, Vandals, and Ostrogoths were successively subdued and removed from their places to make

room for the complete sway of the papacy. A decree of Justinian in A. D. 533, constituted the bishop of Rome head over all the churches, and corrector of heretics. This was accomplished in A. D. 538, when the Ostrogoths were driven from Rome and Italy.

"The whole nation of the Ostrogoths had been assembled for the attack, and was almost entirely consumed in the siege of Rome. . . . One year and nine days after the commencement of the siege, an army, so lately strong and triumphant, burnt their tents and tumultuously repassed the Milvian bridge."—Gibbon's Rome, vol. 4, chap. 41, pp. 172, 173.

The author of "Exposition of Prophecy" says:—

"Prophetic popery commenced in the time of the Emperor Justinian, between A. D. 530 and 539. The exact year even may, I think, be ascertained with the utmost precision. Suffice it to say, however, that it was Justinian, and no other, who gave the bishop of Rome the dragon's 'power, and his seat, and great authority.'"

"Pope Vigilius, A. D. 538, bought the papacy from Belisarius, agent of the Emperor Justinian; though to be sure he broke his promise, and paid nothing. Is this mode of gaining the tiara canonical?"—Speech of a Bishop in Œcumenical Council of 1870, published in Vatican Council, p. 189.

In his New York lectures of 1853, Gavazzi said:—

"The celebrated letter of Justinian to the pope in the year 533 not only recognized all previous privileges, but enlarged them, and entitled the pope and his church to many immunities and rights, which afterward gave origin to the pretensions displayed in the canon law."

THE CONTINUANCE OF THE PAPACY.

"And they [the saints and God's laws] shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time." Dan. 7:25.

The same expression is found in Rev. 12:14, and is explained in verse 12, showing that a time, times, and half a time, or the dividing of time, is the same as 1260 prophetic days. The same time is brought forward in Rev. 13:5 under the symbol of forty-two months. These would give three and one half years, just the same as the three and a half times previously mentioned. It is a fact that by the Hebrews a year was computed to be twelve months of thirty days each, and

would consist of 360 days. Three years and a half, or forty-two months, would therefore be 1260 days. That this was their method of computing time can be readily demonstrated by comparing the following Scriptures: Gen. 7:11; 8:4; 7:24; 1 Kings 4:7; 1 Chron. 27:1-15.

"Until a time (i. e., a year), times (two years), and the dividing of time (i. e. half a year), making, in the whole, three prophetic years and a half; or reckoning thirty days to a month, 1260 days, equal to the same number of years in prophetic language."—Bagster.

"There are three different expressions of the period during which the Church is to be subjected to suffering,—1260 days; forty-two months; a time, times, and half a time,—all of which signify the same duration, or 1260 prophetic years."—Croly on the Apocalypse, p. 163.

"It [the papacy] is to continue a definite period from its establishment. Verse 25. This duration is mentioned as 'a time and times and the dividing of time,'—three years and a half, 1260 days, 1260 years."—Barnes, on Dan. 7.

"Thus matters would be left in his hands 'till a time and times and the dividing of time;' that is, for three years and a half, or forty-two months, which, reckoning thirty days to a month (and this was the general computation), make just one thousand two hundred and sixty days, and those prophetic days signify one thousand two hundred and sixty years, a number which we shall repeatedly meet with in the Revelation of St. John."—Scott, on Dan. 7:23-27.

"The meaning in the passage before us, I take to be that the papal power, considered as a civil or secular institution, will have, from the time when that properly commenced, a duration of 1260 years."—Barnes, on Rev. 13:5.

BLASPHEMOUS CHARACTER OF THE PAPACY.

"A mouth that spake very great things." Dan. 7:20.

"And he shall speak great words against the Most High." Dan. 7:25.

"And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies." Rev. 13:5.

"Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." 2 Thess. 2:4.

Pope Martin V wrote in the dispatches with which he furnished his ambassador to Constantinople:—

"The most holy and most happy, who is the arbiter of heaven and the Lord of the earth, the successor of St. Peter, the anointed

Time
Time
Time

✓ of the Lord, the Master of the universe, the Father of kings, the light of the world."—*Giustianni's Rome as It Is*, p. 181.

A canon of Pope Gregory VII says:—

"All princes should kiss the feet of the pope. . . . To him it belongs to dethrone emperors. His sentence none may oppose, but he alone may annul the judgment of all mankind. The pope cannot be judged by any man. The Roman Church *never erred, and never can err.*"—*Baronius's Annals*, 1076; *Hildebrand, Epist.* 55.

The famous popish author, Augustus Triumphus, in his Pref. Sum. to John 22, used the following words:—

✓ "The pope's power is infinite."

✓ "The very doubt whether a council be greater than the pope is absurd, because it involves this contradiction, that the supreme pontiff is not supreme. He cannot err, he cannot be deceived. It must be conceived concerning him that he knows all things."—*Jacob. de Concil.*, lib. 10.

✓ "The pope is all in all, and above all, so that God himself and the pope, the vicar of God, are but one consistory."—*Hosiensis Cap.*, etc.

The conclusion of Dr. Giustianni's ordination letter runs thus:—

"Given in Rome from our palace, the 10th of February, 1817, the XIV Jurisdiction of the most holy Pontiff and Father in Christ, and Lord our God the pope, Leo XII, etc."—*Rome as It Is*, p. 180.

ITS PERSECUTING POWER.

"And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws." Dan. 7:25.

"And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." Rev. 17:6.

Real "It is permitted neither to think nor to teach otherwise than the court of Rome directs."—*Pope Marcellus's Decrees, Corpus Juris Canonici*, part 2, chap. 18.

"The secular powers shall swear to exterminate all heretics condemned by the Church; and if they do not, they shall be anathema."—*Decretals of Gregory IX*, book 5, title 7.

"Inquisitors may compel the heirs of those who favored heretics to fulfill the penance enjoined by delivering up their goods. After the death of a man, he may be declared a heretic, that his property may be confiscated."—*Decretals of Boniface VIII, Liber Sextus*, book 5, title 2.

Persecution

In the "Directory for the Inquisitors," part 2, chap. 2, we find the following:—

"A heretic merits the pains of fire. By the gospel, the canons, civil law, and custom, heretics must be burned."—*Page 148.*

* "All persons may attack any rebels to the Church, and despoil them of their wealth, and slay them, and burn their houses and cities."—*Ibid.*, pp. 176, 177.

"Heretics must be sought after, and be corrected or exterminated."—*Ibid.*, p. 212.

Pope Leo X, in A. D. 1516, issued the following papal bull:—

"No person shall preach without the permission of his superior. All preachers shall explain the gospel according to the Fathers. They shall not explain futurity, or the times of Antichrist! If any person shall act contrary to this rescript, he shall be divested of his office as preacher, and be excommunicated."—*Directorium Inquisitorium*, published at Rome, October, 1584.

"Heretics are denounced as infamous. The protection of the law and the claims of equity are denied them. They are adjudged to be worthy only of lingering in the most excruciating tortures; and when nature can no more bear the suffering, or barbarity can no longer be gratified, then the fire terminates the anguish of the victim."—*Text-Book*, p. 373.

Real Charles IX, of France, a Roman Catholic prince, laid a snare for the destruction of the Protestants, by offering his sister in marriage to a Huguenot (Protestant) prince of Navarre. All the chief men of the Huguenots were assembled in Paris at the nuptials; when on the eve of St. Bartholomew's day, Aug. 24, 1572, at the ringing of the great bell, the massacre commenced. An unparalleled scene of horror ensued. The Roman Catholics rushed upon the defenseless Protestants. Above five hundred men of distinction, and about ten thousand others that night slept in Paris the sleep of death. A general destruction was immediately ordered throughout France, and a horrid carnage was soon witnessed at Rouen, Lyons, Orleans, and other cities. Sixty thousand perished; and when the news of this event reached Rome, Pope Gregory XIII instituted the most solemn rejoicing, giving thanks to Almighty God for this glorious victory over the heretics! According to the calculation of some, about 200,000 suffered death in seven years under Pope Julius II; no less than 100,000 were massacred by the French in the space of three months; the Waldenses who perished amounted to 1,000,000; within thirty years, the Jesuits destroyed 600,000; under the Duke of Alva, 36,000 were executed by the common hangman; 150,000 perished in the Inquisition; and 150,000 by the Irish massacre; besides the vast multitude of whom the world could never be particularly informed, who were proscribed, banished, starved,

burne?, buried alive, smothered, suffocated, drowned, assassinated, chained to the galleys for life, or immured within the horrid walls of the Bastile, or other Church or State prisons.

X "No computation can reach the numbers who have been put to death, in different ways, on account of their maintaining the profession of the gospel, and opposing the corruptions of the Church of Rome. A million of poor Waldenses perished in France; nine hundred thousand orthodox Christians were slain in less than thirty years after the institution of the order of the Jesuits. The Duke of Alva boasted of having put to death in the Netherlands thirty-six thousand by the hand of the common executioner during the space of a few years. The Inquisition destroyed, by various tortures, one hundred and fifty thousand within thirty years. These are a few specimens, and but a few, of those which history has recorded. But the total amount will never be known till the earth shall disclose her blood, and no more cover her slain."—Scott's Church History. For further evidence, see Barnes's "Notes on Daniel," p. 328; Buck's "Theological Dictionary," art. Persecutions; Dowling's "History of Romanism;" "Fox's Book of Martyrs;" Charlotte Elizabeth's "Martyrology;" "The Wars of the Huguenots;" histories of the Reformation, etc.

"To parry the force of this damaging testimony from all history, papists deny that the Church has ever persecuted any one; it has been the secular power; the Church has only passed decision upon the question of heresy, and then turned the offenders over to the civil power, to be dealt with according to the pleasure of the secular court. The impious hypocrisy of this claim is transparent enough to make it an absolute insult to common sense. In those days of persecution, what was the secular power?—Simply a tool in the hand of the Church, and under its control, to do its bloody bidding. And when the Church delivered its prisoners to the executioners to be destroyed, with fiendish mockery it made use of the following formula: 'And we do leave thee to the secular arm, and to the power of the secular court; but at the same time do most earnestly beseech that court so to moderate its sentence as not to touch thy blood, nor to put thy life in any sort of danger.' And then, as intended, the unfortunate victims of popish hate were immediately executed."—Thoughts on Daniel and the Revelation, p. 141. See Geddes's "Tracts on Popery;" "View of the Court of Inquisition in Portugal," p. 446; Limborch, vol. 2, p. 289.

The question may arise, Has not the Roman Church softened in her feelings toward Protestants? The old saying that "Rome never changes" will find its verification in the following from the Shepherd of the Valley, published in 1876, at St. Louis, Mo., under the supervision of Archbishop Kendrick:—

"We confess that the Roman Catholic Church is intolerant; that is to say, that it uses all the means in its power for the extirpation of error and of sin; but this intolerance is the logical and necessary consequence of her infallibility. She alone has the right to be intolerant, because she alone has the truth. The Church tolerates heretics where she is obliged to do so, but she hates them mortally, and employs all her force to secure their annihilation. When the Catholics shall here be in possession of a considerable majority,—which will certainly be the case by and by, although the time may be long deferred,—then religious liberty will have come to an end in the Republic of the United States. Our enemies say this, and we believe with them. Our enemies know that we do not pretend to be better than our Church, and in what concerns this, her history is open to all. They know, then, how the Roman Church dealt with heretics in the Middle Ages, and how she deals with them to-day wherever she has the power. We no more think of denying these historic facts than we do of blaming the saints of God and the princes of the Church for what they have done or approved in these matters."

Look also at this from Mgr. Ségur, in his "Plain Talk about the Protestantism of To-day":—

"The Church is certainly intolerant in matters of doctrine. True; and we glory in it! Truth is of itself intolerant. In religion, as in mathematics, what is true is true, and what is false is false. No compromise between truth and error; truth cannot compromise. Such concessions, however small, would prove an immediate destruction of truth. Two and two make four: it is a truth. Hence, whoever asserts the contrary, utters a falsehood. Let it be an error of a thousandth or of a millionth part, it will ever be false to assert that two and two do not make four.

"The Church proclaims and maintains truths as certain as the mathematical ones. She teaches and defends her truths with as much intolerance as the science of mathematics defends hers. And what is more logical? The Catholic Church alone, in the midst of so many different sects, avers the possession of absolute truth, out of which there cannot be true Christianity. She alone has the right to be, she alone must be intolerant. She alone will and must say, as she has said in all ages in her councils, 'If any one saith or believeth contrary to what I teach, which is truth, let him be anathema.'"

THE FALL OF THE PAPACY.

If the year 538 A. D. is really the time from which to date the rise of the papacy, then the 1260 years of its supremacy must end in 1798, A. D. That the fall of the papacy did occur in the latter year there is abundance of testimony, as witness the following:—

“On the 9th of February [1798] the French corps commanded by Berthier encamped in front of the Porta di Populo. On the next day the castle of St. Angelo surrendered; the city gates were seized, and the pope and the cardinals, excepting three, were made prisoners. . . . Ten days after, the pope was sent away under an escort of French cavalry, and was finally carried into France, where he died in captivity.” — *Croly on the Apocalypse*, p. 289.

On page 100, of the same work, the author says :—

“On the 10th of February, 1798, the French army under Berthier entered Rome, took possession of the city, and made the pope and the cardinals prisoners. Within a week, Pius VI was deposed. . . . Pius VI died in captivity. . . . The papal independence was abolished by France, and the son of Napoleon was declared king of Rome.”

“On the 22d of Pluiose (Feb. 10, 1798), Berthier came in sight of the ancient capital of the world, which the republican armies had not yet visited. . . . The Castle of St. Angelo was delivered up to the French on the natural condition between civilized nations to respect religion, the public establishments, persons, and property. The pope was left in the Vatican, and Berthier, introduced at the Porta di Populo, was conducted to the capitol, like the Roman generals of old in their triumphs. . . . A notary drew up an act by which the populace, calling itself the Roman people, declared that it resumed its sovereignty, and constituted itself a republic. . . . The pope, treated with respect due to his age, was removed in the night from the Vatican, and conveyed into Tuscany, where he received asylum in a convent.” — *Thier's French Revolution*, vol. 4, p. 246.

“Pius VI Angelo Braschi, February 15; dethroned by Bonaparte; he was expelled from Rome and deposed in February, 1798, and died at Valence, Aug. 29, 1799.” — *Haydn's Dictionary of Dates*, p. 375.

In February, 1798, Berthier entered Rome at the head of the French army, and taking Pope Pius VI prisoner, established a republic in Rome. The pope died in exile the following year. For over two years there was no pope. (See Chambers's Cyclopeda, art. Pius.)

In A. D. 1797, Napoleon was ordered by the French Directory to destroy the papal government. The pope was helpless, but instead of obeying orders, Napoleon, on his own responsibility, made peace with him, and

returned to France. The words of the history are as follows :—

Nap Bonaparte now invaded the papal territories, and rapidly overran them. He had orders from the directory to destroy the papal government, but, on his own responsibility, he disregarded these instructions, and concluded with the helpless pontiff the peace of Tolentino on the 19th of February, 1797. Upon the return of Bonaparte from Italy, General Berthier was ordered by the directory to carry out its instructions respecting the papal government, which Bonaparte had declined to execute. The people of the papal states were thoroughly discontented. Berthier marched to Rome, and was received as a deliverer. He proclaimed the restoration of the Roman republic; made Pope Pius VI a prisoner, and stripped him of all his property, . . . and removed him to France, where he was detained in captivity.” — *Pictorial History of the World*, p. 756.

The pope was just as helpless in 1797 as he was in 1798, but 1797 was too early; the time did not fully expire till 1798; and “the Scripture cannot be broken.”

John 10: 35.

Respecting the effect of the pope's misfortunes upon his temper, Bower, in his “History of the Popes” has the following interesting account :—

“All those misfortunes abased the pope almost to idiotism. At length, the governor of Rome, the General Cervoni, gave him the last stroke, by the official announcement that the people had reconquered their rights, and he was no longer an officer of the government. . . .

“In vain did the pope, who perceived that his plans were discovered, protest against the violence which was offered to him, and which severed him from his people and duties. He was placed in a coach with his physician, his footman, and cook, and driven toward Tuscany. He was set down at the convent of Augustin at Sienna, where he remained three months. There he lived in quiet, and forgotten by the world, when an extraordinary event, an earthquake, shook the asylum where he resided, and destroyed part of the walls of the edifice. . . .

“But nothing could comfort the old pontiff in his exile. The last act of ingratitude by his cherished bastard¹ was a terrible blow to him. Moreover, the energies of his life having been very much exhausted by age, debauchery, and excesses of the table, palsy in his legs seized him, which subsequently affected his whole frame, and on Aug. 29, 1799, Europe was delivered from the last pope of the eighteenth century.” — *Vol. 3, pp. 407-409.*

¹His nephew, duke of Braschi, stole his money and jewels, and fled the country.

THE PRESENT CONDITION OF THE PAPACY.

The following extract is from the *Cleveland (Ohio) Leader* of February, 1883, and is a report of a visit made by Bishop Gilmour (Catholic), of Cleveland, to Pope Leo XIII:—

“He was glad to hear when I stated to him that much of the bitterness and hostility to the Catholic Church, that at times had been manifested, was passing away. Among the interesting scraps of conversation which the bishop conveyed to his interviewer, were many on the condition of the once powerful papal state, and the position occupied by Pope Leo XIII. He said: ‘The Holy Father is virtually a prisoner in the Vatican. All that remains to him of his glory is the grand and spacious Vatican, covering many acres, with its multitude of offices, magnificent treasures in books, paintings, and general art; its gardens and palatial surroundings, made doubly so by past events; the Cancellaria, or papal chancellor’s headquarters; and the palace of Gandolia, fifteen miles out of Rome. Only over these three palaces has he any control, and he never leaves the Vatican. His only recreation is to walk or ride in the spacious gardens of the Vatican. His revenue is reduced to the offerings sent to him from the different parts of the world, and known as Peter’s pence. I have an idea that the papal establishment is none of the richest, but on the contrary, is hampered by poverty.’

“The Italian government, pursuing the policy of King Victor Emmanuel, is confiscating every possession that was formerly attached to Rome. Even now the property belonging to the Propaganda, a Roman Society charged with the management of the Roman Catholic mission, is in the courts. On every hand can be seen the work of confiscation of the Italian government. It has seized on every convent in the land, and the buildings are now used for governmental bureaus and barracks. The large post-office in Rome itself was formerly a large convent.”

The *Springfield (Mass.) Republican* of Feb. 2, 1883, laid before its readers the matter after the following manner:—

“Every one knows that the Roman Church is nothing what it was. The pope once was the greatest potentate in Europe, dethroning princes, compelling tribute, causing wars; now he has only a palace and its gardens, and a country house (which he never occupies); and in those he is not above the law, but amenable to it, like other citizens.”

In a speech at a banquet given in honor of Prime Minister Crispi, of Italy, at Palermo, Oct. 14, 1889, the Prime Minister said:—

“It is necessary to combat all persons, high or low, who are seeking to undermine the political edifice of Italy. The temporal power of the pope, although it had existed for centuries, had been only a transition period. Rome existed before it, and would continue to exist without it. Complaints or threats either from home or abroad, would have no effect.”—*Detroit Tribune*, Oct. 16, 1889.

The *New York Sun*, of Jan. 8, 1890, speaks as follows:—

“In the palace of the Vatican sits another aged statesman meditating the methods of retrieving the temporal fortunes of the papacy. Aside from the duties of supervision and exposition in the domain of faith and morals, many and weighty are the political problems which Leo XIII must essay at least to solve during the year which has now opened. . . . Even if he could personally consent to bear the humiliation and hardship of a virtual captivity, ought he as the trustee of the papal system to permit the next conclave to be held in a place which might at any hour be occupied by King Humbert’s soldiers? Should he deem it, on the other hand, his duty to leave Rome, where is he to go? France is out of the question. In Germany the pope would be the guest of a Protestant sovereign. The Hapsburgs since the day of Joseph II have been but lukewarm defenders of the papacy. Even Spain, through Senor Sagasta, has hinted that the party in power would lose many of its supporters should it offer an asylum to the pope. In no European country could Leo XIII seek a refuge without provoking international jealousies and enmities, which will be dormant as long as he remains in Italy. Untenable, therefore, as his position seems from the view-point of his own dignity and of the independence of the next conclave, a departure from the Vatican would be beset with no less grave objection and misgivings. Of the old men burdened with the conduct of affairs of state in Europe, none will lie upon a bed of roses during the twelve-month now begun; but none will be so tortured with indecision and anxiety as Leo XIII.”

HAS THOUGHT TO CHANGE GOD’S LAW.

“And think to change times and laws.” Dan. 7:25.

“Shall *think himself able* to change.”—*Douay (Catholic) Bible*.

With the Roman Church, the “Decretalia” is esteemed the highest authority in ecclesiastical law. Upon his succession to the papal chair, each pope solemnly affirms that these papal decretals are binding on the Church. In them it is affirmed of the pope that—

“He can pronounce sentences and judgments in contradiction to the right of nations, to the law of God and man. . . . He can free himself from the commands of the apostle, he being their superior, and from the rules of the Old Testament,” etc.

"The pope has power to change times, to abrogate laws, and to dispense with all things, even the precepts of Christ."—*Decretal, de Translat. Episcop. Cap.*

"The pope has authority, and has often exercised it to dispense with the commands of Christ respecting war, marriage, divorce, revenge, swearing, usury, perjury, and uncleanness."—*Pope Nicholas, caus. 15, quest. 6.*

"The pope's will stands for reason. He can dispense above the law; and of wrong make right, by *correcting* and *changing laws*."—*Pope Nicholas, Dist. 96.*

"The pope can dispense against the laws of nature, and against the universal state of the Church."—*Pope Nicholas, caus. 15, quest. 6.*

"The pope is free from all laws, so that he cannot incur any sentence of irregularity, suspension, excommunication, or penalty for any crime."—*Dist. 40.*

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE 2300 DAYS.

"The sanctuary and host were trampled under foot 2300 days (verse 14), and in Daniel's prophecies days are put for years."—*Sir Isaac Newton.*

"Two thousand and three hundred days (see margin), that is, 2300 years."—*Bagster.*

"It is universally allowed that the seventy weeks here mentioned mean 'seventy weeks' of years; that is, 490 years."—*Scott, on Dan. 9: 24.*

"*Seventy weeks.* That is, seventy weeks of years, or 490 years, which [is to be] reckoned from the seventh year of Artaxerxes, coinciding with the 4256th year of the Julian period, and in the month Nisan, in which Ezra was commissioned to restore the Jewish state and polity."—*Bagster, on Ezra 7: 9-26.*

"In the fifteenth year of Darius Nothus, ended the first seven weeks of the seventy weeks of Daniel's prophecy. For then the restoration of the church and state of the Jews in Jerusalem and Judea was fully finished, in that last act of reformation, which is recorded in the thirteenth chapter of Nehemiah, from the twenty-third verse to the end of the chapter, just forty-nine years after it had been first begun by Ezra, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus."—*Prideaux's Connection, vol. 1, p. 322.*

"The date of the going forth of the decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem cannot, therefore, be reckoned from the time of Cyrus's decree or that of Darins. It is generally fixed to the commission granted to Ezra by Artaxerxes in the seventh year of his reign."—*Scott, on Dan. 9: 25-27.*

"The above seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years, are divided, in verse 25, into three distinct periods, to each of which particular events are assigned. The three periods are:—

"1. Seven weeks, that is, forty-nine years.

"2. Sixty-two weeks, that is, four hundred and thirty-four years.

"3. One week, that is, seven years.

"To the first period of seven weeks the restoration and repairing of Jerusalem are referred; and so long were Ezra and Nehemiah employed in restoring the sacred constitutions and civil establishments of the Jews; for their work lasted forty-nine years after the commission was given by Artaxerxes.

"From the above seven weeks the second period of sixty-two weeks, or four hundred and thirty-four years more, commences, at the end of which the prophecy says Messiah the Prince should come, that is, seven weeks, or forty-nine years, should be allowed for the restoration of the Jewish state; from which time till the public entrance of the Messiah on the work of the ministry should be sixty-two weeks, or four hundred and thirty-four years, in all four hundred and eighty-three years."—*Dr. Clarke, on Dan. 9: 25.*

"*For one week.*' The fair interpretation of this, according to the principles adopted throughout this exposition, is, that this includes the space of seven years. (See notes on verse 24.) This is the one week that makes up the seventy, seven of them, or forty-nine years, embracing the period from the command to rebuild the city and temple to its completion under Nehemiah; sixty-two, or four hundred and thirty-four years, to the public appearing of the Messiah, and this one week to complete the whole seventy, or four hundred and ninety years. . . .

"In the middle of that period of seven years, another important event would occur, serving to divide that time into two portions, and especially to be known as causing the sacrifice and oblation to cease, in some way affecting the public offering of sacrifice so that from that time there would be in fact a cessation. . . .

"1. The ministry of the Saviour himself was wholly among the Jews, and his work was what would, in their common language, be spoken of as 'confirming the covenant.' . . .

"2. This same work was continued by the apostles as they labored among the Jews. . . .

"3. This was continued for about the period here referred to; at least for a period so long that it could properly be represented in round numbers as 'one week,' or seven years.

"The Saviour's own ministry continued about half that time; and then the apostles prosecuted the same work, laboring with the Jews, for about the other portion before they turned their attention to the Gentiles, and before the purpose to endeavor to bring in the Jewish people was abandoned. . . . I suppose, therefore, that this last 'one week' embraced the period from the beginning of the ministry of the Saviour to that when the direct and exclusive efforts to bring the principles of his religion to bear on the Hebrew people . . . ceased, and the great effort was commenced to evangelize the heathen world. Then was the proper close of the seventy weeks."—*Barnes's Notes on Dan., pp. 409-412, ed. 1877.*

Concerning the disposition of the seventy weeks, Gesenius in his Hebrew Lexicon says that the original word translated "determined," in Dan. 9 : 24, means properly, "to cut off;" tropically, to divide; and so to determine, to decree.

"Seventy weeks have been cut off upon thy people, and upon thy holy city."—*Whiting's Translation.*

"That is, such a space of time is fixed upon; cut out as the word signifies."—*Dr. Gill, on Dan. 9 : 24.*

"The word here used (*chathak*) occurs nowhere else in the Scriptures. It properly means, according to Gesenius, to cut off, to divide, and hence to determine, to destine, to appoint."—*Farnes, on Dan. 9 : 24, p. 372, ed. 1877.*

CHAPTER III.

THE INCREASE OF KNOWLEDGE.

"But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end; many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." Dan. 12 : 4.

"Many shall run to and fro,' hither and thither, like couriers in the time of war, 'and knowledge shall be increased,' knowledge of the most important kind, the knowledge of God's salvation. Then those who are wise themselves shall endeavor to enlighten others."—*Thomas Williams, on Dan. 12 : 4, in Cottage Bible.*

"The word translated 'run to and fro' is metaphorically used to denote investigation, close, diligent, accurate observation, just as the eyes of the Lord are said to run to and fro. The reference is not to missionary exertions in particular, but to the study of the Scriptures, especially the sealed book of prophecy."—*Duffield on Prophecy, p. 373.*

"Many shall run to and fro. Many shall endeavor to search out the sense; and knowledge shall be increased by these means." *Clarke, on Dan. 12 : 4.*

"It is a part of this prophecy that it should not be understood before the last age of the world; and therefore it makes for the credit of the prophecy that it is not yet understood. . . . But, in the very end, the prophecy shall be so far interpreted as to convince many; 'for then,' says Daniel, 'many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.' Among the interpreters of the last age, there is scarce one of note who hath not made some discovery worth knowing; whence I seem to gather that God is about opening these mysteries."—*Sir Isaac Newton, in Observations on the Prophecies.*

It is a singular coincidence that immediately following the overthrow of the papal power, in 1798, the British and Foreign Bible Society was organized; and the Bible has since been translated into more than two hundred dialects, and sent to every part of the globe. Before that time, a knowledge of the Bible was confined to a few; but now the humblest person has access to its pages, and may have as good a knowledge of its

contents as the most exalted one in the land. A little more than one hundred years ago there was not a Sunday-school in the world, the first one being organized by Robert Raikes, at Gloucester, England, in 1784. Now every town and almost every neighborhood has its Sunday-school, where the Bible is taught. There are about 16,500,000 Sunday-school pupils in the world, and nearly 2,000,000 Sunday-school teachers, one half of whom are in the United States.

The *Illustrated Christian Weekly*, March 6, 1886, says:—

“The London Religious Tract Society was organized in 1799; the British and Foreign Bible Society, in 1804; the American Bible Society, in 1816; the American Tract Society, in 1825; so that the average age of these four great societies is 75 years. Their cash receipts have been over \$112,000,000 (£23,140,495), or an average of over \$1009 (£208) a day for each, during their entire existence. The issues of the two tract societies would be equal to a two-page tract for every inhabitant of the globe. Since 1880 the issues of the two Bible societies have averaged over 10,000 copies for each business day, while their issues for 1885 were over 17,000 copies a day, 28 per minute, reckoning ten hours per day. From these two sources alone, not including the seventy other Bible societies, over 150,000,000 copies of the word of God have gone forth over the world during this nineteenth century.”

In the line of scientific knowledge, there have been quite as remarkable developments since 1798 as in the knowledge of the Bible. In fact, some of the most important inventions have been brought out in the present century. The steamboat in 1807; the steam printing-press in 1811; railroad cars in 1825; the reaper and mower in 1833; the telegraph in 1837; the sewing machine in 1848; and the telephone in 1876.

“More has been done in the course of the fifty years of our lifetime than in all the previous existence of the race.”—*London Spectator*.

“The great facts of the nineteenth century stand out so conspicuously above the achievements of any preceding century, that it would be affectation of humility not to recognize and speak of them.”—*Union Hand-Book, 1870*.

“The most striking characteristic of our times is the rapid strides which the world is making in science, general intelligence, and inventions.”—*Chicago Republican, March 14, 1872*.

“Never was there such activity of invention within the history of mankind as at the present day.”—*Phrenological Journal, April, 1871*.

The same journal, of December, 1870, says concerning the watch manufactories of to-day:—

“There are those [machines] which will take a shaving off a hair, or slice up steel like an apple; those which will drill holes invisible to the naked eye; registers which will measure the ten-thousandth part of an inch; screw-cutters which will turn out perfect screws so small that, on white paper, they appear like tiny dots.”

“Go back only a little more than half a century, and the world . . . stood about where it did in the days of the patriarchs. Suddenly the waters of that long stream over whose drowsy surface scarcely a ripple of improvement had passed for three thousand years, broke into the white foam of violent agitation. The world awoke from the slumber and darkness of ages. The divine finger lifted the seal from the prophetic books, and brought that predicted period when men should run to and fro, and knowledge should be increased. Men bound the elements to their chariots, and reaching up, laid hold upon the very lightning, and made it their message-bearer around the world.”—*Marvel of Nations, pp. 148, 150*.

The question may arise, Why this sudden expansion of knowledge? There must be some design in it, and the answer is this: Before the end is reached, the world is to hear the message of the Lord's coming. Had no more rapid means of conveyance and communication been found than existed a century ago, it would have been impossible to communicate such a message to one generation. But such a work must be done for the last generation. Suppose that the message of the Lord's coming should begin to sound in the generation preceding the one which was to see the culminating events, and when it has gone partly over the world, that generation dies, and another comes on the stage. It is plain that in that case the same territory must necessarily be gone over again before the Lord's coming, in order to have the last generation warned of the event. Therefore, as the last generation everywhere must hear the message, this demands rapid transit, and lightning couriers to bear the tidings to various parts of the earth.

WHAT THE PILGRIM FATHERS LOOKED FOR.

On the occasion of the departure of the Pilgrims from Leyden to this country in the *Mayflower*, 1620, Robinson addressed them as follows :—

“Brethren, we are now quickly to part from one another, and whether I may live to see you face to face on earth any more, the God of heaven only knows ; but whether the Lord hath appointed that or not, I charge you before God and his blessed angels, that you follow me no farther than you have seen me follow the Lord Jesus Christ. If God reveals anything to you by any other instrument, be as ready to receive it as you ever were to receive any truth by my ministry ; for I am verily persuaded, I am very confident, *that the Lord hath more truth yet to break forth out of his holy word.* For my part I cannot sufficiently bewail the condition of the reformed churches, who are *come to a period in religion*, and will go at present no farther than the instruments of their reformation. The Lutherans cannot be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw. Whatever part of his will our God revealed to Calvin, they will rather die than embrace ; and the Calvinists, you see, stick fast where they were left by that great man of God, who yet saw not all things.

“This is a misery much to be lamented ; for though they were burning and shining lights in their time, yet they penetrated not into the whole counsel of God, but were they now living would be as willing to embrace further light as that which they first received. I beseech you, remember it as an article of your church covenant that you be ready to receive whatever truth shall be made known to you from the written word of God.

“But I must nerewith exhort you to take heed what you receive as truth. Examine it, consider it, compare it with other scriptures of truth before you receive it ; for it is not possible that the Christian world should come so lately out of such thick anti-Christian darkness, and that perfection of knowledge should break forth at once.”

Commenting on the above words, Wendell Phillips, in a lecture delivered in Boston, January, 1881, said :—

“The Hon. Robert Boyle (1680) says : ‘As the Bible was not written for any one particular time or people . . . so there are many passages very useful which will not be found so these many ages, being possibly *reserved* by the prophetic Spirit that inclined them . . . to quell some foreseen heresy . . . or resolve some yet unformed doubts, or confound *some error that hath not yet a name.*’ Bishop Butler, in his ‘*Analogy*’ (1737) says : ‘Nor is it at all incredible that a book which has been so long in the possession of mankind, should yet contain many truths as yet undiscovered. For all the same phenomena and the same faculties of investigation from which such great discoveries in natural knowledge have been made

in the present and last age, were equally in the possession of mankind several thousand years before. And possibly it might be intended that events, *as they come to pass*, should open and ascertain the meaning of several parts of scriptures.

“The *Interpreter* (1862) says : ‘A day is coming when Scripture, long darkened by traditional teaching, too frequently treated as an exhausted mine, will at length be recognized in its true character, as a field rich in unexplored wealth, and consequently be searched afresh for its hidden treasures.’

“Vinet, in his lectures, says : ‘Even now, after eighteen centuries of Christianity, we may be involved in some *tremendous* error of which the Christianity of the future will make us ashamed.’

“Dean Stanley says : ‘Each age of the Church has, as it were, turned over a new leaf in the Bible, and found a response to its own wants. We have a leaf *still to turn*,—a leaf not the less new because it is so simple.’”

CHAPTER IV.

THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

“Can ye not discern the signs of the times?” Matt. 16:3.

These words of the Saviour were at first spoken for the benefit of the Pharisees and Sadducees of his own time when they desired from him a sign from heaven to attest his mission. His answer was a rebuke to them. From the signs in the sky they could tell what kind of weather to expect; but notwithstanding the many things transpiring all around them, they could not discern their meaning. The signs to which Christ called their attention were events long before predicted by the Old Testament prophets as those which would accompany the advent of the Messiah. These writings were the very ones which the Pharisees were supposed to understand.

But because they did not perceive in the signs of their times the fulfillment of prophecy, they were led to reject the truth the Saviour brought for that generation, until they, in turn, were rejected by the Saviour. As we near the time of the second coming of the Saviour, we may look for signs of that event in the fulfillment of predictions which the Bible has given as its precursors. The Lord himself has spoken on this point: “And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring.” Luke 21:25.

We may therefore conclude, as has been expressed by Bishop Burnett in his “Theory of the Earth” that, “When the last great storm is coming, and all the volcanoes of earth are ready to burst, and the frame of the world to be dissolved, there will be previous signs

in the heavens and on the earth, to introduce this tragical fate. Nature cannot come to that extremity without some symptom of her illness, nor die silently without pangs of complaint.”

SIGNS IN THE SUN.

“The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and the terrible day of the Lord come.” Joel 2:31.

“A something *strikingly awful* shall forewarn that the world will come to an end, and that the last day is even at the door.”—*Martin Luther*.

The great signs of the near approach of the end of the world were to come “*immediately after the tribulation of those days.*” Matt. 24:29. Those days were the 1260 days of the papal persecution. (But the tribulation was shortened for the elect’s sake. The suppression of the order of the Jesuits by the pope of Rome, and the influence of the reformers, together with the edicts of toleration¹ passed by Austria and Spain cut short the tribulation. So the persecution ceased a few years before the “days” ended, which has been shown to be in 1798. Mark says, “*In those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened.*” The tribulation ceased shortly after the suppression of the order of the Jesuits in 1773. But the *days* did not end until 1798, twenty-five years later. The sun, therefore, must be darkened in the *first part* of the last twenty-five years of the 1260. Any other darkening will not answer the prophecy.

To find a fulfillment of the prophetic specification concerning the sun, we must not look for it in some natural phenomenon. We must seek for this sign in an

¹With reference to the edicts of toleration mentioned, the historian says:—
“In Austria, Maria Theresa made very important improvements for the benefit of her wide dominions. In 1776 she abolished the torture in the hereditary states; and from 1774 to 1778 her attention was given to the establishment of a general system of popular education. Various salutary regulations were introduced, touching the temporalities of the clergy; and in Italy the arbitrary power of the Inquisition was circumscribed within narrow limits.”—*White’s History*, p. 458.

“*Edict of Toleration of the Emperor Joseph.*—By this edict he granted to all members of the Protestant and Greek churches, under the denomination of A Catholics, or non-Catholics, the free exercise of their religion. He declared all Christians of every denomination, equally citizens, and capable of holding all charges and offices in every department of state.”—*Cox’s House of Austria*, vol. 3.

event that cannot be accounted for on natural or scientific principles. There is one event, and but one, to which we may turn for such a fulfilment of the words of our Saviour. That is the recorded fact of a supernatural darkening of the sun, which occurred on May 19, 1780. Of this event, the *Boston Gazette*, of May 22, 1780, thus speaks:—

"The printers acknowledge their incapacity of describing the phenomenon which appeared in that town on Friday last. It grew darker and darker until nearly one o'clock, when it became so dark the inhabitants were obliged to quit their business, and they had to dine by the light of the candle. . . . Such a phenomenon was never before seen here by the oldest person living."

"*Dark Day*, The, May 19, 1780, so called on account of a remarkable darkness on that day, extending over all New England. In some places persons could not see to read common print in the open air for several hours together. . . . The true cause of this remarkable phenomenon is not known."—*Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, in Explanatory and Pronouncing Vocabulary, art. Dark Day.*

"I refer to the dark day of A. D. 1780, May 19. That was a day of supernatural darkness. It was not an eclipse of the sun; for the moon was nearly at the full: it was not owing to a thickness of the atmosphere; for the stars were seen. The darkness began about 9 A. M., and continued through the day. Such was the darkness that work was suspended in the field and shop; beasts and fowls retired to their rest; and the houses were illuminated at dinner time. . . . The sun was supernaturally darkened."—*Josiah Litch, in Prophetic Expositor.*

"The greatest darkness was, at least, equal to what is commonly called candle-lighting in the evening. The appearance was indeed uncommon, and the cause unknown."—*Connecticut Journal of May 25, 1780.*

"But especially I mention that wonderful darkness on the 19th of May inst. [1780]. Then, as in our text, the sun was darkened; such a darkness as probably was never known before since the crucifixion of our Lord. People left their work in the house and in the field. Travelers stopped; schools broke up at eleven o'clock; people lighted candles at noonday; and the fire shone as at night. Some people, I have been told, were in dismay, and thought whether the day of Judgment was not drawing on. A great part of the following night also, was singularly dark. The moon, though in the full, gave no light, as in our text."—*From a manuscript sermon by Rev. Elam Potter, delivered May 28, 1780.*

Milo Bostwick, of Camden, N. J., wrote on this subject, March 3, 1848, as follows:—

"The 19th of May, in the year 1780, I well remember; I was then in my sixteenth year. The morning was clear and pleasant, but somewhere about eight o'clock my father came into the house and said there was an uncommon appearance in the sun. There were not any clouds, but the air was thick, having a smoky appearance, and the sun shone with a pale and yellowish hue, but kept growing darker and darker, until it was hid from sight. At noon we lit a candle, but it did not give light as in the night, and my father could not see to read with two candles."

The American Tract Society bears testimony:—

"In the month of May, 1780, there was a very terrific dark day in New England, when 'all faces seemed to gather blackness,' and the people were filled with fear. There was great distress in the village where Edward Lee lived; 'men's hearts failing them for fear' that the Judgment day was at hand, and the neighbors all flocked around the holy man; for his lamp was trimmed and shining brighter than ever amidst the unnatural darkness. Happy and joyful in God, he pointed them to their only refuge from the wrath to come, and spent the gloomy hours in earnest prayer for the distressed multitude."—*Tract No. 379; Life of Edward Lee.*

"The 19th of May, 1780, was a remarkably dark day. Candles were lighted in many houses. The birds were silent, and disappeared. The fowls retired to roost. It was the general opinion that the day of Judgment was at hand. The Legislature of Connecticut was in session at Hartford, but being unable to transact business, adjourned."—*Timothy Dwight, D. D., in Conn. Historical Collections.*

Dr. Tenney, in 1785, wrote to the Historical Society concerning it. He says:—

"Although the uncommon darkness which attracted the attention of all ranks of people in this part of the country on the 19th of May, 1780, was a phenomenon which several gentlemen of considerable literary abilities have endeavored to solve, yet, I believe, you will agree with me that no satisfactory solution has yet appeared."

"On the 19th of May, 1780, an uncommon darkness took place all over New England, and extended to Canada. It continued about fourteen hours, or from ten o'clock in the morning till midnight. The darkness was so great that people were unable to read common print, or to tell the time of day by their watches, or to dine, or to transact their ordinary business, without the light of candles. They became dull and gloomy, and some were excessively frightened. The fowls went to roost. Objects could not be distinguished but at a very little distance, and everything bore the appearance of gloom and night. Similar days have occasionally been known, though inferior in the degree or extent of their darkness. *The*

causes of these phenomena are *unknown*. They certainly were not the result of eclipses."—*Robert Sears's Guide to Knowledge*, ed. 1844.

"Almost, if not altogether alone, as the most mysterious and as yet unexplained phenomenon of its kind in nature's diversified range of events during the last century, stands the dark day of May 19, 1780, a most unaccountable darkening of the whole visible heavens and atmosphere in New England, which brought intense alarm and distress to multitudes of minds, as well as dismay to the brute creation, the fowls fleeing, bewildered, to their roosts, and the birds to their nests, and the cattle returning to their stalls. Indeed, thousands of the good people of that day became fully convinced that the end of all things terrestrial had come; many gave up, for the time, their secular pursuits, and betook themselves to religious devotions."—*Our First Century*, p. 88.

Herschel, the great astronomer, gives the following testimony concerning the unaccountableness, scientifically, of the darkness:—

"The dark day in Northern America was one of those wonderful phenomena of nature which will always be read with interest, but which philosophy is at a loss to explain."

The nature of the event was so startling that it was considered worthy of being preserved in verse.

An old lady of Kennebunk Port, Maine, has placed in verse her testimony to the impressions left by the events of that day:—

"Ye sons of men who saw the night
Triumphing at high noon,
On nineteenth day of month of May,
Knew well that dismal gloom.
No orb above in coasts could move,
Thus to eclipse the sun;
We understand it was the hand
Of the eternal One,
Who drew a black and fearful veil,
And interposed the light;
And overhead a curtain spread,
Converting day to night.
If every town was burned down,
And forest in our land,
'T would not create a gloom so great;
'T was God's immediate hand."

Whittier, the celebrated poet, writes:—

"'T was on a May day of the far old year
Seventeen hundred eighty, that there fell
Over the bloom and sweet life of the spring,
Over the fresh earth and the heaven of noon,
A horror of great darkness, like the night
In day of which the Norland sagas tell—
The twilight of the gods.

"Birds ceased to sing, and all the barn-yard fowls
Roosted; the cattle at the pasture bars
Low'd, and looked homeward; bats on leathern wings
Flitted abroad; the sounds of labor died;
Men prayed, and women wept; all ears grew sharp
To hear the doom-blast of the trumpet shatter
The black sky."

—*Poem of Abram Davenport.*

THE DARKENING OF THE MOON.

"And the moon became as blood." Rev. 6: 12.

The night following the nineteenth day of May, was as unnaturally dark as the day that preceded it, since, as Dr. Adams informs us, the moon had full'd the day before. It is, too, the most remarkable case of the kind on record since the crucifixion, and must therefore be that to which the prophecy looks. Referring to that time, Milo Bostwick said:—

"My father and mother, who were pious, thought the day of Judgment was near. They sat up that night, during the latter part of which they said the darkness disappeared, and then the sky seemed as usual, but the moon, which was at its full, had the appearance of blood. The alarm that it caused and the frequent talk about it impressed it deeply on my mind."

"The night succeeding that day (May 19, 1780) was of such pitchy darkness that in some instances horses could not be compelled to leave the stable when wanted for service."—*Stone's History of Beverly (Mass.)*.

"The darkness of the following evening or night was probably as gross as has ever been observed since the Almighty first gave birth to light. I could not help conceiving at the time that if every luminous body in the universe had been shrouded in impenetrable darkness, or struck out of existence, the darkness could not have been more complete. A sheet of white paper held within a few inches of the eyes was equally invisible with the blackest velvet."—*Mr. Tenney, in Stone's History of Beverly (Mass.), as quoted by Mr. Gage to the Historical Society.*

The following ballad was written shortly after the events it describes, and was published in the *Green Mountain Freeman*, of Montpelier, Vermont:—

“Nineteenth of May, a gloomy day,
When darkness veiled the sky;
The sun's decline may be a sign
Some great event is nigh.

“Let us remark how black and dark
Was the ensuing night;
And for a time the moon declined,
And did not give her light.

“Can mortal man their wonders scan,
Or tell a second cause?
Did not our God then shake his rod
And *alter nature's laws*?”

THE FALLING STARS.

“And the *stars of heaven fell unto the earth*, even as a fig-tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind.” Rev. 6:13.

This was literally fulfilled on the 13th of November, 1833. There have been other displays of shooting stars before and since, but not such as is described in the prophecy.

“The last sign we shall notice is that of ‘falling stars.’ ‘And the stars shall fall from heaven,’ says our Saviour. Matt. 24:29. We are sure, from the nature of the thing, that this cannot be understood either of fixed stars or planets; for if either of these should tumble from the skies and reach the earth, they would break it all in pieces, or swallow it up as the sea does a sinking ship, and would put all the universe into confusion. It is necessary, therefore, by these stars, to understand either fiery meteors falling from the middle region of the air, or blazing comets and stars. No doubt there will be all sorts of fiery meteors at that time; and among others, those that are called *falling stars*.”—*Bishop Burnett's Sacred Theory of the Earth*, p. 486, ed. 1697.

The eloquent and celebrated Frederick Douglass witnessed the scene, and in his book, “My Bondage and Freedom,” thus describes it. He says:—

“I left Baltimore for St. Michaelis in the month of March, 1833. I know the year, because it was the one succeeding the first cholera

in Baltimore, and was the year also of that strange phenomenon when the heavens seemed about to part with its stary train. I witnessed this gorgeous spectacle, and was awestruck. The air seemed filled with bright descending messengers from the sky. It was about day-break when I saw this sublime scene. I was not without the suggestion at that moment, that it might be *the harbinger of the coming of the Son of man*; and in my then state of mind, I was prepared to hail him as my friend and deliverer. I had read that the stars shall fall from heaven, and *they were now falling*. I was suffering much in my mind, . . . and I was beginning to look away to heaven for the rest denied me on earth.”

“But the most sublime phenomenon of shooting stars, of which the world has furnished any record, was witnessed throughout the United States on the morning of the 13th of November, 1833. The entire extent of this astonishing exhibition has not been precisely ascertained; but it covered no inconsiderable portion of the earth's surface. . . . The first appearance was that of fireworks of the most imposing grandeur, covering the entire vault of heaven with myriads of fire-balls, resembling sky-rockets. Their coruscations were bright, gleaming, and incessant, and they fell thick as the flakes in the early snows of December. To the splendors of this celestial exhibition the most brilliant sky-rockets and fire-works of art bear less relation than the twinkling of the most tiny star to the broad glare of the sun. The whole heavens seemed in motion, and suggested to some the awful grandeur of the image employed in the Apocalypse, upon the opening of the sixth seal, when ‘the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig-tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind.’” — *Burrill's Geography of the Heavens*, p. 163, ed. 1854.

The celebrated astronomer and meteorologist, Prof. Olmsted of Yale College, says:—

“Those who were so fortunate as to witness the exhibition of shooting stars on the morning of November 13, 1833, probably saw the greatest display of celestial fire-works that has ever been since the creation of the world, or at least within the annals covered by the pages of history.”

“In nearly all places the meteors began to attract notice by their unusual frequency as early as eleven o'clock, and increased in numbers and splendor until about four o'clock, from which time they gradually declined, but were visible until lost in the light of day. The meteors did not fly at random over all parts of the sky, but appeared to emanate from a point in the constellation Leo, near a star called Gamma Leonis, in the bend of the Sickle. . . .

“The extent of the shower of 1833 was such as to cover no inconsiderable part of the earth's surface, from the middle of the Atlantic on the east to the Pacific on the west; and from the northern coast of South America to undefined regions among the British

possessions on the north, the exhibition was visible, and everywhere presented nearly the same appearance. This is no longer to be regarded as a terrestrial, but as a celestial, phenomenon; and shooting stars are now to be no more viewed as casual productions of the upper regions of the atmosphere, but as *visitants from other worlds*, or from the planetary voids."

5 "No philosopher or scholar has told or recorded an event, I suppose, like that of yesterday morning. A prophet 1800 years ago foretold it exactly, if we will be at the trouble of understanding stars falling to mean falling stars; or '*hoi asteres tou ouranou epesan eis teen geen*,' in the only sense in which it is possible to be literally true."—*Henry Dana Ward, in Journal of Commerce, Nov. 14, 1833.*

"It was observed that the lines of all the meteors, if traced back, converged in one quarter of the heavens, which was Gamma of Leonis Majoris; and this point accompanied the stars in their apparent motion westward, instead of moving with the earth toward the east. The source whence the meteors came was thus shown to be independent of the earth's rotation, and exterior to our atmosphere."—*American Cyclopaedia, art. Meteors.*

6 "We pronounce the raining of fire which we saw on Wednesday morning last, an awful type, a sure forerunner, a merciful sign of that great and dreadful day which the inhabitants of the earth will witness when the sixth seal shall be opened. The time is just at hand, described not only in the New Testament, but in the Old. A more correct picture of a fig-tree casting its leaves when blown by a mighty wind, it is not possible to behold."—*Connecticut Observer, of Nov. 25, 1833, quoted from Old Countryman.*

"The meteoric phenomenon which occurred on the morning of the 13th of November last, was of so *extraordinary* and interesting a character as to be entitled to more than a mere passing notice. . . . The lively and graphic descriptions which have appeared in various public journals do not exceed the reality. No language, indeed, can come up to the splendor of that magnificent display; and I hesitate not to say that no one who did not witness it can form an adequate conception of its glory. It seemed as if the whole starry heavens had congregated at one point near the zenith, and were simultaneously shooting forth, with the velocity of lightning to every part of the horizon; and yet they were not exhausted—thousands swiftly followed in the track of thousands, *as if created for the occasion.*"—*Christian Advocate and Journal, Dec. 13, 1833.*

"While a mere lad I was waked in the night to see a pale, frightened face bending over me, and to hear, 'Get up! get up! the day of Judgment has come, I believe, for the stars are all falling!'"—*Horace Greeley, in New York Tribune, June 4, 1859.*

FREQUENCY OF EARTHQUAKES.

"There shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places." Matt. 24 : 7.

The alarming frequency of earthquakes in later years has caused some to look upon their history and estimate the ratio in which they have increased through the advancing centuries. In his "Coming Earthquake," D. T. Taylor quotes from Ponton and Mallett the following chronologically arranged table of earthquakes:—

	No.	No. of years.	Average.
Those recorded before A. D. 1.	58	1700	1 in 29 yrs.
A. D. 1 to 900.	197	900	1 in 4 "
" 900 to 1500.	532	600	1 in 1 yr.
" 1500 to 1800.	2804	300	9 in 1 "
" 1800 to 1850.	3240	50	64 in 1 "
" 1850 to 1868.	5000	18	277 in 1 "

Of destructive earthquakes, such as have overthrown cities and destroyed many lives, the number registered is about as follows:—

	No. of years.	Earth- quakes.	Average.
From B. C. 1700 to A. D. 96.	1796	16	1 in 112 years.
" A. D. 96 to 1850.	1754	204	1 in 8 "
" " 1850 to 1865.	15	15	1 in 1 year.
" " 1865 to 1868.	3	15	5 in 1 "

In a single year, 1868, over *one hundred thousand* persons perished by earthquakes. In January, 1869, there were *eleven* earthquakes, two of them great and destructive.

The *Christian Statesman*, of July 17, 1875, says:—

"The continued occurrence and great severity of earthquakes has distinguished the period in which we are now living above all others since the records of such phenomena began to be generally preserved."

The following is from the *Detroit Tribune* of July 8, 1875, and relates to a then recent earthquake at Cucuta, United States of Colombo, which destroyed nine towns and damaged several others:—

"Such was the violence of the shock that not a single house remained standing, and the monuments in the cemetery were thrown down, and many of them removed a considerable distance from their original sites. In thirty seconds, the city of Cucuta was converted into a mountain of ruins. This horrible blow resulted in the death of

more than ten thousand persons, in addition to another thousand who were seriously wounded and bruised. Great numbers of *haciendas* have been destroyed, and hundreds of houses in the country overthrown, leaving the people homeless and consigned to poverty. Many trees were torn up by the roots, and the small hills opened like a melon. The cause of the catastrophe is of course unknown, or the precise place of its first manifestation."

In May, 1877, a most terrible earthquake, accompanied by a tidal wave, visited the South Pacific coast, which is described by the *Panama Star and Herald* as follows:—

"The terrible earthquake and tidal wave on the Peruvian and Bolivian coasts, May 9, 1877, proves it to have been one of the severest calamities of the kind ever known. Six hundred lives and twenty millions worth of property were destroyed. At Mollendo, a violent hurricane unroofed houses, while the sea tore up the railway. At Arica, people were building defenses to repel the expected attack of the rebel ram "Harascar." The shocks were numerous; the waves rose from ten to fifteen feet; houses, cars, locomotives, boats, etc., were tossed about like shuttlecocks. The shock continued all night. The volcano Ilaga is charged with the authorship of the phenomena.

"At Iquique, at the same hour, 8:30 P. M., the shaking began; amid the horrors of falling buildings and quaking earth, a fire broke out, and while trying to stay the flames, the sea rushed in and swept everything away. At Chanavaya the earth opened in crevices of fifteen meters deep. Two hundred persons were killed, dead bodies floated about the bay, and a pestilence was feared. The wave at Guanillos was sixty feet high, and that at Mexillones was sixty-five feet. A mine at Tocapilla caved in, smothering two hundred workmen. Cobija, in Bolivia, was swept of three fourths of its houses. The wave was thirty-five feet high. In Chanural the shock at 8:30 P. M. lasted three minutes. A fire broke out, followed by a swamping by a rush of the sea. At Pabelloa de Pica and Chanara, some sixty workmen were buried under the falling masses of guano. The damage done the shipping was very great, some vessels being sunk with all on board, while the crews of a few were saved on spars and planks. The water at the anchorage suddenly receded so that ships in eight fathoms of water touched bottom. At the same time the ships went swinging round and round in opposite directions, the anchor chains becoming entangled beneath the copper, and the yards and masts interlocking, while the air resounded with falling spars and the crash of bulwarks. The water also came whirling in like a maelstrom, causing the wrecks to spin round and round in great circles till they struck rocks and went down."

In 1886 a terrible earthquake visited New Zealand, destroying some villages, and over one hundred lives.

The following from the *Toledo Blade*, of July 15, 1886, describes the nature and extent of the sudden disturbance:—

"The violence of the earthquake led the people to think that the island had blown up, and would sink in the sea. The sensation experienced is said to have been fearful, and almost beyond description. Immediately after the first shock, the inhabitants rushed about frantically in all directions. When the second was felt, the entire country for miles around was lit up by the glare from the volcano, which had suddenly burst forth. The scene was as grand as it was awful. Huge volumes of smoke illuminated with flames, simultaneously burst forth over the range of mountains for sixty miles in length, and above the flames could be distinctly seen the balance of the fire, presenting the appearance of meteors chasing one another along the expanse of the sky. Reports from nearly all points in New Zealand show that earthquakes generally prevailed during the same period."

CYCLONES.

"Stormy wind fulfilling His word." Ps. 148:8.

The New York *Sun*, of Sept. 22, 1875, gives a most thrilling account of the destructive force of a Texas cyclone, which laid the town of Indianola in ruins, causing the loss of a hundred and fifty lives, out of the town's population of twelve hundred, and strewing corpses for twenty miles along the beach of Matagorda Bay. The same storm completely submerged Galveston Island, with the loss of many lives, and a great amount of property.

Shortly after, another cyclone was reported from Bengal, India, which swept away 2500 people. The terrible work it accomplished is told in the following words:—

"The cyclone which occurred on Oct. 31, 1876, arose in the Bay of Bengal, and took a northward course, wrecking several large vessels which lay in its track. It just missed Calcutta, but struck Chittagong, which lies in the most northeasterly corner of the bay, stranding every vessel in the harbor, and nearly destroying the town. Meanwhile the storm waves submerged the great islands of Hattiah, Sundeeep, and Dakhin, lying in one of the mouths of the Ganges, covered several smaller islands, and then flowed over the land for five or six miles toward the interior. . . .

"Of course the devastation in this district has been complete. The country is dead flat; and the people, when the wave burst upon them, had no place of safety but in the tree tops. And there such as

were able found their way, sharing their refuges with the wild beasts, birds, and serpents. Houses by the thousand were utterly swept out of existence, and the only relics of human habitations afterward found, were cast up on the Chittagong shore, ten miles distant.

"The Calcutta *Government Gazette* says that 'wherever the storm wave passed, it is believed that not a third of the population survived. The islands have barely one fourth of their former inhabitants.' All the cattle were destroyed, and the stench of the decomposing remains has already generated an outbreak of cholera, which, it is feared, will prove general. The British government is taking steps to relieve the distress which prevails."

April 14, 1879, a cyclone struck Collinsville, Ill., and damage was done to the amount of \$50,000. Ten houses were destroyed, several persons were injured, and one killed.

April 16, the lower part of South Carolina was visited by a tornado, which caused great destruction of life and property. One hundred dwellings were destroyed in Waterboro, and all the churches in the town were swept away. Fifteen persons were killed, and many wounded.

June, 1879, a cyclone in Kansas destroyed hundreds of houses, killed forty persons, wounded seventy or eighty, and destroyed an immense amount of property.

July 15, 1881, a terrible cyclone visited New Ulm, Minn., occasioning a great loss of property. The town was laid in ruins, and thirty or forty persons and hundreds of cattle were killed.

During April 6, 7, 8, and 9, 1882, cyclones visited Kansas, killing several persons and injuring others.

April 25, 1882, a cyclone occurred in Saline Co., Mo., in which 11 were killed, 35 wounded, and much property destroyed.

June 17, 1882, the towns of Grinnell and Malcom, Iowa, and their vicinity, were visited by the most destructive cyclone that has been known for twenty years. The storm traveled three hundred miles through the center of the State, carrying destruction and death in its path. The loss of property was estimated to be between \$2,000,000 and \$3,000,000; and besides the large number of persons killed or seriously injured, fifteen hundred were left homeless and destitute. In Grinnell,

as the many trees stripped of their bark and cut to pieces began to turn yellow, it added to the deserted appearance of that portion of the town. A correspondent of the *Inter Ocean* said that though that part of the town should be built up again, fifty years would not efface the marks of the tornado.

In the week ending May 19, 1883, many cyclones were experienced. Six men were injured in Coventry, Montana. In Racine, Wis., twenty were killed, and one hundred wounded. One hundred and fifty houses were wrecked. In Valparaiso, Neb., two persons were injured. White Pigeon, Mich., was visited, a school-house overturned, and many persons were injured.

At Kansas City, Mo., three were killed, and great damage done. At St. Joseph, Mo., also, much damage was done.

In the week ending May 26, 1883, such storms visited Missouri, Beloit, and Racine, Wis., in which twenty-five were killed, and more than one hundred wounded. In Beloit, live fish, one of which weighed a pound, fell in the business street.

The cyclone of Tuesday, Aug. 20, 1883, wrecked 300 houses in Rochester, Minn., damaged 200 others, and killed twenty-five persons. The total loss to the little city is \$400,000. At Kasson five people lost their lives, and in the counties of Dodge and Olmsted, the destruction of property was terrible. The whirling storm blew a passenger train from the track between Zumbrota and Rochester, the force of the gale smashing the cars to kindling wood. It is stated that one hundred passengers were killed or injured, and fifty wounded were removed to Rochester and Owatonna. Thirty-five were killed at Rochester, and eighty-two wounded. The storm covered a tract of country sixty miles long by two wide. Complete destruction marked its path.

April 21, 1885, a terrible cyclone visited Copiah Co., Miss., killing more than forty people, and wounding more than 150 others. A vast number of houses were blown down. It visited Georgia also, and did great damage.

On the same day many people lost their lives by a cyclone in Iowa; Sac, Woodberry, and Monona counties suffered great damage.

The same month a cyclone visited South Carolina, and many persons were killed. In one place thirty-three were killed and sixty wounded.

About the same time a hurricane visited Como, Colorado, and injured many persons.

The New York *Tribune* of Nov. 12, 1862, said concerning the frequency of these occurrences:—

“All over the country these storms have been of unusual frequency and dreadfully destructive this year. The lightning, the hurricane, the water-spout, number their victims this summer in the Western States by hundreds. And in many parts of Europe the same phenomena prevail, with a sprinkling of earthquakes in places where the earthquake is hardly ever felt. The cause is a mystery.”

In a sermon delivered by Mr. Talmage in 1883, on the wonders of the day, he said:—

“But look at the cyclonic,—the disasters cyclonic. At the mouth of the Ganges are three islands,—the Hattia, the Sundeeep, and the Decan Shahbaspoor. In the midnight of October, 1876, the cry on all those three islands was, ‘The waters! the waters!’ A cyclone arose and rolled the sea over those three islands, and of a population of 340,000, 215,000 were drowned, only those being saved who had climbed to the tops of the highest trees. *Did you ever see a cyclone?* No? I pray God you may never see one.

“But a few weeks ago I was in Minnesota, where there was one of those cyclones on land, that swept the city of Rochester from its foundations, and took dwelling houses, barns, men, women, children, horses, and cattle, and tossed them into indiscriminate ruin. It lifted a rail-train, and dashed it down, a mightier hand than that of the engineer on the air-brake. Cyclone in Kansas within a few months, cyclone in Missouri, cyclone in Wisconsin, cyclone in Illinois, cyclone in Iowa. Satan, prince of the power of the air, never made such cyclonic disturbance as he has in our day. And am I not right in saying that one of the characteristics of the time in which we live is disasters cyclonic?”

These are only a few of the many such destructive storms which have so ruthlessly destroyed life and property. The increasing frequency of these cyclonic disturbances has led many people to construct under-

ground cellars, to which they may flee for safety on such occasions. Once these things were not looked for; but now nature seems disarranged, causing perplexity to the inhabitants of earth, and bringing about that very state of affairs which the Saviour said should constitute one of the signs of his second coming. Luke 21:25, 26.

DISTURBANCES AT SEA.

“The sea and the waves roaring.” Luke 21:25.

“Let us then proceed in our explication of this sign, the roaring sea and waves, applying it to the end of the world. I do not look upon this ominous noise of the sea as the effect of a tempest; for then it would not strike such terror into the inhabitants of the earth, nor make them apprehensive of some great evil coming upon the world, as this will do. What proceeds from visible causes, and such as may happen in a common course of nature, does not so much amaze or affright us. . . . And such a troubled state of the waters as does not only make the sea unmanageable, but also strikes terror into all the maritime inhabitants that live within the view or sound of it.”—*Burnett's Sacred Theory of the Earth.*

In describing a tidal wave on the South Pacific coast, in which he was caught, in May, 1877, a writer in *Harper's Magazine* says:—

“I saw the whole surface of the sea rise as if a mountain side, actually standing up. Another shock with a *fearful roar* now took place. I called to my companions to run for their lives on to the pampa. Too late; with a horrible crash the sea was on us, and at one sweep dashed what was Iquique onto the pampa. I lost my companions, and in an instant was fighting with the dark waters. *The mighty waves surged, and roared, and leaped.* The cries of human beings and animals were frightful.”

The British vice-consul, who was at Arica, Peru, at the time, describes the scene as it appeared to him, in the following words:—

“What a sight! I saw all the vessels in the bay carried out irresistibly to sea; anchors and chains were as pack-thread. In a few minutes the great outward current stopped, stemmed by a mighty rising wave, I should judge about fifty feet [15.25 + meters] high, which came in with an *awful rush*, carrying everything before it in its terrible majesty, bringing the shipping with it, sometimes turning in circles, as if striving to elude their fate.”

Speaking of these disturbances and the extent of their influence, the *New York Tribune*, of Nov. 12, 1868, says:—

“The tidal disturbances are the most remarkable and extensive of which there is any record. It is said their velocity was about a *thousand miles an hour*. Both the great ocean waters of the Atlantic and Pacific have been agitated in their whole extent. We mention in particular the tidal waves at St. Thomas and all the neighboring islands, which were *full fifty feet in height* [15.25 + meters]. It is said by those who have witnessed these waves that the ocean’s *roar is exceedingly frightful*.”

One year, to a day, later, the same paper testifies:—

“Later and fuller details are every day increasing the interest with which scientific observers regard the recent earthquakes and tidal disturbances, and confirming our first impression that these convulsions of nature would prove to be among the *most remarkable and extensive of which there is any written record*.”

Says another paper:—

“Old mother earth has been indulging in some old caprices within the last ten years, the variety and frequency of her antics having especially increased during her last three annual revolutions. Tornados, water-spouts by land as well as at sea, freshets, volcanic eruptions, and earthquakes have become of almost daily occurrence and of continually augmenting intensity. Moreover, they embrace a larger and larger area of territory at each recurrence. The last shock, which so fearfully devastated South America, was felt over *one-third of the earth’s surface*. These portentous phenomena are seriously engaging the attention of the scientific world. The remark that they only seem to us more frequent, because our means of communication are more complete and rapid, and that we now hear from all parts of the globe simultaneously, *will not explain the matter*, since the late commotions have been attended by disturbances of both land and sea in parts of the earth which have been constantly accessible for centuries, that were totally unparalleled in previous history. The change of the Gulf Stream from its course, and the alteration of climates, have been some of these increased marvels.”—*New York Mercantile Journal for Nov., 1868*.

THE WORLD GETTING OLD.

“The earth shall wax old like a garment.” Isa. 51:6.

As the earth in its present state grows older, it is evident from the words of the prophet, that we may look for weakness and decay in everything connected

with it. “The earth mourneth and *fadeth away*, the world languisheth and fadeth away, the haughty people of the earth do languish.” Isa. 24:4. This is because of the curse resting on the earth in consequence of sin. Already we see the fulfillment of the prophet’s words. The human race has dwindled in stature, and in vitality. Once man lived for centuries, now his average age is less than forty years. Speaking of the former size of man, the “*Encyclopedia Britanica*,” art. Giant, says:—

“It was a common opinion of the ancients that the human race had itself degenerated, the men of primeval ages having been of so far greater stature and strength, as to be in fact gigantic.

“In authentic history there are accounts of races of men of very large size. The Hebrew Scriptures allude to giants (nephilim) before the Flood, and in and about Palestine there were, in Joshua’s time, the Rephaim, Anakim, Emin, and Zamzummim, all men of great stature. The names of Og, two Goliaths, Ishbibenob, and Saphare preserved to us. In comparatively recent times there was a belief that the Patagonians and the men of Guayaquil were giants; and it is now unquestionable that the former do considerably exceed in stature the average of mankind.”—*Johnson’s Cyclopaedia, art. Giant*.

“After the discovery of America, stories of gigantic races in the New World were not uncommon, and the Patagonians especially were said to be eight and even twelve feet in stature. It is now known that most of the men are six feet in height.”—*New American Cyclopaedia, art. Giant*.

The *Des Moines Leader*, of Nov. 18, 1886, says:—

“Insanity, pauperism, idiocy, and every defect of mind or body, is on the increase. Taken as a whole the human race, as represented all the way up and down the Atlantic coast, appears to be deteriorating. The increase of crime and vice only keeps pace with the general deterioration.”

FAILURE IN CROPS.

On the failure of grain crops in the United States, the *New York Tribune*, of Feb. 10, 1869, quotes the following from a California paper:—

“It will hardly be claimed for California, that, though she has exceptional lands which yield more per acre than any lands in the great West, her soil is more lasting than that of Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan. Yet in those three States the average wheat crop has run

down to less than twelve bushels per acre, and it cannot be long till wheat culture there must be abandoned as unprofitable. Our own experience is not much more encouraging. . . . In our oldest wheat-raising districts there has been a *marked decline* in productions since 1866."

In an agricultural report from Washington, D. C., dated June 17, 1870, and published in the *Detroit Post*, it is stated that : —

"Twenty years have wrought changes in the list of wheat-growing States that are suggestive and even startling. . . . Facts showing the decrease of yield in every State would be equally striking, and more sadly suggestive. . . . Many gloomy reports and forebodings of failure have come from the 'Golden State.'"

CHAPTER V.

THE SECOND ADVENT.

"I WILL come again." John 14:3.

"THIS SAME JESUS which is taken up from you into heaven, SHALL SO COME in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." Acts 1:11.

"They shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." Matt. 24:30.

"Unto them that look for him shall he appear the SECOND TIME without sin unto salvation." Heb. 9:28.

Notwithstanding that the doctrine of the second advent is now looked upon with disfavor by many, there have been many good men in the Church who have held that doctrine as a prominent part of their religious faith. Near the time of his death, Martin Luther said : —

"I persuade myself verily that the day of judgment will not be absent full three hundred years more. God will not, cannot, suffer this wicked world much longer."—*Table Talk, chap. 1, par. 9.*

"The Scripture uniformly commands us to look forward with eager expectation to the coming of Christ, and defers the crown of glory that awaits till that period."—*Calvin's Institutes, b. 3, chap. 25.*

Alexander Campbell has given the following exhortation : —

"Let the Church prepare herself for the return of her Lord, and see that she make herself ready for his appearance."—*Christian System, p. 291.*

"His coming itself is certain. This has been the faith and hope of all Christians in all ages of the Church ; nay it was the faith and hope of the Old Testament saints ever since Enoch, the seventh from Adam, who said, "Behold the Lord cometh," etc.—*Henry, on 2 Thess. 2:1.*

In commenting on Luke 18:8, Dr. Henry speaks thus : —

"In particular . . . it intimates that Christ . . . will delay his coming so long as that, first, wicked people will begin to defy it, and to say, 'Where is the promise of his coming?' 2 Peter 3:4. They will challenge him to come (Isa. 5:10; Amos 5:19) and his delay will harden them in their wickedness. Matt. 24:48. Secondly, even his own people will begin to despair of it, and to conclude he will never come, because he has passed their reckoning."

"Ages have passed away. The latter days are here. An inspired apostle was directed to announce, that in after-days there should come scoffers, mocking at the promise of his coming and the destruction of the whole world. The infidelity of the last day is here. The scoffing unbelief, as foretold, is come; and it was to be accompanied with willful ignorance, the offspring of a secret love for darkness."—*Nelson on Infidelity*, p. 101.

Thomas Coke, the author of the following, was an associate of the Wesleys, and made nine missionary voyages from England to America.

"Near, even at the doors, is the day of Judgment. The period of time which yet remains we know is short; how short, who can tell? We ought to be in constant and hourly expectation of it. At the coming of Christ to avenge and deliver his faithful people, the faith of his coming will, in a great measure be lost. Chronological calculation; and the general appearance of the world, all conspire to tell us that the events of the latter days are even come upon us, and that the time of God's controversy with the earth is near at hand. It is already on the wing."—*Coke's Commentary*.

Lorenzo Dow was a firm believer in the Lord's near coming, as his words unmistakably show:—

"The ten toes of Nebuchadnezzar's image only remain; these times are eventful, and the signs are portentous; let all the Israel of God be in a state of readiness for the coming of the Lord."—*Appendix No. 2. to Life of Dow*, p. 349.

Richard Baxter, also, whose words of comfort have been read in so many thousands of households, has testified to his love for the doctrine in the following strain:—

"Would it not rejoice your hearts if you were sure to live to see the coming of the Lord, and to see his glorious appearing and retinue? If you were not to die, but to be caught up thus to meet the Lord, would you be averse to this? Would it not be the greatest joy that you could desire? For my own part, I must confess to you that death, as death appeareth to me, is an enemy, and my nature doth abhor and fear it. But the thoughts of the coming of the

Lord are most sweet and joyful to me, so that if I were but sure that I should live to see it, and that the trumpet should sound, and the dead should rise, and the Lord appear, before the period of my age, it would be the joyfulest tidings to me in the world. Oh, that I might see his kingdom come! It is the character of his saints to love his appearing, and to look for that blessed hope. 'The spirit and the bride say, Come.' 'Even so, come, Lord Jesus.' Come quickly, is the voice of faith, and hope, and love."—*Vol. 17, p. 555*.

Dr. Lyman Abbott, in speaking of the Lord's coming, said:—

"For this we are to work and watch and hope and pray. For this coming of the Lord we are to prepare the highway. And all ministry of the gospel, all instruction in righteousness, all work of Church, and school-house, and Christian home, is a making of this path straight that he whose right it is may come. 'How long, O Lord, how long?'"—*Christian Union*, March 11, 1886.

And lastly, William Cowper has left his sentiments on the subject, to the world, in a beautiful stanza worthy of particular notice at this portentous time:—

"A world that seems
To toll the death-bell of its own decease,
And by the voice of all its elements
To preach the general doom. When were the winds
Let slip with such a warrant to destroy?
When did the waves so haughtily o'erleap
Their ancient barriers, deluging the dry?
Fires from beneath, and meteors from above,
Portentous, *unexampled, unexplained*
Have kindled beacons in the skies, and the old
And crazy earth has had her shaking fits
More frequent, and foregone her usual rest.

Is it a time to wrangle, when the props
And pillars of our planet seem to fail,
And nature with a dim and sickly eye
To wait the close of all?"—*The Task*, book 2.

CHAPTER VI.

THE THREE MESSAGES.

It would be unlike the merciful God to bring so great events as the coming of Christ and the Judgment upon the world without first fully warning its inhabitants of what he was about to do. Going back in the history of God's dealings with the children of men, we learn that whenever he was to bring only temporal and partial judgments, the people who were liable to be afflicted by them were always warned long enough beforehand to allow them ample opportunity to escape if they chose to do so.

Before the flood Noah was commissioned to warn the world, and to build the ark. All who entered the ark were saved when the flood came, while all others were lost. By carrying out the commission given him of God, Noah condemned the world, since they would not accept the offers of grace. Heb. 11:7.

Before the destruction of Sodom by fire, angels were sent to warn its inhabitants of its impending doom. Even the sons-in-law of just Lot were lost when they refused to heed the message sent to them.

Jonah was sent to warn the Ninevites of the intended overthrow of their city. At his preaching they repented, and God turned away the calamity.

In the days of the Saviour, he warned his disciples of the destruction of Jerusalem, that they might escape before the city was destroyed.

So in view of the second coming of Christ, when the great and final catastrophe is imminent, God will warn the inhabitants of the world of their danger, pointing out, not only their nearness to the Lord's coming, but also their spiritual condition, and the reform necessary

for them to make in order to meet him in peace at his coming. Such a warning must of necessity be confined to the generation which is to witness that coming. It would be out of place to all others. Hence we find the startling announcement of —

THE FIRST ANGEL'S MESSAGE.

“I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him; for *the hour of his judgment is come.*” Rev. 14:6, 7.

When this message goes to the world, the last generation will receive the warning of the approaching Judgment. The work of examination of the records above, for the purpose of deciding who are to be taken from earth to heaven when Christ descends, will already have commenced.

“God has ordained Christ to try the children of men, to be the judge, both of the quick and the dead; — those who shall be found alive at his coming, and those who were before gathered to their fathers. . . . And every man shall there give account of his own works; yea, a full and true account of all he ever did. Oh what a scene will then be disclosed, in the sight of angels and men! Nor will all the actions alone of every child of man be then brought to open view, but all their words. He will bring to light, not hidden works of darkness only, but the very thoughts and intents of the heart. In that day shall be discovered every inward working of every human soul, every appetite, passion, inclination, affection, with the various combinations of them, with every temper and disposition that constitute the whole complex character of each individual. So shall it be clearly and infallibly seen, who was righteous; and in what degree every action, or person, or character, was either good or evil.” — *Wesley's Sermons, No. 15.*

It is while this work, so graphically described by Mr. Wesley, is going on, that another message follows the announcement of the judgment hour, which tells men of their departure from God.

THE SECOND ANGEL'S MESSAGE.

“And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.” — Rev. 14:8.

The Greek word "Babylon" corresponds with the Hebrew word "Babel" which means *confusion*. The term Babel is applied in Scripture to the tower the ancients sought to build, whose top should reach "unto heaven;" because it was there that God confounded the language of those who were engaged in that work. The meaning is derived from a root word which signifies "Gate of God," but after the confusion of tongues was connected with another Hebrew stem which meant confusion. It was in this way that the work, commenced as *Bab-el*, or gate of God, became *babel* or confusion. See Young's Concordance, art. Babylon.

It has been thought that the use of the corresponding word in Greek in this text bears a significance, and that it has reference to a work in the Christian age which was commenced as the gate of God, and that through illicit intercourse with the world that work has become confusion. Be this as it may, one thing is certain: The Bible uses the word to symbolize an organization in which are found many of the people of God. Thus we read: "I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power; and the earth was lightened with his glory. And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird." Rev. 18: 1, 2.

It is evident from this, that prior to its fall, Babylon had a different class of communicants, who were better and purer in every way. But fornication committed by this mystic Babylon has sunk her into degradation. And yet there are those within her pale whom God loves, because they have kept aloof from the evils that contributed to Babylon's downfall. In view of this God calls to this class: "Come out of her, *my people*, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." Verse 4. This, then, must refer to the Church, which started to do a work for God, but has allowed herself to be overtaken in folly, and brought disgrace and confusion to herself.

"Babylon the great; an appellation given to the false Church, or antichristian apostasy, by the writer of the Apocalypse, Rev. 14 and 18."—*Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, art. Babylon.*

"Babylon, that is, the Church of Rome, is not only herself intoxicated and debauched, but she is charged with intoxicating and debauching all the kings or governments by whom she has been supported."—*Cottage Bible, notes on Rev. 18: 2.*

Granting that Babylon as used here signifies the Roman Church, there are others beside her implicated in this adulterous connection with the world. We read of her in Rev. 17: 5, where she is called the "mother of harlots." The Church of Rome, then, has daughters; and these are harlots, as well as herself. Who are those daughters? Are they not those churches which believe a portion, at least, of her doctrines, and practice her customs? The following testimony on this point from the "Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge" is worthy of candid consideration:—

"An important question, however, says Mr. Jones, still remains for inquiry: 'Is antichrist confined to the Church of Rome?' The answer is readily returned in the affirmative by Protestants in general; and happy had it been for the world were that the case. But although we are fully warranted to consider that Church as 'the mother of harlots,' the truth is, that by whatsoever arguments we succeed in fixing that odious charge upon her, we shall, by parity of reasoning, be obliged to allow other national churches to be her unchaste daughters, and for this plain reason, among others, because in their very constitution and tendency they are hostile to the nature of the kingdom of Christ."—*Art. Antichrist.*

William Kinkade, the celebrated Christian minister, said:—

1 ("I also think Christ had a true Church on earth, but its members are scattered among the various denominations, and are all more or less under the influence of mystery Babylon and her daughters."—*Bible Doctrine, p. 294.*)

2 (Speaking of the Roman Church, Lorenzo Dow said:— "If she be 'mother,' who can her daughters be but the corrupt, established Protestant churches which came out of her?"—*Dow's Life, vol. 2, p. 52, ed. 1860.*)

Rev. Josiah Strong truthfully says:—

"We have a good deal of piety in our churches that will not bear transportation. It cannot endure even the slight change of cli-

mate involved in spending a few summer weeks at a watering place, and is commonly left at home. American travelers in Europe often grant license, on which, if at home, they would frown. Very many church-members, when they go West, seem to think they have left their Christian obligations with their church-membership in the East. And a considerable element of our American-born population are apparently under the impression that the ten commandments are not binding west of the Missouri."— *Our Country*, p. 41.

BABYLON'S FALL.

After her fall, she is seen to be the home of the proud and corrupt. Her fall is therefore a moral one. Her fallen condition will be more marked as the end draws near. Thus the apostle says:—

"This know also that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, . . . heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away." 2 Tim. 3:1-5.

Mr. Hopkins, in a treatise on the millennium, says:—

"There is no reason to consider the antichristian spirit and practices confined to that which is now called the Church of Rome. The Protestant churches have much of antichrist in them, and are far from being wholly reformed from corruption and wickedness."

"There is a powerful element of Romanism in all the larger Protestant bodies. The clergymen do not teach the people the Bible itself in its purity and simplicity, but they require them to receive instead, a system of clerical interpretations of the Bible."— *Liberal Christian*.

"A confession can be had from the lips of the pastors of most of our churches, that in our midst there are wicked, unholy, corrupt men who maintain their position, and are saved from a righteous discipline, either by their wealth or social position. It is true of this church, and it is true of many of the churches around us. If a ship should go to sea with as many rotten timbers as we have spiritually rotten members, it would go to the bottom in twenty-four hours. . . . One thoughtful, intelligent layman, a member of a church which is a leader in its denomination, said the other day. 'Our church has degenerated into a great, strong, social, fashionable organization.'"— *Rev. Geo. F. Pentecost, in Christian Statesman of Jan. 8, 1876*.

Robert Atkins, also, in a sermon preached in London, said:—

"The truly righteous are diminished from the earth, and no man layeth it to heart. The professors of religion of the present day, in every church, are lovers of the world, conformers to the world, lovers of creature comfort, and aspirers after respectability. They are called to suffer with Christ, but they shrink from even reproach. *Apostasy, apostasy, apostasy*, is engraven on the very front of every church; and did they know it, and did they feel it, there might be hope, but alas! they cry, 'We are rich, and increased in goods, and have need of nothing.'"

Referring to a session of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland, held in Belfast in 1859, the *News Letter* of that city, in its issue of September 30, said:—

"Here in this venerable body of ministers and elders, we find two ministers openly giving each other the lie, and the whole General Assembly turned into a scene of confusion bordering upon a riot."

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

"You Methodists, who were once poor and unknown, but have grown rich and prominent in the world, have left the narrow way in which you walked twenty or thirty years ago, have ceased to attend class-meeting, seldom pray in your families or in prayer-meetings, as you once did, and are now indulging in many of the fashionable amusements of the day, such as playing chess, dominoes, billiards, and cards, dancing, and attending theaters, or allowing your children to indulge in them."— *Popular Amusements*, p. 3.

Prof. S. C. Bartlett, of Chicago, writing in the *New York Independent* concerning the present status of Methodism said:—

"Religion now is in a different position from Methodism then. To a certain extent it is a very reputable thing. Christianity is, in our day, something of a success. Men 'speak well of it.' Ex-presidents and statesmen have been willing to round off their career with a recognition of its claims, and the popularity of religion tends vastly to increase the number of those who would secure its benefits without squarely meeting its duties. The Church courts the world, and the world caresses the Church. The line of separation between the godly and the irreligious fades out into a kind of penumbra, and zealous men on both sides are toiling to obliterate all difference between their modes of action and enjoyment."

The *New York Herald* says of the adaptation of the Church to modern ideas:—

"Insensibly the Church has yielded to the spirit of the age, and adapted its forms of worship to modern wants. Magnificent edifices, high-priced pews, fashionable music, long salaries and short sermons, all things, indeed, that help to make religion attractive, the Church now employs as its instruments."

Mr. Moody denounced "church fairs," while preaching in Baltimore, in the following scathing words:—

"Your fairs and your bazaars won't do, and your voting, your casting of ballots for the most popular man or the most popular woman, just helping along their vanity. It grieves the Spirit; it offends God. They have got so far now that for twenty-five cents young men can come in and kiss the handsomest woman in the room. Think of this! Look at the Church lotteries going on in New York. Before God, I would rather preach in any barn, or in the most miserable hovel on earth, than within the walls of a church paid for in such a way."

The late Dr. Nadal spoke his mind plainly about church lotteries, and their degrading influence:—

"The church raffles are as complete specimens of gambling as the Crosby Opera House Lottery, and either of them is as real gambling as the operations of the faro bank or the card table.

"In our church fairs, in addition to the countenance and respectability, as in the 'Opera House Raffle,' we give to gambling the sacred sanction of religion. It is the Church spreading her hands, and saying grace over every faro bank and gambling hell in the country.

"The raffles of the Church tend to remove religious and moral scruples; the last breakwater that holds back the threatened inundation of gambling. If the Church fiddles, the world will dance, of course. Like priest, like people.

"The Church's raffles are felt, however unconsciously, in every bet on every race horse, at every card table, in every art lottery, aye, in every prize fight. When the bride of Christ raffles, and pockets her gains amid the smiles of gay ladies and flattering beaux, every gambling hell rises in dignity. Whatever wrong there may be in the gambler's calling, the Church shares it in principle in her raffles; and the only difference between her and the regular gambler in this respect is that he, perhaps, does his rudely, profanely, in a place set apart to sin, while she does hers *genteelly*, *piously*, and in the *church* or *lecture-room*. This abuse of holy things, this profanity, this prostitution of the sacred offices of the Church ought to be stopped."

"The Church has been poor, and can afford, if need be, to be poor again; but she cannot afford, whatever may be the bribe, to be the pomp of worldly lust. We therefore bow penitently under the

world's accusations, and confess that we deserve the scourge of the old proverb, 'Physician, heal thyself.'"

C. H. Spurgeon, in writing an introduction to "The Devil's Mission of Amusements," by Archibald C. Brown, says:—

"We do not hesitate to say that the character of many hopeful young people has been shipwrecked, not by the avowed haunt of vice, but by the influence of the questionable entertainment in connection with their religious relationships. Pleasant lectures and wholesome singing were all very well when used for higher ends; but there has been a gradual coming down, till, in some cases, the school-room has endured what the theater would have refused as too absurd.

"This earnest warning ought to be poured like grape-shot upon the enemy, till the devil is driven to abandon the entertainments of religious amusement. At present, in many cases, the prince of darkness feels himself as much at home in the Church as in the world; and it is time that something was done to disturb his repose."

— Pages 3, 4.

In a prefatory note to the above work Geo. C. Needham remarks:—

"Church entertainments and ecclesiastical amusements have grievously dishonored the Spirit of God, dried the streams of Christian benevolence, encouraged irreverence for sacred things, while inculcating a taste for carnal things. Many who once could joyfully testify 'while I was *amusing* the fire burned,' now sorrowfully complain, 'while I was *amusing* the fire burned out.'"

Of the tendency of church lotteries, the *Watchman* relates the following:—

"A member of a church went to his pastor and entreated his personal intercession with his favorite son, who had become ruinously addicted to the vice of gambling. The pastor consented, and seeking the young man found him in his chamber. He commenced his lecture; but before he concluded, the young man laid his hand upon his arm and drew his attention to a pile of splendid volumes that stood upon the table. 'Well,' said the young man, 'these volumes were won by me at a *fair* given in your church; they were my first venture; but for that lottery, under the patronage of a Christian church, I should never have become a gambler.'"

A few years ago Governor Washburn, of Wisconsin, in his annual message, declared against allowing in the

churches what was held to be illegal out of them. Of this the *Detroit Post* remarked:—

“The governor of Wisconsin, in his annual message, has had the moral courage—and a most desperate courage it is in a politician—to declare point blank, the too long whispered truth that church fairs, charitable raffles, concert lotteries for charitable and other purposes, prize packages, ‘grab-bags,’ Sabbath-school and other religious chances by ticket, are nurseries of crime, inasmuch as they promise something for nothing, are games of chance, and are really gambling. The governor says that the pernicious spirit of gambling is fostered, encouraged, and kept alive by these agencies to a degree little known by good citizens; and that, but for them, the ordinary laws against gambling would be much less violated and much more easily enforced. He says these practices ought not to be permitted any longer to debauch the morals of the young. Think of the row this plain speaking will stir up! Think of the courage necessary to say this in a public official, depending upon the votes of the people for future official honors! Then think how true and well deserved it is.”

The *Examiner and Chronicle* says:—

“Many a church of Christ at the present time sits like Eli, without courage to rebuke sin in its own members, yet trembling for the ark of God.”

SOME MINISTERS PREACH FOR HIRE.

“The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof *divine for money*: yet will they lean upon the Lord, and say, Is not the Lord among us? none evil can come upon us.” Micah 3: 11.

The Cincinnati *Times*, July 28, 1870, says:—

“A well-known clergyman here, who comes under the head of sensationalist, was asked by a friend the other day why he so often violated good taste both in matter and manner, when speaking in the pulpit.

“‘I will tell you,’ was the reply: ‘I have no more liking for the kind of sermons I deliver than you have. They are meretricious in rhetoric, and unsound in sentiment; but they are popular; and I must furnish the sort of article my congregation is willing to pay for. You are aware that my predecessor was an able and scholarly man, and extremely conscientious withal; but he failed to fill the pews, and he was requested to resign. If I had obeyed my own inclination as to sermons, I should have shared his fate. I was

anxious, however, to retain the position; for I have a large family, and it is my duty to support them. Do you blame me for discharging that duty?”

“Churches now are nothing more than theological theaters, and preachers, the actors who are paid so much for performing cleverly and acceptably. When the priestly artists do not draw, their engagement is discontinued. We are forced to make our sermons attractive to those who come to hear them. In consulting our household expenses, we must make a liberal surrender of our tastes and convictions. I receive \$10,000 a year. If I preached simpler and better sermons, reflecting my *real views*, I could not get \$3,000. So, you see, bread-earning outweighs both aspiration and inspiration.”

It is fair to presume that if all were as frank as the minister quoted in the foregoing extract, there would be many such confessions made.

THE TENDENCY OF THE CHURCH.

The *Liberal Christian* states the matter thus:—

“There is a powerful element of Romanism in all the larger Protestant bodies. The clergymen do not teach to the people the Bible itself in its purity and simplicity, but they require them to receive instead, a system of clerical interpretations of the Bible. Their whole ecclesiastical system is based on the preposterous assumption that their opinions about the Bible and its teachings are identical with the teachings of the Bible itself.”

On this point the “Catholic Christian Instructed,” page 20, speaks as follows:—

“If the Church of Rome were ever guilty of idolatry in relation to the saints, her daughter, the Church of England, stands guilty of the same, which has ten churches dedicated to Mary for one dedicated to Christ.”

Mr. Hopkins, in a treatise on the millennium, says:—

“There is no reason to consider the antichristian spirit and practices confined to that which is now called the Church of Rome. The Protestant churches have much of antichrist in them, and are far from being wholly reformed from corruption and wickedness.”

Mr. Simson, in his “Plea for Religion,” says:—

“For though the pope and Church of Rome are at the head of the grand 1260 years’ delusion, yet all other churches, of whatever de-

nomination, whether established or tolerated, which partake of the same spirit, or have instituted doctrines or ceremonies inimical to the pure and unadulterated gospel of Christ, shall sooner or later share in the fate of that immense fabric of human ordinances; and that the Protestant churches should imitate the Church of Rome, in this worst part of its conduct, can never be sufficiently bewailed."

THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE.

"And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation. . . . Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:9-12.

The facts brought to view in the foregoing extracts concerning the state of the churches, show plainly that they are truly in a fallen condition as specified by the prophecy. But it was not enough to state the actual condition of the Church. As already shown by Rev. 18:4, a call to "come out of her my people" is announced by the divine messenger. How may God's people be separated from such a mixture of evil? Only by having their attention called to the remedial message proclaimed under the symbol of the third angel. The remedy therein prescribed, would, if heeded by all, reform the whole Church. But since the majority prefer to walk in a light of their own kindling, God calls his humble, faithful ones to separate from their former associates. This is to be accomplished by their keeping the commandments of God, as well as the faith of Jesus. But were they not doing this before? Had they been, this would not be brought before them as a requirement to separate them from their former associates, and also test their patience by the act.

This will call for those who labor to propagate the message to preach much on the claims of God's law, that all may see wherein they have formerly violated its precepts. Such a message must of necessity be a world-wide one; for it follows the two which precede

it, and they go to every nation, kindred, tongue, and people. See verses 6, 7.

It is, too, a message of fearful import. No severer threatening of divine wrath is to be found in all the book of God. But since the pen of inspiration has traced the words it contains, it is the duty of all both to gather its instruction, and to heed its admonition, and thus escape the judgments it pronounces upon all offenders.

CHAPTER VII.

THE LAW OF GOD.

"THINK not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Matt. 5: 17, 18.

"*Moral law*, the law which prescribes to men their duty to God, and to each other, declared by God himself on Sinai, and contained in the decalogue."— *Worcester's Unabridged Dictionary*, ed. 1879.

"The moral law is summarily contained in the decalogue written by the finger of God on two tables of stone, and delivered to Moses on Mount Sinai. Ex. 20."— *Webster's Unabridged Dictionary*, ed. 1878.

"*Moral law* is that declaration of God's will which directs and binds all men in every age and place, to their whole duty to him. It was most solemnly proclaimed by God himself at Sinai."— *Buck's Theological Dictionary*, art. *Law*.

"In all ages of the Church it has been admitted that the moral law was comprised in ten distinct commandments."— *Bush's Notes on Exodus*, p. 251.

"God's ten words, not only in the Old Testament, but in all revelation, are the most emphatically regarded as the synopsis of all religion and morality."— *Alexander Campbell*, in his *Debate with Purcell*, p. 215.

"The moral law is of use to all men, to inform them of the holy nature and will of God, and of their duty, binding them to walk accordingly. The moral law is summarily comprehended in the ten commandments, which were delivered by the voice of God upon Mount Sinai, and written by him on two tables of stone."— *Presbyterian Confession of Faith*, 1833, pp. 243, 246.

"Q.—What does God require of man?"

"A.—Obedience to his revealed will.

"Q.—What is the rule of our obedience?"

"A.—The moral law."— *M. E. Church Catechism*, No. 2, p. 38, ed. 1866.

"Q.—Where is the moral law given?"

"A.—In the ten commandments."— *Cat. No. 1*, p. 18, ed. 1884.

"Q.—Are all Christians under obligation to keep the law?"

"A.—Yes."— *Cat. No. 2*, p. 43.

"Now our faith is that the whole of the decalogue is binding upon all men."— *E. O. Haven D. D., LL. D., Bp. M. E. Church*.

"We believe that the Scriptures teach that the law of God is the eternal and unchangeable rule of his moral government, . . . and that the inability which the Scriptures ascribe to fallen man to fulfill its precepts, arises entirely from their love of sin, to deliver them from which, and to restore them through a mediator to unfeigned obedience to the holy law, is one great end of the gospel."— *Baptist Church Directory*, pp. 167, 168, ed. 1877.

In Wesley's "Sermons" we find the following excellent instruction on the relation of the law and the gospel:—

"It therefore behooves all who desire either to come to Christ, or to walk in him whom they have received, to take heed how they 'make void the law through faith;' to secure us effectually against which, let us inquire, first, Which are the most usual ways of 'making void the law through faith?' and secondly, How we may follow the apostle, and by faith establish the law?"

"1. Let us first inquire, What are the most usual ways of making void the law through faith? Now the way for a preacher to make it all void at a stroke is, not to preach it at all. This is just the same thing as to blot it out of the oracles of God. More especially, when it is done with design; when it is made a rule not to preach the law, and the very phrase, 'a preacher of the law' is used as a term of reproach, as though it meant little less than an enemy to the gospel.

"2. All this proceeds from the deepest ignorance of the nature, properties, and use of the law; and proves that those who act thus, either know not Christ—are utter strangers to living faith—or at least that they are but babes in Christ, and as such, 'unskilled in the word of righteousness.'

"3. Their grand plea is this: that preaching the gospel, that is, according to their judgment, the speaking of nothing but the sufferings and merits of Christ, answers all the ends of the law. But this we utterly deny. It does not answer the very first end of the law, namely, the convincing men of sin, the awakening those who are still asleep on the brink of hell. There may have been here and there an exempt case. One in a thousand may have been awakened by the gospel, but this is no general rule. The ordinary method of God is to convict sinners by the law, and that only. The gospel is not the means which God hath ordained, or which our Lord himself used for this end. We have no authority in Scripture for applying it thus, nor any ground to think it will prove effectual. Nor have we any more ground to expect this from the nature of the thing. 'They that be whole,' as our Lord himself observes, 'need not a

physician, but they that are sick.' It is absurd, therefore, to offer a physician to them that are whole, or that at least imagine themselves so to be. You are first to convince them that they are sick: otherwise they will not thank you for your labor. It is equally absurd to offer Christ to them whose heart is whole, having never yet been broken. It is, in the proper sense, 'casting pearls before swine.' Doubtless 'they will trample them under foot;' and it is no more than you have reason to expect, if they also 'turn again and rend you.'" — *Vol. 1, Sermon 5, pp. 216, 217.*

Dr. Adam Clarke, in his comments on Rom. 7: 13, says:—

"Man cannot have a true notion of sin but by means of the law of God. . . . It would be almost impossible for a man to have that just notion of the demerit of sin so as to produce repentance, or to see the nature and necessity of the death of Christ, if the law were not applied to his conscience by the light of the Holy Spirit; it is then alone that he sees himself to be carnal and sold under sin; and that the law and the commandments are holy, just, and good."

Andrew Fuller, an eminent Baptist minister [1754–1815], called the "Franklin of Theology," says:—

"If the doctrine of the atonement leads us to entertain degrading notions of the law of God, or to plead an exemption from its preceptive authority, we may be sure it is not the Scripture doctrine of reconciliation. Atonement has respect to justice, and justice to the law, or the revealed will of the Sovereign, which has been violated; and the very design of the atonement is to repair the honor of the law. If the law which has been transgressed were unjust, instead of an atonement being required for the breach of it, it ought to have been repealed, and the Lawgiver have taken upon himself the disgrace of having enacted it. . . . It is easy to see from hence, that in proportion as the law is depreciated, the gospel is undermined, and both grace and atonement rendered void. It is the law as abused, or as turned into a way of life, in opposition to the gospel, for which it was never given to a fallen creature, that the sacred Scriptures depreciate it; and not as the revealed will of God, the immutable standard of right and wrong. In this view the apostles delighted in it; and if we are Christians we shall delight in it too, and shall not object to be under it as a rule of duty; for no man objects to be governed by laws which he loves." — *Atonement of Christ, Works of Andrew Fuller, published by the American Tract Society, pp. 160, 161.*

The following are the closing words of Bishop Simpson's "Yale Lectures on Preaching," No. 4, and were published in the New York *Independent*, of Jan. 2, 1879:—

"The law of God should be distinctly set forth. The congregation should be gathered as around the base of Sinai, as from the summit is heard the voice of God in those commandments which are eternal and unalterable in their character. The effect of preaching the law will be that some hearts will be opened; others may be repelled, and say, 'Let not God speak to us any more.' Some will object to the preaching of the law, and say, 'Prophecy better things.' But still the law must be preached. It brings the sinner to a recognition of his sins, that he has transgressed God's holy law, and shows him the fearfulness of the doom which is impending over him. The law must be followed by the gospel. The awakened sinner must be pointed to the Saviour, that he may see that, deep as his transgression may be, the blood of Christ can wash it away. There are many preachers who love to talk of the gospel alone. They dwell especially on the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of Christ. This is well. It is more than well. It is essential. But sometimes they neglect these matters of the law, and assign them to a place in the past age, claiming that men now can be best moved by love alone. They may thus rear a beautiful structure; but its foundation is on the sand. No true edifice can be raised without its foundation's being dug deep by repentance toward God. The gospel has no significance, except as it is based on the positive law, which Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfill. The law without the gospel leads to service; the gospel without the law leads to antinomianism; the two combined—charity out of a pure heart and of a good conscience and of faith unfeigned."

"These statutes are therefore not simply commands or precepts of God; for God may give commandments which have only a transient and local effect; they are in a distinctive sense the word of God, an essential part of that word which 'abideth.' . . . By the phrase 'the ten words,' as well as in the general scope of Hebrew legislation, the moral law is fully distinguished from the civil and ceremonial law. The first is an abiding statement of the divine will; the last consists of transient ordinances having but a temporary and local meaning." — *Essay on the Abiding Sabbath, by Rev. Geo. Elliott, p. 116.*

"This law is so extensive that we cannot measure it; so spiritual that we cannot evade it, and so reasonable that we cannot find fault with it." — *Scott's Com. on Ex. 20 1-17.*

DURATION OF LAWS, AND EFFECT OF REPEALS.

"When a law [not limited in itself] is once enacted by the proper authority, it must remain in force until the same authority repeals it; and the repeal must be as plainly stated as the original enactment." — *Tappan's Logic, pp. 482, 487.*

"The general principle relied upon, independent of some statutory rule, is not controverted, that when a statute is repealed, it must be considered as if it had never existed, except with reference

to such parts as are saved by repealing statute."—*Decisions of the Supreme Court of Iowa, 1862, Iowa Reports, vol. 12, p. 311.*

THE MORAL LAW DISTINCT FROM THE RITUAL OR
CEREMONIAL LAW.

"Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." Rom. 3:31.

"It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16:17.

"Moral law is that declaration of God's will which directs and binds all men, in every age and place, to their whole duty to him. It was most solemnly proclaimed by God himself at Sinai. . . . It is denominated *perfect* (Ps. 19:7), perpetual (Matt. 5:17, 18), holy (Rom. 7:12), good (Rom. 7:12), spiritual (Rom. 7:14), and exceeding broad (Ps. 119:96)."—*Buck's Theological Dictionary, art. Law.*

"Ceremonial law; the Mosaic institutions which prescribe the external rites and ceremonies to be observed by the Jews as distinct from the *moral precepts* which are of *perpetual* obligation."—*Webster's Dictionary, ed. 1854.*

"The moral law—the law of God—prescribing personal and social duties and prohibiting transgressions; the law of ten commandments in distinction from the ceremonial law."—*Worcester's Dictionary, ed. 1860.*

"Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rights, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet, notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral."—*M. E. Discipline, art. 6, p. 11.*

"Moses wrote in a book the judicial and ceremonial precepts that he had received; but God himself [as it is evident from texts referred to in the margin] wrote the ten commandments, the substance of the moral law, on the tables of stone. This difference strongly marked the permanency and perpetual obligation of the moral law, and the inferior importance and temporary obligation of the ceremonial institutions, and even of the judicial law, except as coincident with the moral."—*Scott's Comments on Ex. 34:27.*

"*Ques.*—How many kinds of law are given in the Old Testament?"

"*Ans.*—Three. (1.) The ceremonial, or church law, which God gave to the Jews for the regulation of their worship, sacrifices, festivals, and other ceremonies; (2.) The civil law, or that which regulated their political affairs; (3.) The moral law, or that which

related to their duties to God and man, which is summarily comprehended in the ten commandments.

"*Q.*—Are we under obligation to keep the ceremonial, or church law of the Jews?"

"*A.*—No; the ordinances which it enjoined were only types and shadows of Christ; and when they were fulfilled by his death, and the distinction between Jew and Gentile was removed, the ceremonial law was abolished, because it was no longer necessary.

"*Q.*—Are we under obligation to keep the moral law?"

"*A.*—Yes; because that is founded on the nature of God, and cannot be changed; it is of universal application, which was impossible with respect to the ceremonial and civil laws. Christ demands obedience to his law."—*Luther's Shorter Catechism, p. 16, ed. 1834.*

"The law which God delivered by Moses' ministry was of three sorts: ceremonial, judicial, and moral law. . . . The ceremonial law was wholly taken up in enjoining those observances of sacrifices and offerings, and various methods of purifications and cleansings, which were typical of Christ, and that sacrifice of his which alone was able to take away sin."—*Complete Works of Bishop Hopkins, The Ten Commandments, p. 7, ed. 1841.*

"And concerning this it is that the apostle [Paul] is to be understood, when, in his epistles, he so often speaks of the abrogation and disannulling of the law. He speaks it, I say, of the ceremonial law and Aaronical observations."—*Idem, p. 8.*

"The judicial law consisted of those constitutions which God prescribed the Jews for their civil government; for their state was a theocracy. . . . But the moral law is a system, or body of precepts, which carry a universal and natural equity in them, being so conformable to the light of reason and the dictates of every man's conscience, that as soon as ever they are declared and understood, he must needs subscribe to the justice and right sources of them.—*Id. pp. 7, 20.*

"The decalogue is a compendium of all that they [the prophets, apostles, or our Lord himself] taught concerning moral worship and justice."—*Id. p. 11.*

"Under the Jewish dispensation were incorporated two kinds of laws. One was founded on obligations growing out of the nature of men, and their relations to God and one another; obligations binding before they were written, and which will continue to be binding upon all who shall know them to the end of time. Such are the laws which were written by the finger of God on the tables of stone, and are called *moral laws*.

"The other kind, called *ceremonial laws*, related to various outward observances, which were not obligatory till they were commanded, and then were binding only on the Jews till the death of Christ."—*Justin Edwards, in Sabbath Manual, p. 133.*

THE IMMUTABILITY OF THE MORAL LAW.

"All his commandments are sure. They stand fast forever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness." Ps. 111 : 7, 8.

In the reply to Robert Ingersoll made by Judge J. S. Black, and published in the *North American Review* for August, 1881, he says : —

"The moral code of the Bible consists of certain immutable rules to govern the conduct of all men, at all times and at all places, in their private and personal relations with one another. It is entirely separate and apart from civil polity, the religious forms, the sanitary provisions, the police regulations, and the system of international law laid down for the special and exclusive observance of the Jewish people. This is a distinction which every intelligent man knows how to make. Has Mr. Ingersoll fallen into the egregious blunder of confounding these things ?"

"We believe that the law of God is the eternal and unchangeable rule of his moral government ; that it is holy, just, and good ; and that the inability which the Scriptures ascribe to fallen men to fulfill its precepts arises entirely from their love of sin ; to deliver them from which, and to restore them through a mediator to unfeigned obedience to the holy law, is one great end of the gospel, and of the means of grace connected with the establishment of the visible Church."—*Baptist Church Manual, art. 12, p. 55.*

"Beware of antinomianism, making void the law, or any part of it, through faith. . . . Let this be our voice, 'I prize thy commandments above gold or precious stone. Oh, what love have I unto thy law. All the day long is my study of it.' Beware of antinomian books. They contain many excellent things, and this makes them the more dangerous. Oh, be warned in time ! Do not play with fire ; do not put your hand upon the hole of a cockatrice's den."—*Christian Perfection, by John Wesley, pp. 45, 46.*

Speaking of antinomianism, Martin Luther has left the following : —

"I wonder exceedingly how it came to be imputed to me that I should reject the law of ten commandments. . . . Can it be imaginable that there should be any sin where there is no law ? Who-soever abrogates the law, must of necessity abrogate sin also."—*Spiritual Antichrist, pp. 71, 72.*

"The law has sustained no diminution of its authority, but ought always to receive from us the same veneration and obedience."—*Calvin's Institutes, book 2, chap. 7, sec. 15.*

Concerning the ten commandments as a rule of life, Dr. Adam Clarke says : —

"And let it be observed that the law did not answer this end *merely among the Jews* in the days of the apostles ; it is *just as necessary to the Gentiles to the present hour*. Nor do we find that true repentance takes place where the moral law is not preached and enforced. Those who preach only the gospel to sinners, at best only heal the hurt of the daughter of my people slightly."—*Com. on Rom. 7 : 13.*

Thomas Scott says : —

"This law, which is so extensive that we cannot measure it, so spiritual that we cannot evade it, and so reasonable that we cannot find fault with it, will be the rule of the future judgment of God, as it is of the present conduct of man."—*Com. on Ex. 20 : 1-17, Practical Observations.*

Dr. Albert Barnes, in his note on Matt. 5 : 19, says : —

"We learn hence, 1. That all the law of God is binding on Christians ; 2. . . . That all the commands of God should be preached, in their proper place, by Christian ministers ; 3. That they who pretend that there are any laws of God so small that they need not obey them, are unworthy of his kingdom ; and, 4. That true piety has respect to all the commandments of God, and keeps them."

"The law of God is a divine law, holy, heavenly, perfect. . . . There is not a command too many ; there is not one too few ; but it is so incomparable that its perfection is a proof of its divinity. . . . No human lawgiver could have given forth such a law as that which we find in the decalogue."—*Spurgeon's Sermons, p. 280.*

THE ABOLITION OF THE MORAL LAW IMPOSSIBLE.

"All his commandments are sure. They stand fast forever and ever." Ps. 111 : 7, 8.

"Thy word is true from the beginning : and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever." Ps. 119 : 160.

"My righteousness shall not be abolished." Isa. 51 : 6.

President Humphrey, of Amherst College, speaking of the law of ten commandments, says : —

"The law has no limitations, and therefore can never expire. It has *never been repealed*, and as the sacred canon is full and complete, we are certain it never will be. It is, therefore, binding on every one of us at this moment, and will be upon all future generations. No human authority may expunge a single word from the statutes of Jehovah."—*Essay on the Sabbath, p. 24.*

Rev. E. O. Haven, D. D., LL. D., bishop of the M. E. Church, and president of Michigan University, has left this record:—

“This decalogue can never become obsolete. It was designed for all men, and, obeyed, would render all men noble and worthy of immortal blessedness. It is a kind of consecration of the moral teachings of the Bible.”—*Pillars of Truth*, p. 235.

“The moral law, summarily comprehended in the ten commandments uttered from Mount Sinai, requires in all its precepts a spiritual obedience. . . . This law, we have said, never loses its force. Every human soul is at all times under its authority. . . . It requires full obedience or tremendous punishment. . . . According to this law we are to be judged. “The ceremonial law of the Jews comprehended a vast number of precepts. It stood in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them till the time of reformation.”—*Newins Biblical Antiquities*, pp. 214, 225.

Dr. Barnes, in his “Notes on the Gospels” says:—

“The laws of the Jews are commonly divided into moral, ceremonial, and judicial. The moral laws are such as grow out of the *nature of things*, which cannot, therefore, be changed; such as the duty of loving God and his creatures. These cannot be abolished, as it can never be made right to hate God, or to hate our fellow-men. Of this kind are the ten commandments; and these our Saviour has neither abolished nor superceded. The ceremonial laws are such as are appointed to meet certain states of society, or to regulate the religious rites and ceremonies of a people. These can be changed when circumstances are changed, and yet the moral law be untouched. A general may command his soldiers to appear sometimes in a red coat, and sometimes in blue, or in yellow. This would be a ceremonial law, and might be changed as he pleased. The duty of obeying him, and of being faithful to his country, could not be changed.”—*Comment on Matt. 5:18*.

In John Wesley’s “Sermons,” vol. 1, sermon 25, pp. 221, 222, is the following:—

“The ritual or ceremonial law, delivered by Moses to the children of Israel, containing all the injunctions and ordinances which related to the old sacrifices and service of the temple, our Lord indeed did come to destroy, to dissolve, and utterly abolish. To this bear all the apostles witness; not only Barnabas and Paul, who vehemently withstood those who taught that Christians ‘ought to keep the law of Moses’ (Acts 15:6); not only St. Peter, who termed the insisting on this, on the observance of the ritual law, a ‘tempting God,’ and ‘putting a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers,’ saith he, ‘nor we were able to bear;’ but ‘all the

apostles, elders, and brethren, being assembled with one accord’ (verse 10), declared that to command them to keep this law was to subvert their souls; and that ‘it seemed good to the Holy Ghost’ and to them ‘to lay no such burden upon them.’ This ‘handwriting of ordinances’ our Lord did ‘blot out,’ take away, and nail to his cross. Verse 24.

“But the moral law contained in the ten commandments, and enforced by the prophets, he did not take away. It was not the design of his coming to revoke any part of this. This is a law which never can be broken, which ‘stands fast as the faithful witness in heaven.’ The moral stands on an entirely different foundation from the ceremonial or ritual law, which was only designed for a temporary restraint upon a disobedient and stiff-necked people; whereas this was from the beginning of the world, being ‘written not on tables of stone,’ but on the hearts of all the children of men, when they came out of the hands of the Creator. And however the letters once written by the finger of God are now in a great measure defaced by sin, yet can they not wholly be blotted out while we have any consciousness of good and evil. Every part of this law must remain in force upon all mankind and in all ages, as not depending either on time or place, or any other circumstances liable to change; but on the nature of God and the nature of man, and their unchangeable relation to each other.”

Elder Barton W. Stone, one of the pioneers of the Christian Church, writes as follows concerning the law of God:—

“By the abolition of the law I do not think that the *moral law* of love to God and love to man was destroyed; for this must be unchangeable and eternally binding on all intelligent creatures. I see no connection between the death of Christ and the destruction of the moral law, but there is an intimate connection between his death and the *ceremonial laws*; for these were types and shadows of Christ, the antitype and substance. Though the moral law was not abolished, yet its *political curse* was, which I before proved to be death under Moses.”

Tract No. 64, of the American Baptist Publication Society, which treats of the moral law, says:—

“To prove that the ten commandments are binding, let any person read them, one by one, and ask his own conscience as he reads, whether it would be any sin to break them? Is this, or any part of it, the liberty of the gospel? Every conscience that is not seared as with a hot iron must answer these questions in the negative. . . . The Lawgiver and the Saviour were one; and believers must be of one mind with the former as well as with the latter; but if we depreciate the law which Christ delighted to honor, and deny our obligations to obey it, how are we of his mind? Rather are we

not of that mind which is enmity against God, which is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be? . . . If the law be not a rule of conduct to believers, and a perfect rule too, they are under no rule; or, which is the same thing, are lawless. But if so, they commit no sin; for *where no law is there is no transgression*; and in this case they have no sins to confess, either to God or to one another; nor do they stand in need of Christ as an advocate with the Father, nor of daily forgiveness through his blood. Thus it is, by disowning the law, men utterly subvert the gospel. Believers, therefore, instead of being freed from obligation to obey it, are under greater obligation to do so than any men in the world. To be exempt from this is to be without law, and of course without sin; in which case we might do without a Saviour, which is utterly subversive of all religion."—Pages 2-6.

In his published "Sermons," p. 23, Rev. T. R. Morris, bishop of the M. E. Church, utters the following trenchant words:—

"The moral law is of perpetual obligation, hence Christ said: 'I am not come to destroy the law, but to fulfill.' What law did he not destroy? Certainly not the ceremonial law; for this, Paul says, he 'abolished in his flesh;' but the moral law he destroyed not. On the contrary, he magnified and made it honorable by a holy life and a sacrificial death."

"One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass till heaven and earth pass," or, as it is expressed immediately after, *ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται*, till all (or rather all things) be fulfilled, till the consummation of all things. Here is, therefore, no room for that poor evasion (with which some have delighted themselves greatly) that 'no part of the law was to pass away till all the law was fulfilled; but it has been fulfilled by Christ; and therefore now must pass, for the gospel to be established.' Not so; the word 'all' does not mean all the law, but all things in the universe; as neither has the term 'fulfilled' any reference to the law, but to all things in heaven and earth."—*Wesley's Sermons, vol. 1, pp. 222, 223.*

"Long should pause the erring hand of man before it dares to chip away with the chisel of human reasoning *one single word* graven on the enduring tables by the hand of the infinite God. What is proposed?—To make an erasure in a Heaven-born code; to expunge one article from the recorded will of the Eternal! Is the eternal tablet of his law to be defaced by a creature's hand? He who proposes such an act *should fortify himself by reasons as holy as God and as mighty as his power.* None but consecrated hands could touch the ark of God; thrice holy should be the hands which would dare to alter the testimony which lay within the ark."—*Rev. George Elliot, in Abiding Sabbath, pp. 128, 129.*

CHAPTER VIII.

THE SABBATH OF THE LORD.

"AND God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it." Gen. 2:3.

"The Lord hath given you the Sabbath." Ex. 16:29.

"The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Ex. 20:10.

"The Sabbath was made for man." Mark 2:27.

"And rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment." Luke 23:56.

"Sabbath, in the Hebrew language, signifies rest, and is the seventh day of the week,—a day appointed for religious duties, and a total cessation from work."—*Buck's Theological Dictionary, art. Sabbath.*

IT WAS SANCTIFIED BY GOD.

"'Sanctify,' from the Hebrew 'Kadash,' to pronounce holy, to sanctify, to institute an holy thing, to appoint."—*Gesenius, Heb. Lex., p. 914, ed. 1854.*

"Signifies to consecrate, separate, set apart a thing or person from all secular purposes, to some religious use."—*Dr. A. Clarke.*

"Sanctify: To make sacred or holy; to set apart to a religious use. Also to secure from violation; to give sanction to."—*Webster.*

"Hallow: To make holy, to consecrate, to set apart for a holy or religious use."—*Webster.*

"Appoint: 1. An order, edict, or law, made by a superior as a rule to govern an inferior. Example: 2 Sam. 15:15.

"2. Enacted or decreed by authority for preference, as laws established.

"3. Made, fixed by a mandate uttered, an order given."—*Webster.*

"'Kadash;' appoint. Joshua 20:7; Joel 1:14; 2:15; Ex. 19:23, 12; Mark 2:27.

Geo. Bush, Prof. of Hebrew and Oriental Literature in New York City University, says:—

"'And sanctified it.' Heb., *שָׁבַט*, *kadash*. It is by this term that *positive appointment* of the Sabbath as a day of rest to man is

expressed. God's sanctifying the day is equivalent to his commanding men to sanctify it. As at the close of creation the seventh day was thus set apart by the Most High for such purposes, without limitation to age or country, the observance of it is obligatory upon the whole human race, to whom, in the wisdom of Providence, it may be communicated. This further appears from the reason why God blessed and sanctified it, viz., 'because that in it he had rested,' etc., which is a reason of equal force at all times and equally applying to all the posterity of Adam; and if it formed a just ground for sanctifying the first day which dawned upon the finished system of the universe, it must be equally so for sanctifying every seventh day to the end of time. . . . The sanctification of the seventh day in the present case can only be understood of its being set apart to the special worship and service of God." — *Notes on Genesis, vol. 1, pp. 47-49.*

"Sanctify means to set apart to a sacred or religious use. This could not refer to past time, but to the seventh day for time to come. And it was to be used in this sacred or religious manner, not by the Lord, for he does not need it; but for man, for whom, says Christ, the Sabbath was made. Mark 2:27. How, then, we ask, could the Sabbath be thus sanctified for man's use, or be set apart to be used in a holy or sacred manner by him? — Only by telling man to use it in this manner. But just as soon as the Lord had told Adam to use the Sabbath in a sacred or religious manner, he had given him a command for its observance.

"The record in Genesis is therefore plain that a Sabbath commandment was given in Eden. And we should do no violence to the text if we should read it, *And God blessed the seventh day, and commanded Adam to sacredly observe it.* But a command given to Adam under these circumstances was a command through him to all his posterity of every age and clime." — *Smith's Two Covenants, pp. 16, 17.*

Dr. Lange, the great German commentator, says: —

"If we had no other passage than this of Gen. 2:3, there would be no difficulty in deducing from it a precept for the universal observance of a Sabbath, or seventh day, to be devoted to God as holy time, by all of that race for whom the earth and its nature were specially prepared. The first men must have known it. The words, 'he hallowed it,' can have no meaning otherwise. They would be a blank unless in reference to some who are required to keep it holy." — *Commentary, vol. 1, p. 197.*

IT WAS SANCTIFIED AT CREATION.

The *Baptist Weekly*, of October, 1879, in discussing the *time* of the sanctification of the Sabbath forcibly said: —

"Now the antiquity of the institution depends on the space of time covered by this word, 'remember.' It would lead us to infer at the least that the Israelites were acquainted with the Sabbath in Egypt; if acquainted with it there, it is but a fair inference that the knowledge of it was brought into Egypt by Jacob's family, and so backward to the time stated in the Mosaic record, where we find that 'God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it.' He set it apart as a memorial of his cessation from the creative work. Here, then, we reach a principle; memorials were always instituted or set up synchronically with the events they were intended to commemorate. The precious possessions of the ark (memorials) were not laid up there a thousand years after the events they were intended to commemorate. The stones set up in Jordan to memorialize the passage of the Israelites, were not erected a thousand years after the passage. The memorial is always coeval with the event which it symbolizes, and on this principle, therefore, the Sabbath must be as old as creation."

The same point was ably handled by a writer in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, in 1856. Reviewing the position of one who argued that the sanctification of the day did not occur till the Exode, he replied: —

"The first thing that strikes us in the survey of this passage, is the at least apparent violence done to the narrative in the book of Genesis. He may well lay great stress upon this narrative, as creating, if not, as he asserts, 'the whole controversy upon the subject,' at least an important part of it. But certainly it seems to demand the existence and exigencies of some preconceived theory, to account for the gloss which he has put upon it. Who that had no such theory to defend, would imagine the sacred writer here to describe a transaction, which, according to the supposition, had not occurred for two thousand five hundred years afterward? It would not be asserted by him, or any of those who occupy the same side in this controversy, that the interpretation thus given to this passage is the one which would naturally present itself to any one of ordinary intelligence upon the first perusal of it. We will not allege, indeed, that the obvious, or seemingly obvious, import of the passage is always the true one. But if there be no dispute respecting the terms employed (and there is none here), and if the subject matter be of easy comprehension (as in the present instance), then the *onus probandi* rests upon those who would reject the obvious for the more recondite construction.

"Here is a historical statement: and the only question is, Does Moses, after describing the work of six days, suddenly, and without any intimation, alter his style when he comes to describe the procedure of the seventh day? and using a highly rhetorical figure, does he set down in connection with the record of this procedure an event which did not take place until twenty-five centuries had

elapsed? We have said, *without intimation*, but it should be added also, in the face of the fact that the whole, being a plain narrative, would inevitably be differently understood by all who might read it apart from the light of such an hypothesis as the one now under examination. This, assuredly, is not what we might have expected to discover in any book written beneath the guidance of the divine Spirit, and intended for the instruction of the unsophisticated in all ages.

"We utterly deny, then, that 'it was natural in the historian, when he had related the history of the creation and of God's ceasing from it upon the seventh day, to add' the words in question, unless they are expressive of an event which actually occurred at the creation. And to state in the way of argument that Moses does 'not assert that God then blessed and sanctified the seventh day,' but simply that he did so for a certain reason, is to be guilty of a species of sophistry very unworthy the gravity which becomes the discussion of such a theme. How could he have conveyed more lucidly the idea that this was done *then*, than by recording it, as he does other things, in the past tense, and also in immediate connection with that very cessation from work on the part of God which it was designed to commemorate? True, he assigns the reason for this consecration; but he does this in such a manner as to imply that as the reason existed from the beginning, so also did the consecration. And it is but natural to ask, What ground could exist for the appointment of such a memorial in after ages, which did not operate 'from the foundation of the world'?"

"On the whole it does appear to us that until all the principles of sound criticism are abandoned, and we are at liberty, by a dexterous and convenient application of the figure prolepsis to convert history into prophecy at our pleasure, we cannot adopt the interpretation which this writer has so strenuously advocated. We can understand what is meant by the total rejection of this inspired record, or by the reduction of it to the rank of a mere myth; but we are at an utter loss to understand the position which accepts its divine authority, and acknowledges the opening portion of Genesis to be the narrative of real transactions, and yet, to serve the purpose of a theory, would mutilate and distort its obvious meaning, and that in gross violation of all the laws which guide the historian and chronologist's pen."

F. Denison, A. M. (Baptist), in his "Sabbath History," says:—

"Because, therefore, so little is said in the *book of Genesis* upon the subject of this institution, is it at all reasonable to suppose, as some have done, that the institution was then unknown? As well might we suppose that Noah preached no particular doctrine because we have no record of his sermons. Or as well might we conjecture that the Jews had no Sabbath from Joshua to David.—five hundred years,—because no record is made of it; or that they were without circumcision from Joshua to Jeremiah,—eight hundred years,—be-

cause no mention is made of that."—*The Sabbath Institution*, pp. 24, 25.

"The sacred writer here both records the appointment of the Sabbath, and assigns the reason for it: 'Because that in it the Lord rested from all his work.' This is evidently *historical* and not by anticipation; for the reason subsisted from the beginning, and was more cogent immediately than it could be at a distance of more than two thousand years, when the command was solemnly renewed from Mount Sinai, long after sin had marred the beauty of the great Creator's work; and it concerns the whole human race as much as the nation of Israel."—*Dr. Scott, on Gen. 2:3*.

In his celebrated work, "The Ten Commandments," p. 196, Bishop Hopkins says:—

"Others, who I believe concur with the truth, date its original as high as the creation of the world, grounding their opinion upon the unanswerable testimony of Gen. 2:2, 3. . . . Now, that there cannot in these words be understood any prolepsis, or anticipation, declaring that as done then which was done many ages after, appears plainly, because God is said to sanctify the Sabbath then, when he rested; but he rested precisely on the seventh day after the creation; therefore that very seventh day did God sanctify, and made it the beginning of all ensuing Sabbaths. So you see that the Sabbath is but one day younger than man; ordained for him in the state of his uprightness and innocence."

IT IS A MEMORIAL OF GOD'S CREATIVE POWER.

"Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you . . . that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you." Ex. 31:13.

"I gave them my Sabbaths to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them. . . . And hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." Eze. 20:12, 20.

"O Lord Almighty, thou hast created the world by Christ, and hast appointed the Sabbath in memory thereof."—*Apostolic Constitutions, Book 7, sec. 2, par. 36*.

Josephus, in his "Antiquities," book 1, chap. 1, sec. 1, speaks of the creation and its accompanying rest, on this wise:—

"Moses says that in just six days, the world and all that was therein was made, and that the seventh day was a day of rest and a release from the labor of such operations; whence it is that we celebrate a rest from our labors on that day, and call it the Sabbath, which word denotes rest in the Hebrew tongue."

Philo, an ancient Jewish writer, says:—

“But after the whole world had been completed according to the perfect nature of the number six, the Father hallowed the day following, the seventh, praising it and calling it holy. For that day is a festival, not only of one city or one country, but of all the earth,—a day which alone it is right to call the day of festival for all people, and the birthday of the world.”—*Works, vol. 1; the Creation of the World, sec. 30.*

Prof. M'Owen (Methodist), in his work on the Sabbath, pp. 12, 14, has the following:—

“The Sabbath was instituted to commemorate the creation of the world. To furnish the world with a standing demonstration of the falsehood and absurdity of idolatry, he instituted the Sabbath. By blessing the Sabbath and hallowing it, by resting therein, and by challenging it for himself, God stamped it with his own image and superscription, and hence its desecration was reckoned among the Jews as a sin of treason against his infinite majesty.”

Justin Edwards, speaking of the creation of the world in connection with the Sabbath, says:—

“As a memorial of that fact, he set apart the Sabbath, kept it, sanctified it, and blessed it, for the benefit of all. . . . Thus the keeping of the Sabbath makes God known, and gives efficacy to his moral government. . . . It commemorates the work of God as Creator.”—*Sabbath Manual, pp. 16, 19, 22.*

Alexander Campbell speaks thus of the Sabbath as a commemorative institution:—

“The humblest pillar in honor of the dead has ‘in memory of’ inscribed, either in fact or by circumstances, upon its front; and so reads the fourth principle of the *everlasting ten*, *remember* that in six days God created the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day; wherefore, remember the seventh day, to sanctify and hallow it.”—*Popular Lectures, p. 284.*

“The seventh-day Sabbath celebrated the work of creation, and for four thousand years did its weekly return talk of the day when God ceased from his works, and lit up the sun and the stars.”—*Luther Lee, D. D., in Theology, p. 378.*

Kitto's “History of the Bible,” note on p. 67, says:—

“Thus was the seventh day appointed by God, from the very beginning of the world, to be observed as a day of rest by mankind, in memory of the great benefits received in the formation of the universe.”

Tract No. 271, Presbyterian Board of Publication, p. 3, says:—

“Any plain reader would understand that the Sabbath was ordained for man as man, to commemorate creation and Jehovah God as the creator, against the idolatry whose ignorance of the origin of all things, it was foreseen, would tend to multiply gods. Hence the saying of the rabbins, ‘He that violates the Sabbath denies the Creator.’”

Rev. F. R. Boston (Baptist), “Essays and Addresses” (First Congress Virginia Baptists, 1803), p. 38, says, after quoting the fourth commandment:—

“The Sabbath, then, is the memorial day of the Creator.”

THE ORIGIN OF THE WEEK.

“Week—a period of seven days, a division of time adopted by the ancient Egyptians and Hebrews, and in general use among Christians and Mohammedans. Its origin is referred back in the Mosaic account to the creation of the world, and there is no other record relating to it.”—*American Cyclopaedia.*

Smith's “Bible Dictionary” says concerning the week:—

“There can be none [controversy] about the great antiquity . . . of measuring time by a period of seven days. Gen. 8 : 10 ; 29 : 27. . . . The origin of this division of time is a matter which has given birth to much speculation. Its antiquity is so great, its observance so wide-spread, and it occupies so important a place in sacred things that it has been very generally thrown back as far as the creation of man. . . . The week and the Sabbath are as old as man himself. . . . In Exodus, of course, the week comes into very distinct manifestation.”

“The week, another primeval measure, is not a natural measure of time, as some astronomers and chronologers have supposed, indicated by the phases or quarters of the moon. It was originated by divine appointment at the creation, six days of labor and one of rest being wisely appointed for man's physical and spiritual well-being.”—*Bliss's Sacred Chronology, p. 6.*

Dr. Coleman says:—

“Seven has been the ancient and honored number among the nations of the earth. They have measured their time by weeks, from the beginning. The original of this was the Sabbath of God, as Moses has given the reasons of it in his writings.”—*Brief Dissertation on the First Three Chapters of Genesis, p. 26.*

The "Bible Dictionary" of the American Tract Society, art. Sabbath, says:—

"The week was an established division of time in Mesopotamia and Arabia (Gen. 29 : 27); and traces of it have been found in many nations of antiquity, so remote from each other, and of such diverse origin, as to forbid the idea of their having received it from Sinai and the Hebrews."

"We learn, also, from the testimony of Philo, Hesiod, Josephus, Porphyry, and others, that the division of time into weeks, and the observance of the seventh day, were common to the nations of antiquity. They would not have adopted such a custom from the Jews. Whence, then, could it have been derived, but through tradition, from its original institution in the Garden of Eden?"—*John G. Butler, in Natural and Revealed Theology, p. 396.*

Tract No. 271, Presbyterian Board of Publication, says:—

"In fact, the division of time into weeks is not only *non-natural*, but in a sense *contra-natural*, since the week of seven days is no sub-division of either the naturally measured month or year. Yet this singular measure of time by periods of seven days may be traced not only through the sacred history before the era of Moses, but in all ancient civilizations of every era, many of which could not possibly have derived the notion from Moses. . . . Among the learned of Egypt, the Brahmins of India, by Arabs, by Assyrians, as may be gathered from their astronomers and priests, this division was recognized. Hesiod (900 B. C) declares the seventh day is holy. So Homer and Callimachus. Even in the Saxon mythology, the division by weeks is prominent. Nay, even among the tribes of devil-worshippers in Africa, we are told that a peculiar feature of their religion is a weekly sacred day, the violation of which by labor will incur the wrath of the devil god. Traces of a similar division of time have been noticed among the Indians of the American continent. Now, on what other theory are these facts explicable than upon the supposition of a divinely ordained Sabbath at the origin of the race?"—*Pages 5-7.*

THE DAYS OF CREATION WEEK.

A point of controversy has been raised concerning the length of the days of creation week. Some have argued that they were successive, yet indefinite periods, while others have strongly contended that the periods, there employed were literal days, such as are now known to man. But could there possibly be six *indefinite* periods succeeding each other? Would two or

more *indefinite* periods coming together make more than *one* indefinite period? In other words, Would not these periods, if separated at all, have to be so marked by the *definite* ending of one, and the *definite* beginning of its successor? If not, who can tell that there were any such divisions? But just as soon as that is found which marks the ending of one period and the beginning of another, the periods are that moment proven to be *definite* in the length. And since each day of creation week is definitely bounded by an "evening and morning," and distinctly numbered one, two, three, etc., there can be no hesitancy in pronouncing them definite days. The following, concerning this subject, is from H. W. Morris, A. M., D. D. :—

"Here the point to be decided is not what this scripture can be *made* to mean, but what does it mean; what idea was it intended to convey? We believe that it means literal and natural days, for the following reasons:—

"1. No language could have been chosen more explicit, nor any terms found in the Hebrew more definite, to express literal days, than those here employed. There was a first day, a second day, a third day, etc., each opening and closing with a definite evening and morning—literally rendered, there was evening, there was morning, day one; there was evening, there was morning, day two; etc.

"2. Moses, who penned the record, we have every reason to believe, understood these days, and meant that his *readers* should understand them as literal days; for we cannot suppose for a moment that he ever had in his mind anything like the ideas suggested by modern geology.

"3. God himself refers to them as literal days in the commandment given from Sinai, 'Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy. . . . For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day.' No impartial mind can read these words and come to any other conclusion than that the *six days*, as well as the *seventh*, were literal days.

"4. There is no adequate reason for this departing from the plain and natural sense of the record. . . . Why might not that creation, then, have been accomplished in six days? Nay, we ask, what has there ever been discovered in the sea or on the land that may not be explained in entire harmony with it? On the other hand, indeed, the supposition that this day [the third] was a period of unmeasured and immeasurable duration, does involve us, among other serious difficulties, in the grave one of holding that herbs, shrubs, and trees flourished and blossomed, and matured seeds and fruits *in darkness, even ages before the sun had ever once shone upon the face of the earth*; for the sun did not appear until the fourth

period. . . . The fine 'theories' and beautiful 'visions' of mighty periods, that have been invented to relieve us of a few seeming difficulties connected with the sacred history, will be found without exception, when duly studied, to involve more numerous and vastly more serious difficulties, so far as the Bible is concerned. By forsaking the more simple and natural interpretation of this chapter, nothing is gained, much is lost, and everything is hazarded."—*Work-Days of God, or Science and the Bible, pp. 184-190.*

Rosenmuller, whose authority as a Hebrew philologist and critic, is entitled to the highest respect, says:—

"It could scarcely be more clearly expressed than by this formula (God divided the light from the darkness, and called the light day, but the darkness he called night), that the *natural day* is to be understood, and not a space consisting of more days or years."—*Scholæ, Gen. 1: 15, quoted in Work-Days of God, p. 179.*

The "Union Bible Dictionary" (American Sunday-school) testifies:—

"And with respect to the nature of those six days, so particularly defined in the record. . . . we can have no reasonable doubt that they were such days as now, and ever have been, occasioned by one revolution of the earth on its axis; because a perfect creation may be as easily the work of one day, or of one moment, as of thousands of years; and because that record, in the evidence of which our confidence rests, on the subject of the creation, has distinctly defined each of those days by its evening and its morning."—*Art. Creation.*

"Defined throughout the chapter, as the term *day* is to its natural meaning by the recurring phrase of 'morning and evening,' as if with the very object of excluding any such signification (as immense periods), we cannot but fear that the latter explanation does considerable violence to the plainest principles of scriptural interpretation. On that ground *alone* we should be disposed to prefer the former, which seems to us even better than the other suited to the demands of geological science, while it does not appear that Biblical criticism can urge any substantial objection to it."—*John Kitto, D. D., Quoted in Work-Days of God, p. 180.*

In a speech at Saratoga Springs, New York, Daniel T. Spear, D. D. expressed himself as follows:—

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

ment this same day is spoken of as a day in a week consisting of seven days, each of which was twenty-four hours in length; and the still further fact that the Jews, for whom the record in Genesis and Exodus was originally made, not being geologists, would understand the term 'day' as thus described, to mean a natural day of twenty-four hours. They could give it no other meaning; *and no man would give to it any other meaning* unless led to do so in order to meet a supposed difficulty. The fact that the term is used for an indefinite period *does not make it in this use*, with this description and in these connections, *anything but a natural day of twenty-four hours*. To force another meaning into it is to give it a meaning which it does not bear; and moreover, when this meaning is forced into it, the supposed difficulty created by geology is by no means removed."—*New York Independent, Sept. 20, 1883.*

Prof. Kurtz says:—

"Now there is no question but that the division of time which is here called *day*, was conditioned and limited by the presence of *natural light*; consequently the 'evening' which followed such a day, and the 'morning' which preceded the next day, must in like manner be understood as parts of an *ordinary natural* whole day; and the latter can only be measured according to the natural, everyday standard still in use.—the occurrence of one regular, natural change of light and darkness (of day and night). The days of creation were thus measured by the natural advent and departure of the light of day, by the occurrence of evening and morning. This standard of measurement is given by the record itself, and must be applied alike to each of the six days of creation."—*Quoted in Work-Days of God, pp. 179, 180.*

We would do well to remember in this connection that the science of geology knows nothing of six geological periods. The following, from the "Library of Universal Knowledge," vol. 6, p. 587, art. Geology, tells the number of geological periods which that science allows for the creation of the world:—

"By common consent it is admitted that names taken from the region where a formation or group of rocks is typically developed, are best adapted for general use. Cambrian, Devonian, Silurian, Permian, Jurassic, are of this class, and have been adopted all over the globe. The geological record is classified into five main divisions: 1. The archæan, azoic (lifeless), or eozoic (dawn of life) periods; 2. The primary, or palæozoic (ancient life) periods; 3. The secondary, or mesozoic (middle life) periods; 4. The tertiary or post-tertiary periods. These divisions are further arranged into systems, each system into formations, each formation into groups, and each group or series into single zones or horizons."

COMMENCEMENT OF THE DAY.

The day being a natural division of time, produced by regular revolutions of the earth, it would seem reasonable that its Author should designate some point in those revolutions, at which one day should close and its successor commence. The day is now generally regarded as being bounded at both ends by the mid-night hour; but there is nothing in nature to determine that as the boundary line of a day. Then in the absence of a natural sign, one would of necessity be obliged to resort to artificial means of ascertaining the commencement of the day.

But man has not been left to depend upon such methods. It is plainly stated by the Author of the day, that he "made two great lights; the greater light to *rule the day*, and the lesser light to *rule the night*" (Gen. 1:16), "and to divide the light from the darkness." Verse 18. It may also be learned from verse 5 that one each, of these light and dark periods (in reverse order, however), constituted a day; for thus it is stated: "The *evening* and the *morning* were the first day." The same expression is used concerning each of the six days of creation week, as will be seen by reference to verses 8, 13, 19, 23, 31.

From this it is evident that the day commenced at the setting of the sun. More than this, the Lord, when instructing the children of Israel when to commence and end the celebration of their days of worship, said: "From *even unto even*, shall ye celebrate your Sabbath." Lev. 23:32. The exact meaning they were to attach to the word "even" may be learned by reference to Deut. 16:6, which says: "Thou shalt sacrifice the passover at even, *at the going down of the sun.*" Nehemiah, also, tells how he guarded the city of Jerusalem, after the captivity, from being entered by fish merchants and others to sell their wares on the Sabbath: "And it came to pass, that when the gates of Jerusalem began to be dark before the Sabbath, I com-

manded that the gates should be shut, and charged that they should not be opened till after the Sabbath." Neh. 13:19.

Coming to the New Testament, we find the day reckoned in the same manner. On one occasion, the Saviour was in Capernaum teaching on the Sabbath (Mark 1:21), but on returning to Simon's house, that disciple's wife's mother was found suffering from fever. Verses 29, 30. The Saviour did not scruple to heal her even though it was the Sabbath-day. The Pharisees thinking this wrong, would not bring their sick to him on that day, however much they desired him to heal them. But the record says that, "at even, when the sun did set, they brought unto him all that were diseased, and them that were possessed with devils." Verse 32.

The following statements from eminent authors are directly to the point on this question:—

"The Jews reckoned their days from evening to evening, according to the order which is mentioned in the first chapter of Genesis, in the account of the work of creation: 'The evening and the morning were the first day.' Their Sabbath, therefore, or seventh day, began at sunset on the day we call Friday, and lasted till the same time on the day following."—*Newins's Biblical Antiquities*, p. 171.

"The Hebrews began their day at evening. Lev. 23:32."—*Union Bible Dictionary*, art. Day.

"The Jews kept their Sabbath from evening to evening, according to the law. Lev. 23:32. And the Rabbins say, 'The Sabbath doth not enter but when the sun is set.' Hence it was that the sick were not brought to our Lord till after sunset, because then the Sabbath was ended."—*A. Clarke, on Matt. 8:19*.

"One of the priests stood, of course, and gave a signal beforehand with a trumpet, at the beginning of every seventh day, in the evening twilight, as also at the evening when the day was finished, giving notice to the people when they were to leave off work, and when they were to go to work again."—*Josephus's Wars of the Jews*, book 4., chap. 9, sec. 12.

"According to the Jewish computation of time, the day commences at sunset on Friday evening; and about an hour before sunset on this evening all business transactions and secular occupations cease, and the twenty-four hours following are devoted to the celebration of the holy Sabbath."—*M. A. Berk, in History of the Jews*, p. 335.

Calmet's "Bible Dictionary," art. Sabbath, thus states the ancient method of beginning the Sabbath:—

"About half an hour before the sun sets, all work is quitted, and the Sabbath is supposed to be begun."

The same author, speaking of the close of the Sabbath, says:—

"When night comes, and they can discern in the heaven three stars of moderate magnitude, then the Sabbath is ended, and they may return to their ordinary employments."

In answering the query of a correspondent, the *Chicago Inter Ocean* of August 4, 1881, said:—

"The Romans reckoned the day from midnight to midnight, as did also the ancient Egyptians; while the Hebrews, Athenians, and others reckoned it from sunset to sunset. Hipparchus, the astronomer who lived during the second century before Christ, reckoned the twenty-four hours from midnight to midnight. It was therefore easy for Rome to graft this upon the Christian system."

"The only trace of the ancient manner of dating a festival from the eve, or vesper, of the previous day,—a practice discontinued since the 12th century, when the old Roman way of counting the day from midnight to midnight was introduced."—*Chambers's Encyclopedia*, art. *Festivals*.

Prof. C. S. Cooke (Baptist) says:—

"In this age they make the day commence at midnight instead of sunset. . . . The change of the hour for commencing the day is wholly unsupported by Scripture; it should never have been made; it rests wholly on the authority of civil enactment. That days shall commence at sunset is of divine authority."—*Essays and Addresses*, *First Congress of Va. Baptists*, 1803, p. 29.

NAMES OF THE DAYS OF THE WEEK.

William M. Jones, formerly missionary to Palestine, speaks as follows concerning these names:—

"Not any of the nations, whether Jew or Arab, name the days of the week, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, etc.; nor do they call the first day of the week the Lord's day, nor do they ever give to the seventh day the name Saturday."

The celebrated astronomer, Lockyer, says on this point:—

"Although the week, unlike the day, month, and year, is not connected with the movements of any heavenly body, the names of the seven days of which it is composed were derived by the Egyptians from the seven celestial bodies then known. The Romans, in their names for the days, observed the same order, distinguishing them as follows:—

"Dies Solis	Sun's Day	Sunday.
"Dies Lunæ	Moon's Day	Monday.
"Dies Martis	Mars' Day	Tuesday.
"Dies Mercurii	Mercury's Day	Wednesday.
"Dies Jovis	Jupiter's Day	Thursday.
"Dies Veneris	Venus's Day	Friday.
"Dies Saturni	Saturn's Day	Saturday.

"We see at once the origin of our English names for the first three days; the remaining four are named from Tiu, Woden, Thor, and Frigga, Northern deities, equivalent to Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, and Venus, in the classical mythology."—*Elements of Astronomy*, p. 222.

The following "Testimony of Languages" to the unchanged order of the days of the week, is a selection from the second edition of a "Table of Days, in Eighty-one Languages," by the Rev. William Mead Jones. In his prefatory note he says:—

"The Asiatic and African languages are here classified according to the 'Standard Alphabet' of the late Dr. Lepsius, and the European by his imperial highness, Prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte, one of the most learned of living philologists. The languages of mankind are divided into three great classes; namely, *Shemitic*, *Hamitic*, and *Japhetic*. There are various subdivisions of these, especially of the Japhetic; such as *Sanscritic* (Aryan or Arian); *Afghan*, *Iranian* (Zend, Persian, Armenian, etc.); *Lithuanian*, *Slavonic*, *Italic*, *Germanic*, and *Celtic*. Then there is a long list of *No-Gender* languages, such as *Oceanic*, *Illiterate*, *African*, and various *Isolated* and *American* languages, whose origin and affinities are difficult to discover.

"The student of the following selection will observe that the Hebrew has its ancient, mediæval, and modern uses, and so have all the Shemitic tongues, as also the Hamitic and Japhetic families of languages. These all agree that Sunday is the first day of the cluster of days which we call 'week,' and that Saturday is the seventh day. Then it is most noteworthy that Saturday in this selection retains its ancient and God-given name, Sabbath. Here, then, is a continuous history of the week, and of the Sabbath, unbroken, unchanged, without an interstice, and without loss of a day from creation until the present time. The author of this, and his greater collection of languages, has given much of his best toil and

strength through many years to gather these Voices from their homes, and bring them within sight and hearing of his fellow-Christians, in the firm hope that thereby the clap-trap and quibbling, the ignorant assertion and trifling about a day being lost, the Sabbath being changed, and our Sunday being the original seventh day (?) may be swept away from all honest minds. After reading and studying this chart, the student may well conclude that it is utterly impossible that these historical languages should lie in this matter, but that they all 'tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.' Therefore, let him rise from the investigation with unshaken confidence in this 'Testimony of Languages,' and with love and zeal 'lay hold on' the Saturday as the Sabbath of the Lord his God, and of Christ, and keep it, and refrain 'from polluting it,' and 'keep his hand from doing any evil.' Verily to such the promise is, 'I will give them an everlasting name that shall not be cut off.' Isaiah 56: 2, 5."

THE SABBATH WAS OBSERVED BEFORE COMMANDED FROM SINAI.

"The first men must have known it. The words, 'He hallowed it,' can have no other meaning. They would be a blank unless in reference to some who were required to keep it holy."—*Lange's Commentary, vol. 1, p. 197.*

"The moral and religious institutions of the patriarchal or family worship, which continued from the fall of Adam to the covenant of circumcision, were the Sabbath, the service of the altar, oral instruction, prayer, praise, and benediction. . . .

"The religious observance of weeks or Sabbaths in commemoration of creation . . . was religiously observed, to the giving of the law. . . . The righteous always remembered the weeks, and regarded the conclusion of the week as holy to the Lord. Hence . . . we find Noah religiously counting his weeks, even while incarcerated in the ark. In the wilderness of Sin, before the giving of the law, we also find the Jews observing the Sabbath."—*Alexander Campbell, in Christian System, pp. 128-130.*

"This primeval measure of time was instituted as a memorial of the work of creation in six days, and of the ensuing Sabbath. . . . It was therefore universally observed by Noah's descendants during the prevalence of the patriarchal religion; but mankind degenerated and sunk into idolatry, the primitive institution was neglected and at length lost. And the days of the week were dedicated by the Egyptians, Chaldeans, Syrians, etc. to the heavenly host, the sun, moon, and planets."—*Hale's Chronology, vol. 1, pp. 18, 19.*

"Heaven left not this fact, the creation, the basis of a thousand volumes, to be gathered from abstract reasonings, vitiated traditions, ingenious analogies, or plausible conjectures, but from a *monumental* institution which was as *universal* as the annals of time, as the birth

of nations, and as the languages spoken by mortals. An institution too, which, notwithstanding its demand, not only of the seventh part of all time, but of the *seventh day* in uninterrupted succession, was celebrated from the creation to the deluge, during the deluge, and after the deluge till the giving of the law."—*Alexander Campbell, in Popular Lectures, pp. 283, 284.*

"The Sabbath was observed from Abraham's time, nay from the creation."—*Alexander Campbell, in Evidences of Christianity, pp. 301, 302.*

"The Sabbath is an institution as old as the world. . . . It shares with inmarriage the glory of being the sole relic saved to the fallen race from the lost paradise. One is the foundation of the family, and consequently of the State; the other is equally necessary to worship and the Church. These two fair and fragrant roses, man bore with him from the blighted bliss of Eden."—*Rev. George Elliot, in Abiding Sabbath, chap. 1.*

IT WAS RECOGNIZED BY OTHER NATIONS BESIDES ISRAEL.

"The sacredness of one of the seven days was generally admitted by all. . . . It would appear that the Chinese, who have now no Sabbath, at one time honored the seventh day of the week."—*History of the Sabbath, by Gilfillan, p. 360.*

"The Phœnicians, according to Porphyry, 'consecrated the seventh day as holy.'"—*Ibid. p. 359.*

"The Greeks and Romans, according to Aretius, consecrated Saturday to rest, conceiving it unfit for civil actions and warlike affairs, but suited for contemplation."—*Ibid. p. 363.*

Josephus says:—

"There is not any city of the Grecians, nor any of the barbarians, nor any nation whatsoever whither our custom of resting on the seventh day hath not come."—*Against Apion, book 2, par. 40.*

Archbishop Usher's "Works," part 1, chap. 4, say:—

"The very Gentiles, both civil and barbarous, both ancient and of later days, as it were by a *universal* kind of tradition, retained the distinction of the seventh day of the week."

The *Congregationalist* (Boston), Nov. 15, 1882, says:—

"Mr. George Smith says in his 'Assyrian Discoveries' (1875): 'In the year 1869 I discovered, among other things, a curious religious calendar of the Assyrians, in which every month is divided into four weeks, and the seventh days, or Sabbaths, are marked out as

days on which no work should be undertaken.' Again, in his 'History of Assur-bani-pal,' he says: 'The 7th, 14th, 21st, and 28th are described by an ideogram equivalent to *sulu* or *sulum* meaning "rest." The calendar contains lists of work forbidden to be done on these days, which evidently correspond to the Sabbaths of the Jews.'"

H. Fox Talbot, F. R. S., one of the learned Assyriologists of Europe, says of the fifth "creation tablet," found by Mr. George Smith, on the bank of the Tigris, opposite the site of ancient Nineveh, and now to be seen in the British Museum:—

"This fifth tablet is very important because it affirms clearly, in my opinion, that the origin of the Sabbath was coeval with the creation. . . . It has been known for some time that the Babylonians observed the Sabbath with considerable strictness. On that day the king was not allowed to take a drive in his chariot; various meats were forbidden to be eaten; and there were a number of other minute restrictions."—*Sec. 4 R, plate 32.*

"But it is not known that they believed the Sabbath to have been ordained at creation. I have found, however, since this translation of the fifth tablet was completed, that Mr. Sayce has recently published a similar opinion. See the *Academy* of Nov. 27, 1875, p. 554."—*Records of the Past, vol. 9, pp. 117, 118.*

A. H. Sayce, in his lectures before the Royal Institution concerning the Assyrian tablets discovered in the excavations on the site of ancient Babylon, says:—

"The Sabbath of the seventh day appears to have been observed with great strictness; even the monarch was forbidden to eat cooked meat, change his clothes, take medicine, or drive his chariot on that day."—*Northern Christian Advocate.*

Dr. Kindall, in the Second Presbyterian Church, Kansas City, Mo., June 6, 1880, said on this point:—

"We have read of this [Babylonian] Sabbath in the library which has recently been dug up from the ruins of the Mesopotamian city. In the very dawn of history we see how strictly the Sabbath was kept. We read their Sabbath law, and find that not only work of every kind, but Sabbath carriage-riding was forbidden, as well as dosing with medicine and changing apparel."—*Review, July 22, 1880.*

ITS BINDING OBLIGATION UPON CHRISTIANS.

"The Sabbath was made for man; not for the Hebrews, but for all men."—*Bishop E. O. Haven, in Pillars of Truth, p. 88.*

"God instituted the Sabbath at the creation of man, setting apart the seventh day for that purpose, and imposed its observance as a universal and perpetual moral obligation upon the race."—*Archibald A. Hodge, D. D., Tract No. 175 of Presbyterian Board of Publication.*

"The divine authority for the institution of the Sabbath is found in Gen. 2:1-3. Now concerning this passage we remark, it was given to our first parents, that is, to the whole human race. . . . The object to be accomplished is general, and can apply to no one people more than another."—*Francis Wayland, D. D., in Elements of Moral Science, pp. 180-184.*

"If the decalogue applies to all people, and governs to all time, so does the fourth commandment."—*Dr. Cuyler, in New York Weekly Witness, Jan. 9, 1875.*

Dr. Chalmers says:—

"For the permanency of the Sabbath, however, we might argue its place in the *decalogue*, where it stands enshrined among the moralities of a rectitude that is *immutable and everlasting.*"—*Sermons, vol. 1, p. 51.*

"A further argument for the perpetuity of the Sabbath we have in *Matt. 24:20*, 'Pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath-day.' Christ is here speaking of the flight of the apostles and other Christians out of Jerusalem and Judea, just before their final destruction, as is manifest by the whole context, and especially by the 16th verse: 'Then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains.' But the final destruction of Jerusalem was after the dissolution of the Jewish constitution, and after the Christian dispensation was fully set up. Yet it is plainly implied in these words of our Lord, that even then, Christians were bound to a strict observation of the Sabbath."—*Works of President Edwards, vol. 4, pp. 621, 622.*

The American Tract Society has published a sheet called the *Centennial Voice* in the interest of a better observance of Sunday, which has been widely circulated. From it we take the following extract:—

"Has the law ceased to bind us? If it has, where is the proof? It cannot be found in the words of Scripture. It is as true now as it ever was that God is the creator of men. He may and does say to us, as to his people of old, 'In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is.' God claimed authority over Cyrus because Jehovah had 'formed' him. Till we cease to be creatures, we cannot cease to be truly and firmly held to obey every divine precept. It is true that he who enacts a statute may repeal it. But Jehovah has never repealed any precept of the decalogue. Where is the proof? No man can give us chapter and

Re
 verse for such repeal of the law of the Sabbath. Human governments repeal laws when are found to be mischievous. But the law of the Sabbath never wrought ill to any man. Sometimes a law ordained by man to meet an exigency is afterward fitly repealed. When a law of man is found to do harm, and not good, it ought to be set aside. But Jehovah, who knows the end from the beginning, and who rules the world in wisdom, knows that man as much needs a Sabbath now as at any previous history of the world. All admit that the law of the Sabbath was in force till the world was more than four thousand years old. What competent authority has set it aside? There has been one on earth competent to declare God's will on all subjects. Jesus Christ was the brightness of his Father's glory and the express image of his person. But he never said that any part of the decalogue was or could be abolished. Hear him: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Matt. 5: 17, 18."

IT WAS OBSERVED BY CHRISTIANS LONG AFTER CHRIST.

Coleman says:—

"Down even to the fifth century the observance of the Jewish Sabbath was continued in the Christian Church, but with a rigor and solemnity gradually diminishing until it was wholly discontinued."—*Ancient Chris. Exem., chap. 26, sec. 2.*

Edward Brerewood, professor in Gresham College, London, says:—

"It is commonly believed that the Jewish Sabbath was changed into the Lord's day by Christian emperors, and they know little who do not know that the *ancient Sabbath* did remain and was observed by the Eastern churches *three hundred years* after our Saviour's passion."—*Treatise on the Sabbath, p. 77.*

The American Presbyterian Board of Publication, in Tract No. 118, states that—

"The observance of the seventh-day Sabbath did not cease till it was abolished after the empire became Christian."

Socrates, A. D. 440, says:—

"There are various customs concerning assembling; for though all the churches throughout the whole world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the Sabbath-day, yet the Alexandrians and the Romans, from an ancient *tradition*, refuse to do this."—*Ecc. Hist., p. 289.*

M. de la Roque, a French Protestant, says:—

"It evidently appears that, before any change was introduced, the Church religiously observed the Sabbath for many ages; we of consequence are obliged to keep it."

NO BIBLE AUTHORITY FOR A CHANGE TO THE FIRST DAY.

"It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." Luke 16: 17.

3
 "The festival Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance; and it was *far from the intention of the apostles* to establish a divine command in this respect,—far from them, and from the early apostolic Church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday. Perhaps at the end of the second century a false application of this kind had begun to take place; for men appear by that time to have considered laboring on Sunday as a sin."—*Neander's Church History, Rose's Translation, p. 186, ed. 1843.*

Sir William Domville bears this testimony in the matter:—

4
 "Not any ecclesiastical writer of the first three centuries attributed the origin of Sunday observance either to Christ or his apostles."—*Examination of the Six Texts, Supplement, pp. 6, 7.*

In vindicating their desertion of the Roman Church, the reformers, Luther, Melancthon, and others spoke of the false boasting of that power as follows:—

4
 "They allege the Sabbath changed into Sunday, the Lord's day, contrary to the decalogue, as it appears; neither is there any example more boasted of than the changing of the Sabbath-day. Great, say they, is the power and authority of the Church, since it dispensed with one of the ten commandments."—*Augsburg Confession, art. 28.*

Referring to the course pursued by these reformers, Dr. Cox says that—

"They failed to see in the New Testament any of those indications which the Puritans were the first to discover, of a transference of the Sabbath to the first day of the week by Jesus or the apostles."—*Literature, vol. 1., p. 127.*

Later reformers have also failed to see the New Testament authority for such a change. Alexander Campbell shows, in the following terse statement, why it would be impossible to make the change:—

"No it never was changed, nor could be, unless creation were gone through with again; for the reason assigned must be changed

before the observance, or respect to the reason can be changed."—*Bible Advocate, January, 1848.*

Richard Watson wrote thus : —

"Now there is not on record any divine command to the apostles to change the Sabbath from the day on which it was held by the Jews to the first day of the week."—*Theological Dictionary.*

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

"It is true, there is no positive command . . . for keeping holy the first day of the week."—*M. E. Theological Compendium.*

Rev. Clark Braden, a minister and author, and ex-President of one of the Western colleges of the Disciples, said in the *Christian Standard*, of Sept. 26, 1874 : —

"Others observe the first day, contending without a particle of evidence that the commandment has been changed from the seventh day to the first. Our preachers are by no means agreed in their teachings. They have no well-defined views on the subject, and are defeated when they attempt a defense of our practice of observing the first day, or a review of the arguments of the advocates of the seventh day. Nor are we alone in this. There is no clear, tenable teaching on this subject in our theological works and commentaries, or by any religious press. Advocates of the observance of the first day *stultify themselves* by taking *contradictory and inconsistent* positions."

A Catholic priest made the following statement in the opera house, Hartford, Kansas, Feb. 18, 1883, which was reported in the *Weekly Call* of that place four days later : —

"The Bible commands you to keep the Sabbath-day. Sunday is not the Sabbath-day ; no man dare assert that it is ; for the Bible says as plainly as words can make it that the seventh day is the Sabbath, *i. e.*, Saturday ; for we know Sunday to be the first day of the week. Besides, the Jews have been keeping the Sabbath unto the present day. I am not a rich man, but I will give \$1000 to any man who will prove by the Bible alone that Sunday is the day we are bound to keep. No ; it cannot be done ; it is impossible. The observance of Sunday is solely a law of the Catholic Church, and therefore is not binding upon others. The Church changed the Sabbath to Sunday, and all the world bows down and worships upon that day, in silent obedience to the mandates of the Catholic Church."

"Jesus confirms the Sabbath on its spiritual basis. 'The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath ; therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.' . . . Thus he at once rids it of all the false restrictions of Judaism, and, establishing it upon its primitive foundations, he brought forth its higher reason in the assertion of its relation to the well-being of man. 'The Sabbath was made for man ;' not for the Jew only, but for the whole race of mankind ; not for one age alone, but for man universally, under every circumstance of time and place."—*Abiding Sabbath, p. 165.*

CHAPTER IX.

SUN WORSHIP.

HOW SUNDAY RECEIVED ITS NAME.

THE first day of the week is now commonly called Sunday. The origin of its name is thus given by Webster:—

“Sunday; so called because this day was anciently dedicated to the sun or to its worship. The first day of the week.”

It is true that all the days of the week have heathen names, but this day alone was a conspicuous heathen festival day in early times. Of this, an early writer says:—

“The most ancient Germans being pagans, and having appropriated their first day of the week to the peculiar adoration of the sun, whereof that day doth yet in our English tongue retain the name of Sunday.”—*Verstegan's Antiquities*, p. 10, London, 1628.

Referring to the idols of these early people, the same author says:—

“Of these, though they had many, yet seven among the rest they especially appropriated unto the seven days of the week. . . . Unto the day dedicated unto the special adoration of the idol of the sun, they gave the name of Sunday, as much as to say the sun's day, or the day of the sun. This idol was placed in a temple, and there adored and sacrificed unto, for that they believed that the sun in the firmament did with or in this idol correspond and co-operate.”—*Ibid*, p. 68.

Sun-worship may be traced back to the most ancient times. Jennings says that when the Israelites left Egypt, their custom of commencing the day [at sunset] was in opposition to—

[132]

“The idolatrous nations, who, in honor to their chief god, the sun, began their day at his rising.”—*Jewish Antiquities*, book 3, chap. 1, p. 297.

SUN-WORSHIP AMONG THE ISRAELITES.

That sun-worship was common as early as the days of Moses, would seem to be confirmed by a statement of the patriarch Job, who, it is thought lived contemporary with Moses. He says: “If I beheld the sun when it shined, or the moon walking in brightness; and my heart hath been secretly enticed, or my mouth hath kissed my hand; this also were an iniquity to be punished by the judge; for I should have denied the God that is above.” Job 31: 26–28. Referring to verse 26, Dr. Clarke says:—

“In this verse Job clears himself of that idolatrous worship which was the most ancient and most consistent with reason of any species of idolatry, namely; *Sabianism*, the worship of the heavenly bodies; particularly the *sun* and *moon*, *Jupiter* and *Venus*; the latter two being the *morning* and *evening stars*, and the most resplendent of all heavenly bodies, the sun and moon excepted.”

Commenting on the same, Calmet says:—

“Job points out three things here: 1. The worship of the sun and moon, much used in his time, and very anciently used in every part of the East; and in all probability that from which idolatry took its rise. 2. The custom of adoring the sun at its rising, and the moon at her change; a superstition which is mentioned in Eze. 8: 16, and in every part of profane antiquity. 3. The custom of *kissing the hand*; the form of adoration, and token of sovereign respect.”

It seems that sun-worship was practiced by most of the eastern nations. Morer says:—

“It is not to be denied but we borrow the name of this day from the ancient Greeks and Romans, and we allow that the old Egyptians worshipped the sun, and as a standing *memorial* of their veneration, dedicated this day to him. And we find by the influence of their examples, *other* nations, and among them the Jews themselves, doing him homage.”—*Dialogues on the Lord's Day*, p. 22.

The “*Encyclopedia Britannica*,” art. Baal, also says:—

"The Baal of the Syrians, Phœnicians, and heathen Hebrews is a much less elevated conception than the Babylonian Bel. He is properly the sun-god, Baal-Shamem, Baal (lord) of the heavens, the highest of the heavenly bodies, but still a mere power of nature, born like the other luminaries from the primitive chaos. As the sun-god he is conceived as the male principle of life and reproduction in nature, and thus in some forms of his worship is the patron of the grossest sensuality, and even of systematic prostitution. An example of this is found in the worship of Baal-Peor (Num. 25), and in general in the Canaanitish high places, where Baal, the male principle, was worshiped in association with the chaste goddess Ashera, the female principle of nature. The frequent references to this form of religion in the Old Testament are obscured in the English version by the rendering 'grove' for the word Ashera, which sometimes denotes the goddess, sometimes the tree or post which was her symbol."

SUN-WORSHIP AMONG THE EGYPTIANS.

Prof. George Rawlinson says of sun-worship in Egypt:—

"Ra was the Egyptian sun-god, and was especially worshiped at Heliopolis [city of the sun]. Obelisks, according to some, represented his rays, and were always, or usually, erected in his honor. Heliopolis was certainly one of the places which were thus adorned, for one of the few which still stand erect in Egypt is on the site of that city. The kings for the most part considered Ra their special patron and protector; nay, they went so far as to identify themselves with him, to use his titles as their own, and to adopt his name as the ordinary prefix to their own name and titles. This is believed by many to have been the origin of the word Pharaoh, which was, it is thought, the Hebrew rendering of Ph' Ra—'the sun.'"—*Religions of the Ancient World (Alden Edition), p. 20.*

Osiris, one of the Egyptian gods, was identified with the sun, and the bull Apis, so extensively worshiped by that people, was only a form of Osiris. Concerning this the "Encyclopedia Britannica, art. Apis, says:—

"According to the Greek writers, Apis was the image of Osiris, and worshiped because Osiris was supposed to have passed into a bull, and to have been soon after manifested by a succession of these animals. The hieroglyphic inscriptions identify the Apis with Osiris, adorned with horns or the head of a bull, and unite the two names as Hapi-Osor, or Apis Osiris. According to this view the Apis was the incarnation of Osiris manifested in the shape of a bull."

The association of the Hebrews, while in Egypt, with the disgusting orgies connected with sun-worship en-

abled them to readily engage in the same lascivious dance around the golden calf at the base of Sinai. Surrounded, as they were, too, after settling in Palestine, by whole nations of sun-worshipers, it is easy to see how they were repeatedly led away from the true worship of God to that of idolatrous sun-worship in the days of the judges and the prophets. See Judges 2:11; 3:7; 6:25-32; 10:6; Ps. 106:35, 36; 1 Kings 12:26-31; 18:17-26; 2 Kings 10:29; 21:1-7, etc. These apostasies marked the course of the Israelites through the whole history of their national life.

SUN-WORSHIP AMONG THE ROMANS.

In the second century before Christ the Roman empire arose, in which were found all the idolatrous tendencies of the nations from which it sprang. In this empire, under the reign of Elagabalus (A. D. 218-222), sun-worship became the principal form of religion, and was carried out in its vilest forms. Referring to this time, Dean Milman says:—

"The pontiff of one of the wild forms of the nature worship of the East, appeared in the city of Rome as emperor. The ancient rites of Baal-Peor, but little changed in the course of ages, intruded themselves into the sanctuary of the Capitoline Jove, and offended at once the religious majesty and the graver decency of Roman manners. Elagabalus derived his name from the Syrian appellation of the sun; he had been educated in the precincts of the temple; and the emperor of Rome was lost and absorbed in the priest of an effeminate superstition. The new religion did not steal in under the modest demeanor of a stranger, claiming the common rights of hospitality as the national faith of a subject people: it entered with a public pomp, as though to supersede and eclipse the ancestral deities of Rome. The god Elagabalus was conveyed in solemn procession through the wondering provinces; his symbols were received with all the honor of the Supreme Deity. . . .

"It was openly asserted, that the worship of the sun, under his name of Elagabalus, was to supersede all other worship. If we may believe the biographies in the Augustan history, a more ambitious scheme of a universal religion had dawned upon the mind of the emperor. *The Jewish, the Samaritan, even the Christian, were to be fused and recast into one great system, of which the sun was to be the central object of adoration.*"—*History of Christianity, book 2,*

chap. 8, pp. 176-179, Standard Edition. (See also Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chap. 6, par. 22-25.)

Aurelian became emperor of Rome A. D. 270, and four years later, on his return from a triumphant march through the Orient, a magnificent festival was held in his honor, when he in turn devoted the greater part of his spoils to the maintenance of sun-worship, as an act of gratitude. On this point Gibbon says:—

“A considerable portion of his oriental spoils was consecrated to the gods of Rome; the capitol, and every other temple, glittered with the offerings of his ostentatious piety; and the temple of the sun alone received above fifteen thousand pounds of gold. This last was a magnificent structure, erected by the emperor on the side of the Quirinal hill, and dedicated, soon after the triumph, to that deity whom Aurelian adored as the parent of his life and fortunes. His mother had been an inferior priestess in the chapel of the sun; a peculiar devotion to the god of light was a sentiment which the fortunate peasant imbibed in his infancy; and every step of his elevation, every victory of his reign, fortified superstition by gratitude.”—*Decline and Fall*, chap. 11, par. 43.

CHAPTER X.

HOW SUNDAY TOOK THE PLACE OF THE SABBATH.

SURROUNDED by such influences, it was only natural that the early Christians, especially those who were drawn from among the heathen, should be influenced by these gorgeous attractions. Indeed, we are told by Mosheim, that as early as the second century the worship of the Christians was visibly affected by them:—

“Before the coming of Christ, all the Eastern nations performed divine worship with their faces turned to that part of the heavens where the sun displays his rising beams. This custom was founded upon a general opinion that God, whose *essence* they looked upon to be *light*, and whom they considered as being circumscribed within certain limits, dwelt in that part of the firmament from which he sends forth the sun, the bright image of his ~~benignity and~~ glory. The Christian converts, indeed, rejected this gross error [of supposing that God dwelt in that part of the firmament]; but they retained the ancient and universal custom of worshiping toward the East, which sprang from it. Nor is this custom abolished even in our times, hut still prevails in a great number of Christian churches.”—*Church History*, cent. 2, part 2, chap. 4, par. 7; *Eze.* 8: 16.

It was but a step from this custom to that of worshiping the sun itself, which many in the early Church actually descended to, and for the reason that they adopted the belief of Hermogenes, that Christ had put off his body in the sun. This doctrine was derived from Ps. 19: 4, by rendering it thus: “He has placed his tabernacle in the sun.” Milman says in reference to this:—

“The universal deity of the East, the sun, to the philosophic was the emblem or representative; to the vulgar, the Deity. Diocletian himself, though he paid so much deference to the older faith as to assume the title of Jovius, as belonging to the Lord of the world, yet, on his accession, when he would exculpate himself from all concern in the murder of his predecessor, Numerian, appealed in the face of the army to the all-seeing deity of the sun. It is the oracle of Apollo of Miletus, consulted by the hesitating emperor,

which is to decide the fate of Christianity. The metaphorical language of Christianity had unconsciously lent strength to this new adversary; and, in adoring the visible orb, some, no doubt, supposed that they were not departing far from the worship of the 'Sun of Righteousness.'—*History of Christianity, book 2, chap. 9, p. 215.*

The "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia," says with reference to the effect this had upon the early Christians:—

"Sunday (*Dies Solis*, of the Roman Calendar; 'day of the sun,' because dedicated to the sun), the first day of the week, was adopted by the early Christians as a day of worship. The 'sun' of Latin adoration they interpreted as the 'Sun of Righteousness.' . . . No regulations for its observance are laid down in the New Testament, nor, indeed, is its observance even enjoined."

Milman further says:—

"But, though it might enter into the imagination of an imperious and powerful sovereign to fuse together all these conflicting faiths, the new Paganism was beginning to advance itself as the open and dangerous adversary of the religion of Christ."—*History of Christianity, book 2, chap. 9, p. 215.*

It is plain from these passages that by the close of the third century sun-worship had so far encroached upon Christianity as to capture many of its votaries. But the Christians did not stop with a simple adoration of the sun. They hastened to adopt many of the mysterious forms of worship connected with that system, hoping thereby to attract to themselves greater numbers of the influential heathen. To this Mosheim bears testimony:—

"The unlucky success which some had in discovering the carcasses and remains of certain holy men, multiplied the festivals and commemorations of the martyrs in the most extravagant manner. The increase of these festivals would not have been offensive to the wise and the good, if Christians had employed the time they took up, in promoting their spiritual interests, and in forming habits of sanctity and virtue. But the contrary happened. These days, which were set apart for pious exercises, were squandered away in indolence, voluptuousness, and criminal pursuits, and were less consecrated to God than employed in the indulgence of sinful passions."—*Church History, cent. 2, part 2, chap. 4, par. 5.*

THE CHARACTER OF CONSTANTINE.

In the early part of the fourth century Constantine ascended the throne of the Cæsars, bringing with him

his heathen adoration of the sun. Of this Gibbon bears the following testimony:—

"Whatever symptoms of Christian piety might transpire in the discourses or actions of Constantine, he persevered till he was near forty years of age in the practice of the established religion; and the same conduct which in the court of Nicomedia might be imputed to his fear, could be ascribed only to the inclination or policy of the sovereign of Gaul. His liberality restored and enriched the temples of the gods; the medals which issued from his imperial mine are impressed with the figures and attributes of Jupiter and Apollo, of Mars and Hercules; and his filial piety increased the council of Olympus by the solemn apotheosis of his father Constantius. But the devotion of Constantine was more peculiarly directed to the genius of the sun, the Apollo of Greek and Roman mythology; and he was pleased to be represented with the symbols of the god of light and poetry. The unerring shafts of that deity, the brightness of his eyes, his laural wreath, immortal beauty, and elegant accomplishments, seem to point him out as the patron of a young hero. The altars of Apollo were crowned with the votive offerings of Constantine; and the credulous multitude were taught to believe that the emperor was permitted to behold with mortal eyes the visible majesty of their tutelary deity; and that, either waking or in a vision, he was blessed with the auspicious omens of a long and victorious reign. The sun was universally celebrated as the invincible guide and protector of Constantine."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 20, par. 3.*

Though only a pagan, Constantine could see that Christianity was becoming popular in spite of the obstacles it had to meet. Its adoption of the heathen rites made it especially acceptable to the emperor, who through policy nominally adopted it, as that which would be able to maintain him in power. He therefore contrived to artfully balance himself between paganism and Christianity, in that way which would secure the favor of both parties. Gibbon says:—

"He artfully balanced the hopes and fears of his subjects, by publishing in the same year two edicts; the first of which enjoined the solemn observance of Sunday, and the second directed the regular consultation of the Aruspices."—*Decline and Fall, chap. 20, par. 2.*

"To fully understand the provisions of this legislation, the peculiar position of Constantine must be taken into consideration. He was not himself free from all remains of heathen superstition. It seems certain that before his conversion he had been particularly devoted to the worship of Apollo, the sun-god. . . . The problem before him was to legislate for the new faith in such a manner as

not to seem entirely inconsistent with his old practices, and not to come in conflict with the prejudices of his pagan subjects. These facts serve to explain the peculiarities of this decree. He names the holy day, not the Lord's day, but the 'day of the sun,' the heathen designation, and thus at once seems to identify it with his former Apollo-worship; he excepts the country from the operation of the law, and thus avoids collision with his heathen subjects."—*Rev. Geo. Elliott, in the Abiding Sabbath, p. 229.*

The following from a popular author is also to the point:—

"Of religious convictions Constantine had none. But he possessed an intellect capable of penetrating the condition of the world. He perceived the conclusion of the great syllogism in the logic of events. He saw that Destiny was about to write *Finis* at the bottom of the last page of paganism. He had the ambition to avail himself of the forces of the new and old, which, playing on the minds and consciences of men, were about to transform the world. As yet the Christians were in the minority, but they had zeal and enthusiasm. The enthusiasm of paganism, on the contrary, had yielded to a cold and formal assent quite unlike the pristine fervor which had fired to human action in the time—

'When the world was new and the gods were young.'

So, for policy, the emperor began to favor the Christians. There was now an *ecclesia*, a church, compact, well-organized, having definite purposes, ready for universal persuasion, and almost ready for universal battle. Against this were opposed the warring philosophic sects of paganism. While biding his time, watching the turns of the imperial wheel, and awaiting the opportunity which should make him supreme, he was careful to lay hold of the sentiments and sympathies of budding Christendom, by favoring the sect in Gaul. . . .

"In the same year of his triumph, the emperor issued from Milan his famous decree in favor of the Christian religion. The proclamation was in the nature of a license to those professing the new faith to worship as they would, under the imperial sanction and favor. Soon afterward he announced to the world that the reason for his recognition of Christianity was a vision which he had seen while marching from Gaul against Galerius. Gazing into heaven, he had seen a tremendous and shining cross with this inscription: '*In Hoc Signo Vinces*,' 'Under this sign conquer.' The fiction served the purpose for which it was invented. As a matter of fact, the double-dealing moral nature of Constantine was incapable of any high devotion to a faith either old or new.

"His insincerity was at once developed in his course respecting the Roman Senate. That body was the stronghold of paganism. Any strong purpose to extinguish heathenism would have led Constantine into irreconcilable antagonism with whatever of senatorial

power still remained. Instead of hostility, however, he began to restore the ancient body to as much influence in the State as was consistent with the unrestricted exercise of his own authority. In order further to placate the perturbed spirits of paganism, he himself assumed the office of Pontifex Maximus; and when the triumphal arch was reared commemorative of his victory, he was careful to place thereon the statues of the old gods, as well as the emblems of the new faith."—*History of the World, by John Clark Ridpath, LL.D., Prof. of History in De Pauw University, vol. 1, chap. 63, pp. 881-883.*

Dr. Haweis is of opinion that—

"Nothing in the whole life of Constantine discovers a trace of real conversion to God. . . . The whole tenor of his life, except favoring the bishops, building churches, enriching them with wealth and finery, and other very equivocal marks of Christianity, displays no trait of a Christian character."—*Church History, vol. 1, p. 278.*

The "Encyclopædia Britannica," vol. 6, p. 301, art. Constantine, says that—

"Paganism must still have been an operative belief with the man who, down almost to the close of his life, retained so many pagan superstitions. He was at best only half heathen, half Christian, who could seek to combine the worship of Christ with the worship of Apollo, having the name of the one and the figure of the other impressed upon his coins, and ordaining the observance of Sunday under the name *Dies Solis* in his celebrated decree of March, 321, though such a combination was far from uncommon in the first Christian centuries. Perhaps the most significant illustration of the ambiguity of his religious position is furnished by the fact that in the same year in which he issued the Sunday decree he gave orders that, if lightning struck the imperial palace or any other public building, 'the haruspices, according to ancient usage, should be consulted as to what it might signify, and a careful report of the answer should be drawn up for his use.' "

Another witness, at this point, concerning the duplicity of Constantine, will not be out of place, coming as it does from Bishop A. C. Coxe, one of the strictest of churchmen:—

X "He permitted heathenism, and while he did so, how could he be received as a Christian? The Christian Church never became responsible for his life and character, but strove to reform him and to prepare him for a true confession of Christ at some 'convenient season.' In this, there seems to have been a great fault somewhere, chargeable perhaps to Eusebius or to some other Christian counselor; but, when could any one say, 'The emperor is sincere and humble and penitent, and ought now to be received into the

Revd

church? It was a political conversion, and as such was accepted, and Constantine was a heathen till near his death. As to his final penitence and acceptance — 'Forbear to judge.' — "Elucidation" 2 of Tertullian against Marcion, book 4.

THE DESIGN OF CONSTANTINE'S SUNDAY EDICT.

His celebrated Sunday edict of A. D. 321, previously referred to, carries upon its face the fact that it was not designed to enforce the observance of the day as a distinctively Christian institution. On the other hand, it shows that the day was to be enforced as a pagan festival — "The venerable day of the sun." Following are the words of the edict, the original of which is in the library of Harvard College: —

"Let all judges and townspeople, and all artisans, rest on the venerable day of the sun. But let those who are situated in the country freely and at full liberty attend to the cultivation of their fields; because it often happens that no other day is so fit for sowing corn or planting vines; lest, by neglecting the proper occasion, they should lose the benefits granted by divine bounty." — *Given the seventh day of March, 321, Crispus and Constantine being consuls for the second time.*

On the point that this edict was not entirely in behalf of Christianity, the statement of Dr. Talbot W. Chambers is worthy of consideration: —

"The Emperor Constantine, before his conversion, revered all the gods as mysterious powers, especially Apollo, the god of the sun, to whom, in the year 308, he presented munificent gifts; and when he became a monotheist, the god whom he worshiped was, as Uhlhorn says, rather the 'Unconquered Sun' than the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. And indeed, when he enjoined the observance of the Lord's day, it was not under the name of *Sabbatum* or *Dies Domini*, but under its old astronomical and heathen title, *Dies Solis*, so that the law was as applicable to the worshipers of Apollo and Mithras as to the Christians." — *Old Testament Student, January, 1886.*

And yet, while he desired to make it appear to the bishops, who had by that time become so far semi-paganized as to demand a law of that kind, that such a law was necessary, he was careful to use language that would not offend those who were entirely pagan. In a note to paragraph 2, chapter 20, the editor of Gibbon says: —

"Constantine styles the Lord's day *Dies Solis* (day of the sun), a name which could not offend the ears of his pagan subjects."

Thus it is seen that through the efforts of early Roman emperors to unite the Christian and pagan religions, not only was the heathen sun-god confounded with Christ the Sun of Righteousness, but Sunday, "the wild solar holiday of all pagan times," was made, by Constantine's edict, the connecting link between the two systems. And as though this was not enough, Constantine labored, as did others of his day, to show that there existed no real difference between the principles of the pagan and Christian religions, and so succeeded in blending the two. On this point, Milman speaks thus: —

"The lingering attachment of Constantine to the favorite superstition of his earlier days may be traced on still better authority. The Grecian worship of Apollo had been exalted into the oriental veneration of the sun, as the visible representative of the Deity; and of all the statues which were introduced from different quarters, none were received with greater honor than those of Apollo. In one part of the city stood the Pythian, in the other the Sminthian deity. The Delphic Tripod, which, according to Zosimus, contained an image of the god, stood upon the column of the three twisted serpents, supposed to represent the mythic Python. But on a still loftier, the famous pillar of porphyry, stood an image in which Constantine dared to mingle together the attributes of the sun, of Christ, and of himself. According to one tradition, this pillar was based, as it were, on another superstition. The venerable Palladium itself, surreptitiously conveyed from Rome, was buried beneath it, and thus transferred the eternal destiny of the old to the new capital. The pillar, formed of marble and of porphyry, rose to the height of a hundred and twenty feet. The colossal image on the top was that of Apollo, either from Phrygia or from Atheus. But the head of Constantine had been substituted for that of the god. The scepter proclaimed the dominion of the world; and it held in its hand the globe, emblematic of universal empire. Around the head, instead of rays, were fixed the nails of the true cross. *Is this paganism approximating to Christianity, or Christianity degenerating into paganism?*" — *History of Christianity, book 3, chap. 3, pp. 340-342.*

While the early Church observed the Sabbath, it also recognized Sunday as a festival day. Concerning this practice in the time of Tertullian, Neander tells us that —

“Those churches, however, which were composed of Jewish Christians, though they admitted, with the rest, the festival of Sunday, yet retained also that of the Sabbath.”—*Church History, vol. 1, p. 296, Torrey's Translation, ed. 1852.*

But at this time no one had thought of the honor given to Sunday as bestowed by divine authority. Thus Dr. Domville bears testimony:—

“Not any ecclesiastical writer of the first three centuries attributed the origin of Sunday observance either to Christ or to his apostles.”—*Examination of the Six Texts, Supplement, pp. 6, 7.*

THE WORK OF THE COUNCIL OF NICE.

From the close of the second century, to the opening of the fourth, a bitter contention was kept up between the churches of eastern and western Rome, as to the proper time to celebrate the Passover. The difficulty is thus fully stated by Dr. Isaac Boyle:—

“It appears that the churches of Syria and Mesopotamia continued to follow the custom of the Jews, and celebrated Easter on the fourteenth day of the moon, whether falling on Sunday or not. All the other churches observed that solemnity on Sunday only; namely, those of Rome, Italy, Africa, Libya, Egypt, Spain, Gaul and Britain; and all Greece, Asia, and Pontus. It was considered indecorous, and as affording occasion of scandal to unbelievers, that while some were engaged in fasting and penitence, others should be indulging in festivity and relaxation.”—*Historical Views of the Council of Nice, p. 22, ed. 1839.*

After discussing the matter, the council of Nice decided that uniformity of practice should be followed, and that Easter should be celebrated on the “Sunday immediately following the new moon which was nearest after the vernal equinox.” The reason assigned by Constantine in a letter to the churches for thus favoring Sunday above other days was:—

“It seemed to every one a most unworthy thing that we should follow the custom of the Jews in the celebration of this most holy solemnity. . . . Let us then have nothing in common with the most hostile rabble of the Jews.”—*Ibid, p. 52.*

This shows the real animus of the great Council of Nice. “*Have nothing in common with the Jews,*” But

why not put the celebration of Easter on some other day of the week than Sunday? Simply because by putting it on that day, it was one more honor conferred on the “venerable day of the sun,” and another step toward carrying out the cherished plans of the emperor—to unite Christianity to paganism, and thus save that ancient form of worship from hopeless decay. Not that Constantine cared especially for paganism, only so far as would contribute to his political greatness; for he did not. But he saw that it was doomed to fall before Christianity unless the power of the latter could be neutralized. Paganism had prepared from ancient days an institution which it was seen would accomplish the object, and it was therefore elevated to supreme power. Constantine's end was thus accomplished. The outgrowth of the union formed was the papacy, and the Church was plunged into that midnight of darkness which followed, and held the Church in superstition for ages.

Eusebius, who lived contemporary with Constantine, says of the work done in his time:—

“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 those things according to the spiritual law, which were decreed for the priests to do on the Sabbath.”—*Commentary on the Psalms, quoted in Justin Edwards's Sabbath Manual, pp. 125-127.*

Thus it is seen that the transfer of Sabbath duties to Sunday, was effected by the pagans in conjunction with fawning bishops of the Christian Church during the days of Constantine.

But while the edict of A. D. 321 commanded judges and townspeople to rest on the day of the sun, all others were permitted to follow their avocations. This leniency, however, was only temporary. Soon another step was taken to oblige all to cease from labor on that day. Mr. James says:—

“When the practice of keeping Saturday Sabbaths, which had become so general at the close of this century, was evidently gaining,

429925

Keeping of Sunday

ground in the Eastern Church, a decree was passed in the council held at Laodicea [A. D. 364] 'that members of the church should not rest from work on the Sabbath, like Jews; but should labor on that day, and preferring in honor the Lord's day, then, if it be in their power, should rest from work as Christians.'—*Sermons on the Sacraments and Sabbath, p. 123.*

Neander speaks of further legislation as follows:—

"By a law of the year 386, those older changes effected by the emperor Constantine were more rigorously enforced, and in general, *civil transactions of every kind* on Sunday were strictly forbidden. Whoever transgressed was to be considered, in fact, as guilty of sacrilege."—*Church History, vol. 2, p. 300.*

The foregoing points of history are now well understood by many, as the two following extracts will serve to show:—

"When, why, and by whom was the day of rest changed from the seventh to the first? Has the Christian Sabbath been observed since the time of the apostles?—*Reader.*

"*Ans.*—The Sabbath was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, not by any positive authority, but by a gradual process. Christ was in the tomb during the seventh day. He rose upon the first. The Christians naturally observed the first day as a festal day in the early Church, and, as gradually the Gentile Christians came to be the vast majority of the Church, they cared little or nothing about Jewish observances of any kind, abandoned the Jewish Sabbath along with temple services and the like, and thus, by a natural process, the first day of the week came to take its place."—*Christian Union, June 11, 1879.*

In answer to a similar query, the *Inter Ocean* replied as follows:—

"The change of the day of worship from the Sabbath, or the last day of the week, to Sunday, the first day of the week, was done by the early Christians; but the work was so gradual that it is almost impossible to determine when the one left off and the other began. ~~It was not until after the Reformation that the change was confirmed by legal enactment.~~ In the first ages after Christ it does not appear that the Christians abstained from their regular business upon that day, but they were accustomed to meet early in the day, and indulged in singing and some other religious services. It was not until the beginning of the third century that it became customary for Christians to abstain from their worldly business and occupation on that day."

CHAPTER XI.

THE SABBATH DURING THE DARK AGES.

THE WALDENSES.

It is clearly sustained in history that there were many, who, during the Dark Ages, paid no attention to the festivals of Rome. Among these were the Waldenses and Albigenes. Concerning their origin we read:—

"We have already observed from Claudius Seyssel, the popish archbishop, that one Leo was charged with originating the Waldensian heresy in the valleys, in the days of Constantine the Great. When those severe measures emanated from the Emperor Honorius against re-baptizers, the Baptists left the seat of opulence and power, and sought retreats in the country, and in the valleys of Piedmont; which last place in particular became their retreat from imperial oppression."—*Gilfillan's Sabbath, pp. 32, 33.*

Of their remarkable piety, Saccho, a popish writer says of them:—

"There is no sect so dangerous as the Leonists, for three reasons: First, it is the most ancient, some say as old as Sylvester [bishop in Constantine's time], others as the apostles themselves. Secondly, it is very generally disseminated; there is no country where it has not gained some footing. Thirdly, while other sects are profane and blasphemous, this retains the utmost show of piety; they live justly before men, and believe nothing respecting God which is not good."—*Waddington's Church History, part. 4, chap. 1.*

Speaking of their religious doctrines, Dr. Allix says:—

"They hold that none of the ordinances of the Church that have been introduced since Christ's ascension ought to be observed, as being of no worth; the feasts, fasts, orders, blessings, offices of the Church, and the like, they utterly reject."—*Ecl. Hist. Ancient Churches of Piedmont, p. 209.*

Their peculiar adherence to the Bible subjected them to much criticism. Mr. Jones,¹ in his "History of the Church," speaks of this fact as follows:—

¹This is William Jones, M. A., pastor of a Scotch Baptist church in London, 1830. He was the author of an ecclesiastical history relating specially to the Waldenses, but should not be confounded with William Mead Jones of London, the well-known S. D. Baptist minister and author.

“Because they would not observe saints’ days, they were falsely supposed to neglect the Sabbath also, and called *Insabbatati* or *Insabbathists*.”—*History of Church, chap. 5, sec. 1.*

Mr. Benedict makes the following statement:—

“We find that the Waldenses were sometimes called *Insabbathos*, that is, regardless of Sabbaths. Mr. Milner supposes this name was given to them because they observed not the Romish festivals, and rested from their ordinary occupations only on Sundays. A Sabbatarian would suppose that it was because they met for worship on the seventh day, and did not regard the first-day Sabbath.”—*Hist. of Baptists, vol. 2, p. 413, ed. 1813.*

Again we quote from Mr. Jones:—

“Louis XII, king of France, being informed by the enemies of the Waldenses inhabiting a part of the province of Provence, that several heinous crimes were laid to their account, sent the Master of Requests and a certain doctor of the Sorbonne, who was the confessor to his Majesty, to make inquiry into this matter. On their return, they reported that they had visited all the parishes where they dwelt, had inspected their places of worship, but that they had found there no images, nor signs of the ornaments belonging to the mass, nor any of the ceremonies of the Romish Church; much less could they discover any traces of those crimes with which they were charged. On the contrary, they kept the Sabbath-day, observed the ordinance of baptism according to the primitive church, instructed their children in the articles of the Christian faith and the commandments of God. The king, having heard the report of his commissioners, said with an oath that they were better men than himself or his people.”—*Jones’s Church History, vol. 2, chap. 5, sec. 4.*

THE ABYSSINIANS.

Another nation, the Abyssinians, having been separated from Rome since the fourth century and being nearly forgotten, were found to have kept the Sabbath as well as Sunday, a custom with many when this people were lost sight of. Geddes says of their doctrines:—

“Transubstantiation, and the adoration of the consecrated bread in the sacrament, were what the Abyssinians abhorred. . . . They deny purgatory, and know nothing of confirmation and extreme unction; they condemn graven images; they keep both Saturday and Sunday.”—*Church History of Ethiopia, pp. 34, 35.*

The Armenians, also, of the East Indies, with fifteen hundred churches, were Sabbath-keepers. Mr. Yeates says that—

“Saturday among them is a festival day, agreeable to the ancient practice of the Church.”—*East Indian Church History, pp. 133, 134.*

Mr. Buchanan, a clergyman of the Church of England, says of these people:—

“They have preserved the Bible in its purity; and their doctrines are, as far as the author knows, the doctrines of the Bible. Besides, they maintain the solemn observance of Christian worship throughout our empire, ON THE SEVENTH DAY, and they have as many spires pointing to heaven among the Hindus as we ourselves. Are such a people, then, entitled to no acknowledgment on our part, as fellow-Christians? Are they forever to be ranked by us with Jews, Mahometans, and Hindus?”—*Christian Researches in Asia, pp. 159, 160.*

SABBATH-KEEPERS DURING THE REFORMATION.

Carlstadt, who was associated with Luther in the Reformation, observed the Sabbath. This is attested by Dr. White, Lord Bishop of Ely:—

“The same [the observance of the seventh day] likewise being revived in Luther’s time by Carolaftadius, Sternebergius, and by some sectaries among the Anabaptists, hath both then and ever since been censured as Jewish and heretical.”—*Treatise of the Sabbath Day, p. 8.*

He and Luther disagreed concerning the nature of the communion, which engendered so much bitterness on the part of Luther that he procured the banishment of Carlstadt from Saxony. The latter then visited Switzerland, where his instructions attracted so much attention that Luther in his indignation wrote a book, “Against the Celestial Prophets,” which was mainly directed against the teachings of Carlstadt. In that work Luther said:—

“Indeed, if Carlstadt were to write further about the Sabbath, Sunday would have to give way, and the Sabbath—that is to say, Saturday—must be kept holy; he would truly make us Jews in all things, and we should come to be circumcised; for that is true, and cannot be denied, that he who deems it necessary to keep one law of Moses, and keeps it as a law of Moses, must deem all necessary, and keep them all.”—*Quoted in Life of Luther in Pictures, p. 147.*

In Hungary some of the laborers in the Reformation were also Sabbatarians. In the “History of the Prot-

stant Church in Hungary," p. 50, we find the following:—

"In Kashaw and some other towns the Reformation may have been considered as complete. Antonius Transylvanus was laboring here with great success, and was so well known to Luther that he received a letter from the great Reformer to use his influence with a preacher in Hermannstadt who had joined the Sabbatarians, and try to bring him back."

The translator, Dr. Craig, adds a note of explanation to this, saying that those Sabbatarians were a "sect which kept the Sabbath on the seventh day of the week." It is thus plain that God has had witnesses for his Sabbath in various countries, all through the Christian dispensation.

CHAPTER XII.

THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.

ITS PLACE IN PROPHECY.

"AND I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon." Rev. 13: 11.

This beast was seen by the prophet coming up at the time the preceding beast of the prophecy went into captivity. It is quite generally agreed that the captivity of the first beast was fulfilled in 1798, when the French army under Berthier overthrew the papacy, marking the end of the period of papal supremacy. Speaking of the two-horned beast, John Wesley, as early as 1750, said:—

"He has not yet come, though he cannot be far off; for he is to appear at the end of the forty-two months of the first beast."—*Notes on Rev. 13: 11.*

Christopher Kelley leaves the following:—

"The Roman republic was proclaimed on the 15th of February, 1798. The pope, however, made one additional effort for the continuance of his temporal existence, by sending an embassy to Berthier, who was encamped outside the walls. The general refused to admit any other deputation than that of the *people of Rome*, thus *dissipating the last hope of the holy father*. The arrival of the French army, and the proclamation of the general, had given the *fatal blow* to the papal sovereignty."—*The French Revolution*, p. 243.

The following prophetic words of Bishop Berkeley, written in the early part of the eighteenth century, express the truth in the history of the development of all nations in the past:—

“*Westward* the course of empire takes its way;
The first four acts already past,
A fifth shall close the drama with the day;
Time’s noblest offspring is the last.”

John Adams, also, records that nothing was “more ancient in his memory than the observation that arts, sciences, and *empire* had traveled westward.” He also spoke of a couplet that had been “drilled into a rock on the shore of Monument Bay, in our old colony of Plymouth:—

“The Eastern nations sink, their glory ends,
And empire rises where the sun descends.”
—*John Adams’s Works*, vol. 9, pp. 597-599.

Since the cradle of the race was in Asia, and the circuit of progress has been continuously westward, we may, in looking for the nation indicated by the two-horned beast, conclude that its location is to the westward of the four empires of earlier days. Taking a stand, then, in 1798, the time indicated by the prophecy, the inquiry arises: What independent power (*another* beast) was at that time arising in a way to fulfil the words of the prophecy? All that part of North America north of the United States, was under the dominion of Russia and Great Britain. Mexico, to the southwest, was a Spanish colony; Brazil belonged to Portugal, while most of the other South American states were controlled by Spain. There was not at that time a single civilized, independent government in the New World except the United States. It alone answers the specifications. We conclude, therefore, that that nation must be the one represented in the prophecy.

MANNER OF ITS RISE.

The words “coming up” in the text are from an original word, one of the chief definitions of which is “to grow or spring up as a *plant*.” In reviewing the history of the growth of the United States, it would seem as though it was “a word fitly spoken.” It is, too, a remarkable coincidence that political writers, in illus-

trating the rise of that government have used the same figure as is conveyed in the original scripture itself. Thus, a writer in the *Dublin Nation*, in 1850, said:—

“*In the West*, an opposing and still more *wonderful* American empire is *emerging*. We islanders have no conception of the extraordinary events which, *amid the silence of the earth*, are daily adding to the power and pride of this gigantic nation. Within three years, territory more extensive than these three kingdoms, France and Italy put together, has been *quietly*, and in almost ‘matter of course’ fashion, annexed to the Union.”

Mr. G. A. Townsend says:—

“Since America was discovered, she has been a subject of revolutionary thought in Europe. The *mystery of her coming forth from vacancy*, the marvel of her wealth in gold and silver, the spectacle of her captives led through European capitals, filled the minds of men with unrest; and unrest is the first stage of revolution.”—*New World Compared with the Old*, p. 462.

On page 635 he further says:—

“In this web of islands, the West Indies, began the life of both [North and South] Americas. There Columbus saw land; there Spain began her baneful and brilliant Western empire; thence Cortez departed for Mexico, De Soto for the Mississippi, Balboa for the Pacific, and Pizarro for Peru. The history of the United States was separated by a beneficent providence far from this wild and cruel history of the rest of the continent, and *like a silent seed, we grew into empire*.”

Referring in an oration to the motives which induced the Pilgrim Fathers to seek a home in the wilds of an unknown country, Edward Everett said:—

“Did they look for a retired spot, inoffensive from its obscurity, safe in its remoteness from the haunts of despots, where the little church of Leyden might enjoy freedom of conscience? Behold the mighty regions over which in *peaceful conquest—victoria sine clade*—they have borne the banners of the cross.”—*Quoted in Martyn’s History of the Great Reformation*, vol. 4, p. 238.

On December 22, 1620, one hundred of these voluntary exiles landed from the “*Mayflower*,” at Plymouth Rock, in New England. When the War of the Revolution broke out, the number of the colonists had increased to over 3,000,000 souls. At the termination of

the war in 1783, Great Britain acknowledged their independence and ceded them territory to the extent of 815,615 square miles. In 1787 the United States Constitution was framed, and ratified by the thirteen States, and it went into operation April 30, 1789.

ITS WONDERFUL DEVELOPMENT.

In one hundred years the area of the country has increased to 3,547,000 square miles, comprising forty-four States and four Territories, bordering on two oceans, and in two zones, with a population of 65,000,000 people, whose consuls and ambassadors are in every port and metropolis of the world. This is the most striking instance of national growth to be found in the history of mankind.

In the words of Rev. Josiah Strong, the question may here be pertinently asked,—

“What, then, should we say of a republic of eighteen States, each as large as Spain; or one of thirty-one States, each as large as Italy; or one of sixty States, each as large as England and Wales? What a confederation of nations! Take five of the six first-class powers of Europe, Great Britain and Ireland, France, Germany, Austria, and Italy; then add Spain, Portugal, Switzerland, Denmark, and Greece. Let one greater than Napoleon weld them into one mighty empire, and you could lay it all down in the United States west of the Hudson River once, and again, and again—three times!” — *Our Country, p. 8.*

Well may Mr. Gladstone say in his “Kin beyond the Sea,” that the United States has “a natural base for the greatest continuous empire ever established by man.”

As long ago as 1849, the *Dublin Nation* thus noticed this country:—

“The census of 1850, about to be taken in the United States, will show a growth of numbers, territory, and industry entirely unexampled in human history. Let the ‘gray powers’ of the Old World look at it—let the statesmen of France, Germany, and Russia read the census carefully through, though it should startle them. Let despotism count every man of these millions as a mortal enemy, and every acre of that vast commonwealth as an inheritance

of mankind mortgaged to the cause of freedom. America is as grand a field for human enterprise as when the ships of Columbus first neared the shores of Guanahana.”

The industrial developments of the United States are almost phenomenal. Their statistics for the year ending June 30, 1884, are as follows: Value of foreign exports, \$32,456,505; domestic exports, \$775,190,487; total value of products of industry, \$10,000,000,000; average annual coal production, 77,908,874 tons.

The author of the “Marvel of Nations,” on pp. 15, 16, gives the following interesting summary of the growth of the country:—

“No nation ever acquired so vast a territory in so quiet a manner.

“No nation ever rose to such greatness by so peaceable means.

“No nation ever advanced so rapidly in all that constitutes national strength and capital.

“No nation has ever risen to such a pinnacle of power in a space of time so incredibly short.

“No nation in so limited a time has developed such unlimited resources.

“No nation has ever existed, the foundations of whose government were laid so broad and deep in the principles of justice, righteousness, and truth.

“No nation has ever existed in which men have been left as free to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience.

“In no nation and in no age has the gospel found such freedom, and the churches of Christ had such liberty to enlarge their borders and develop their strength.”

THE TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE.

There are now nearly 2,000,000 miles of telegraph line in operation in the world. This method of communicating was perfected in America. The fact that Benjamin Franklin called the lightning down from the clouds by experimenting with a kite, and that electricity was first used by Prof. S. F. B. Morse to send messages on wires, originated the following:—

“The steed called lightning, say the fates,
Is owned in the United States;
Franklin’s hand first caught the horse,
'T was harnessed by Professor Morse.”

When a bill was presented in the House of Representatives of the United States, during the session of 1843-'44, asking an appropriation of \$30,000 to enable Prof. Morse to establish a line of telegraph between Washington and Baltimore, it was, at first, considered almost a farce, and the electrician became the butt of ridicule and the target of merciless arrows of wit. His persistency, however, secured the appropriation, and in 1844 a line of wire was stretched between the two cities named. After the successful laying of the Atlantic cable, a message was sent from San Francisco, California, to Valentia, Ireland, and an answer received in just *two minutes*. The system has now been so perfected that messages may be sent in both directions between two points, at the same time, and also may be both received and sent on rapidly moving railroad trains. In fact, the wonders of the telegraph became so startling in the earlier stages of its development, as to cause much comment upon it. Dr. John Pierrepont, of Vergennes, Vermont, writing on the subject concluded thus:—

“A hero chieftain, laying down his pen,
Closes his eyes in Washington at ten;
The lightning courier leaps along the line,
And at St. Louis tells the tale at nine;
Halting a thousand miles whence he departed,
And getting there an hour before he started.”

The telephone, an apparatus for transmitting sounds to a distance through the agency of electricity, is an invention, the perfection and usefulness of which was not known until the past few years. By this means messages may be transmitted, and the speaker's voice easily recognized hundreds of miles away. It may also be used in a sub-marine cable, the same as a telegraph. The first patent on a telephone was granted to Prof. A. G. Bell, of Massachusetts. Like the telegraph, its first presentation to the public was met with incredulity; but now telephonic companies have been organized in every part of the civilized world, employing many thousands of persons.

The invention of the phonograph, another wonder of the 19th century, is also accorded to an American, Prof. Thomas A. Edison, of New Jersey. By means of this instrument, conversation, music, or any sound whatever, is received, and, after an unlimited time reproduced with wonderful fidelity.

NATURE OF THE WORK OF THE TWO-HORNED
BEAST POWER.

“And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, . . . saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast which had the wound by a sword, and did live.” Rev. 13: 12-14.

In order to learn the nature and extent of the work predicted of the United States in the foregoing quotation, it will be necessary briefly to call attention to the acts of that power to which this government was to make an image. The prominent characteristic of the Roman power (symbolized by the leopard beast of Rev. 13: 1-10) has ever been to unite religion with the State in order to secure the enforcement of religious dogmas by the civil power.

In the second century the Christian Church had so far departed from the faith of the gospel that they had adopted many heathen rites and customs. The reason for such conduct is clearly stated by Mosheim:—

“The bishops augmented the number of religious rites in the Christian worship, by way of accommodation to the infirmities and prejudices, both of Jews and heathen, in order to facilitate their conversion to Christianity. . . . For this purpose, they gave the name of *mysteries* to the institutions of the gospel, and decorated particularly the holy sacrament with that solemn title. They used in that sacred institution, as also in that of baptism, several of the terms employed in the heathen mysteries, and proceeded so far, at length, as even to adopt some of the ceremonies of which those renowned mysteries consisted.”—*Church History, cent. 2, part 2, chap. 4, par. 2, 5, Maclaine's translation.*

These included also the heathen custom of turning their faces toward the rising of the sun while in the attitude of worship. See page 137 of this work. At the same time there was developing in the Church the theory that

the Church should administer the government as the direct instrument of God. By the beginning of the fourth century this theory so strongly prevailed in the Church that its leaders sought a way to put it in operation, and they firmly resolved to make use of the State to lift themselves into power. Speaking of this condition of affairs, the great Church historian, Neander, says:—

“There had in fact arisen in the Church, as we observed in the previous period, a false theocratical theory. . . . This theocratical theory was the prevailing one in the time of Constantine; and . . . the bishops voluntarily made themselves dependent on him by their disputes, and by their determination to make use of the power of the State for the furtherance of their aims.” — *Neander's History of the Christian Religion and Church, Torrey's Translation, vol. 2, p. 132.*

Constantine, in turn, seeing the state of affairs, resolved to use the Church in maintaining himself in power. He therefore called the Nicene Council, and when it adopted a creed, the emperor declared that whoever refused to receive it, should be sent into banishment. And yet we are assured that at the same time “Constantine was disposed to give his sanction to any creed.” — *Milner's Church History, vol. 2, p. 49.*

By his duplicity the emperor led the Church to flatter him, and to put in his hands a power that never belonged to him. Thus we read:—

“Constantine holding solely the reins of power, the professed ministers of Christ, already secularized in spirit, and aspiring to worldly pre-eminence, obtained access to his presence, and ingratiated themselves into his esteem. While he assumed the high office and authority of prescribing the faith of the empire, his obedient clergy bartered their independence for the possession of his favor. Instead of maintaining an erect posture as men, and deciding all theological inquiries for themselves, they solicited his attention to their controversies, and made him the arbiter of their differences, not because he was *wise*, but because he was *powerful*. They flattered him into a persuasion that he had a right to exercise an absolute supremacy over all the Christian communities in the empire. The most extravagant panegyrics were lavished upon him, and his unworthy adulators ascribed to him honors and prerogatives of the Divinity. The office of prescribing to the faith of mankind, and of judging offenses against the gospel, which the invisible Head of the Church had hitherto challenged as exclusively his own, was now

accounted proper for a mortal! Constantine became the judge of heresy. He summoned and presided in ecclesiastical councils. He published rescripts and issued edicts, not as formerly, to assure the subjects of the empire of secure protection in the exercise of their religion, but to denounce religious opinions, and to threaten the infliction of tremendous punishments against all persons whose tenets and discipline did not accord with his imperial standard.” — *Brook's History of Religious Liberty, pp. 40, 41.*

What else could be expected from such a union, than error and superstition, followed by persecution? See what did come:—

“Christianity now changed her attire, and filled the throne of her discarded rival. The ministers of the churches raised their heads, extended their views, and became lords not only over God's heritage, but of the dominions of sovereign princes. The spirit of innovation raged. Superstition opened all her tinsel treasures. Ignorance erected her ebon throne. The doctrines of Christianity were adulterated. . . . And to whatever religious opinions the emperor inclined, he dragged the churches of Christ in imperial chains to profess an attachment to the same courtly articles, and proceeded, without ceremony, to anathematize all the Christian world beside.” — *Ibid. pp. 47, 48.*

While these aspiring bishops were thus entangling themselves with worldly affairs, instead of caring for their flocks (see Neander, vol. 2, p. 16), the emperor, to make sure of their support, proclaimed himself favorable to Christianity, and, beginning with the edict of Milan, issued in 313 A. D., established Christianity, or rather the religion which then passed itself off for Christianity, as the religion of the empire. He was then ready to grant them their requests. The famous pagan Sunday edict was soon issued, in a form such that the Christian subjects of the empire could construe it as favorable to the Church festival of Sunday. (See page 142 of this work.) But this law was afterward seen to be inadequate to the wants of the bishops. At a convention held at Carthage in 401, they resolved to petition the emperor—

“That the public shows might be transferred from the Christian Sunday, and from feast days, to some other days of the week.” — *Neander's Church History, vol. 2, p. 300.*

The reason they gave for asking this favor, was indeed significant :—

"The people collect more at the circus than at the church. Nor ought any Christian to be compelled to attend these games, especially, since in the practice of these things which are contrary to the commands of God, no constraint of persecution should (must) be employed by any one, but, as is fitting, let a man stand in the freedom of will granted to him of heaven."— *Ibid*, note 5.

That is to say, some of the people were obliged to attend the circus, because if it continued in operation on Sunday, they were obliged to work, or others would be employed in their places. Others, too, attended to witness the games in preference to attending church and listening to the discourses of the preachers. Hence a law was demanded to make people attend church instead of the circus. That this is not a distorted view of the matter we have only to read another extract from the same page of Neander's History :—

Theaters
 "Owing to the prevailing passion at that time, especially in the large cities, to run after the various public shows, it so happened that when these spectacles fell on the same days which had been consecrated by the Church to some religious festival, they proved a great hinderance to the devotion of Christians, though chiefly, it must be allowed, to those whose Christianity was the least an affair of the life and of the heart."— *Neander's Church History*, vol 2, p. 300.

That was the trouble. Church members had not Christianity enough to keep them away from public shows when they ought to have been at church; and because they would not voluntarily do right while temptations were in their path, the State was called upon to take away the opportunity to do wrong, in order that they might be Christians. To put the matter in its true light, according to the words of our historian,—

"Church teachers . . . were in truth often forced to complain that in such competitions the theater was vastly more frequented than the church."— *Id.*

It was this competition that the Church could not brook, hence the appeal to the secular power. The bishops did not get at that time all they asked, but

the matter was kept alive till the year 425, when exhibitions on Sunday were prohibited—

"In order that the devotions of the faithful might be free from all disturbance."— *Id.*, p. 301.

Just what was the nature of the disturbance they were called to suffer on account of the games, is recorded in note 1, on the same page :—

"Every faculty of the mind should be occupied with the worship of God."

Yes; and the thought that some were enjoying themselves at the games, would disturb the *minds* of the church members so that they could not fully worship God; so easily was the devotion of the faithful "disturbed." But because the Church of that period had only "outward conversion," she called on the State to supply her lack, and, says Neander :—

"In this way the Church received help from the State for the furtherance of her aims."— *Id.* p. 301.

But this step led to another, which was inevitable in the nature of things. The people, deprived of the shows, were no better than before, in the opinion of the bishops, because they still neglected the Church. But their theoretical theory was equal to the emergency. When the people were disinclined to serve God, the doctrine of St. Augustine, that the Church has power to compel such service, was brought to the front and applied. His opinions, as stated by Dr. Philip Schaff, were as follows :—

H
 "It is indeed better that men should be brought to serve God by instruction than by fear of punishment, or by pain. But because the former means are better, the latter must not therefore be neglected. . . . Many must often be brought back to their Lord, like wicked servants, by the rod of temporal suffering, before they attain to the highest grade of religious development."— *Schaff's Church History*, vol. 2, sec. 27.

The foregoing is fully verified by the words of Augustine himself, contained in a letter written to the Donatist, Vicentius :—

"I was formerly of opinion that no one ought to be compelled to return to the bosom of the Church, under the impression that we ought not to use any other arms than words; that our contest ought to be no other than argument; and that such only ought to be esteemed as a victory which is gained through the force of conviction; for otherwise those would become feigned Catholics, who before were avowed heretics. But some of my companions have since pressed me closely, not with reasons but with facts, which they quoted to me in great numbers, whence I have been induced to adhere to their opinion. For they argued with me from the example of my own residence (Hippo), which, having formerly decided in favor of the heresy of Donatus, was afterward restored to the Catholic unity by means of the decrees of the emperors; and this so cordially, that it now hates the above heresy, and even appears never to have belonged to it. They quoted similar examples of other cities to me in such a manner, that I conceived that what is said in Proverbs may also be understood in this sense: 'Give instruction to a wise man, and he will be yet wiser.'

"How many of them had we not among us, as I was afterward informed, who were desirous of being converted from a conviction of the truth of our religion; nevertheless they delayed it, in order not to expose themselves to the animosity of their own party. How many were withheld, not by a supposition that their sect was founded in truth, which most assuredly they left out of the question, but by a blind custom which rendered them callous, so that it might be said of them, 'A servant will not be corrected with words; for though he understand, he will not answer.' . . . How many, in short, who, believing it was of no consequence to be a Christian in this or the other sect, continued in that of Donatus, because they had been therein born, and because there was no one to withdraw them from it, and lead them to the true Church! Hence do they now rejoice with us that in consequence of the grievances they then suffered, they were roused from the lethargy of inveterate habits, in which they would otherwise infallibly have perished. It may indeed be said, that with some, such measures do not avail. To this I will answer, that the incurable diseases of some, ought not to cause the refusal of remedies to others seeking the re-establishment of their health. We ought not to be foiled by the obstinate, unwilling to yield to persuasion, and of whom it is written, 'In vain did I chastise my children, that they might be well educated.' It is necessary also to attend to many others of whose amendment we bear witness, to the great consolation of our heart. Finally, I agree that it would be exercising a tyrannical power to terrify heretics without convincing them of their error; but it is also undeniable, that their inveterate habits will not suffer them to incline to conviction, and will obstruct their being led, unless it is very slowly, toward the road of salvation unless they are moved by terror."—*Clark's History of Intolerance*, pp. 313-316.

The natural outgrowth of all this was intolerance

and persecution, which the Roman Church developed to its intensest degree. On this point Neander says:—

"It was by Augustine, then, that a theory was proposed and founded, which . . . contained the germ of that whole system of spiritual despotism, of intolerance and persecution, which ended in the tribunals of the Inquisition."—*Neander's Church History*, vol. 2, p. 217.

EARLY MANIFESTATIONS OF INTOLERANCE AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE IMAGE.

As the symbolical beast with the seven heads and ten horns was the result of a union between religion and the State, an *image* to that beast must be a combination of the same elements. As the special characteristics of Christianity were exchanged for those of a slacker nature, until the distinction between the Church and the world was largely obliterated, and an affiliation was thereby effected, in order that the Church might carry out her unholy ambition, so we may look for the same tendencies in the formation of the *image to the beast*.

Through the medium of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, a class of earnest Christians was developed in Europe, who sought to throw off the papal yoke. Some who espoused the cause of the reformed Church left the shores of the Old World to seek a quiet home in America. Landing on the shores of New England, they regarded this country as an asylum from the intolerance and persecutions of the Church and State powers, from whose tyranny they had lately fled. In the fullness of their gratitude they resolved to found "a Church without a pope, and a State without a king."

But the attractions of the New World drew thither not only non-religionists, but those who differed with these people in religious opinions. Believing that they "ought to imitate the children of Israel, in punishing the wicked, and in establishing a holy government," almost insensibly they glided into the same spirit of intolerance that had driven them from Europe. Accordingly laws were framed in some of the colonies,

requiring all to contribute, according to their circumstances, to the support of a certain form of religion prescribed by the majority. In November, 1644, Massachusetts made a law to banish Baptists ("Backus's Church History of New England," pp. 52, 53); in October, 1658, another law was passed at Boston to banish Quakers on pain of death, which resulted in the hanging of four of these unfortunate religionists. — *Ibid*, pp. 90, 91.

This dominant feeling had grown so strong that in order to prevent others from having opportunity to preach in their respective localities, the ministers of Connecticut secured a law in May, 1742, which provided that,—

"If any settled minister in this government shall preach in the parish of another without his consent, he shall lose all the benefit of the laws for his support; and if any man who is not a settled minister, shall go into any parish and preach without such consent, he shall be imprisoned until he give an hundred pound bond not to do so again; and if any minister come out of any other government, and preach without such consent, he shall be taken up by authority, and carried as a vagrant person out of Connecticut." — *N. E. Church History, by Backus, pp. 155, 156.*

This was tyranny, pure and simple. But they had laws reaching even further than this. There was an old law in force at that time, by which every person was to be fined ten shillings (\$2.50) who drew off from parish ministers, and met for worship in a place separate from them. Numerous instances are recorded where these penalties were enforced. But as an object-lesson and warning such a spirit of intolerance evidently had its effect in the formation of this government. When the Constitution was drawn up which was to cement the interests of the new nation, this history, as well as that of the religious despotisms of the Old World, was before the framers of that document, and they therefore purposely kept out of it all religious tests whatever, leaving it a purely civil compact. (See art. 6 of the Constitution.)

But by some it was thought that that instrument did not even then guard the consciences of the people suf-

ficiently. Lest a law might be framed that would abridge the religious freedom of some, an amendment was proposed to the legislatures of the several States by the first Congress, on the 25th of Sept., 1789, which was endorsed by ten of the legislatures of the thirteen States. There is no evidence on the journals of Congress that the legislatures of Connecticut, Massachusetts, or Georgia ratified it. This amendment reads as follows:—

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

Under this Constitution up to the year 1892, Church and State in the United States government were kept apart. With these kept thus separate every one, whether Protestant, Catholic, Jew, or infidel, has here been free to worship, or not to worship, according to the dictates of his conscience. Since 1864, however, an association has existed known as—

THE NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION,¹ whose avowed purpose has been,—

"To secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ, and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land." — *Art. 2, of National Reform Constitution.*

In giving reasons for desiring this amendment, Mr. M. A. Gault, one of the district secretaries of this association, said:—

"We need it to correct our most unfortunate attitude under the first amendment, which restrains Congress from prohibiting the free exercise of any false religion, such as Mormonism, Oneidaism, pagan idolatry, etc." — *Christian Statesman, 1888.*

¹ This Association was started by the Reformed Presbyterian Church. A convention for the consideration of the attitude of the government toward religion was first called at Xenia, Ohio, Feb. 3, 1863. Representatives of eleven religious denominations were present. A national convention was held at Allegheny, Pa., Jan. 27, 1864, at which time the National Reform Association was organized, with John Alexander as president.

This plainly indicates their position, that the government has a right to interfere in matters of religion as such, and to determine which religion is true and which religions are false. How vastly different is this from the views of James Madison, who, with Washington, was one of the principal framers of our national Constitution, and in the debate on this very point in the Virginia convention, in 1785, thus clearly and forcibly expressed himself:—

"There is not a shadow of right in the general government to intermeddle with religion. Its least interference with it would be a most flagrant usurpation."

Directly in opposition to this, note the further words of Mr. Gault:—

"Our remedy for all these malefic influences is to have the government simply set up the moral law, and recognize God's authority behind it, and lay its hand on any religion that does not conform to it."—*Christian Statesman*, Jan. 13, 1887.

Said Rev. W. P. Gray, secretary of the Missouri State Sabbath Union, at Sedalia, Mo., May 22, 1889:—

"I, for one, do not believe that as a political maxim, governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. And I believe with Mr. Gault on this, I think. And so the object of this movement is an effort to change that feature in our fundamental law."—*Christian Statesman*, July 4, 1889.

The gospel of Christ aims at the individual. Its specific work is individual conversion and acceptance of Christ. How directly the opposite of this is the work of the National Reform Association, how it ignores the individual, and work for the individual, and seeks to convert men by wholesale, is well stated by Rev. Wm. Wier, district secretary of the association, in the following plain words:—

"The National Reform Association does not aim at the individual, but at the nation. Its specific purpose is to bring the whole people not as so many individuals but as one organized body, being a living, active, moral person, to confess the Lord Jesus Christ as King."—*Christian Statesman*, Feb. 4, 1893.

This party, whose bone and sinew for a time were almost wholly made up from the Reformed Presbyterian

Church in America, labored almost alone for years without making much apparent headway. But more recently it succeeded in forming alliances which have given it a cool effrontery that seems marvelous indeed. In 1885, the Women's Christian Temperance Union became one of the allies of this association, and thus proclaimed its principles in harmony with the foregoing National Reform Constitution:—

"A true theocracy is yet to come, and the enthronement of Christ in law and law-makers; hence I pray devoutly as a Christian patriot, for the ballot in the hands of women, and rejoice that the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union has so long championed this cause."—*Monthly Reading*, Sept., 1886.

"The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, local, State, national, and world-wide, has one vital, organic thought, one all-absorbing purpose, one undying enthusiasm, and that is that Christ shall be this world's king;—yea, verily, THIS WORLD'S KING in its realm of cause and effect,—king of its courts, its camps, its commerce,—king of its colleges and cloisters,—king of its customs and its constitutions. . . . The kingdom of Christ must enter the realm of law through the gate-way of politics. . . . We pray heaven to give them [the old parties] no rest. . . . until they shall . . . swear an oath of allegiance to Christ in politics, and march in one great army up to the polls to worship God."—*President's Annual Address in Convention*, Nashville, 1887.

THE BLAIR SUNDAY-REST BILL. 170

In harmony with these platforms prominent members in these organizations set to work, as did the ambitious prelates of the fourth century, to secure Sunday legislation. Accordingly they secured a list of names to a petition praying Congress to intercede in behalf of their cherished design. A hearing was granted April 6, 1888, by the United States Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and the claims of those in favor of Sunday legislation, were duly presented. The petitions were taken in hand by the Committee on Education and Labor, and on May 21, 1888, there was presented in the Senate, by Mr. H. W. Blair, of New Hampshire, chairman of that committee, the following bill, which was read twice and referred to the committee, whose chairman had drafted it:—

"50th CONGRESS, }
1ST SESSION. } S. 2983.

"A bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, as a day of rest, and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship.

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That no person, or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employee of any person or corporation, shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others, on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, or during any part thereof, in any territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section.

"SEC. 2. That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal-route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week: *Provided,* That whenever any letter shall relate to a work of necessity or mercy, or shall concern the health, life, or decease of any person, and the fact shall be plainly stated upon the face of the envelope containing the same, the post-master-general shall provide for the transportation of such letter.

"SEC. 3. That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, the same not being work of necessity, mercy, or humanity, by the transportation of persons or property by land or water in such way as to interfere with, or disturb the people in the enjoyment of the first day of the week, or any portion thereof, as a day of rest from labor, the same not being labor of necessity, mercy, or humanity, or its observance as a day of religious worship, is hereby prohibited; and any person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employee of any person or corporation who shall willfully violate this section, shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid for the same.

"SEC. 4. That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in time of active service or immediate preparation therefor, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States, on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited; nor shall any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the Lord's day.

"SEC. 5. That it shall be unlawful to pay or to receive payment or wages in any manner for service rendered, or for labor per-

formed, or for the transportation of persons or property, in violation of the provisions of this act, nor shall any action lie for the recovery thereof, and when so paid, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same.

"SEC. 6. That labor or service performed and rendered on the first day of the week in consequence of accident, disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal-routes and routes of travel and transportation, the preservation of perishable and exposed property, and the regular and necessary transportation and delivery of articles of food in condition for healthful use, and such transportation for short distances from one State, district, or Territory, into another State, district, or Territory as by local laws, shall be declared to be necessary for the public good, shall not be deemed violations of this act, but the same shall be construed so far as possible to secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the religious observance of the Sabbath day."

The appearance of this bill was hailed by the National Reformers as a piece of good fortune to their cause, and it was soon arranged to have a hearing before the committee in whose hands the bill was resting, in order to urge its passage. In the meantime another ally was found in a newly organized association called the American Sabbath Union,¹ whose prominent representative at that time was Wilbur F. Crafts, of New York. This association held a grand Sunday convention in the Foundry Church, Washington, Dec. 12, 1888, and the following day, the Senate hearing took place in the Senate reception room at the United States Capitol.

While the friends of that bill had loudly proclaimed that it was only a *civil* measure to give overworked employees an opportunity for physical rest, the wording of the bill itself, and expressions which its advocates occasionally let fall, showed that it was not only designed to be a *religious* document, but that it was so to all intents and purposes. For instance: A document was submitted by Mr. Crafts at the hearing just referred to, which purported to be the questions asked

¹By request the Methodist Church took the initiatory step in the organization of this union. The American Sabbath Union was organized in New York City in Col. Elliott F. Shepard's parlors, Dec. 8 and 9, 1888. Mr. Shepard being elected president.

him by members of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, and his replies thereto. Upon his pressing them for their vote in favor of the Sunday-rest bill, one of the engineers asked:—

“Could not this weekly rest day be secured without reference to religion, by having the workmen of an establishment scheduled in regular order for one day of rest per week, whichever was most convenient — *not all resting on any one day?*”

“Answer: A weekly day of rest has never been permanently secured in any land *except on the basis of religious obligation. Take the religion out, and you take the rest out.* Greed is so strong that *nothing but God and conscience* can keep him from capturing all the days for toil.” — *Notes of Sunday-rest Bill Hearing, p. 21.*

Upon Mr. Crafts's own showing, then, it is impossible to have an effective Sunday law, except on the “basis of religious obligation.” The Blair Sunday-rest bill was therefore a proposition for *religious* legislation and not civil legislation. And yet when another question was put, asking if the Sunday rest could not be secured without legislation, but through mutual agreements between churches, engineers, etc., and so avoid interfering with personal liberties, the answer was as follows:—

“Sunday laws do not in any way interfere with true liberty, for they do not require any man to be religious.” — *Ibid.*

To enact Sunday laws on the basis of “religious obligation” according to these statements, does not oblige one to be religious! But in a Sunday convention held at Elgin, Ill., Nov. 8, 1887, Dr. W. W. Everts, of Chicago, in speaking of Sunday observance said:—

“It is the test of all religion.”

To enforce a Sunday law then, according to their own ideas of the matter, would be to enforce a religious test. But in what way is it a religious test? The answer is found in the words of the same speaker on the same occasion:—

“He who does not keep the Sabbath, does not worship God; and he who does not worship God, is lost.”

The demand is therefore for a law to compel men to worship God, according to their ideas, of course, of the forms and customs essential to such worship. But all such legislation is unconstitutional. (See First Amendment, quoted on page 165 and in Appendix A.)

Following the introduction of the Blair Sunday-rest bill, the W. C. T. U. circulated a petition asking for the passage of such a law. And just prior to the Sunday convention held in Washington, Dec. 11–13, 1888, Mr. Crafts received, upon his personal solicitation, a letter from Cardinal Gibbons, of Baltimore, in which Mr. Gibbons said:—

“I am most happy to add my name to those of the millions of others who are laudably contending against the violation of the Christian Sabbath by unnecessary labor, and who are endeavoring to promote its decent and proper observance by judicious legislation.”

The reception of this letter, in which the cardinal simply *added his name* to the list of petitioners, gave the interested ones boldness to announce that the letter pledged the names of 7,200,000 Catholics to their petitions in behalf of the movement. They already claimed a large number of names to their petitions by estimating the combined membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Baptist Church, the Presbyterian Churches, North and South, and the Reformed (Dutch) Church, in consequence of these organizations having officially appointed members in the American Sabbath Union. These, aggregated in this way, footed up 6,000,000 names. By adding 7,200,000 Catholic members to the number, it gave them, according to this reckoning, over 13,000,000 names to their petitions. (See “Sunday-rest Bill Hearing,” p. 18.)

Let it be observed that Cardinal Gibbons in this letter offered to add his name to those of the millions of others who are “laudably contending against the *violation of the Christian Sabbath.*” His name was accepted, and with him were counted 7,200,000 Catholics. These, if in harmony with their cardinal, were petitioning for legislation on the *Christian Sabbath*, which of

course can be none other than a *religious* institution; and in adding these names to their petition, the W. C. T. U. and American Sabbath Union acknowledged the sentiments of Cardinal Gibbons to be in harmony with their objects and purposes.

THE SUNDAY-LAW PETITION.

But let us examine the petition :—

“The undersigned, *adult residents of the United States, twenty-one years of age or more*, hereby earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill,” etc.

Who does not know that a certain proportion of these Protestant churches are not adult, and that a large per cent of Catholic members are only children? And yet these are all represented in the counted membership of these churches as “adults.” Again, from the way the letter of Cardinal Gibbons was worded, it was a question in the minds of many whether he intended by it to pledge the entire membership of the Catholic Church in favor of the movement. A note was therefore forwarded to him by a Mr. D. E. Lindsey, of Baltimore, asking his design in the letter sent to Mr. Crafts, and the following answer was returned :—

“CARDINAL’S RESIDENCE, 408 NORTH CHARLES ST.,
BALTIMORE, MD., Feb. 27, 1889.

“MY DEAR SIR : In reply to your favor dated Feb. 25, 1889, and duly received, His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons directs me to say to you that whatsoever countenance his Eminence has given to the “National Sunday Law” referred to in your favor, as he had not the authority, so he had not the intention of binding the Archbishops, Bishops, or the Catholic laity of the United States. His Eminence bids me say to you that he was moved to write a letter favoring the passage of the bill, mainly from a consideration of the rest and recreation which would result to our poor, over-worked fellow-citizens, and of the facility which it would afford them of observing the Sunday in a religious and decorous way.

“It is incorrect to assume that his Eminence in the alleged words of Senator Blair, as set forth in your favor, ‘Signed the bill, thus pledging 7,200,000 Catholics as endorsing the bill.’

“I have the honor to remain with much respect,

“Yours faithfully,

“P. J. DONAHUE, *Chancellor.*”

To D. E. LINDSEY. ESQ. 708 Rayner Ave., Baltimore, Md.

It may also be proper to observe further that this endorsement of the Cardinal’s was not received without solicitation. In a leaflet written by Mr. Crafts, entitled, “The Seventh-day Adventist Petition,” referring to this, he says :—

“This endorsement was given after millions of Protestants had endorsed it, and *at my own solicitation.*”

It will thus be seen that in endeavoring to secure this piece of compulsory religious legislation, professed Protestants sought the support of those who, when in power, have been the greatest abusers of it. Notwithstanding this, they appear to have no hesitation in forming such alliances. Prof. Charles A. Briggs, D. D., of Union Theological Seminary, in the *Christian at Work*, of April 10, 1888, says :—

“In all matters of worship we are in essential concord with the Roman Catholics, and we ought not to hesitate to make an alliance with them as far as possible to maintain the sanctity of the Sabbath [Sunday] as a day of worship.” 183

In this is again manifested the purpose for which the legislation is desired, — to maintain the “sanctity” of the day as “a day of worship.”

THE OBJECT.

But these people want Sunday legislation, and are determined to have it; so they demand that the Sunday newspaper shall be stopped. And why? Listen again to Dr. Everts in the convention held at Elgin, Ill., Nov. 8, 1887 :—

“The laboring class are apt to rise late on Sunday morning, read the Sunday papers, and allow the *hour of worship* to go by unheeded.”

Dr. Herrick Johnson, in the Illinois Sunday convention, held in Farwell Hall, Chicago, Nov. 20, 21, 1888, said on this point :—

“What a *melange!* what a dish to set down before a man before breakfast and after breakfast, to prepare him for hearing the word of God! It makes it twice as hard to reach those who go to the sanctuary, and it keeps many away from the house of worship altogether.”

They read the paper; the time comes to go to church; but it is said, 'Here is something interesting; I will read it, and not go to church to-day.'

Concerning the necessity for a law to stop Sunday railroad trains, Dr. Everts said at the Elgin convention:—

"The Sunday train is another great evil. They cannot afford to run a train unless they get a great many passengers, and so break up a great many congregations. The Sunday railroad trains are hurrying their passengers fast on to perdition. What an outrage that the railroad, that great civilizer, should destroy the Christian Sabbath!"

But these are not all the "evils" complained of. Speaking before the United States Senate committee, April 6, 1888, Mr. Crafts lamented that—

"The law allows the post-office to be kept open through the church hours unless the first mail of the day comes during those hours. If it comes five minutes or more before the church service begins, the post-office can be run, and is run in many cases, all through church hours as the rival and antagonist, and the competitor of the churches."—Notes of Senate Hearing, p. 135.

From the speeches of those who are urging Sunday legislation, one can plainly see that theirs is a religious move from beginning to end. They desire the Sunday newspapers stopped, not because they hinder the people from resting on Sunday, but because they keep many away from the house of worship. They want the Sunday trains interdicted, not because they require a few to work on that day, but because they "get a great many passengers, and so break up a great many congregations." They want the post-offices closed on Sunday, not because it is a sin to distribute mail on that day, but because by opening the post-office on that day, it draws people there who ought to be at Church, thus making it "the rival, and antagonist, and the competitor of the churches."

Who can fail to see from the foregoing testimony what the object of these people is? It was just the same in the fourth century. The bishops wanted the circus and theater closed on Sunday, not because they

considered the plays immoral, but because they kept people from religious service, and were therefore the competitors of the churches. (See "Neander," vol. 2, p. 300.)

And upon securing the help of the government in carrying out their aims, what then do they propose? Do they intend to let others have the same rights they demand for themselves, or will they, like those who secured the religious legislation in the fourth century, become intolerant toward all dissenters? Let Dr. McAllister reply in words used by him at Lakeside, Ohio, July, 1887:—

"Let a man be what he may,—Jew, seventh-day observer of some other denomination, or those who do not believe in the Christian Sabbath,—let the law apply to every one, that there shall be no public desecration of the first day of the week, the Christian Sabbath, the day of rest for the nation. They may hold any other day of the week as sacred, and observe it; but that day which is the one day in seven for the nation at large, let that not be publicly desecrated by any one, by officer in the government, or by private citizen, high or low, rich or poor."

ANOTHER BOLD STEP

But as though the Sunday-rest bill did not go far enough in religious legislation, another principle of the National Reformers was embodied in a joint resolution, proposing an amendment to the United States Constitution, and was presented before the National Senate by Senator Blair, on May 25, 1888, just four days after the introduction of his Sunday-rest bill. That document reads as follows:—

"50th Congress, } S. R. 86.
1st Session. }

"Joint resolution, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting establishments of religion and free public schools.

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the States, as provided in the Constitution:—

" ARTICLE.

"SECTION 1. No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

"SEC. 2. Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion. But no money raised by taxation imposed by law, or any money or other property or credit belonging to any municipal organization, or to any State, or to the United States, shall ever be appropriated, applied, or given to the use or purposes of any school, institution, corporation, or person, whereby instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character; nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances be taught or inculcated in the free public schools.

"SEC. 3. To the end that each State, the United States, and all the people thereof, may have and preserve governments republican in form and in substance, the United States shall guaranty to every State, and to the people of every State and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.

"SEC. 4. That Congress shall enforce this article by legislation when necessary."

At first sight one would say from reading the first section of this resolution that the proposed amendment was in harmony with the United States Constitution, and therefore was intended to guard carefully the religious rights of all citizens. But that clause is for another purpose altogether. It is true that the National Constitution says that *Congress* shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, etc., but that does not prohibit any State from doing so if its citizens see fit thus to legislate. On the other hand, Article X of the Amendment to the National Constitution provides that —

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Thus, while the Constitution forbids Congress to legislate on religion, it does not prohibit the States from doing so, and therefore each State might establish by law any religion in its borders which had the majority of its voters as devotees.

Until 1819, the State of Connecticut imposed a tax upon all her citizens to support the Congregational churches within her borders. Up to 1833, Massachusetts had a State religion, and to this day the State Constitution of New Hampshire permits the legislature to authorize "the several towns, parishes, bodies corporate, or religious societies within this State to make adequate provisions, at their own expense, for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion and morality. (See Part 1, Art. 6.) It also prohibits any Catholic holding office under the State. The fear of bringing in such a state of affairs as this was one great hinderance to Utah's becoming a State when she knocked for admittance into the Union a few years ago.

But one has only to read Section 2 of the resolution to learn the true import of the measure. That proposed to have established a uniform system of public schools throughout the States, in which the "principles of the Christian religion" are taught, without allowing the tenets of any one denomination to prevail in such teaching. But it would be next to impossible to bring this uniform system about without first having a prohibitory clause forbidding any State to teach "principles" in religion peculiar to the majority within its boundary, and hence the cause for Section 1. If such a clause did not guard the resolution, when it became a law, it would admit of as many phases of religious thought as there should be States to legislate on the subject. This would, in religious things, make each State a principality of its own. But in order that there might be uniformity, and also to maintain a republican form of government in this respect, as in all others, Section 3 of the resolution provided that Congress

should guarantee to each State the maintenance of the system of schools called for. Section 4 adds that Congress shall enforce the *article*, that is, the entire resolution, by legislation.

It is thus easy to see that studious care was taken in framing the resolution to deprive the States of all power in the matter outside of congressional legislation. Another necessary step which was apparent, was that if Congress should provide that a set of principles, which it might vote to be those of the Christian religion, and which should not savor of any one sect, should be taught in the public schools, it would be necessary that these be compiled by theologians from all religious sects of the country, and these in turn accepted by vote of Congress. There would be no other way open by which to decide what were the principles of the Christian religion, for no one person or denomination could be entrusted to determine them, and neither Congress nor the Supreme Court of the United States had up to this time attempted either to establish the Christian religion or to define its principles. The author of the proposed amendment (Senator Blair) evidently saw this, for in a letter to the secretary of the National Reform Association, proposing a solution of the matter, he said:—

“I believe that a text-book of instruction in the principles of virtue, morality, and of the Christian religion, can be prepared for use in the public schools, by the joint effort of those who represent every branch of the Christian Church, both Protestant and Catholic, and also those who are not actively associated with either.”

Let such a thing as this be done, or anything similar to it, and the decision of such a council enforced upon the people, and it would be the same thing as was carried out by the Council of Nice and the Emperor Constantine. In other words it would be the logical result of an established national religion—of a union of Church and State. But this is just what the National Reformers have wanted all the time. Their theory, as enunciated in the Cincinnati convention, in 1872, by Prof. J. R. W. Sloane, D. D., is that—

“Every government by equitable laws, is a government of God. A republic thus governed is of him, through the people, and is as truly and really a theocracy as the commonwealth of Israel.”

In a speech made by Jonathan Edwards, D. D., in a National Reform convention, held in New York City, Feb. 26, 27, 1873, that gentleman said:—

“We want State and religion, and we are going to have it. It shall be that so far as the affairs of State require religion, it shall be religion—the religion of Jesus Christ. The Christian oath and Christian morality shall have in this land ‘an undeniable legal basis.’ We use the word *religion* in its proper sense, as meaning a man’s personal relation of faith and obedience to God.”—*Proceedings of the (1873) National Convention to Secure the Religious Amendment to the Constitution*, p. 60.

And Prof. C. A. Blanchard, in the Pittsburg convention, in 1874, thus put himself on record:—

“Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measures, and of course Congress establishes a standard for money, weights, and measures. So Congress must establish a standard of religion, or admit anything called religion.”—*Proceedings of the Fifth National Reform Convention*, p. 71.

Their design, then, has been and is still to have the State obtrude itself into every man’s personal relation of faith and obedience to God. Such a theory carried out would of course make outlaws of those who could not subscribe to their dogmas. And this result, indeed, lay so near the surface that Mr. Edwards himself saw it, and spoke in relation to it as follows:—

“Now, we are warned that to ingraft this doctrine upon the Constitution will be oppressive; that it will infringe the rights of conscience; and we are told that there are atheists, deists, Jews, and Seventh-day Baptists who would be sufferers under it.”—*Proceedings of the National Reform Convention (1873)*, p. 60.

But how does Mr. Edwards justify himself and those with whom he is associated in doing that which he knows would be intolerant toward these parties he names? Let him answer the question, as he deals with that phase of the subject:—

“What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would tolerate a poor lunatic; for in my view *his mind is scarcely*—”

sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator. *The atheist is a dangerous man.*"—*Ibid*, p. 63.

Then the atheist will be put under surveillance to see that he does not rave, that is, propagate his views. When he does this he becomes dangerous, and must be restrained by the arm of the law. In other words, the National Reformers want a law which will give them a monopoly in propagandism. But having learned what they propose to do with incorrigibles, let us see what part of the various communities the charity of this doctor of divinity will permit him to class among hardened and obdurate criminals. Under the general head of atheists, he classes deists, Jews, and Seventh-day Baptists in the following manner:—

"These all are, for the occasion, and so far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together, which we very much regret, but which we cannot help. The first-named is the leader in the discontent and in the outcry—the atheist, to whom nothing is higher or more sacred than man, and nothing survives the tomb. It is his class. Its labors are almost wholly in his interest; its success would be almost wholly his triumph. The rest are adjuncts to him in this contest. They must be named from him; they must be treated as, for this question, one party."—*Ibid*. p. 62.

And after getting all they ask—the laws of this Government to be administered upon Christian (?) principles,—do they then propose to manifest the spirit of the Master, and tolerate dissenters? Hear Mr. Edwards further on this theme:—

"Tolerate atheism, sir? There is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon! The atheist may live, as I have said; but, God helping us, the taint of his destructive creed shall not defile any of the civil institutions of all this fair land! Let us repeat, atheism and Christianity are contradictory terms. They are incompatible systems. *They cannot dwell together on the same continent!*"—*Ibid*, p. 63.

And what would they do with these poor despised irreclaimables? This may be determined by an extract of a speech delivered at York, Nebraska, by Rev. E. B.

Graham, a vice-president of the National Reform Association, and published in the *Christian Statesman*, of May 21, 1888:—

"We might add in all justice, If the opponents of the Bible do not like our government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land, and in the name of the devil, and for the sake of the devil, subdue it, and set up a government of their own on infidel and atheistic ideas; and then if they can stand it, stay there till they die."

Said Rev. D. A. Gault, district secretary of the National Reform Association, in a letter dated June 3, 1889:—

"We propose to incorporate in our national Constitution the moral and religious command, 'In it [the Sabbath] thou shalt do no work,' except the works of necessity, and by external force of sheriffs we propose to arrest and punish all violators of this law."

Pres. Charles E. Knox, D. D., of the German Seminary at Bloomfield, New Jersey, laid down this rule:—

"Whatever makes the best citizen, Congress has a right to prescribe."—*Crafts's Sabbath for Man*, p. 255.

The gospel as manifested in its power to regenerate man, give him a new heart, and create him in Christ Jesus unto good works (Eph. 2:10), makes the best citizen. The absurdity of such a theory is exposed upon the very thought of Congress prescribing that a man shall believe in the gospel, have a new heart, and be created unto good works.

But were these National Reformers in harmony with the proposed amendment of Mr. Blair? Indeed they were, for they saw in it principles which would lead up to the end for which all these years they have been seeking. In its issue of July 19, 1888, the *Christian Statesman*, their official organ, discussed the subject matter of Mr. Blair's proposed amendment, and in doing so took occasion to say of Christianity as the religion of the nation, and of the adoption of the Bible as the text-book in the public schools that,—

"These have been our watch-words in the discussions of a quarter of a century. And now these ideas are actually pending before the

P. 209

124

188

Senate of the United States, in the form of a joint resolution proposing their adoption as a part of the Constitution of the United States. Here is a great opportunity. Shall we boldly and wisely improve it?"

The National Reformers saw in the Blair amendment, as soon as it was proposed, that which if adopted would give them their hearts' desire. As evidence of this, there appeared in the columns of the *Christian Statesman*, of Sept. 6, 1888, from the pen of Mr. John Alexander, the father and founder of the National Reform movement, the following counsel regarding the position they should occupy:—

"Let us begin without delay the circulation of petitions (to be furnished in proper form by the Association), and let an opportunity be given to all parts of the country to make up a roll of petitions so great that it will require a procession of wheelbarrows to trundle the mighty mass into the presence of the representatives of the nation in the House of Congress. . . . Let a mass convention of the friends of the cause be held in Washington, when the Blair resolution shall be under discussion, to accompany with its influence the presentation of the petitions, and to take such other action as may be deemed best to arouse the nation to a genuine enthusiasm in behalf of our national Christianity."

That these people are really in earnest, will be seen by the preceding extracts. But these just as forcibly demonstrate their design to invade the rights of men's consciences. It would seem, too, that some of them are well aware of that fact. In the *Christian Statesman* of Aug. 9, 1888, Rev. R. C. Wylie, while lauding the proposed amendment, made a very significant statement. He wanted the amendment to be adopted because they would then have a vantage ground which they do not now have. Thus he said:—

"The leading objection that has been urged against us will have lost its power. That objection, which has such a tender regard for the infidel conscience, will have spent its force against this amendment, and will be no more fit for use against us."

In these words the author tacitly admitted that there have been objections against the principles of the National Reformers. And how did he propose to remove them? Simply by laying them off on the Blair amend-

Union of Protestants and Catholics.

ment. In thus disposing of the objections hitherto urged against his party, Mr. Wylie virtually admitted that the amendment carried the same objections with it; enough so at least that his party in their work could escape these, because the attention of the objectors would be called away from them to the Senate resolution which they were willing should bear the brunt of criticism, and thus allow them to escape. Another admission concealed in these words is that the amendment, if adopted, would have been open to the charge of invading the rights of conscience; for that is what he says they themselves have met as an objection to their work, and the amendment was that which was going to relieve them from it.

BID FOR CATHOLIC SUPPORT.

And these clamorers for religious legislation are ready, also, to go to extreme lengths to obtain their ends. They will even link hands with what they know to have always been the most despotic of religious tyrants, in order to enlist the sympathies of that power. As long ago as Aug. 31, 1884, in an article in the *Christian Statesman*, Rev. Sylvester Scovel, writing of the common interests of Protestants and Catholics, said:—

"This common interest ought to strengthen both our determinations to work and our readiness to *co-operate* with our Roman Catholic fellow citizens. We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, for the time is not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike hands with other churches—as such; but the time has come to make repeated advances and *gladly to accept co-operation in any form* in which they may be willing to exhibit it."

And Dec. 11, 1884, the *Christian Statesman* said editorially:—

"Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to co-operate in resisting the progress of political atheism, we will gladly join hands with them."

It is a point well understood by those who have taken the pains to inform themselves that Pope Leo XIII has commanded all Catholics to do all in their power to "cause the Constitutions of the States, and legislation,

✓

✓ ORN

to be modeled to the principles of the true Church." In 1885 he issued an encyclical letter in which appeared the following: —

"All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in the countries where they live; they must penetrate wherever possible in the administration of civil affairs; must constantly exert the utmost vigilance and energy to prevent the usage of liberty from going beyond the limits fixed by God's law. All Catholics should do all in their power to cause the Constitutions of the States, and legislation, to be modeled to the principles of the true Church."

Although the Catholics have apparently been slow to manifest their willingness to co-operate as the National Reformers desired they should, this bid on the part of professed Protestants for Catholic co-operation in order to secure legislation for the support of the Catholic Sabbath, finally met a response at the first Congress of Catholic laymen in the United States, held at Baltimore, Md., Nov. 10-12, 1889. In the platform which was adopted "with enthusiastic unanimity" at the closing meeting of this Congress, the following declarations were made: —

"There are many Christian issues in which Catholics could come together with non-Catholics and shape legislation for the public weal. In spite of rebuff and injustice, and overlooking zealotry, we should seek alliance with non-Catholics for proper Sunday observance. . . . We favor the passage and enforcement of laws rigidly closing saloons on Sunday."— *Chicago Inter Ocean*, Nov. 13, 1889.

The same report further states that —

"The planks of education, labor, and Sunday observance were received with the greatest demonstrations."— *Ib.*

In view of these facts it is easy to see that although until recently, outwardly quite indifferent to this burning question, at the right time—when they shall have secured the proper vantage ground—the help of the Catholics may then be counted on, not, however, to give the Protestants special control in the nation, but to secure to themselves that ascendancy and management of affairs in the United States, which they have so long waited for, apparently in vain, and which they perhaps

could never secure in any other way. The fact that such a proposition had not only been made but virtually accepted, was sufficient evidence that some tangible developments and realizations of the National Reformers' hopes might be expected.

LATER DEVELOPMENTS.

Although the Blair Educational Amendment, together with his Sunday-rest bill, were, with slight modifications re-introduced into the Fifty-First Congress, and both vigorously supported by petitions and wide-spread endeavor, yet they failed to materialize into organic law, and died with the Congress named. But the seeds of National Reformism had been sown and were still alive, awaiting only a more favorable opportunity to spring forth. What the National Reformers desired in their proposed religious amendment, and what the Blair Educational Amendment would have done had it been adopted, was practically met in —

THE DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES OF FEB. 29, 1892,

declaring this to be a "religious people" and a "Christian nation." (See Appendix B.) This decision established a national religion (not the Christian religion, however, for the religion of Christ cannot be established in government by law, but only in the hearts of individuals by the Spirit of God), and it affords the "undeniable legal basis" so much and so long longed for by National Reformers.

In citing as it does the commission of Ferdinand and Isabella to Columbus, with the establishment of the Catholic faith in view; the colonial grant from Queen Elizabeth to Sir Walter Raleigh, with the maintenance of "the true Christian faith" of the Church of England as one of its express conditions; quotations from colonial charters and State constitutions upholding State religions, requiring contributions for their support, religious tests and religious test oaths as qualifications

for public office, such as a belief in God, the inspiration of the Old and New Testaments, future rewards and punishments, etc.;—in citing these as proof that the United States government is a Christian nation, it repudiated the “new order of things” upon which this government was founded, returned to the “old order of things,” and in principle justified the adoption and revival of all these things in this country. It ignored the spirit and intent of the First Amendment to the Constitution, and directly contradicted that part of the “fundamental law of the land” (Art. VI of Constitution) expressed in the treaty with Tripoli in 1797, which declares that,—

“The Government of the United States is not, in any sense, founded on the Christian religion.”—*American State Papers*, p. 54.

In this act the United States Supreme Court assumed the prerogative which belonged only to the people, and virtually *made* law, supreme law, instead of interpreting law in harmony with the supreme law of the land, which by oath they were sworn to do.

WHAT NATIONAL REFORMERS THINK OF IT.

In the *Christian Statesman* of June 25, 1892, one of the secretaries of the National Reform Association said:—

“Is not this the time to remember that the United States Supreme Court has officially declared [in a document that reads as if largely gathered from the National Reform Manual] that this is a Christian nation?”

The *Pearl of Days*, the official organ of the American Sabbath Union, May 7, 1892, says that this decision—

“Establishes clearly the fact that our government is Christian. *This decision is vital to the Sunday question in all its aspects*, and places that question among the most important issues now before the American people. . . . And this important decision rests upon the fundamental principle that religion is imbedded in the organic structure of the American government—a religion that recognizes, and is bound to maintain, *Sunday* as a day for rest and worship.”

In its issue of May 21, 1892, the *Christian Statesman* said:—

“‘Christianity is the law of the land.’ ‘This is a Christian nation.’—*U. S. Supreme Court, Feb. 29, 1892*. The Christian Church, therefore, has rights in this country. Among those is the right to one day in seven protected from the assaults of greed, the god of this world, that it may be devoted to worship of the God of heaven and earth.”

And just before Thanksgiving the same paper, under date Nov. 19, 1892, printed the following article:—

“CHRISTIAN POLITICS.

“THE SUPREME COURT DECISION.

“THE GREATEST OCCASION FOR THANKSGIVING.

“[Department edited by Wm. Wier, Washington, Pa., District Secretary of the National Reform Association.]

“‘This is a Christian nation.’ That means Christian government, Christian laws, Christian institutions, Christian practices, Christian citizenship. And this is not an outburst of popular passion or prejudice. Christ did not lay his guiding hand there, but upon the calm, dispassionate, supreme judicial tribunal of our government. It is the weightiest, the noblest, the most tremendously far-reaching in its consequences of all the utterances of that sovereign tribunal. And that utterance is for Christianity, for Christ. ‘A Christian nation!’ Then this nation is Christ’s nation, for nothing can be Christian that does not belong to him. Then his word is its sovereign law. Then the nation is Christ’s servant. Then it ought to, and must, confess, love, and obey Christ. All that the National Reform Association seeks, all that this department of Christian politics works for, is to be found in the development of that royal truth, ‘This is a Christian nation.’ It is the hand of the second of our three great departments of national government throwing open a door of our national house, one that leads straight to the throne of Christ.

“Was there ever a Thanksgiving day before that called us to bless our God for such marvelous advances of our government and citizenship toward Christ?

“‘O sing unto the Lord a new song, for he hath done marvelous things; his right hand and his holy arm hath gotten him the victory. Sing unto the Lord with the harp and the voice of a psalm.’

“WILLIAM WEIR.”

This shows that these National Reformers and “Christian” politicians recognize in this decision a founda-

tion for all they have ever asked in the way of religious legislation; and that all they have desired would be fulfilled in the "development" of that which was here brought into existence and established. They at once seized upon this, and the development began immediately to take place.

SUNDAY BILL FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. Blair's Sunday rest bill not becoming a law, Jan. 6, 1890, Mr. W. C. P. Breckinridge, member of Congress from Kentucky, introduced in the House of Representatives the following bill:—

"A BILL

"TO PREVENT PERSONS FROM BEING FORCED TO LABOR ON SUNDAY.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall be unlawful for any person or corporation, or employee of any person or corporation in the District of Columbia, to perform any secular labor or business, or to cause the same to be performed by any person in their employment, on Sunday, except works of necessity or mercy; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or services performed or rendered in violation of this act.

"Any person or corporation, or employee of any person or corporation in the District of Columbia, who shall violate the provisions of this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than one hundred dollars for every such offense: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this act shall not be construed to apply to any person or persons who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day of the week than Sunday as a day of rest."

The purpose of this was to commit Congress, in local legislation for the District of Columbia, to the general principles of legislation upon religion and the enactment of law for the enforcement of Sunday observance. Could the passage of this bill have been secured, the way would have been opened for a bill to secure national Sunday observance, as the only difference between the two would have been in the extent of their application. This bill was referred to the House Committee on the District of Columbia, but like Mr. Blair's Sunday-rest bill, was never reported back from the committee to which it was referred.

SUNDAY ICE BILL FOR THE DISTRICT.

The failure to secure a general Sunday law for the District of Columbia led to the presentation of a bill of still more restricted application but precisely the same in principle. April 25, 1892, Mr. McMillan, of Michigan, in the Senate, and Mr. Hemphill, of South Carolina, in the House introduced this bill, by request:—

"A bill prohibiting the delivery and sale of ice within the District of Columbia on the Sabbath-day, commonly known as Sunday.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"That from and after the passage of this act it shall be unlawful to sell or deliver ice in any quantity or quantities, by means of wagons or other vehicles, on the public streets or thoroughfares or at depots or offices within the District of Columbia, on the Sabbath-day, commonly known as Sunday,

"SEC. 2. That any person or corporation violating the provisions of this act shall be liable to a penalty of not less than twenty-five dollars nor more than fifty dollars for each offense upon conviction in the police court of the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 3. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act be, and the same are hereby, repealed."

This varied from the Sunday bill for the District in no way except that while the other was an attempt to secure a Sunday law to include all forms of labor, this specified but one; but its passage would have paved the way for other special enactments, until, at length, the full scope of the general act would be reached. This bill met the approval of the District committees of both Houses, and was reported to the House and passed by that body. Before passage, the word "prohibiting" in the title was amended to read "regulating;" and the insertion of the words, "except between the hours of 7 and 9 o'clock antemeridian and 5 and 6 o'clock post-meridian," was made after the expression, "commonly known as Sunday." This was the first instance, in the legislative history of the United States, in which either house of Congress ever intelligently and deliberately legislated upon a religious question. It is to be noticed, and remembered, that in this case the House of Repre-

sentatives presumed to decide authoritatively, so far as the wording and spirit of the bill could go, that Sunday is "the Sabbath." The Senate Committee failed to report on the bill to the Senate.

TO PROHIBIT SUNDAY OPENING OF EXPOSITIONS.

No sooner had the holding of a great World's Columbian Exposition been determined upon, than it was immediately seen by the friends of Sunday legislation that here was an opportunity to further the cause of Sunday observance by congressional legislation. Mr. Morse, a representative from Massachusetts, and Mr. Dawes, a senator from the same State, introduced in the House and the Senate, respectively, the following:—

"A bill to prohibit the opening of any exhibition or exposition on Sunday where appropriations of the United States are expended.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"That no exhibition or exposition for which appropriation is made by Congress shall be opened on Sunday.

"SEC. 2. That any violation of this act shall be punishable by a fine of not less than one hundred dollars nor more than one thousand dollars for every violation of the foregoing act."

This bill was referred to the committees on the World's Fair, of both Senate and House, and strenuously advocated before them, several hearings being granted on the matter by both committees. It was soon seen, however, by the advocates of congressional legislation upon Sunday observance that the terms of this bill were too general, and that it covered so much as to be in danger of failure from that fact. Their demand was therefore reduced to the very least compatible with the attainment of their purpose. It was determined to attain Sunday closing of the World's Fair and the committal of Congress to legislation upon religion by an indirection.

PROVISO CONDITIONING GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATION ON SUNDAY CLOSING OF THE FAIR.

The insertion of the appropriation for the World's Fair as a clause in the Sundry Civil Appropriation bill

was decided upon. There was a purpose in this,—for, once passed, with whatever provisos might be attached, being incorporated into the bill providing for the running expenses of the Government, it must stand with the entire bill. May 25, in the House of Representatives, Mr. Johnstone, of South Carolina, precipitated the discussion of the Sunday-closing question, by offering an amendment to the clause of the Sundry Civil bill, then under consideration, appropriating funds for the Government exhibit, as follows:—

"Provided, That no part of the amount hereby appropriated shall be available unless the doors of the Exposition shall be closed on Sunday."

This would have made the Sunday closing of the entire Exposition a condition precedent to the making of an individual exhibit by the general Government. After two days of the most boisterous and excited scenes witnessed during this session of Congress, another provision was substituted for this by Mr. Dockery, of Missouri, and passed the House, May 26, 1892, as follows:—

"Provided, That the Government exhibits at the World's Columbian Exposition shall not be opened to the public on Sundays."

This was carried by a vote of 131 to 36. In this the House of Representatives committed itself, a second time, to an acknowledged act of religious legislation, and by a vote of almost four to one.

A notable incident immediately followed this. As the quickest way of suggesting to the House, evidently, the utter impropriety of the action it had just taken, Mr. Bowers, of California, offered an amendment and made accompanying remarks as follows:—

"Resolved, That the Government exhibits at the World's Fair shall not be opened to the public on the Sabbath-day, which is Saturday.

"Mr. Bowers.— This is a religious question, and Saturday is the only Sabbath-day. It was the Sabbath-day when Christ was on earth, and it is the Sabbath-day now. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

"The question being taken.

"The Chairman said, The noes seem to have it.

"*Mr. Bowers.*—I call for a division.

"The question again being taken, the amendment of Mr. Bowers was rejected, there being ayes 11, noes 149."—*Congressional Record*, May, 1892.

A gentleman who was present when this incident occurred, writing of Mr. Bowers's nobly outspoken expression of truth, said: "It was met with derision, laughter, and contempt by every member in the House." Thus did the United States House of Representatives set itself in array against the Sabbath of the Lord and the law of God.

THE SENATE CONDITIONED THE ENTIRE APPROPRIATION
ON SUNDAY CLOSING.

When, in the Senate, an amendment to the Sundry Civil bill, appropriating five million dollars for the World's Fair, was offered, Mr. Quay, of Pennsylvania, moved to insert a Sunday-closing provision in language and manner worthy of note, and to be remembered as the real initial step in the general enforcement of religion by the government of the United States, in pursuance of the decision of the Supreme Court that this is a religious and a Christian nation.

The *Congressional Record* of July 10, 1892, page 6614, reads thus:—

"*Mr. Quay.*—On page 122, line 13, after the word 'act,' I move to insert:—

"And that provision has been made by the proper authority for the closing of the Exposition on the Sabbath-day."

"The reasons for the amendment I will send to the desk to be read. The secretary will have the kindness to read from the Book of Law I send to the desk, the part enclosed in brackets.

"*The Vice-president.*—The part indicated will be read.

"The secretary read as follows:—

"Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it."

The discussion which followed upon this amendment deserves well to rank among the debates in the great religious councils of the fourth century. It was even more significant than they. Its result is fraught with even greater peril, as it marks the culmination of added centuries of error, and also because, that, amid the greater opportunities to know and do the right, the wrong was deliberately chosen. The debate was opened by Senator Manderson, of Nebraska. In the *Congressional Record*, of July 12, pp. 6694, 6695, 6701, appears the following:—

"*Mr. Manderson.*—The language of this amendment is that the Exposition shall be closed on the 'Sabbath-day.' I submit that if the Senator from Pennsylvania desires that the Exposition shall be closed upon Sunday, this language will not necessarily meet that idea. The Sabbath-day is not Sunday. . . .

"The word 'Sabbath-day' simply means that it is a rest day, and it may be Saturday or Sunday, and it would be subject to the discretion of those who will manage this Exposition, whether they should close the Exposition on the last day of the week, in conformity with that observance which is made by the Israelites and the Seventh-day Baptists, or should close it on the first day of the week, generally known as the Christian Sabbath. It certainly seems to me that this amendment should be adopted by the senator from Pennsylvania, and, if he proposes to close this Exposition, that it should be closed on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday. . . .

"Therefore I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I hope may be accepted by the senator from Pennsylvania, to strike out the words 'Exposition on the Sabbath-day,' and insert 'mechanical portion of the Exposition on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday.' . . .

"*Mr. Quay.*—I will accept the modification so far as it changes the phraseology of the amendment proposed by me in regard to designating the day of the week on which the Exposition shall be closed.

"*The Vice-president.*—The senator from Pennsylvania accepts the modification in part, but not in whole. . . .

"*Mr. Harris.*—Let the amendment of the senator from Pennsylvania, as modified, be reported.

"*The Vice-president.*—It will be again reported.

"*The Chief Clerk.*—On page 122, line 13, after the word 'act' it is proposed to amend the amendment of the committee by inserting:—

"And that provision has been made by the proper authority for the closing of the Exposition on the first day of the week commonly called Sunday."

As a final amendment to Mr. Quay's amendment, Mr. Gray, of Delaware, offered the following, which was accepted by Mr. Quay:—

"And it is hereby declared that all appropriations herein made for, or pertaining to, the World's Columbian Exposition are made under the condition that the said Exposition shall not be open to the public on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday; and if the said appropriations be accepted by the corporation of the State of Illinois, known as the World's Columbian Exposition, upon that condition, it shall be, and it is hereby made, the duty of the World's Columbian Commission, created by the act of Congress of April 25, 1890, to make such rules or modification of the rules of said corporation as shall require the closing of the Exposition on the said first day of the week, commonly called Sunday."

THIS BECAME A LAW.

This was adopted by the Senate, on July 14; and by the House on July 19; and received the signature of the president of the United States on August 5, and thus became a law.

This is the first finished enactment of religion by the Congress of the United States in the history of the government. Its importance as a historical event cannot be overstated. Its significance as to the legislative future of this country cannot be put into language too vivid or too intense. The centuries waited to see this day. The spirit of all evil bided his time to this hour. Here he began an onset upon the principle of justice and equity, for which this nation and government heretofore stood, such as humanity never before met in all its bitter experiences. He is about to come to the conflict himself, in great wrath, knowing that his time is short.

THIS ENACTMENT RELIGIOUS LEGISLATION.

In his "Sabbath for Man," page 194, speaking of Sabbath laws, Mr. Crafts says:—

"At first thought they would seem to be *religious* laws."

True enough, and so they are; first impressions are usually correct. So was this legislation on the part of

Congress touching the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday, religious legislation. Men who were there and took part in it recognized the whole proceedings as religious. Reporting to the New York *Independent*, of July 28, 1892, the chaplain of the Senate said:—

"During this debate you might have imagined yourself in a general council or assembly or synod or conference, so pronounced was one senator after another."

Senator Hawley said:—

"Everybody knows what the foundation is. It is founded in religious belief."—*Congressional Record*, July 12, 1892.

And Senator Peffer said of it:—

"To-day we are engaged in a theological discussion concerning the observance of the first day of the week."—*Id.*

Closing his speech, Senator Colquitt, a National Reformer, thus betrayed a consciousness of the fact that such proceedings and such speeches as he and others had made were out of place in the halls of a civil government:—

"But I shall continue this no further, Mr. President, for it may to some sound like cant, like preaching, as though we were undertaking to clothe ourselves in overrighteous habiliments and pretend to be better than other men."—*Congressional Record*, 52d Cong., page 6755.

SECURED UNDER RELIGIOUS PRESSURE.

This legislation was not secured from Congress without the use of political and boycotting measures on the part of the so-called Protestant "evangelical churches." To many of their petitions asking for this legislation was attached the following threat:—

"Resolved, That we do hereby pledge ourselves and each other, that we will from this time henceforth refuse to vote for or support for any office or position of trust, any member of Congress, either senator or representative, who shall vote for any further aid of any kind to the World's Fair except on conditions named in these resolutions."—*Congressional Record*, May 25, 1892, p. 5144.

Many churches by vote declared that they would stay away from the Fair if it were not closed on Sunday. Many churches and church papers went so far as to declare their intention to do what they could to persuade exhibitors to withhold their exhibits if the Fair were not closed on Sunday, thus resorting to boycotting methods to compass their ends. And these threats of loss of votes and patronage were not without their weight upon those congressmen who cared more for position than principle.

In the Senate, Senators Hawley, of Connecticut, and Hiscock, of New York, were the most prominent advocates of the measure. Senator Hiscock said:—

“If I had charge of this amendment in the interest of the Columbian Exposition, *I would write the provision for the closure in any form that the religious sentiment of the country demands*, and not stand here hesitating or quibbling about it. Rather than let the public sentiment against the Exposition being opened on Sunday be reinforced by the opposition in the other House against any legislation of this kind in the interest of the Exposition, I say to the junior senator from Illinois [Mr. Palmer], *he had better yield to this sentiment*, and not let it go out to the country that there is the slightest doubt that if this money shall be appropriated, the Exposition will be closed on Sunday. . . . If I were interested in this measure, as I might be interested if it were located in my own State, *I should make this closure provision satisfactory to those petitioners* who have memorialized us against the desecration of the Lord's day. . . . I would not leave it uncertain whether the government might engage in business or not upon the Sabbath-day.” — *Congressional Record, July 13, 1892, p. 6755.*

Senator Hawley said:—

“There is no use in endeavoring to escape responsibility. If the Senate to-day decides that it will not close that Exposition on Sunday, the Exposition will be opened on that day, and you will have offended more than 40,000,000 people—seriously and solemnly offended them. No wise statesman or monarch of modern times, no satrap of Rome, would have thought it wise to fly in the face of a profound conviction of the people he governed, no matter if he thought it a profound error. *It is not wise statesmanship to do it.* . . . Now, if gentlemen repudiate this, if they desire to reject it, if they deny that this is in the true sense of the word a religious nation, I should like to see the disclaimer put in white and black and proposed by the Congress of the United States. Write it. How would you write it? How would you deny that from the foundation of the

country, through every fiber of their being, this people has been a religious people? Word it, if you dare; advocate it, if you dare. *How many who voted for it would ever come back here again? None, I hope.*”— *Congressional Record, July 12, 1892, p. 6700, and July 13, p. 6759.*

Senator Vest, of Missouri, though professedly speaking for an open Fair, was constrained to say:—

“If I abhorred anything it would be any public act of mine which would say to the honest, religious people of the United States, ‘I am prepared to flout your opinions, to entirely disregard them, and to stamp upon them my disapprobation by giving a vote directly in conflict with what you have asked.’”— *Id., July 12, p. 6697.*

It was the same way in the House. A dispatch from Washington to the *Chicago Daily Post*, April 9, 1892, gave the following from an interview with a member of the House committee on the World's Fair:—

“The reason we shall vote for it is, I will confess to you, a fear that, unless we do so, the church folks will get together and knife us at the polls; and—well you know we all want to come back, and we can't afford to take any risks.”

“Do you think it will pass the House?”

“Yes; and the Senate too. We are all in the same boat. I am sorry for those in charge of the Fair; but self-preservation is the first law of nature, and that is all there is about it.”

The true condition of things was quite clearly indicated in an article in the *Chicago Herald* of Jan. 14, 1892, after the hearings before the House committee on the World's Columbian committee of January 10, 11, 12, and 13, in the following words:—

“It is anything but an encouraging prospect which the friends of Sunday opening of the World's Fair have before them. . . . The hearings which have taken place during the last four days have greatly hurt the Sunday-opening cause. Not that the advocates of closing have had the best of the argument, for they have not; but the publicity given to the matter throughout the country by this agitation has brought down upon Congress an avalanche of protests and appeals *from religious people and church organizations* all over the country.

“The *churches* and the *ministers* are at work again quite as earnestly as they were a year ago, and with equal effectiveness. . . .

“General Cogswell, who was counted upon till to-day, is now wavering. The Methodist Episcopal Church has brought some influence to bear upon him which he finds it difficult to resist. . . .

The trouble is that a large number of members who believe in Sunday opening on principle and as a matter of right are *too timid to vote their convictions in the face of organized opposition from the churches and ministers*. These statesmen argue that the men who want the Fair open on Sunday are *reasonable* men who will not permit their judgment or their votes to be affected by failure to get what they want. While on the other hand the Church people who are for Sunday closing will, if their wishes are thwarted, *lose their tempers and at the next election make trouble for those who vote against them*.

"This sort of cowardice or caution, combined with the fact that the ministers who are making Sunday closing a sort of stock-in-trade *have no hesitancy about bulldozing their congressional representatives, or any one else they can get hold of, offers an explanation of the changed condition of affairs with reference to this question.*"

This cringing and subservient attitude on the part of Congress and congressmen is noted with great satisfaction by the Sunday-law managers. In the *Union Signal*, Oct. 20, 1892, appeared an account of an editorial interview with Joseph Cook on Congress and Sunday closing of the Fair, in which Mr. Cook was reported as saying:—

"In Boston the first question asked a stranger is, 'Have you written a book?' in New York, 'How much are you worth?' in Chicago, 'How much do you expect to be worth?' in Washington, 'Do you hope to be re-elected?' The American people have convinced Congress that *this latter question is of great and growing importance in connection with votes on Sunday closing.*"

THE CONSTITUTION BARRED OUT.

So great was the pressure brought to bear upon Congress from this church element that Congressman Durborow, chairman of the House committee on the World's Columbian Exposition, at the hearing granted by that committee on the Sunday-closing question, Dec. 10-13, 1892, ruled out all constitutional argument. The friends of Sunday legislation at once saw that in this they had gained the day. What they had failed to secure by a proposed constitutional amendment they had accomplished by getting the Constitution set aside. In his opening remarks before the committee the second day of the hearing, Col. Elliot F. Shepard, president of the American Sabbath Union, said:—

"We have resolved not to say one single word as to the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of this law before this committee; for to claim that it is unconstitutional here would be a reflection upon the committee, upon both houses of Congress, and upon the president of the United States who approved this law. And you yourself very wisely took that last consideration entirely out from before the committee when you stated that this was not the place to argue that question. Therefore we dismiss it without saying a single word."

But notwithstanding this resolution, to say nothing upon the constitutionality of the question, the leaders of the movement were well aware of the unconstitutionality of the legislation they had secured. This is shown in a statement by the editors of the *Political Dissenter*, Rev. T. P. Stevenson and Dr. D. Mc Allister, former editors of the *Christian Statesman*. In the *Dissenter* of Feb. 1, 1893, they say:—

"We believe that the commonwealth of Illinois would be able to make out a strong case in its interpretation of the national constitution, and of the powers of Congress under it. Congressional legislation on behalf of the Christian Sabbath, or any other Christian institution in the life of our nation, has no adequate legal basis in our written constitution."

THEY FEEL THEIR POWER.

By Congress and congressmen thus yielding, these churches knew the State had become the servant of the Church. Rev. J. D. Sands, of the Seventh United Presbyterian Church, Pittsburg, Pa., in a sermon preached July 17, 1892, said:—

"That the Church has weight with great political or governing bodies has been demonstrated most effectually in the late World's Fair matter, when the United States Senate, the highest body in the country, *listened to the voice of religion*, and passed the World's Fair \$5,000,000 appropriation bill *with the Church-instituted proviso* that the gates of the great Exposition should not be opened upon Sunday. That grand, good fact suggests to the Christian's mind that if this may be done, so may other equally needful measures. The Church is gaining power continually, *and its voice will be heard in the future much oftener than in the past.*"

Rev. H. H. George, D. D., said, in a speech in Patterson, N. J., August 7, 1892, these words:—

"I have learned that . . . we hold the United States Senate in our hands."

And in a meeting held in Lansing, Mich., Dec. 9, 1892, the same speaker again said : —

“We can hold Congress in our hands, and wield this country just as we please.”

And the *Christian Statesman* of Oct. 1, 1892, thus joyfully exclaimed : —

“The forty millions in the Christian homes of the land, *the ruling majority* when they assert themselves, have won at least one great moral victory in each of the recent sessions of Congress. . . . The Sabbath-closing victory with which the quarter century closes, shows the way to others that will make the nineteenth go out in glory eight years hence. For *the great Christian majority has learned*, by response to its great petition, and its host of letters with reference to the World's Fair, *that it can have* of national and State governments whatever legislation against immorality it will ask unitedly and earnestly.”

This church control over the government, over which these men here boast, is a most certain evidence that —

CHURCH AND STATE UNITED IN THE UNITED STATES.

National Reformers have themselves admitted that this sort of church domination is a union of Church and State, as note the following words of Rev. J. M. Foster in the *Christian Statesman* of Aug. 29, 1889 : —

“A union of Church and State exists where the Church usurps control over the State, as on the Romish theory, or where the State assumes to establish and control the Church, as in England.”

The union of Church and State now in existence in the United States is of the Romish kind, — a veritable image to the papacy.

Thus has the country been sold into the hands of a religious hierarchy, and at last departed from its Protestant features of government, and swung back into the old order of things. And by just so much as in the past, while it remained true to its Constitution and the principles of absolute separation of Church and State, it has been a beacon-light of liberty to other nations, influencing them away from the papacy and the papal theory

of government, now, since it has gone back on all this, and virtually said that this sort of government is a failure, and that Church and State must be united, by just so much will it influence the other nations to go back to the old order of things and exalt the papacy to a place it has never enjoyed before in all the world. Rev. 13 : 8 ; 18 : 7.

What effect this departure from the principles of Christianity, true Protestantism, and sound Americanism, will have, is well expressed in the following words : —

“As America, the land of religious liberty, shall unite with the papacy in forcing the consciences of men to honor the false sabbath, the people of every country on the globe will be led to follow her example.”—Mrs. E. G. White, in *Daily Bulletin of the S. D. A. General Conference, Feb. 2, 1893.*

AIMS OF THE PAPACY.

For many years the papacy has had its eyes upon America. What its aims are in this respect is quite clearly told by the Rome correspondent to the *New York Sun*, in its issue of July 11, 1892, in an article entitled “The Papacy and Nationality; Pope Leo and the United States.” After speaking of certain classes in the Catholic Church, bishops, archbishops, etc., and as to their aims in the United States, he says : —

“But Leo XIII has a still higher aim. His appeal for national unification is founded upon a traditional conception of the Holy See. “In his view the United States has reached the period when it becomes necessary to bring about the fusion of all the heterogeneous elements in one homogeneous and indissoluble nation. Statesmen are preoccupied, and very properly, with the multiplicity of centrifugal forces which threaten the republic with disintegration. Enemies make use of this latent danger to accuse the foreign Catholics of having a tendency to form a State within the State. It is for this reason that the pope wants the Catholics to prove themselves the most enlightened and most devoted workers for national unity and political assimilation. Certain incidents have given a bad color to the loyalty of some foreign groups. All doubt upon this subject ought to disappear. The Church has always been the able collaborator of all people in the work of national unity. It was she that constituted, through the efforts of popes and bishops, the great political bodies and the great national organizations. The most united

aces and the most solid populations, politically and nationally, are those which have most profoundly felt the salutary action of the papacy and the Church. France is the typical example of this law of history. If Italy in the Middle Ages did not take advantage of this incomparable benefit, was it not because the jealous states interfered with the work of unification of the Church and of the Roman pontiffs?

"America feels the urgent need of this work of internal fusion. Formed of a mosaic of races and nationalities, she wants to be a nation, a collective being, one strong and united. *What the Church has done in the past for others, she will do for the United States.* . . .

"That is the reason why the Holy See encourages the American clergy to guard jealously the solidarity and to labor for the fusion of all the foreign and heterogeneous elements in one vast national family. The American Church furnishes and must furnish at the present time the proof that Christianity is the school of patriotism and of national sentiment. By continuing to favor this work of unification it will form the grandeur of the United States, and will demonstrate the degree to which religion and the Church are the generators of political and patriotic independence.

"As the approaching danger to the United States lies in fractionalizing the republic into centrifugal and hostile parties, the Catholics will appear, through their co-operation in national concentration, the best sons of the land and the upholders of political unity. The pope will impose upon all, the American motto, *E pluribus unum*, applied to the subject we are treating.

"Finally, Leo XIII desires to see strength in that unity. Like all intuitive souls, he hails in the united American States and in their young and flourishing church, *the source of a new life for Europeans. He wants America to be powerful, in order that Europe may regain strength from borrowing a rejuvenated type.*

"Europe is closely watching the United States. Certain things there may frighten some people, but the general attraction is invincible. Bryce, Claudio, Fanet, Carlies, and all the historians and publicists have the inclusiveness of the record. Henceforth we will need authors who will place themselves upon this ground: '*What can we borrow and what ought we to borrow from the United States for our social, political, and ecclesiastical re-organization?*' And from the pope's particular point of view, 'What are the examples that these American Catholics are giving us?' The problem is difficult; but in its wanderings and its immense variety it captivates all strong and far-reaching minds.

"The answer depends in a great measure upon the development of American destinies. If the United States succeeds in solving the many problems that puzzle us, Europe will follow their example, and this *outpouring of light will mark a date in the history not only of the United States, but of all humanity. Res vestra agitur* is what we might then say to Americans. That is why the holy father, anxious for peace and strength, collaborates with passion in the work of consolidation and development in American affairs. Ac-

ording to him, the Church ought to be the chosen crucible for the moulding and the absorption of races into one united family. And that especially is the reason why he labors at the codification of ecclesiastical affairs, *in order that this distant member of Christianity may infuse new blood into the old organism.*"

The papacy does not thus openly divulge its plans until it knows it has the advantage. It does not spring until it is ready. But from the national events of 1892, it saw its time had come. Until then there was nothing for Europe or any other nation to "borrow from the United States" for their "ecclesiastical re-organization." What then can it mean when the affairs in the United States have come to such a pass that the papacy can talk like that, other than that an apostate Protestantism has sold the government into the hands of the papacy?

But the papacy had hardly proclaimed her purpose until the first bold step was taken to carry it into effect. The following appeared in the New York *Sun* of Jan. 15, 1893:—

ROME, Jan. 14.—The pope has decided to establish a permanent apostolic delegation in the United States, and has nominated Monsignor Satolli to be the first delegate. . . .

WASHINGTON, Jan. 14.—Mgr. Satolli, the papal ablegate, received at the Catholic University to-day, the following cable message from Dr. O'Connell, the American Secretary of the Propaganda, who accompanied Mgr. Satolli to this country, and recently returned to Rome:—

ROME, Jan. 14, 1893.

Mgr. Satolli:

The apostolic delegation is permanently established in the United States and you are confirmed as the first delegate.

O'CONNELL.

"The Catholic Church in America is now thoroughly organized and has put on the mantle of perfect stature. She has on her own territory a supreme court—a branch of the Appellate Court of Rome, deriving from this latter its life, but capable in itself of immediate action. This is home rule for American Catholics, so far as Catholics away from Rome can have home rule. In addition to our own energy and inspiration, we shall have in all our undertakings the direction and impetus, as directly as never before, of the sovereign head of the Church. Catholics will have a more practical realization of what Church unity and papal supremacy means.

Referring to this, Rev. Joseph Cook in the *Christian Statesman* of Feb. 11, 1893, says:—

“But Satolli is in America to make the most of press, pulpit, platform, and the secret power of the confessional to advance Romish pretensions *smoothly*. He is a little American pope. . . . His taking up his residence among us as first incumbent of the office of a permanent apostolic delegate, is an omen of mischief to American institutions. There is much significance in the rumor that he may be the next pope.”

EXTENT OF THE MOVEMENT.

It would seem impossible that intelligent men—men of education and influence—should for a moment have lent their assistance to a movement of this kind, which a single glance shows would introduce a system of religious despotism into this country. But many have become so infused with National Reform ideas as to say as Senator Blair said in a letter to the secretary of the National Reform Association:—

“I earnestly trust that your movement may become strong, general, in fact, all-pervading; for the time has fully come when action is imperative and further delay is most dangerous.”

Of those who for years have favored the movement may be mentioned, Bishop Huntington, of New York; President Seelye, of Amherst College; Professor Edmund H. Bennett, LL. D., Law Department of Boston University; Rev. T. L. Cuyler, D. D., Brooklyn; Rev. J. H. Mac Ilvaine, President Evelyn College, Princeton, N. J.; Rev. E. R. Craven, D. D., Secretary Presbyterian Board of Publication; Rev. Charles A. Blanchard, President of Wheaton College, Ill.; Miss Frances E. Willard, President of National W. C. T. U.; Mrs. Woodbridge of the same organization; Mrs. J. C. Bateham, Secretary of the Sabbath Observance department of the W. C. T. U., and Joseph Cook, the Boston Monday Lecturer. All these are or have been vice-presidents of the National Reform Association.

Among the organizations which have been in sympathy with this movement and practical allies to the National Reform Association, may be mentioned the Womans'

Christian Temperance Union, the American Sabbath Union, the Prohibition Party, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Christian Endeavor Society, and numerous Law and Order Leagues, all of which are supported by the leading churches of the land.

It will not do to assume that all those connected with this movement are dishonest or insincere in their work, or that they understand its real nature and final outcome. The condition of many in the past, and thousands doubtless even now (1893), is well stated in a work published by Seventh-day Adventists in 1885, in the following words:—

“The Sunday movement is now making its way in darkness. The leaders are concealing the true issue, and many who unite in the movement do not themselves see whether the under-current is tending. Its professions are mild, and apparently Christian; but when it shall speak, it will reveal the spirit of the dragon.”—*Testimony to the Church No. 32, p. 208.*

It is possible for a mistaken zeal to lead people into religious extremes, especially when they entertain, as do these, the notion that Christ desires to be formally recognized as king of the nation. Christ said to his disciples that the time would come when those who should kill them would think they were doing God's service. John 16:2. And to the accusers and murderers of Christ, Peter said, “I wot that through ignorance ye did it.” Acts 3:17.

A SKETCH OF THE NEW ENGLAND THEOCRACY.

Thus it was under the New England theocracy. The Puritan Fathers who fled from the persecutions of the Old World, seduced into the same theory of government as that which had caused them to suffer, upon finding themselves in the majority in the New World, enacted laws which sadly oppressed those who differed with them in religious sentiment. Roger Williams, who believed in religious liberty for every one, was one of the first to feel their vindictive wrath. Because he would not retract a statement he had made to the effect

that civil rulers could of right have nothing to do with matters of religion and individual conscience, the court passed the following sentence:—

"Whereas, Mr. Roger Williams, one of the elders of the church of Salem, hath broached and divulged divers new and dangerous opinions against the authority of magistrates, as also writ letters of defamation both of the magistrates and churches here, and that before any conviction, and yet maintaineth the same without any retraction; it is therefore ordered, that the same Mr. Williams shall depart out of this jurisdiction within six weeks now next ensuing; which if he neglect to perform, it shall be lawful for the governor and two magistrates to send him to some place out of this jurisdiction, not to return any more without leave from the court."—*Backus's Church History of New England*, p. 38.

But as he did not go, they sent an officer to take him away from his family and put him on board a ship bound for England. He evaded the officer, however, and was wandering in the forests for fourteen weeks, suffering the rigors of a New England winter. He finally came upon the Narragansett tribe of Indians, who had more humanity than the Puritans. These took him into their wigwams, and kindly cared for him, after which they bestowed on him a grant of land, where he began the first civil government on earth that gave equal liberty of conscience to all. Upon taking a view of the great things done for him, he called the place PROVIDENCE, by which name it is still known.

But what were the sentiments of Mr. Williams, which were so obnoxious to the Puritans? They were just this, as stated in one of his published works:—

"The sovereign, original, and foundation of civil power lies in the people; and it is evident that such governments as are by them erected and established, have no more power, nor for no longer time, than the civil power or people consenting and agreeing shall betrust them with it. This is clear, not only in reason, but in the experience of all commonwealths, where the people are not deprived of their *natural freedom* by the power of tyrants."—*Bloody Tenets*, p. 137.

At another time he defended his views by the following illustration:—

"There goes many a ship to sea, with many hundred souls in one ship, whose weal and woe is common, and is a true picture of a commonwealth, or human combination or society. It hath fallen out some times that both papists, Protestants, Jews, and Turks, may be embarked in one ship; upon which supposal I affirm that all the liberty of conscience I ever pleaded for, turns upon these two hinges; that none of the papists, Protestants, Jews, or Turks be forced to come to the ship's prayers or worship if they practice any. I further add that I never denied that, notwithstanding this liberty, the commander of this ship ought to command the ship's course, yea, and also command that justice, peace, and sobriety be kept and practiced, both among the seamen and passengers. If any of the seamen refuse to perform their service, or passengers to pay their freight; if any refuse to help, in person or purse, toward the common charges or defense; if any refuse to obey the common laws and orders of the ship, concerning their common peace and preservation; if any shall mutiny and rise up against their commander and officers; if any shall preach or write that there ought not to be any commanders or officers, because all are equal in Christ, therefore no masters nor officers, no laws nor orders, no correction nor punishments; I say I never denied but in such cases, whatever is pretended, the commander or commanders may judge, resist, compel, and punish such transgressors according to their deserts and merits."—*Arnold's History of Rhode Island*, vol. 1., p. 254.

But though Mr. Williams was banished outside the jurisdiction of the court of Massachusetts, others remained who entertained views akin to his. And because they persisted in holding these views, they were harassed at every turn. Nine persons, Thomas Gould, Thomas Osborne, Edward Drinker, John George, Richard Goodale, William Turner, Robert Lambert, Mary Goodale, and Mary Newell, who were Baptists, signed a covenant of church fellowship, and although they were so retiring in their habits that few ever knew where their place of worship was, they were hunted out, and brought before the court. Upon hearing their confession the court declared that it "contemned the authority of their laws," and it therefore decreed that,—

"Such of them as are freemen are to be disfranchised, and all of them, upon conviction before any one magistrate or court, of their further proceeding herein, to be committed to prison until the general court shall take further order with them."—*Backus's Church History*, p. 66.

These same persons were afterward brought on a

warrant before the court at Boston, April 14, 1668, when six ministers were brought in to argue their case before the bench. Upon hearing them the court decided to carry out upon the culprits (for so they were regarded) the sentence of Deut. 17 : 8-12, the closing words of which are,—

“And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken to the priest that standeth to minister before the Lord thy God, or unto the judge, even that man shall die ; and thou shalt put away the evil from Israel.”

At the general court in May these people were again called to account to know whether they were yet convinced, after what the ministers had laid before them, of the enormity of their error in not attending the established Church. They replied that they were not ; whereupon the court adjudged them *obstinate* persons, “whom they were *in conscience bound* to proceed against.” The aforesaid scripture was then read, and three of them, who were considered leaders, were sentenced to leave the jurisdiction of the court within a given number of days.

As a law had already been passed which banished Quakers upon pain of death, and under which four of that people were actually executed for returning from their place of banishment, it is possible the Puritans might have thought themselves quite mild in the treatment they gave the Baptists ; for they considered that theirs was but a legitimate work. They said in their defense, that, concerning the Quakers, they were,—

“Malignant and *assiduous* promoters of doctrines directly tending to subvert both our Church and State. After all other means, for a long time used in vain, we were at last constrained, for our own safety, to pass a sentence of banishment against them upon pain of death. Such was their desperate turbulence both to religion and State, civil and ecclesiastical, as that the magistrate at last, *in conscience both to God and man*,¹ judged himself called for the defense of all, to keep the passage with the point of the sword held toward them. *This could do no harm to him that would be warned thereby. Their wittingly rushing themselves thereupon was their own act, we*

¹John 16 : 1, 2.

with humility conceive, a crime, bringing their blood upon their own heads.” — *Hutchinson's Collections*, pp. 326, 327.

It is hard to justify the use of such language from those who had acted so fiendishly. And yet, the theory they had adopted obliged them to thus vindicate themselves. It will be the same again here under the “true theocracy” which the National Reformers expect to see set up for their benefit.² Thus spoke one who thought to warn opposers to this movement in which he was engaged :—

“You look for trouble in this land in the future, if these principles are applied. I think it will come to you, if you maintain your present position. The foolhardy fellow who persists in standing on a railroad track, may well anticipate trouble when he hears the rumbling of the coming train. If he shall read the signs of the times in the screaming whistle and flaming head-light, he may change his position and avoid the danger ; but if he will not be influenced by these, his most gloomy forebodings of trouble will be realized when the express strikes him. So you, neighbor, if, through prejudice or the enmity of unregenerate hearts, you have determined to oppose the progress of this nation in fulfilling its vocation as an instrument in the divine work of regenerating human society, may rightly expect trouble. It will surely come to you.” — *Rev. W. T. McCune, a representative National Reformer, in an “Open Letter” to the editors of the American Sentinel, published in the Christian Nation, Dec. 14, 1887.*

But were the Puritans really sincere in the work they did? John Cotton, who seemed to be foremost in urging on the prosecution of those who dissented from the views of the majority, was so far from thinking that he was a persecutor that he declared,—

“It is not lawful to prosecute any until after admonition once or twice ; and so the apostle directeth, and giveth the reason, that in fundamental points of doctrine or worship, the word of God is so clear that he cannot but be convinced in conscience of the dangerous error of his way, after admonition once or twice, wisely and faithfully dispensed. And then if any one persist, it is not out of conscience, but *against his conscience*, as the apostle saith.” — *Backus's Church History*, p. 63.

EXCUSES FOR SUNDAY LAWS.

Sunday laws, like all other religious laws, are compatible only with a theocratical theory of government,—a

²For proof, see quotation from Rev. J. M. Foster, page 230 of this work.

government where Church and State are united. They of right can have no place in civil government. In such governments, as is the case with laws against blasphemy, they are not generally enforced, but remain inoperative, and dead letters, except in cases where certain men desire to give vent to some grudge they may hold against other men, or desire privileges which upon like terms they are not willing should be granted to others. It is a rule generally held to in legislative matters that,—

“All laws of a general nature shall have a *uniform operation*. The general assembly shall not grant to any citizen or class of citizens privileges or immunities which upon the same terms shall not equally belong to all citizens.”—*Iowa State Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 6, under Bill of Rights.*¹

Sunday laws are claimed as a matter of protection to Sunday-keepers,—to protect them from “disturbance,” from being “forced” to labor, or from financial “loss” through business competition on that day. But if Sunday-keepers need a Sunday law thus to protect them, then those who keep Saturday or Friday or any other day likewise need a Saturday or Friday or some other day law to protect them for the same reasons. The terms and ground for legislative protection and interference are the same in both cases. This at once stamps Sunday laws as class legislation. They are manifestly a church regulation embodied into the law, secured at the behest of the Sunday-keeping churches, as Mr. Crafts has clearly indicated in the following admission :—

“During nearly all our American history the churches have influenced the States to make and improve Sabbath laws.”—*Christian Statesman, July 3, 1890.*

Speaking of the observers of the first and seventh days of the week, he says :—

¹“Protection to person and property is the paramount duty of government, and shall be *impartial and complete*.”—*Georgia Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 1, under Declaration of Fundamental Principles.*

“All religious sects and denominations demeaning themselves peaceably and as good citizens of the commonwealth, shall be *equally under the protection of the law*; and no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law.”—*Constitution of Massachusetts, Part First, under Declaration of Rights.*

“The fourth commandment can be observed by keeping either day, but society cannot wisely encourage or protect but one of them.”—*Watertown (S. D.) Public Opinion, July 25, 1890.*

Observations : 1. Let it not be forgotten that this apostle of Sunday laws admits that those who keep the seventh day obey the fourth commandment. He can never consistently charge them with violating God’s law in this respect.

2. Society can afford to encourage and protect the inalienable rights of the people composing it, one of which is the right of the individual to observe any day as Sabbath that he may choose, or no day for that matter, and to labor on every other day. It cannot afford to trample upon one such right in one of its members.

As is stated in the Kentucky bill of rights :—

“Absolute, arbitrary power over the lives, liberty, and property of free men exists nowhere in a republic, not even in the largest majority.”

3. It is not some day or some religious rite or ceremony that needs the encouragement and protection of the government, but the people. Civil governments were not instituted to protect religious rites and ceremonies, but to guard men and women in the exercise of their inalienable rights, and to protect them from the wicked and ambitious designs of those who in their thirst for position or cravings for power would lord it over the souls and bodies of men.

In endeavoring to show that the enforcement of Sunday laws is not inconsistent with the liberties of the Jews, Mr. Crafts, in his “Sabbath for Man,” page 258, says :—

“It is not sufficiently emphasized that the Jew is left absolutely free to observe the seventh day. He can close his shop; he can refuse to work.”

Herein lies a principle. As long as a man has the privilege of closing his shop and refusing to work, he is free to observe a day. Question : What man has not this privilege? Certainly all men have it, the Christian as well as the Jew. Then what Sunday-keeper is not

absolutely free to observe Sunday? They all are. What consistency, then, can there be in Mr. Crafts and his party pleading for a law "to prevent persons from being *forced* to labor on Sunday"?

But it is claimed that without a Sunday law if the laboring man insists upon observing Sunday, he will "lose his job." Upon this theory the government would be obliged to take away every possible obstacle to the citizen's being religious; to remove every cross in his path to the kingdom of heaven; to see that he suffers no financial or worldly loss whatever in serving the Lord, however much time he may choose to devote to his service. The Sunday-law Christian's idea of things gives the affirmative to the poet's interrogation—

"Must I be carried to the skies
On flowery beds of ease?"

And this is confirmed by the following from an editorial in the *Christian Statesman* of Dec. 10, 1892:—

"It is the purpose of the law to make it as easy as possible to do right, and as hard as possible to do wrong."

But read Luke 9:23-25. This is the doctrine for Christians to inculcate, and not that of dependence upon the government or of freedom from crosses and cross bearing on account of a lack of moral stamina on the part of the individual to live up to his conscientious convictions. In religious matters the individual must sometimes decide between losing his *job* and losing his *soul*; and it is the business of Christians to teach and practice this sort of Christian manliness.

But Mr. Crafts himself upsets this financial-loss idea completely in his "Sabbath for Man," in the following manner:—

"Among other printed questions to which I have collected numerous answers, was this one: 'Do you know of any instance where a Christian's refusal to do Sunday work or Sunday trading has resulted in his financial ruin?' Of the two hundred answers from persons representing all trades and professions, not one is affirmative. . . . David said that he had never seen the righteous forsaken,

nor his seed begging bread. I have, but I never knew a case, nor can I find one in any quarter of the globe where even beggary, much less starvation, has resulted from courageous and conscientious fidelity to the Sabbath. Even in India, where most of the business community is heathen, missionaries testify that *loyalty to the Sabbath in the end brings no worldly loss*. On the other hand, incidents have come to me by the score, of those who have gained, even in their worldly prosperity, by daring to do right in the matter of Sunday work."—*Crafts's Sabbath for Man*, pp. 428, 429.

This shows the utter uselessness of Sunday laws from any standpoint whatever.

THE CIVIL SABBATH FRAUD; OR RELIGIOUS LEGISLATION IN DISGUISE.

The advocates and defenders of religious laws often seek to justify the existence of such laws and their oppressive operations by calling them "civil" laws and styling those who disregard them as "civil" offenders. To gain their point and avoid opposition and the imputation of being religious persecutors and unifiers of Church and State, they disguise their motives, urge their measures under false names, and plead for them for other reasons than those for which they really desire them. This is an old trick. The charge made by the Jews that Christ was an "enemy of Cæsar" was not the reason why they sought his life. Their charges against him before the chief priests and the Sanhedrim were all of a religious character; but knowing that Pilate, a Roman procurator, would not listen to these, they accomplished their purpose by declaring that he was a civil offender, accusing him of "stirring up the people," of "perverting the nation," of "forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar," and of saying that he was "a king." They at once to all appearances became the most loyal citizens and the warmest friends and supporters of that government to which they were under tribute, and which in their hearts they despised. To Pilate they said: "If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar's friend; whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Cæsar." "We have no king but Cæsar." John 19:12, 15.

The "civil" excuse was the one finally resorted to by the emperor Justin to defend his persecution of dissenting religionists. It was the reason given by the Catholic Church for the massacre of the Huguenots, and by the State Church of England for the imprisonment and banishment of the Puritans, and one which the Puritans of Massachusetts themselves in turn used to defend their cruel treatment of the Quakers and Baptists who came among them.

Thus Robert Baird, in his work, "Religion in America," page 94, clearly states the case:—

"The rulers of Massachusetts put the Quakers to death, and banished the 'Antinomians' and 'Anabaptists,' not because of their religious tenets, but because of their violations of the civil laws. This is the justification which they pleaded, and it was the best they could make. Miserable excuse! But just so it is; wherever there is such a union of Church and State, heresy and heretical practices are apt to become violations of the civil code, and are punished no longer as errors in religion, but infractions of the laws of the land. So the defenders of the inquisition have always spoken and written in justification of that awful and most iniquitous tribunal."

The same argument is being used to-day to secure the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws. When addressing a class of religionists who favor the enforcement of religious practices by law, the promoters of Sunday laws argue that God wills it; but when arguing their cases before those who are opposed to religious legislation, or who are not religiously inclined, they resort to the old trick, and urge the enactment and enforcement of them for "civil" and selfish reasons, such as "sanitary measures," "physical necessity," "for the public good," or "in the interests of a rest day for laboring men." In corroboration of this, note the following statement made by a leading Sunday-law agitator:—

"We, the Sabbath Union, all the churches, and the Y. M. C. A., are laboring with all our might to carry the religious Sabbath with our right arm and the civil Sabbath with our left. Hundreds of thousands will receive it as a religious institution, all the rest will receive it as a civil institution, and thus we will sweep in the whole nation."—*W. F. Crafts, in Sunday Union Convention, at Wichita, Kan., Sept., 20, 1889.*

This statement, by the way, also quite clearly indicates the meaning and the application of the text, "And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a *mark* in their right *hand*, or in their *foreheads*" (Rev. 13:16), the hand being a symbol of *labor*, and the mind that with which voluntary and active *worship* is rendered. Rom. 7:25.

And even Judge Hammond, in his decision in the King case, though deciding against the Sabbatarians, characterizes as "disingenuous [mean, unworthy, wanting in noble candor or frankness] the argument of his [King's] adversary sects that it is the economic value of the day of rest, and not its religious character, that they would preserve by civil law."

As an example of this attempt at covering up and disguising things, the history of the Blair Sunday-rest bill itself presents a good illustration. As first introduced into the 50th Congress, from the nature of the terms and expressions used, it bore unmistakable evidences of being a religious measure. It was to prevent work being done on "the *Lord's day*," "to promote its observance as a day of *religious worship*," and to secure to the whole people "the *religious* observance of the *Sabbath-day*." But when it was re-introduced into the 51st Congress, these expressions were all eliminated and cautiously avoided. Instead of the proposed legislation being in the interests of the day "commonly known as the *Lord's day*," it was in the interest of the day "commonly known as *Sunday*!" Instead of preventing military drills, etc., "on the *Lord's day*" it proposed to prevent these "on the first day of the week."

The following from the Litchfield (Minn.) *Independent* of April 25, 1890, well states the facts:—

"Since the present session of Congress opened (the 51st), Senator Blair has re-introduced his famous Sunday-rest bill. He has changed the title and made other modifications in the bill to disarm opposition. One of the most important is a sop thrown to Seventh-day Adventists in a proviso exempting them from the operations of the bill. Notwithstanding these disguises and concessions the spirit of the bill remains the same."

The following shows the changes and modifications made in the attempt to present this religious bill in secular dress:—

THE BLAIR SUNDAY-REST BILL
50TH CONGRESS.

A bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the *Lora's day*, as a day of rest, AND TO PROMOTE ITS OBSERVANCE AS A DAY OF RELIGIOUS WORSHIP.

SECTION I. . . . nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation, to the disturbance of others, on the first day of the week, commonly known as the *Lora's day*.

SEC. 4. That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in time of active service or immediate preparation therefor, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States, on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited; nor shall any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the *Lora's day*.

SEC. 6. . . . but the same shall be construed so far as possible to secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH-DAY.

THE BLAIR SUNDAY-REST BILL
51ST CONGRESS.

A bill to secure to the people the *privileges of rest and of religious worship, free from disturbance by others*, on the first day of the week.

SECTION I. . . . nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly known as *Sunday*.

SEC. 4. That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in time of active service or immediate preparation therefor, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States, on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited; nor shall any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the first day of the week.

SEC. 6. . . . nor shall the provisions of this act be construed to prohibit or to sanction labor on *Sunday* by individuals who conscientiously believe in and observe any other day than *Sunday* as the Sabbath or a day of religious worship, provided such labor be not done to the disturbance of others.

This shows that this proposed legislation was in its nature designedly religious, but that for the purpose of getting it through Congress some of its most obvious religious features were suppressed.

The advocates of Sunday laws themselves know that the foundation for the Sabbath and all Sabbath laws is religious and religious only. In the hearing before the Senate committee on the Blair Sunday-rest bill, Dec. 13, 1888, Dr. Herrick Johnson, of Chicago, who appeared in favor of the bill, said:—

“This appointment of one day in seven is arbitrary. There is nothing in nature to indicate that division of time. There is the day of twenty-four hours, there is the month, there is the year,—all these are natural divisions; but there is nothing in nature to indicate the weekly division, the observance of one day in seven. It is arbitrary, and we regard that as an evidence of its divine origin.”—*Hearing on the Sunday-rest bill, p. 50.*

The following from the opening remarks of Col. Elliott F. Shepard, President of the American Sabbath Union, at the hearing before the House committee on the World's Columbian Exposition, in Washington, Dec. 11, 1892, shows the same thing:—

“I approach this subject with great reverence. When we come to deal with heavenly things, we should put aside earthly things, and should do very much as the Jews used to do in the temple at Jerusalem; before they made their offerings, before they entered upon the service, they prepared themselves by ablution and by prayer for the proper discharge of their duties. Now when we come to consider the Sabbath, that it rests upon the law of God, that it is a revelation to mankind which no one would have thought of, that we owe it entirely to our Father which is in heaven, we ought therefore to come with the same reverential spirit to its consideration ourselves.”

January 6, 1890, Hon. W. C. P. Breckinridge, member of Congress from Kentucky, introduced in the House of Representatives a Sunday-rest bill for the District of Columbia, under the specious plea of preventing persons “from being forced to labor on Sunday,” when in reality it was for the purpose of forcing persons to observe the day.

Rev. H. W. Cross, a Presbyterian minister from Ohio,

in a five-minute speech at the hearing before the House committee on the World's Columbian Exposition in Washington, D. C., Dec. 10-13, 1892, made the following honest confession for the "orthodox churches" as to the nature of their petitions for Sunday legislation and the number signing them:—

"Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee: The real object of my being here to speak a word, is in favor of intellectual honesty on the part of the orthodox churches. I am a minister of an orthodox church. I notice in my territory that these church petitions are exceedingly delusive as to the number of those that sign them or vote for them.

"Now for example, in one instance in our State the Presbyterians passed a resolution, saying: that we represent so many, aggregating a certain membership; and then the Christian Endeavor Society, composed of many of the same church-members alluded to by that Presbyterian Church, will pass a like resolution, and say we represent fifty, seventy, or one hundred members. And then it will be brought before the Sunday-school. And many of the persons who are counted as voting for the resolutions will have been counted three, four, or five times; and it is almost on the principle of voting early and often—which is so much opposed in secular politics. I am a witness to this fact. There was one petition claiming to represent eighty church-members that signed the petition to Congress, but they were not present at all. It was at a Sunday-school, and the vote was taken by the Sunday-school superintendent, and there were children that voted for these resolutions that were not old enough to know whether the expression "World's Fair" meant the pretty girls in the next pew or the Columbian Exposition in Chicago.

"I deem it a duty to inform this Committee of the facts in that case. *The real animus of these petitions is religious. But you cannot tell by the wording of the petitions just what they mean; it is the spirit back of them that shows this.* The columns of the religious press and the exhortations of class leaders and Sunday-school superintendents,—it is what they said to the few that were voting, that tell what these petitions mean. I deem our legislators thoroughly competent, intellectually and morally, to decide this question without any imperious dictation from any sect or group of sects, as to whether this opening of the great educational exposition is consistent with the civil Sabbath. I notice a tendency in my own church papers and in other orthodox church papers to gloat over the fact that 'we (that is, this group of denominations having this common idea) have been strong enough by our own strength, to grasp Congress; we have hurled Congress against the Seventh-day Adventists, against the Seventh-day Baptists, and against the Roman Catholic citizens, and against various other of our citizens.' Now it seems to me that is hardly a desirable thing to do in this country."

A modern writer, in a work published in 1885, has well said:—

"The Sunday movement is now making its way in darkness. The leaders are concealing the true issue, and many who unite in the movement do not themselves see whither the under-current is tending. Its professions are mild, and apparently Christian, but when it shall speak, it will reveal the spirit of the dragon."—*Testimony for the Church, No. 32, p. 208.*

SUNDAY LAWS RELIGIOUS.

That Sunday laws are religious is evident from the following facts:—

1. They originated when the Church and the State were first united. The first Sunday law was enacted by Constantine, who is commonly known as the first Christian emperor.
2. The demand for them comes only from religious people, and those whom they succeed in enlisting with them in their cause. As Rev. W. F. Crafts, in the *Christian Statesman* of July 3, 1890, says, "During nearly all our American history, the churches have influenced the State to make and improve Sabbath laws."
3. The disregard of them is decried because it lessens church attendance; the enforcement of them, then, must be to increase church attendance.
4. The septenary order of days is not a natural division of time, but depends wholly upon divine revelation, as admitted in the words of Dr. Herrick Johnson and Col. Elliot F. Shepard: "There is nothing in nature to indicate the weekly division." "It is a revelation to mankind which no one would have thought of."
5. The Sabbath was instituted by God for religious reasons only.
6. The Fourth of July is a civil rest day in the true sense of the term. All can rest upon this if they choose, but such a day is the farthest from the Sunday-law advocates' ideas of a "civil Sabbath," which betrays the motives of those who demand the laws. In one breath they declare for a civil Sabbath, and in the next, deplore the sin of Sabbath-breaking and the ten-

dency toward secularizing the day. A civil Sabbath is just what they do not want.

7. Sunday laws prohibit civil things, such as common labor, hunting, fishing, base-ball playing, the running of street-cars, the opening of libraries, museums, art galleries, etc., which can only be prohibited upon religious grounds.

8. They countenance religious exercises only, permitting simply works of mercy and necessity—a purely religious permission.

9. They exempt, if at all, only upon religious grounds. Those exempted must “*religiously*” or “*conscientiously*” observe another day, or observe it “*as the Sabbath.*”

10. They are enacted to protect the day as a religious institution, and not to protect the people.

11. The American Sabbath Union, organized to secure the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws, is an ecclesiastical organization, and in its constitution declares it to be its object “to preserve the *Christian Sabbath* as a day of rest and *worship.*”

12. The founder of this union, in his “*Sabbath for Man,*” p. 194, says: “At first thought, they would seem to be *religious laws,*” to which it only needs to be added that first impressions are usually correct.

The following from a report on this very subject of Sunday legislation, adopted by the United States Senate in 1829 is to the point:—

“If a solemn act of legislation shall in one point define the law of God or point out to the citizen one religious duty, it may with equal propriety define every part of revelation, and enforce every religious obligation, even to the forms and ceremonies of worship, the endowments of the Church, and support of the Clergy.”

EXEMPTION CLAUSES.

Many Sunday laws have in them an exemption for those who “*conscientiously* believe that the seventh day of the week ought to be observed as the Sabbath, and *actually refrain* from secular labor on that day,” or who “keep another day of the week as *holy time,*” or “ob-

serve *as the Sabbath* any other day of the week than Sunday,” or “observe *as the Sabbath* one day in each seven, as herein provided.” (See Sunday laws of Michigan, Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Minnesota, Kentucky, etc.) But such exemptions are wrong for the following reasons:—

1. Because the law which gives occasion for them is wrong. A law which demands an exemption to prevent its coming in conflict with the inalienable rights and conscientious convictions of men, must certainly be wrong.

2. They are wrong because they are merely acts of toleration. To grant that the government has a right to say whether the individual shall be allowed to exercise his rights or not, is to grant to it the power to deny him his rights. But toleration is not the doctrine of true civil and religious liberty, nor of the founders of the American government.

Of Madison, history says:—

“Religious liberty was a matter that strongly enlisted his feelings. When it was proposed that, under the new Constitution, all should enjoy the fullest *toleration* in the exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience, Madison pointed out that this provision did not go to the root of the matter. The free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience, is something that *every man may demand as a right, not something for which he must ask as a privilege.* To grant to the State the power of tolerating is implicitly to grant to it the power of prohibiting: whereas Madison would deny it any jurisdiction whatever in the matter of religion.”—*Appleton's Cyclopædia of American Biography, vol. 4, p. 165.*

Dr. Philip Schaff, in laying down the same principle, says:—

“Toleration is an important step from State-churchism to free-churchism. But it is only a step. There is a very great difference between toleration and liberty. Toleration is a concession which may be withdrawn; it implies a preference for the ruling form of faith and worship, and a practical disapproval of all other forms. . . . In our country we ask no toleration for religion and its free exercise, but we claim it as an inalienable right.”—*Schaff's Church and State in the United States, p. 14.*

And Hon. Richard M. Johnson in his famous Sunday

Mail Report adopted by the United States Senate in 1829, well observed that,—

“Our Constitution recognizes in every person the right to choose his own religion and to enjoy it freely, without molestation. . . . The proper object of government is to protect all persons in the enjoyment of their civil as well as religious rights, and not to determine for any whether they shall esteem one day above another, or esteem all days alike holy. . . . What other nations call religious toleration, we call religious rights. They are not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights of which government cannot deprive any portion of citizens, however small. Despotic power may invade those rights, but justice still confirms them.”— *American State Papers*, pp. 89-100.

3. They are wrong, because to consent that they are right is to admit that the government has a right to compel everybody to observe a rest day, which is not true. At most it can only enforce idleness; but it has no right to compel men to be idle or to deprive them of their God-given time, so long as in their use of it they keep within the bounds of civility. Industry and not idleness is in the interest of both the individual and the government.

Mr. Andrew Young, in his “Government Class Book,” p. 198, speaking of personal liberty, says:—

“Every person has the right to go wherever he pleases, free from restraint on the part of others. If any one restrains him of his liberty even for a very short period or without violence, as by locking him in a room, he may recover damages. This is one of our most valued rights, and is forfeited only by crime.”

4. They are wrong, because they require a religious observance, which civil government has no right to do, and are granted only upon religious considerations. In order to receive the benefit of the exemption, one must “conscientiously believe” that some other day than Sunday is “the Sabbath,” and “actually refrain from business and labor on that day,” or observe it “as the Sabbath.”

5. They are wrong, because the exemption requires more of those who are exempted than the law itself requires of those who are not. They must “conscien-

tiously” observe the day they keep, or keep it “as the Sabbath,” while of those not exempted no such requirement is made, though as the exemption itself indicates, and as all men know, that is the implied intent of the law. Sunday laws, exemptions and all, are enacted for the purpose of enforcing the observance of a religious institution and compelling the conscience.

6. They are wrong, because to enact that which is professedly designed for the benefit of the consciences of one class only, is to enter upon class legislation, and thereby to consent that the government may disregard the consciences of all other classes in this respect.

7. They are wrong, because for any class to ask for or accept of them is but selfishness. James Russell Lowell, in a poem entitled “Freedom,” has well rebuked the asking for this sort of freedom, in the following words:—

“Is true freedom but to break
Fetters for our own dear sake,
And with leathern hearts forget
That we owe mankind a debt?
No; true freedom is to share
All the chains our brothers wear;
And, with heart and hand, to be
In earnest to make others free.

“They are slaves who fear to speak
For the fallen and the weak;
They are slaves who will not choose
Hatred, scoffing, and abuse
Rather than in silence shrink
From the truth they needs must think.
They are slaves who dare not be
In the right with two or three.”

8. They are wrong, because those who ask for or accept them thereby virtually shut themselves off from protesting against the law from which they have asked to be exempted; but all men everywhere have a right to protest and should protest against religious legislation on the part of civil government now and forevermore.

9. They are wrong, because they assume that the majority have rights and liberties to grant to the min-

ority, which is false. Inalienable rights come from the Creator, and are possessed by all equally; and with the rights belong the liberty to exercise and enjoy them. This assumption is clearly indicated in the following words of Rev. F. W. Ware, Secretary of the American Sabbath Union for Michigan, in the *Michigan Sabbath Watchman* for June, 1892:—

“There is not a Seventh-day Adventist in this State that dare plow his field, or reap his grain, or build his house, or thrash his wheat, or chop his wood, without pleading *his right to do so* under the *exemption clause* of our laws, which clause has its root in his *conscientious and religious convictions and customs*. The only legal right the Seventh-day Adventists have to do secular work in shop, on house, in field, or to run their presses, etc., in their publishing concern on the Christian Sabbath, is a *right given them by this State on religious grounds only*.”

That Seventh-day Adventists dare do and have dared to do just what Mr. Ware here says they dare not do, reference needs only to be made to their practice in the State of Tennessee where there is no exemption clause to the State Sunday law, and in Arkansas during the time the exemption clause was there repealed.

10. They are wrong, because this assumption of superiority and of being the dispensers of the rights and liberties of others on the part of Sunday-keepers carries with it the idea that they may rightfully curtail or deny those rights and privileges whenever they see fit to do so. Thus Mr. Crafts claims that—

“The tendency of legislatures and executive officers toward those who claim to keep a Saturday-Sabbath is to over-leniency rather than over-strictness.”—*Crafts's Sabbath for Man*, p. 262.

Instead of granting exemption clauses, he says:—

“Infinitely less harm is done by the usual policy, the only constitutional or sensible one, to *let the insignificantly small minority* of less than one in a hundred, whose religious convictions require them to rest on Saturday (unless their work is of a private character such as the law allows them to do on Sunday) *suffer the loss of one day's wages* rather than have the ninety-nine suffer by the wrecking of their Sabbath by public business.”—*Ibid*.

Thus also thought Caiaphas in regard to the crucifixion

of Christ. (See John 11: 49, 50.) The Bill of Rights in the Kentucky State Constitution well declares—

“That absolute, arbitrary power over the lives, liberty, and property of free men exists nowhere in a republic, *not even in the largest majority*.”

Mr. Andrew W. Young, in his “Government Class Book,” p. 199, says:—

“Every man has a right to demand protection by the government. This protection is afforded by its police and other civil officers. So, also, if these are not sufficient, the governor is bound to call out the militia, to protect *even a single person*.”

This idea of Sunday-law makers being the benefactors of, and dispensers of rights to, those who observe another day than Sunday, is further shown in the words of Mr. Crafts, in his “Sabbath for Man,” p. 262:—

“Instead of reciprocating *the generosity shown toward them by the makers of Sabbath laws*, these Seventh-day Christians expend a very large part of their energy in *antagonizing* such laws, seeking by *the free distribution of tracts and papers* to secure their repeal or neglect, seemingly on the policy of rule or ruin. They persuade very few to keep the seventh day; they only succeed in confusing the consciences of many about the first. They increase the desecration of the Lord's day, but not the hallowing of Saturday.”

This is what the observers of the seventh day are asked to pay for exemption clauses. They are asked to cease their use of the freedom of speech and the press guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States; to say nothing against either the Sunday Sabbath or Sunday laws; in fact to say nothing about the Sabbath question at all. A quotation from the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of West Virginia, is here in place, which declares that—

“All men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion.”

Here is the ground upon which the apostles stood (Acts 4: 17-20; 5: 27-29); here is where the Reformers of the sixteenth century stood; and here is where those who honor the divine precepts and the Sabbath of the Lord now stand.

HOW SUNDAY LAWS OPERATE.

The Sunday law of Arkansas, together with its exemption clause, furnishes an illustration of the real nature and intent of such laws, and of how much dependence can be placed in exemption clauses as securities to inalienable rights. Up to the year 1885 this law contained an exemption clause, granting to observers of another day of the week as Sabbath, the privilege of pursuing their vocations on Sunday, provided they did not do so to the disturbance of others. But the power which had assumed the right to grant the "privilege," now saw fit to deny the liberty before allowed to be enjoyed. In the year mentioned a bill was introduced in the Senate of the State legislature, by Senator Anderson, which resulted in the repeal of the exemption clause, leaving the Sunday law straight, without clog or hindrance, free for universal application and enforcement.

And what was the result of the law thus left on the statute books? No sooner had this been brought about than the object of those who had prompted the legislators to thus arrange matters was clearly seen. Immediately there followed the arrest and conviction of a large number of seventh-day observers for working on Sunday, and they were obliged to pay a heavy fine in every case. This would not have been so surprising were it not for the fact that, while saloon-keepers and others plied their business on Sunday, not one of them, so far as was ever heard, was complained against, or forced to pay a fine for their violation of the law.

On the other hand the seventh-day observers were all earnest Christians, and faithful, law-abiding citizens in every respect, except in the matter of working on Sunday, which was done in most cases, in retired places, away from places of worship or public highways. Yet when one of these cases was appealed, and carried to the Supreme Court of the State, the conviction was confirmed. The concluding part of the decision reads as follows:—

"The appellant's argument, then, is reduced to this: That because he conscientiously believes he is permitted by the law of God to labor on Sunday, he may violate with impunity the statute declaring it illegal to do so; but a man's religious belief cannot be accepted as a justification for his committing an overt act made criminal by the law of the land. If the law operates harshly, as laws sometimes do, the remedy is in the hands of the legislature. It is not the province of the judiciary to pass upon the wisdom or policy of legislation. That is for the members of the legislative department; and the only appeal from their determination is to the constituency.

It will be noticed that this not only justifies common, honest toil being "made criminal by the law of the land," but sanctions the giving of preference by law to a certain mode of worship. This is certainly a singular decision for a supreme court to render, with the State Constitution in the hands of the judges. They knew or ought to have known, that the Constitution of the State of Arkansas declares that—

"All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry against his consent. No human authority can in any case, or manner whatsoever, control or interfere with the right of conscience; and no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishment, denomination, or mode of worship, above any other."

They ought to have known, moreover, that—

"The Constitution of the State is higher in authority than any law, direction, or decree made by any body, or any officer assuming to act under it, since such body or officer must exercise a delegated authority, and one that must necessarily be subservient to the instrument by which the delegation is made. In any case of conflict the fundamental law must govern, and the act in conflict with it must be treated as of no legal validity."—*Cooley's Constitutional Limitations*, p. 43.

Instead of declaring the legislature omnipotent, the judges should have exercised their prerogative, and placed the Constitution where it belongs—above the acts of the legislature. As to how or by whom it is to be determined whether or not statutes conflict with the Constitution, the following will show:—

"The Constitution being the supreme law, it follows, of course, that every act of the legislature contrary to that law must be void. But who shall decide this question? Shall the legislature itself decide it? If so, then the Constitution ceases to be a legal, and becomes only a moral restraint upon the legislature. If they, and they only, are to judge whether their acts be conformable to the Constitution, then the Constitution is admonitory or advisory only, not legally binding; because if the construction of it rests wholly with them, their discretion, in particular cases, may be in favor of very erroneous and dangerous constructions. Hence the courts of law necessarily, when the case arises, must decide on the validity of particular acts."—*Kent's Commentaries*, p. 507, quoted in *Cooley's Constitutional Limitations*, p. 47.

Yet in the face of all this, the judges of the Supreme Court of Arkansas confirmed a penal sentence against a man, though he had done nothing more than what the Constitution of his State declares all men have a natural and indefeasible right to do. They condemned as a crime the quiet, peaceable work of agriculture on Sunday, performed by a man on his own premises, after having religiously observed the preceding day as the Sabbath, in harmony with the dictates of his conscience and the law of God. By this decision, they declared such quiet occupation to be against the "peace and dignity of the State," and therefore worthy of the treatment due a criminal. Religious legislation by civil enactment is entirely wrong, and when once entered upon, be it in never so small a way, lays the foundation for that which culminates in intolerance and persecution.

It will be noticed that the foundation for this persecution was not due primarily to the repeal of the exemption clause, but to the law which was left after the exemption clause had been repealed.

In 1887 the exemption clause was restored; but in 1889, the same intolerant spirit came back again, and through a bill framed by J. N. Tillman, the Senate by a vote of sixteen to eleven, passed a bill again to remove the exemption clause from the statute and make the law of general application, as all laws of a general nature should be if by right they exist at all. In his argument favoring the passage of this measure, Mr. Tillman said:—

"I have a local interest in the measure. In my county (Washington) we have a religious sect known as the Seventh-day Adventists, a very devout and respectable people, but they labor on our Sabbath, and greatly annoy the Christian people of that section. In Springdale, where most of these people live, there exists a very great demand for the passage of this bill. I promised those people to introduce a bill of this kind. I have done so, and worked earnestly for its passage; and if it does pass this Senate, I will meet a hearty 'well done' from my friends there, on my return from my labors here."

This reveals one of the sordid motives which actuated the man; but his own words which followed, show that there existed a baser motive for his action:—

"If you lived in Springdale for a few months, your opinions on the 'religious liberty' function would undergo a radical change. Those Seventh-day Adventists are generally good citizens, but they have become very aggressive since the passage of the Sunday law of two years ago, and our people are getting very tired of them. The senator from Independence suggests that if this bill should pass, it will drive these people from the State. That would not be a serious loss. There would be fewer Sabbath-breakers to deal with. After having left Arkansas, they might very truly exclaim:—

" 'True patriots are we,
For be it understood,
We left our country
For our country's good.' "

This reveals the real spirit behind religious legislation. Here was a man who, though admitting that the members of a certain sect were "a very devout and respectable people," and that they were "generally good citizens," yet, because their religious practices, though quiet and inoffensive of themselves, annoyed the Christians (?) of the community, would entirely ignore their privileges under the Constitution of the State, and coolly urge the bringing about of a condition of affairs and the enforcement of a law which he had been assured would drive some hundreds of "devout and respectable people" from the State,—all this to meet the approbation of certain religious bigots in his section. This, in what is said to be a country of free thought and religious liberty! Was Rome ever more intolerant in her most relentless days?

As might be expected, the promoters of such laws

seek to exonerate themselves from any responsibility for whatever hardships result in consequence of them. The Puritans felt themselves "called for the defense of all, to keep the passage with the point of the sword held toward" the Quakers, and justified themselves for executing them by saying:—

"Their wittingly rushing themselves thereupon was their own act, we with humility conceive, a crime bringing their blood upon their own heads."

The same sophistical reasoning is employed by National Reformers in regard to the results of enforcing Sunday laws. Witness the following:—

"As to the alleged cases of persecution in three States, I have read the Adventists' description of the cases in Arkansas, and they are not of the public spirited class that is willing to 'suffer for the common good.'¹ The old man and his son of seventeen whose horse was sold for \$27, and the man whose young wife and child died while he was in prison, brought that evil on themselves by breaking the law."—*Rev. J. M. Foster, in Christian Statesman, Oct. 10, 1889.*

And this is but a parallel to the reasoning of the Spanish inquisitors. They declared that if the poor victim, upon refusing to renounce his belief and profess allegiance to the pope, should die under the torture, he would be guilty by his obstinacy of self-murder. In settling such questions, recourse must be had first to the justice of the demands. A dividing line must be drawn, and the proper place to draw it is between that which is civil and that which is religious; between that which a man owes to Cæsar and that which he owes to God.

Years ago before any of these developments of later years had taken place, National Reformers, referring to the views of Seventh-day Adventists in reference to their movement, said:—

"From the beginning of the National Reform movement, they have regarded it as the first step toward the persecution which they, as keepers of the seventh day, will endure when our Sabbath laws are revived and enforced. One can but smile at their apprehensions

¹John 11:49, 59.

of the success of a movement which would not harm a hair of their heads: but their fears are sincere enough, for all that."—*Christian Statesman, March, 1874.*

But now as that which they were told would result from their movement is taking place, they seek to justify the persecution,—that which they at first alleged would never occur.

Another illustration of how Sunday laws operate, and the spirit which prompts to their enactment and enforcement, comes from Tennessee. In the year 1888 certain citizens in the western part of the State, residents of Obion County, seemed to have discovered the purpose for which the State Sunday law was made, and found occasion for setting in motion that hitherto inoperative section of the code. Previous to this time the Sunday law had long been violated and disregarded by many if not the majority of the people of this section. Scores of men had made Sunday a day for hunting and fishing. The gambler had used it as a convenience for his purpose. Church members even, of various denominations, as well as non-professors, had made it a rule, if business was urgent, to do common labor upon this day. But none of these had been complained against or prosecuted for violating the law. About this time, however, a new element began to develop in the community, which led to the discovery of the necessity (?) for the existence and enforcement of the State Sunday law. This was the organization of a small church of seventh-day Sabbath-keepers. Some of the people living in this section, becoming convinced that the seventh day is the Sabbath, began its observance and the practice of working the other six days of the week, Sunday included. But this must be stopped. Accordingly, a league, composed mostly of members of the Methodist Church, was organized to effect this purpose. The following is an exact copy of the pledge taken by this league when it was organized:—

"NOTICE.—*To whom it may concern*—That the undersigned citizens of——, being desirous of the welfare of our community, and that peace and harmony may prevail, and that the morals of our

selves and our children may not be insulted and trampled upon by a wilful violation of the *Sunday laws* of our land, do this day pledge our word and honor, that we will individually and collectively prosecute each and every violation of the Sunday law of our State that may come under our observation.

“Dec. 10, 1888.”

Notwithstanding the fact that those composing this league had upon their word and honor bound themselves to “prosecute each and every violation of the Sunday law” of the State, which should come under their observation, the general disregard for the law was allowed to go on the same as before. Aside from the observers of the seventh day, no complaint was made against any one. But when R. M. King, a member of the Seventh-day church, went out into his field one Sunday in June, quietly to cultivate his corn, which was so tall at the time as nearly to hide him from view, he was promptly arrested, brought before a justice of the peace (July 6, 1889), tried, and assessed fines and costs, amounting to \$12.85. The details of the case from the time it was appealed from the County Circuit Court, to the State Supreme Court, thence to the United States Circuit Court, and finally, to the Supreme Court of the United States, where the case was put at rest by the death of Mr. King, are too long to give here. For account of this and other trials, see “American State Papers,” pp. 334-360, and an editorial on “Religious Intolerance in the Republic,” in the *Boston Arena*, for December, 1892.

It will be noticed according to the wording of the pledge taken by this league, that the reason why the members composing it pledged themselves to the enforcement of the Sunday law was that the morals of themselves and their children might not be “insulted and trampled upon by a wilful violation of the Sunday laws of our land.” But the sequence revealed the fact that only the Sunday labor of the observers of the seventh day insulted or trampled upon their morals. The spirit and animus behind all this movement is well set forth in the following editorial in the *Sigourney* (Iowa) *Review*, of July 9, 1890:—

“All these religious laws and prosecutions which have stained the history of the Church in all ages, come not from an earnest, Christian desire to elevate mankind, but from the malicious disposition of the professor of religion to punish the man who dares to question the superior excellence of his professions. The religious Sunday observer of Tennessee could afford to be lenient with the squirrel hunters whose rifles could be heard popping in the timber on all hours of that holy day. He could easily ignore their violations of his Sunday law because the transgressors were low white trash whose influence cut no figure. But when a man making equally high religious professions with himself, whose life was just as pure and exemplary, who derived the authority for his position from the same sacred volume from which he derived his, and could defend his position with arguments and citations which could not be refuted,—when such a man disputed the sanctity of his Sunday observance, a challenge was thrown out which he could not afford to ignore without serious sacrifice of his professed sanctity. It was not Mr. King’s immortal soul he cared to save from the consequences of his Sunday labor; it was Mr. King’s influence that challenged the soundness of his theology, and set at naught his assumed religious superiority and authority, and aroused a combative malice that would have lighted the fagots around the seventh-day observer, had the law of the State permitted it.”

LIMITS OF OBEDIENCE TO CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

A modern writer has well observed that—

“To protect liberty of conscience is the duty of the State, and this is the limit of its authority in matters of religion.”—*Great Controversy*, Vol. 4, p. 159.

The same writer again says:—

“When the laws of men conflict with the word and law of God, we are to obey the latter, whatever the consequences may be.”—*Testimonies to the Church*, vol. 1, pp. 201, 202.

And once again:—

“The question is asked, Shall we not obey the powers that be?—Yes, when they are in harmony with the higher powers that be. God made his law for all the universe. He created man, he gives the bounteous provisions of nature, holds our breath and life in his hand. He is to be recognized, his law honored, before all the great men and the highest earthly powers.”—*Mrs. E. G. White, in Review and Herald*, April 15, 1890.

In his remonstrance against a proposed “Bill Establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion” in Virginia, in 1785, Mr. Madison said:—

"It is the duty of every man to render to the Creator such homage, and such only, as he believes to be acceptable to him. This duty is precedent, both in order of time and in degree of obligation, to the claims of civil society. *Before any man can be considered a member of civil society, he must be considered as a subject of the Governor of the universe*; and if a member of civil society who enters into any subordinate association must do it with a reservation of his duty to the general authority, much more must every man who becomes a member of any particular civil society do it with a saving of his allegiance to the Universal Sovereign. We maintain, therefore, that in matters of religion no man's right is abridged by the institution of civil society, and that *religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance.*"

President Fairchild, of Oberlin College, Ohio, in his "Moral Philosophy," devotes a whole chapter to this subject, "Limits of Obedience to Civil Government," in which occur the following sound and forcible utterances:—

"Obedience is to be rendered to all human governments, in subordination to the will of God. These governments are a recognized necessity in the nature of the case, and their existence is manifestly in accordance with the divine will. Hence the presumption is always in favor of the authority of civil law; and any refusal to obey, must be based on the moral proof that obedience will be sin. The one who proposes to disregard human law, must be persuaded in his own mind that, in that course, he will meet the approval of God. It is too obvious to need discussion, that the law of God, the great principle of benevolence, is supreme, and that, 'we ought to obey God, rather than men,' in any case of conflict between human law and the divine.

"There are cases so clear that no one can question the duty to refuse obedience. In all times and in all lands such cases have arisen. In a case of this kind, either of two courses is possible; to *disobey* the law, and *resist the government* in its attempt to execute it, or to *disobey* and *quietly suffer the penalty*. The first is revolutionary, and can be justified only when the case is flagrant, and affects such numbers that a revolutionary movement will be sustained. Sometimes a decided attitude on the part of a large number, in opposition to a wicked law, will set the law aside, and make it inoperative. Such a movement is as justifiable as any revolution. But these cases are rare. The second course will, in general, commend itself to considerate and conscientious men. It is a testimony against the law as unrighteous, and at the same time, a recognition of government as a grave interest.

"It is often urged that the right of private judgment, as now maintained, in reference to obedience to the laws of the land, will subvert government, and introduce confusion and anarchy. . . . The

danger, however, is greatly over-estimated. *Government is never the gainer in the execution of a law that is manifestly unjust. . . . Conscientious men are not the enemies, but the friends, of any government but a tyranny. They are its strength, and not its weakness.* Daniel, in Babylon, praying, contrary to the law, was the true friend and supporter of the government; while those who, in their pretended zeal for the law and the constitution, would strike down the good man, were its real enemies. *It is only when government transcends its sphere, that it comes in conflict with the consciences of men.*

"But it is objected that the example is corrupting, that a bad man will violate a good law, because the good man refuses to obey a wicked law. The cases are just as unlike as right and wrong, and any attempt to justify the one by the other, is gross dishonesty. Unquestionably, the principle can be abused by the wicked, and so can any truth whatever, but *the principle of unquestioning obedience to human law is false*, and needs no perversion to make it mischievous. Practically, the cases are few, in well-established governments, where the law encroaches upon the rights of conscience; but *if the principle be surrendered, the cases will multiply. . . .* The most grievous of all imperfections in government, is the failure to secure the just and good result. *Injustice and oppression are not made tolerable by being in strict accordance with the law.* Nothing is surer, in the end, than the reaction of such wrong, to break down the most perfectly constituted government."—*Fairchild's Moral Philosophy*, pp. 178-186.

A favorite expression with National Reformers and Sunday-law advocates is, "We ask only obedience to law." Of course this is all they ask after they have secured the laws they desire. This expression, in fact, is the motto of their "Sunday-rest Leagues" and "Law and Order Leagues." But as Mr. Fairchild says, "Injustice and oppression are not made tolerable by being in strict accordance with the law." He also states a grand truth when he says, "The principle of unquestioning obedience to human law is false."

How blind to all sense of justice the Sunday-law infatuation makes men is well shown by a statement from Judge S. B. Davis, in an article in the *Terre Haute (Ind.) Gazette*, of Jan. 14, 1893, headed, "The Sunday Question: A correspondent who maintains that 'this is a Christian nation,' and favors the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday." In this the judge says:—

"It is better for society that even a bad law be obeyed than broken."

It has often been argued that the quickest way to get rid of a bad law is to *enforce* it; but Mr. Davis maintains that it should be *obeyed*. This latest rule of jurisprudence would have said to the three Hebrew captives, "Bow down to the golden image;" to Daniel, "Cease praying to the God of heaven;" and justified Herod in beheading John the Baptist "for his oath's sake."

Col. Richard M. Johnson, in his famous Sunday Mail Report, which was adopted by the United States Senate in 1829, very clearly set forth the correct principle upon this subject in the following forcible words:—

"The framers of the Constitution recognized the eternal principle that man's relation with his God is above human legislation, and his rights of conscience inalienable. Reasoning was not necessary to establish this truth; we are conscious of it in our own bosoms. It is this consciousness, which, in defiance of human laws, has sustained so many martyrs in tortures and in flames. They felt that their duty to God was superior to human enactments, and that man could exercise no authority over their consciences. It is an inborn principle which nothing can eradicate. The bigot, in the pride of his authority, may lose sight of it; but, strip him of his power, prescribe a faith to him which his conscience rejects, threaten him in turn with the dungeon and the fagot, and the spirit which God has implanted in him rises up in rebellion, and defies you."—*American State Papers*, pp. 113-116.

Thus also declared the Protestants of the sixteenth century. Referring to the decree passed at the second diet of Spire, they said:—

"Let us reject this decree. In matters of conscience the majority has no power."—*D'Aubigné's History of the Reformation*, book 13.

For refusing to attend the established Church of England and for conducting meetings himself, Bunyan was arrested, brought to trial, and for twelve long years imprisoned. When the indictment against him was read, the clerk said to him, "What say you to this?" to which Bunyan replied, and a conversation occurred as follows:—

"*Bunyan*.—I say as to the matter of attending church, I am a frequenter of the church of God.

"*Judge*.—But you know what we mean,—to the parish church to hear divine services?

"*Bunyan*.—No, I do not.

"*Judge*.—Why not?

"*Bunyan*.—Because I do not find it commanded in the word of God.

"*Judge*.—We are commanded to pray.

"*Bunyan*.—Not by the Common Prayer Book, but with the spirit. As the apostle saith, 'I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding.'

"*Judge*.—What do you count prayer? Do you think it is to say a few words over before the people?

"*Bunyan*.—No; for men might have many elegant and excellent words, and yet not pray at all; but when a man prayeth, he doth, through a sense of those things which he wants, which sense is begotten by the Spirit, pour out his heart before God through Christ, though his words be not so many and so excellent as others. But yet, notwithstanding, they that have a mind to use the Prayer Book, they have their liberty; I would not keep it from them, nor them from it; for my part I can pray to God without it. Blessed be his name!

"*Judge*.—You have no right to preach.

"*Bunyan*.—I can prove by the first Epistle of Peter, 4: 10, 11: 'As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God. If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.'

"*Judge*.—If any man has received a gift of tinkering, as thou hast done, let him follow his tinkering; and so other men their trades, and the divine his calling. You may do it in your family, but not otherwise.

"*Bunyan*.—If it is a good thing to exhort our families, it is a good thing to exhort others; but if you hold it a sin to meet together to seek the face of God, and exhort one another to follow Christ, I will sin still, for this will I do.

"*Judge*.—Then you confess your indictment, do you?

"*Bunyan*.—This I confess: We have had many meetings together, and that we had the sweet, comforting presence of the Lord among us for our encouragement. I confess myself guilty no otherwise.

"*Judge*.—Then you must be had back to prison, and there lie for three months, and at the end of three months, if you do not submit to the church to hear divine service, and leave your preaching, you must be banished from the realm, or stretch by the neck, I tell you plainly.

"*Bunyan*.—As to that matter, if I was out of prison to-day, I would preach the gospel again to-morrow, by the help of God."—*Life and Times of John Bunyan*.

Bunyan was sent to jail for many months longer, when the justices sent their clerk to admonish him and demand his submission, upon which the following conversation took place:—

"*Clerk.*— I came to tell you that it is desired that you would submit yourself to the laws of the land, or during the next session it will go worse with you.

"*Bunyan.*— I desire to demean myself in the world both as becometh a man and a Christian.

"*Clerk.*— You must leave off those meetings you were wont to have, for the statute is directly against it.

"*Bunyan.*— The law by which I am in prison neither reaches me nor my meetings, being directed against those who meet for wicked and treasonable purposes.

"*Clerk.*— Are you willing to stand in the judgment of the church ?

"*Bunyan.*— Yes, sir, to the approbation of the church of God ; the church's judgment is best expressed in Scripture.

"*Clerk.*— You know that the Scripture saith, ' The powers that be are ordained of God.'

"*Bunyan.*— Yes ; and that I am to submit to the king as supreme, and also to the governors as to them that are sent by him.

"*Clerk.*— Well, then, the king commands you that you have no private meetings, because it is against his law ; and he is ordained of God, therefore you should not have any meetings.

"*Bunyan.*— Paul owned the powers that were in his day to be of God, and yet he was often in prison under them for all that. And also, though Jesus Christ told Pilate that he had no power against him but of God, yet he died under the same Pilate ; and yet I hope you will not say that either Paul or Christ did deny magistracy, and so sinned against God in slighting the ordinance. Sir, the law provides two ways of obeying ; the one to do that which in my conscience I do believe that I am to do actively ; and where I cannot obey actively, then I am willing to lie down and suffer what they may do to me."— *Ibid.*

These answers of Bunyan's were wonderful ; nor can any one of true principles do other than admire the wisdom, fitness, patience, and calmness of his replies. His last reply contains the whole secret of the course to be pursued by Christians in their relation to civil laws. He says, " The law provides two ways of obeying ; the one to do that which in my conscience I do believe that I am to do *actively* ; and where I cannot obey actively, then I am willing to *lie down and suffer what they may do to me.*" This is in harmony with the second course indicated by Mr. Fairchild in his statement already quoted, that in cases where it is a duty to refuse obedience " either of two courses is possible ; to disobey the law, and resist the government in its attempt to execute it, or to *disobey and quietly suffer the penalty.*"

A FALSE CHARGE.

But those who ignore this principle, that there is a limit to civil *authority*, and consequently a limit of *obedience* to be rendered to it, are very apt, when the religious measures which they are seeking to enforce upon all are disregarded by some, to accuse these individuals who refuse to render obedience to such measures, of disaffection toward the government, of seeking to break down the moral restraints of society, of being guilty of rebellion and causing anarchy and confusion. But as well might the same charges be laid against Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, who, when commanded by the king to fall down and worship the image he had set up, replied : —

" We are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up."— *Dan. 3 : 16-18.*

From the very nature of the case and the theory which they hold, National Reformers would very naturally fall into this error of making these charges against those who refuse to adopt their ideas of things and comply with the measures they are seeking to enforce. In a work published by Seventh-day Adventists as long ago as 1884, it was predicted that they would do this very thing. Note the following statements from the work referred to : —

" Those who honor the Bible Sabbath will be denounced as enemies of law and order : as breaking down the moral restraints of society, causing anarchy and corruption, and calling down the judgments of God upon the earth. . . . Conscientious obedience to the word of God will be treated as rebellion."— *Great Controversy, vol. 4, pp. 409, 425.*

In fulfillment of this, note the following from a speech made by Rev. H. H. George D. D., a National Reformer of long standing, and General Field Secretary of the American Sabbath Union. In replying to some

telling arguments against the National Reform and Sunday-law movement, made by Elder A. T. Jones (Seventh-day Adventist, and editor of the *American Sentinel* of New York), at a mass-meeting held at the South Park M. E. Church, in Chicago, on the evening of Dec. 13, 1892, at which the American Sabbath resolutions were voted down, Mr. George, referring to Seventh-day Adventists, said :—

“There are only about twenty-five thousand of you in America. Sir, forty millions of people are against you, thank the Lord. Forty millions are against you. I do not care anything about this little flurry. [Jones and others laughing.] Sir, you may laugh just as much as you please. We have been through the mill. We have fought this question every inch of the road. It is only *anarchy*, and nothing else. Do not want any day recognized. Let's go to the devil. Let everything go to the devil. That is what it means. Every man have a day of his own. It is like that thing you had down in Haymarket some time ago. No law at all. Give every man a law to himself, and that means no day in this country at all.”

And Rev. Mr. J. R. Day, Secretary of the American Sabbath Union for the State of Indiana, in a speech following Mr. George's speech, at the same mass-meeting said :—

“It is religious *anarchy*. It is calculated to break down our rest day, destroy the peace of the country, and *bring the judgments of heaven down on the land.*”

In further fulfillment of the foregoing prediction, note the following from the *Michigan Sabbath Watchman* for November, 1892, in an article entitled, “‘Dandies,' These Seventh-day Adventists Are, to be Sure,” written by the editor, Rev. Francis W. Ware, Secretary of the American Sabbath Union for the State of Michigan :—

“REBELLION DECLARED.

“On the same page of the aforementioned paper [the *American Sentinel* of Sept. 22, 1892] we have the following scandalous utterance. Speaking against the act of Congress in closing the World's Fair gates on Sunday, the *Sentinel* says, ‘We had the right to refuse to keep Sunday when it was required by the churches without the aid of the government; and we have the same right to refuse to keep it when it is required by the churches *with* the aid of the government. . . . We refused before to keep Sunday, we refuse

now to keep Sunday.’ Here we have Seventh-day Adventists openly declaring that they will not be controlled by the authorities of this country. . . . These threats are but expositions of their true spirit and character, and it would have been well for them, perhaps, if they had kept their ‘gates closed,’ and not have allowed such thoughts and purposes to have got out. . . . We are very much mistaken if Seventh-day Adventists have not by the foregoing utterances, and others equally wicked and *disloyal*, placed in the hands of society a weapon that will be used with telling effect against them. The American people are a patient people, but they will not patiently bear with such *disloyal* utterances as those we have quoted.”

THE SPEAKING OF THE IMAGE.

According to Rev. 13:11-18, an image to the papal beast was to be *made* in the United States. This was done, the foundation all laid, and in principle its formation all completed, in the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, of Feb. 29, 1892. From the nature of the case the image must consist of the leading churches of the country clothed with civil power. After its formation, *life* was to be given to it. The national act which gave vigor to the papal theory of government laid down by the Supreme Court, was the World's Fair Sunday-closing act of Congress, July, 1892. This was the first act of the kind ever enacted by Congress, and was hailed with delight by all the so-called “evangelical churches” of America. But it was only a beginning. This does not satisfy them; they demand more Sunday legislation; and it must be of such kind as they shall dictate. They must be allowed to *speak*. Thus Rev. J. M. Foster, in the *Christian Nation* of Oct. 12, 1892, called for the image to speak :—

“But one danger lies in this: The Church does not *speak* as a Church. The American Sabbath Union has done a good work. The denominations have *spoken*. But the Christian organized Church has not officially gone to Washington and *spoken*. The work there has been largely turned over to associations. But the *voice of God*, authoritative, official, is through his Church. Should there not be joint action of the denominations in this? They should, it would appear, appoint a joint committee to *speak for God*, and properly and courageously done, with a plain recital of judgments which will follow upon refusing to hear, there can follow but the very best results. ‘These have power to shut heaven, that it rain not in the days of their prophecy; and have power over

Church
Oct. 11, 1892

waters to turn them to blood, and to smite the earth with all plagues.' Rev. 11:6. Much is lost by the Church failing officially to *speak* at the right time and in the right place. No association is clothed with this authority. They are individual and social; but the Church is divine. She can and ought to *utter the voice of God* in the halls of Congress, and as an organized Church."

This was practically all done at the hearing before the House committee on the World's Columbian Exposition, in Washington, D. C., Dec. 10-13, 1892, when thirty-five speakers from various churches appeared as a joint committee, as a united whole, to "speak for God" on the Sunday-law question. Even the "plain recital of judgments which will follow upon refusal to hear" was not omitted, but given in plain and unmistakable language, as note the following:—

"And therefore it is, dear friends, if we touch that fourth commandment, which lies at the very root of all the other commandments, *we touch the honor of God*. It has never been repealed, and *if we touch that, God will bring a curse upon us as a nation*, because he distinctly told his people anciently that he would punish them for the profanation of his Sabbath-day. And therefore it is, dear friends, that we as a nation cannot afford to touch this commandment. What it becomes us to do is, therefore, to set the nations of the world a good example of the American Sabbath; set them an example of the Christian Sabbath; set them an example of the Sabbath as God has ordained it."—*From speech of Rev. F. A. McCarrel, before the House Committee on World's Fair, Jan. 11, 1893.*

THE DEATH DECREE.

The prophecy further states that the image would finally "cause (decree) that as many as would not worship the image of the beast *should be killed*." This is the logical outcome of attempting to enforce a religious institution by law. The conscientious dissenter refuses obedience; his refusal is considered rebellion and anarchy, and this must be put down by resorting to capital punishment if necessary. Thus Gibbon well states the case:—

"It is incumbent on the authors of persecution previously to reflect whether they are determined to support it in the last extreme. They excite the flame which they strive to extinguish: and it soon becomes necessary to chastise the contumacy, as well as the crime,

of the offender. The fine which he is unable or unwilling to discharge, exposes his person to the severity of the law; and his contempt of lighter penalties suggests the use and propriety of capital punishment."—*Gibbon's Decline and Fall, chap. 37, par. 23, part 5.*

Mr. Young lays down the principle thus:—

"The right to use force implies the right to take the life of those who make resistance."—*Young's Government Class Book, p. 267.*

The following statement of the case with reference to the enforcement of the Sunday institution, was made in a work published by Seventh-day Adventists as early as 1884:—

"In the last conflict the Sabbath will be the special point of controversy throughout all Christendom. Secular rulers and religious leaders will unite to enforce the observance of Sunday; and *as milder measures fail, the most oppressive laws will be enacted*. It will be urged that the few who stand in opposition to an institution of the Church and a law of the land, ought not to be tolerated, and *a decree will finally be issued denouncing them as deserving the severest punishment, and giving the people liberty after a certain time to put them to death*."—*Great Controversy, Vol. 4, pp. 444, 445 (new edition, p. 615).*

In the *Michigan Sabbath Watchman* for December, 1892, Mr. Ware, its editor, says: "The conflict between the friends and foes of the Sabbath is much severer than the world has ever before known;" and in an article headed, "Just Exactly Like Them," further remarks:—

"Most of our readers know that we have a very low estimate of Seventh-day Adventists, that we look with profound contempt upon their principle of Scriptural interpretation, and hold in absolute detestation their methods of work. We have again and again warned our people against these people; especially have we called attention to the dishonorable methods adopted and universally practiced by the Adventists in securing purchasers for their books, among the families of other denominations. . . . We have repeatedly said in the columns of this paper that the Seventh day Adventists are a sly, slippery, and dangerous sect of fanatics, if not a set of artful and deliberate deceivers, who operate, for the most part, only in the use of dishonorable means. They are unquestionably a set of trained and practiced set of tricksters, who maintain themselves only in ways that are dark, crooked, and very often consummately mean."

Then, as if conscious that such language manifested a spirit not altogether consistent with the profession of

a minister of the gospel, he offers a sort of apology and justification for it in the following note:—

“If at any time some of our words or criticisms appear a little too tart, or sharp, or strong, we would remind our readers that this is no time for blank cartridges or aimless shooting. We would rather err on the side of severity than to have our foes get away with our Sabbath. We load, and aim, and fire to kill—not men, but measures.”—*Ibid.*

From this last expression it is evident there are deadly intents on the part of those who have set themselves for the defense of the Sunday sabbath. When the apostles preached the plain, naked truth, we read of the priests, the rulers and the Sadducees of those times, who were likewise set for the defense of traditions and the commandments and doctrines of men, that they were “grieved that they taught the people.” As the result of this we learn from the inspired narrative that “they laid hands on them.” And then “in order that it spread no further” they denied them the freedom of speech, deciding to “straitly threaten them, that they speak henceforth to no man in this name,” the name of Jesus. “So they called them, and commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus.” (See Acts 4.) In this, they, too, “aimed to kill—not men, but measures.” But this sort of aiming did not accomplish their purpose. So they began to aim to kill the measures by killing the men. “They were cut to the heart, and took council to slay them.” First they “threatened them,” then they “beat them.” But all this failed to stop the preaching and teaching of the apostles. Finally “they stoned Stephen,” and raised “a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem.” Acts 5, 7, 8.

This evidently outlines quite accurately the future conflict between the foes and the friends of the Bible Sabbath.

RELIGION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

The fact that Catholics are in some large cities demanding a division of the public school fund, that they may have a proportionate part to support schools in

which are taught their distinctive doctrines, has caused no little alarm in certain quarters. In his annual message to Congress, Dec. 7, 1875, President U. S. Grant, called attention to this subject as follows:—

“I suggest for your earnest consideration, and most respectfully recommend it, that a constitutional amendment be submitted to the legislatures of the several States, for ratification, making it the duty of each of the several States to establish and forever maintain free public schools, adequate to the education of all the children, in the rudimentary branches within their respective limits, irrespective of color, birthplace, or religion, forbidding the teaching in said schools of religious, atheistic, or pagan tenets, and prohibiting the granting of any school funds or school taxes, or any part thereof, either by legislative, municipal, or other authority, for the benefit or in aid, directly or indirectly, of any religious sect or denomination or in aid or for the benefit of any other object, of any nature or kind whatever.”

The fourteenth of the same month, Hon. James G. Blaine presented in the House of Representatives the following amendment to the United States Constitution, as Article XVI:—

“No State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and no money raised by school taxation in any State, for the support of public schools, or derived from any public fund therefor, nor any public lands devoted thereto, shall ever be under the control of any religious sect; nor shall any money so raised, or lands so devoted, be divided between religious sects or denominations.”

This was thought by many to be a check upon the encroachments of the Roman Church on the public-school fund. The amendment passed the House by an almost unanimous vote of those present, but was amended and defeated in the Senate by a lack of the necessary two-thirds vote. Since then matters have grown worse, and the necessity for some constitutional law on the point has been so strongly felt that a demand has been made from various quarters. When Senator Blair's proposed amendment came up, it was hailed by some as the “one thing needful” to relieve the difficulty of the situation. The National Reformers especially, accepted the proposed legislation as that which would, at least, secure to them a portion of what they had long demanded. They

therefore immediately set about working in its behalf with voice and pen. Rev. J. C. K. Milligan took occasion to say through the *Statesman* of July 26, 1888:—

“Your editorial of July 12, on a Christian constitutional amendment pending in the Senate, is most gratifying news to every Christian patriot. It seems too good to be true. It is too good to prevail without a long pull, a strong pull, and a pull all together on the part of its friends; but it is so good that it surely will have many friends who will put forth the necessary effort. True, the pending amendment has its chief value in one phrase, “the Christian religion;” but if it shall pass into our fundamental law, that one phrase will have all the potency of Almighty God, of Christ the Lord, of the Holy Bible, and of the Christian world, with it. By letters to senators and representatives in Congress, by petitions numerously signed and forwarded to them, by local, State, and national conventions held, and public meetings in every school district, such an influence can quickly be brought to bear as will compel our legislators to adopt the measure, and enforce it by the needed legislation. The Christian pulpits, if they would, could secure its adoption before the dog-days end. The National Reform Association, the *Christian Statesman*, and the secretaries in the field are charged with this work, and will not be wanting as leaders in the cause.”

This advice was well heeded. At each of the two hearings on the proposed amendment before the U. S. Senate Committee on Education and Labor, February 15 and 22, a representative from the National Reformers was present in the interest of the measure. Protracted arguments were there presented to prove that the American commonwealth would soon be at the mercy of the pope of Rome, unless the growing influence of the Catholic Church upon the question of public schools could in some way be neutralized. The proposed amendment of Senator Blair was thought by its advocates to be the only proper remedy, and was urged upon that ground. The point maintained was that when the “principles” of the Christian religion, as defined by the courts of the nation, were fully taught in the public schools, and that all children in the country, between the ages of six and sixteen years would be compelled to attend such schools, Catholic parochial schools must be closed; and that would stop their demand for a portion of the public school money.

In this way these zealots would guard the doctrines of the Protestant Church against the encroachments of all other forms of religion. This the National Reformers consider the duty of the national government. Thus spoke Rev. J. M. Foster, for some years a “district secretary” of that association:—

“An acknowledgement and performance of the nation's duty to guard and protect the Church, by suppressing all public violations of the moral law; by maintaining a system of public schools, indoctrinating their youth in morality and virtue; by exempting church property from taxation;” and “by providing her funds out of the public treasury for carrying on her aggressive work at home and in the foreign field.”—*Christian Statesman*, Feb. 21, 1884.

To one who was arguing before the United States Senate Committee against the proposed amendment and its prospective consequences, Senator Blair, the chairman, asked if he objected from his standpoint, to the use of the Bible in the schools simply as a reading-book. The answer was:—

“Personally, I have no objection to it whatever as a reading-book, or even as a book of religious doctrines, because I am a believer in the Bible. But I cannot see how I, or any one else would be justified in trying to oblige others to use it in the same way. I would rather my children would read the Authorized Version of the Bible rather than the Douay Version, because there are some very objectionable texts in the latter. For instance, in Heb. 11:21, that version says that ‘Jacob when he was a dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph and *worshiped the top of his staff.*’ Then again in Gen. 3:15, the Catholic Bible says: ‘I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; *she shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise her heel.*’

“But the Catholic has just as good right to object to his children reading the Protestant Bible. Would it be right to tax the Catholic to educate his children in a book that he does not believe in?—Certainly not. Neither would it be justice to the Jews of the country to oblige them to assist in the maintenance of public schools, at which their children must be taught principles which they do not believe, and could not be hired to have taught to their children.

“I am well persuaded that He whom the New Testament exalts as the Son of God deserves the exaltation he receives therein. But for all that, I do not believe it would be right to compel the children of Jewish parents to read the New Testament in school against the wishes of those parents; for that would be against the principles taught in the Bible itself. That says: ‘All things whatsoever ye

would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them ; for this is the law and the prophets.'

"But there is another class of citizens whose rights and convictions are just as sacred as those of any other class. I mean those who do not indorse any version of the Bible. These are taxed equally with all others in support of the public schools. These should not be compelled, any more than others, to be taught that in which they have no faith. Whatever class is involved, the statement of the General Assembly of Virginia in 1785 is still true, that 'to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical.' The decision also of the Supreme Court of Ohio on this matter is equally to the point, that 'to tax a man to put down his own religion is the very essence of tyranny.' And that is just what the State does, when it taxes men to pay for forcing upon their children the religious ideas which the parents themselves do not believe."—*Senate Hearing on Religion and Schools, pp. 91, 92.*

When in 1869 the celebrated case as to whether the Bible should, or should not be retained in the public schools of Cincinnati, was being argued in the superior court, Hon. Stanley Matthews, afterward associate justice of the United States Supreme Court, in his argument said :—

"Conscience, if your honors please, is a tender thing, and tenderly to be regarded ; and in the same proportion in which a man treasures his own moral integrity, sets up the light of conscience within him as the glory of God shining in him to discover to him the truth, so ought he to regard the conscience of every other man, and apply the cardinal maxim of Christian life and practice, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.'"

"Now, here is the Christian community. There are a large number of the citizens of this community who are not Christians at all, yet are devout religionists. They are descendants of the men who crucified Christ ; and yet, as old Thomas Browne says, we ought not to bear malice against them for that, for how often since have we, who profess his name, crucified him, too. . . .

"But there are in this community devout worshipers of the only living and true God, according to their conscientious convictions, and I will say if your honors please, in all respects capable of performing every duty of the civil State, and equally entitled to, not to toleration—I hate that word, there is no such thing known in this country as toleration—but civil and religious equality, equality because it is right, and a right. Then there is another sect of religionists. They are the Roman Catholics. I know the Protestant prejudices against the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and the Roman Catholic system of faith, and the Roman Catholic Church. I know, too, from a reading of that history, a part of which has been reproduced in argument

upon this occasion, that the Roman Catholic Church has too well deserved that bitter memory at the hands of those whom it persecuted. But it is not to be denied that the victims of persecution, with singular inconsistency, have not always omitted the opportunity, when power was in their hands, to inflict upon their oppressors the same measure of persecution, as if the wrong consisted, not in the principle, but in the person. . . .

"The record of this divine life and death and resurrection is something more to the Jew than an ordinary history ; it is a blasphemy, sacrilege. And yet your honors would by law compel the reading of that book, of that record of the sayings and doings, of that life, of the manner of that death, of that resurrection, to the children of Jewish parents, or else forbid them to come into the common schools that belong to them as they do to your honor, and to us all equally, or at least tax them equally for the support of schools in which, by law, their religion and the religion of their fathers is taught to be false and that they themselves are unbelievers and rejecters of God.

"But it is asked by some, who by asking it betray their want of comprehension of the real question : Have Protestants no rights ? Cannot the majority of the community insist upon their consciences ? Must the rights of minorities alone be consulted ? Are we to be ruled by Catholics or Jews, or infidels ?

"The answer is obvious and easy. Protestants have no rights, as such, which do not at the same time and to the same extent belong to Catholics, as such, to Jews, and infidels too. Protestants have a civil right to enjoy their own belief, to worship in their own way, to read the Bible and to teach it as a part of their religion, but they have no right in this respect to any preference from the State or any of its institutions. They have no right to insist upon Protestant practices at the public expense, or in public buildings, or to turn public schools into seminaries for the dissemination of Protestant ideas. They can claim nothing on the score of conscience which they cannot concede equally to all others. It is not a question of majorities against minorities, for if the conscience of the majority is to be the standard, then there is no such thing as rights of conscience at all. It is against the predominance and power of majorities that the rights of conscience are protected, and have need to be."—*The Bible in the Public Schools, pp. 221-227.*

Mr. Matthew says further :—

"There is one practical test to which this matter can be brought that, if it would only be honestly applied by every one within the sound of my voice, I think would settle this controversy without another word, and that is this : Suppose this was a Catholic community, and the Protestants were in the minority, and suppose that the Catholics had established a system of common schools in which they had declared that religion, morality, and knowledge being essential to good government, therefore the general assembly should pass laws for the purpose of protecting every religious denomination in the en-

joyment of its own mode of public worship, and also for the encouragement of schools and the means of education; and that, therefore, they had created a large fund, taken partly out of my pocket and partly out of yours, and of the remainder of the citizens, for the establishment of a magnificent system of schools, and had said: 'But inasmuch as our Constitution requires that religion shall be the handmaid of government, therefore we must incorporate religious instruction into those schools, and we know no religion except that which Mother Church teaches, and we know no hands to teach it except those whom God has appointed, and whom his representative and vicegerent upon earth has anointed with the holy oil of his approbation for that purpose. Now, therefore, we shall declare by constitutional rule, which shall be so firmly fixed in the social institutions of the country that nothing can change it, that every morning the exercises of the day shall commence by the solemn worship of Almighty God in the only way in which he can acceptably be approached; namely, in the sacrifice of the mass.

"Suppose your children were brought to that school and were taught, and were made, by a rule of that school, at the name of Christ to bow the head in adoration, and to cross themselves with the sign of the cross, how would your honors like it?"

"Or suppose the Catholic majority should prove themselves extremely liberal and say, we do not propose to violate your rights of conscience, and if you who are Protestants, Jews, and infidels, do not desire your children to be taught religious truth as we understand it, and to be present at the religious services in these public schools, they shall be excused from attendance, for we are willing to grant you perfect toleration, and more than this you cannot ask, or if you do, we cannot grant, for our consciences require this much, and we too, have rights. Would not the Protestant answer be ready, We are not only not willing that our children shall be exposed to the dangerous influences of your religious practices and examples, but also, we are not willing to be taxed to support you in the education of your own children, in what we conceive to be religious error, destructive to their eternal interests. If you are willing to take the responsibility, do so, but we cannot share it with you. Teach them what you please at home or in your church, but not your religion in schools that belong to us as much as to you."—*Ibid.*, pp. 233, 234.

Again he says:—

"Let me not be misunderstood. I believe in religion, in its pricelessness, inestimable importance and value, both 'for the life that now is, and for that which is to come'—for this world and eternity.

"I believe in the religious education of children; in their careful training, from infancy to youth and manhood, by precept and example, in true piety in the fear of God, and to love their fellow-men; that they should be taught to remember their Creator in the days of their youth. I believe as firmly as a man can that they should be most watchfully and sedulously instructed, day by day, precept upon

precept, line upon line, here a little and there a little, not merely in the learning of abstract morals, but in the duties of a religious life, based upon the motives, sanctions, instructions, examples, and inspirations that can only be found in the gospel of God our Saviour and the scheme of redemption for a lost and sinful race as revealed in the person and work of the God-man, Christ Jesus, and held forth in the instructions, and services, and means of grace, and living oracles, committed to the keeping of the Church of the living God, as his kingdom on the earth.

"But what I do say, and say most earnestly and with vehement protest, is that with this branch of education, the State, the civil power,—through its law-making, judicial, and executive administration; through its politics and its parties; through its secular agents and officers; through its boards of education and school teachers,—has, rightfully, and can have, nothing whatever to do. *Procul, procul este profani!* Let no unholy hands be laid upon the sacred ark."—*Ibid.*, pp. 256, 257.

The promoters of the amendment resolution, say they do not want *all* the Bible taught in the public schools, because some special parts of it are used to uphold the tenets of the various sects. They therefore want just enough of it to give them the "principles of Christianity." In other words, they demand a "broad Christianity" on which all shades of belief may stand together. On this point Mr. Mathews has the following:—

"But if the State is to furnish education in religion, in what, I ask, shall it consist? Who shall judge and determine what is true and what is false in all that claims to be religion, or even Christianity. Who shall pronounce with authority of law, what is to be taught as embraced within what have been styled the fundamental or elementary truths of religions? Who shall declare the amount, and kind, and degree of the knowledge to be imparted?"

"These are important questions, seriously propounded and deserving of respectful answer. The gentlemen on the other side say they limit the religious instruction demanded to what they call a 'broad Christianity.' I have once or twice adverted to the term. I do not know that I understand it. If I do, it is a 'broad' humbug. The Christian religion is not a vain and unmeaning generality. It is a definite and positive thing. It means something, or it means nothing. In my view it is a supernatural scheme of redemption—a revelation from God of his gracious purpose and plan of salvation, to a race 'dead in trespasses and sins,' through the mediation and atonement of Jesus Christ, who, being God from eternity, became incarnate and by his death upon the cross became a sacrifice for sin, made expiation for it, and having risen from the grave, ascended into heaven, and there sitteth on the right hand of the Father, to

make intercession for his people. The whole character and value of it as a religion consists altogether in being, as it claims to be, a supernatural plan of salvation from sin, otherwise irremediable. Strike out from the Bible the parts which disclose, reveal, and teach that scheme, and the rest is insignificant. And any instruction or education in religion which does not specifically teach the facts which constitute that scheme, and which cannot be stated even, except as conveying dogma, is no instruction in the Christian religion whatever—it is simply instruction in philosophy and ethics, or practical morals.”— *The Bible in the Public Schools*, p. 274.

But the objection is sometime raised that because in many cases children are not taught religion which is necessary to good citizenship, either in the church or in the family; and as these embryotic citizens really belong to the State, in view of their prospective relations to it, the State has a right to establish schools in which all shall be taught the principles of that religion which is believed by the majority in the State. Thus the Hon. George R. Sage argued before the Superior Court of Cincinnati, in the case previously referred to:—

“The State has a paramount interest in the children who are soon to control its affairs, and has, moreover, the right to insist that what the law has defined as indispensable for the education of those children, shall be taught them. Neither parent nor Church has any right to interpose private or sectarian objections. The State has a right to educate them, and to educate them in everything necessary to make them good citizens.”— *The Bible in the Public Schools*, p. 189.

But in replying to this point, Mr. Matthews well said:—

“But upon the argument made by counsel for the plaintiffs in this case, if I understand it, and if carried to its logical results, we cannot afford to be so liberal, even as proposed in England where they have an established church. For if religion be here, under our Constitution, the care of the State, to a certain extent as claimed, and that religion means the religion of the Bible—a broad Christianity—so that the State is bound by its fundamental law to provide education in that religion as a necessary part of the instruction to be given in the public schools, then it cannot permit exceptions to be made, even upon the plea of conscience; for the exception destroys in this case, not proves, the rule, and the State may, yea, if the argument be sound, must by the terms of its Constitution, step in between father and child, and educate the child in opposition to the father's faith. And to justify this interference, we are told that parents neglect their duty, and that a child has rights of conscience as against its father!

“I protest against the doctrine. Its application would be a monstrous tyranny. Its idea is pagan, not Christian.”— *Ibid.*, p. 246.

No wonder that Judge Matthews thought such a theory a monstrous tyranny. Carried to its final results, it would subvert society itself, since it attacks its most vital point—the sanctity of the family relation. The following statement from Pere Hyacinthe in a discourse on civil society and Christianity, and quoted by Judge Matthews, is directly to the point:—

“Man exists before the State, with all those essential and inalienable rights which he holds directly from God, by virtue of reason and moral liberty. The family, also, exists before the State with rights equally essential, equally inalienable, exercised in its bosom by the human person raised to his fullest dignity and felicity. It is not for the State to create these rights which are antecedent to it, and which come, I am bold to say, from a higher source; it is only for the State not to destroy them, nor to encroach upon them. Its mission extends no farther than to protect them, and to establish over them the sway of what the English in their noble language call the Queen's peace,— what Saint Paul bids us ask for when we pray for kings and all that are in authority, ‘that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.’” The mission of the State consists, then, in fixing the *modality* of rights, that is, in regulating the best way in which the reciprocal duties of individuals and families should be exercised in order to help, rather than hinder each other in their common development. It consists further, in protecting by force the right and interests which belong to it, from every unjust and violent attack, whether from within or from without. Such are the natural frontiers of civil society and domestic society—the family and the State—frontiers far more important for peace and liberty of the world than those of the Pyrenees, the Alps, or the Rhine!”— *Bible in the Public Schools*, pp. 247, 248.

He quotes again on page 249 from the same source:—

“The child belongs to its parents. I know the prejudices of my contemporaries, but I affirm none the less, in some measure, a right of property of man in man; and there can be no example of this sort of right more legitimate and noble than that of the right of the father to the child. Doubtless the *person* of every human being is essentially free and sovereign; it belongs to itself under the ‘eminent domain’ of God. But it is not so with its *nature*. Saving and excepting the rights of the person, we may say—we must say—that the nature of the son belongs to the father. It is flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone. The breath which inspires it is breathed from his nostrils; the vital heat which animates it is kindled from himself; and, as they were wont to say in Israel, it is his spark, his lamp!

which is to go shining on when he is dead, and perpetuate his name and glory in the midst of his people. The father is then, indeed, the proprietor of this sacred nature; to him alone it belongs to impress upon it its controlling momentum and direction toward the future. Consequently the school, the sanctuary of education, has its proper place beneath or near the parental roof."

In the matter of the relation of the State to religious worship, Judge Cooley says:—

"Whoever is not led by choice or a sense of duty to attend upon the ordinances of religion, is not to be compelled to do so by the State. It is the province of the State to enforce, so far as it may be found practicable, the obligations and duties which the citizen may be under or may owe to his fellow-citizens or to society; but those which spring from the relations between himself and his Maker, are to be enforced by the admonitions of the conscience, and not by the penalties of human laws."—*Constitutional Limitations*, p. 468.

At one time Mr. Gladstone believed the same theory which now leads some to urge that the State should attempt to teach religion in the public schools. But in a series of articles, which appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* for 1839, the celebrated historian, Macaulay, reviewed Mr. Gladstone's work on "Church and State." Among other good things he said, was the following, which well illustrates the folly of saying that because the best Christians make the best citizens, therefore the State should compel Christianity to be taught to all:—

"To say that the ends of government are temporal and not spiritual, is tantamount to saying that the temporal welfare of man is of more importance than his spiritual welfare. But this is an entire mistake. The question is not whether spiritual interests be or be not superior in importance to temporal interests; but whether the machinery which happens at any time to be employed for the purpose of protecting certain temporal interests of society, be necessarily such a machinery as is fitted to promote the spiritual interests of society. It is certain that without a division of duties the world would not go on. It is of very much more importance that men should have food than that they should have piano-fortes. Yet it by no means follows that every piano-forte maker ought to add the business of a baker to his own; for if he did so, we should have both much worse music and much worse bread. It is of much more importance that the knowledge of religious truth should be widely diffused, than that the art of sculpture should flourish among us. Yet it by no means follows that the Royal Academy ought to unite with

its present functions those of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, to distribute theological tracts, to send forth missionaries, to turn out Nollikins for being a Catholic, Bacon for being a Methodist, and Flaxman for being a Swedenborgian. For the effect of such folly would be that we should have the worst possible Academy of Arts and the worst possible Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge. The community, it is plain, would be thrown into universal confusion if it were supposed to be the duty of every association which is formed for one good object, to promote every other good object."

It is only just to say that thirty years after the appearance of Macaulay's essay, Mr. Gladstone was called to take the place of prime minister of England, because of his advocacy of the disestablishment of the State Church in Ireland, which measure he carried through Parliament, though it was in hostility to the domination of his own church.

As a sample of what the teaching of religion in the public schools implies,—that all believe, or be made to believe in a God and a hereafter, hold views on the nature of the soul and the condition of man in death, and "cherish the hope" of heaven,—read the following, written expressly for the *Public Opinion* by Cardinal Gibbons:—

"We want our children to receive an education that will make them not only learned, but pious men. We want them to be not only polished members of society, but also conscientious Christians. We desire for them a training that will form their heart, as well as expand their mind. We wish them to be not only men of the world, but above all, men of God.

"A knowledge of history is most useful and important for the student. He should be acquainted with the lives of those illustrious heroes that founded empires, of those men of genius that enlightened the world by their wisdom and learning, and embellished it by their works of art.

"But is it not more important to learn something of the King of kings, who created all those king doms and by whom kings reign? Is it not more important to study the Uncreated Wisdom before whom all earthly wisdom is folly, and to admire the works of the divine Artist who paints the lily and gilds the clouds?

"If indeed, our souls were to die with the body, if we had no existence beyond the grave, if we had no account to render to God for our actions, we might more easily dispense with religion in our schools. Though even then Christian morality would be a true source of temporal blessings; for, as the Apostle teaches, 'Piety is

profitable to all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.'

"But our youth cherish the hope of one day becoming citizens of heaven as well as of this land. And, as they cannot be good citizens of this country without studying and obeying its laws, neither can they become citizens of heaven unless they know and practice the laws of God. Now, it is only by a good religious education that we learn to know and to fulfill our duties toward our Creator.

"The religious and the secular education of our children cannot be divorced from each other without inflicting a fatal wound upon the soul." — *Public Opinion*, July 13, 1889.

The fatal mistake in all this is summed up in the last statement that secular and religious education cannot be divorced without doing harm. The false hypothesis upon which the Cardinal reasons, is based upon the supposition that the child can learn nothing but what he learns at the public school. Such reasoning ignores the fact that, even in his school days, the child spends three fourths of his time at home under the influence of his parents or guardians, whose duty it is to teach him his duties to God when they sit in their house, when they walk by the way, when they lie down, and when they rise up (Deut. 11 : 19); it ignores the fact that there are churches, colleges, academies, and schools erected for the especial purpose of moral and religious instruction.

The fallacy of this theory was well shown up in the same issue of the same journal. Rev. Dr. Minot J. Savage, of Boston, said :—

"By 'religious instruction in the public schools,' then, what is really meant is *sectarian* instruction, or the teaching of the peculiar theories or beliefs of *some particular part* of the religious world. For whatever claim the Anglican or the Roman Church may make as to not being a sect, it is evident that, from the point of view of the Protestant or the Jew, each of them must be so regarded. That is, each one is only a part, a section, of the religious world. The question, then, plainly is as to whether any one special religion, or more than one, shall be taught in the 'public schools.'

"The public may be divided into two classes. First, there are those who sincerely believe that the eternal welfare of their children's souls depends on the teaching and acceptance of their particular kind of religion. Secondly, there are those who do not believe this. Now, in the case of those who do believe that the salvation of their children's souls is at stake, there cannot possibly be a more

odious tyranny than that of compelling them to submit to a teaching that, to their minds, entails such unspeakably horrible consequences. 'Taxation without representation' is a trivial grievance compared with it. So far as this goes, therefore, my sympathies are entirely with the Romanist as against the teaching of any form of Protestantism in the schools. And, on the other hand, in the case of those who do not believe that the endless welfare of their children is at stake, the tyranny is only less hateful. To large numbers, at least, of such as these, this compelling their children to submit to the teaching of a religion they do not believe in, is not only a waste of needed time, it is subjecting them to the influence of what is regarded as hurtful superstitions which hinder true learning, impart false theories of life and duty, and so interfere seriously with the happiness and progress of this world, if not the next. In either case, then, it is tyranny, except as to those whose special ideas are being taught.

"Turn now to the basis of the public school system and see what it is for. Many wise men are of opinion that the education of children is purely a parental matter, and no part of public right at all. But though that position might be made good in a monarchy, it cannot possibly hold in a democracy. Under a monarchy the individual may have little to do in determining the public welfare. But, under our form of government, every man is a voter, and every voter has power to shape public affairs. The State legislature, then, or the national Congress, may compel such a popular education as fits a man intelligently to vote, as a *measure of public safety*. It has the same right to do this as it has to suspend a writ of *habeas corpus*, or to declare war for the national defense.

"But what education is necessary? and so, what comes within the scope of public right? The national jurisdiction is confined strictly to *this world*. There are good citizens of all religions and of no religion. The only thing the State, as a *State*, is interested in, or has any right to be interested in, is the matter of a man's behavior, as a citizen, in this world. It is none of the State's business to engage in the work of *saving souls* in the next world. If it is, then it ought to decide which religion is true. Then it should adopt it. Then it should devote its first and chief energies to the conversion of the rest of the world. But America will probably think twice before it will decide to go back to the eleventh century. The world's experiments in this direction are not over-encouraging.

"Once grant, then, that it is not the State's business to save souls, and it follows, with inexorable logic, that it is none of the State's business to undertake the work of teaching anybody's special religion. If a Calvinistic father wants to teach his boy Calvinism, nobody questions his right to do it. But most certainly he has no right to take my money out of my pocket (by tax or in any other way) to do it with. And the same holds true of the Romanist, or the Jew, or the agnostic.

"The principle, then, is as clear as daylight. The public school, supported by the equal taxation of people of all beliefs, exists, and

has a right to exist, *simply and solely* for the sake of such education as fits for citizenship, and so is for the *public good*.

"The Church and the home give ample scope for all individual peculiarities of belief or theory. The public school is for the people and for all the people. Let it be kept true to its own high and sacred mission."—*Public Opinion*, July 13, 1889.

In the same paper, Prof. W. T. Harris, editor of the *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, remarked:—

"It seems to me that religious instruction in the public schools is inexpedient on the ground that these schools are for all classes of citizens, whatever their religious belief, or no belief, just as the public market, the public library, the municipal government, and the State are all alike, whatever their creeds. The question is not in regard to boarding-schools or asylums or reformatories. In those institutions the school takes up the functions of the family and should provide religious instruction, in my opinion. But in the case of the public school, which receives a child for only a few hours daily, the family and the Church are left sufficient time for religion. It is the conviction of the average American citizen that rights of private conscience must be respected, and that Church and State must be entirely separated. . . .

"The separation of Church and State implies, too, the separation of religious and secular instruction. The principle of religious instruction is authority; that of secular instruction is demonstration and verification. It is obvious that these two principles should not be brought into the same school, but separated widely asunder. Religious truth is revealed in allegoric and symbolic form, and is to be appreciated not merely by the intellect but by the imagination and the heart. The analytic understanding is necessarily hostile and skeptical in its attitude toward religious truth, and the mingling of religious and secular instruction cultivates habits of flippant and shallow reasoning on sacred themes."—*Public Opinion*, July 13, 1889.

These arguments are certainly worthy of careful consideration.

The *New York Press* thus succinctly states the case:—

"It is utterly impracticable, because unjust, to teach any theology in public schools at the cost of public treasuries which raise money by taxing Christians, Hebrews, Mohammedans, Buddhists, agnostics, and atheists alike."—*Quoted in Public Opinion*, March 1, 1890.

The following from the *New York Independent*, of Oct. 1, 1891, is to the point:—

"If there is anything which is unseemly to fight over, it is the Bible, and if there is anything which it is unwise to fight about, it

is the Bible in public schools. Our readers know that our position has always been that the public schools shall be absolutely unsectarian; that religion should not be taught in the public schools; that God gave the business of teaching religion to the Church and not to the State, but that the State has the privilege and the duty of giving intellectual and moral instruction. Our readers will also remember a long series of articles written by the late Dr. Samuel T. Spear fully expounding and supporting this position of the *Independent*. An unseemly quarrel over this matter has lately occurred in Reading, Penn. A member of the School Board made the charge that one of the teachers, Miss Maggie O'Rourke, was using the Douay Version of the Bible in her school, and a committee was appointed to investigate the charge. She stated to the committee that such was the fact, and that she read the Scriptures from this version without note or comment. The Board thereupon acquitted her of the charge of having violated any of its rules. But the Board then voted to purchase twelve copies of the King James Version of the Bible and distribute them through the schools, and required that the teachers should read only from those copies. It is now ordered, we understand, that none but Protestant Bibles shall be used in the schools of Reading. That we have not misstated the facts, the following statement made to us by Samuel A. Baer, City Superintendent of Schools, will prove:

"The facts in regard to the Bible question in our schools are as follows:—

"One of the rules of the Board requires that at the opening each morning the teacher shall read a portion of the Bible of at least ten verses. At least one of the dozen Catholic teachers in the employ of the Board used her own, viz., the Catholic Bible. The matter was finally brought before the Board, and a committee of investigation appointed. The facts were found as stated, but the teacher claimed she violated no rule of the Board, inasmuch as it was not specified which Bible should be read. This position was sustained in a manner, but a resolution was passed in the form of an amendment to this report, that hereafter teachers shall read only such Bibles as are furnished by the Board. The Board, of course, supplies only the Protestant Bible."

"There is no question that this is making public schools sectarian, and that it is unjust and contrary to the principles of our government, which allow of no establishment of religion. The only consistent and the only truly Christian way is to give religion to the care of the Church and let the State take care of secular matters."

General Grant spoke wisely when in a speech at Des Moines, Iowa, in September, 1875, he said:—

"Leave the matter of religion to the family altar, the church, and the private school, supported entirely by private contribution. Keep the State and Church forever separate."

Dr. Tiffany, pastor of the Hennepin avenue M. E. church of Minneapolis, also reasoned well, when, in an address at the Rochester (Minn.) High School commencement exercises, he said:—

“Church and State must not be united. As Americans, we deny the right of any religious or other combination to have authority in civil matters. We recognize religion as a necessity, and the Church as a form of it, but we look with suspicion upon any interference it may attempt in government. . . . Home shall teach youth obedience, the churches, religion, but the schools shall give knowledge. The State must not teach religion, for that would give it authority to decide what religion to teach. The State must educate the children to make them intelligent, not saints.”—*Rochester (Minn.) Post, July 13, 1890.*

During the year 1892, a bitter combat arose in Toledo, Ohio, between Protestants and Roman Catholics, over the public-school question. The following paragraph appeared in the published report of the trial of one of the members of the Board of Education of that city, for unjustly seeking the dismissal of teachers who were Roman Catholics:—

“Professor Hutchinson, assistant superintendent of schools, testified that Dr. Scott asked for a list of the Catholic teachers employed in the city. The list was furnished. The doctor remarked that he wanted to get rid of the Catholic teachers, and he (Hutchinson) had remarked that Miss Sullivan was one Catholic that should be kept anyway, owing to her excellence as a teacher. Mr. Hutchinson continued: ‘Dr. Scott wanted a Miss Beall removed, saying she was a Catholic. He also told me Miss Sugarman must not get a school. I asked him how he would prevent it if she passed the examination.’ He said: ‘Has she got her certificate yet?’ I replied, ‘No, but she will.’ Then he said: ‘She must be marked down so low she will not get a certificate. Compton should do that; I would do it myself if I dared.’ Professor Hutchinson admitted belonging to a secret anti-Catholic society, therefore his testimony was certainly not swayed by religious bias in favor of the Catholics.”—*Copied from daily paper in American Sentinel, Dec. 22., 1892.*

Such conditions as these immediately bore their legitimate fruit, as this shows—the closing paragraph of the same report:—

“The city is greatly excited over the affair, which is dished up in the daily papers to the extent of pages. Several bloody affray

have resulted from the excitement, and neighbor is arrayed against neighbor, according to their sympathies.”—*Ibid.*

The same sectarian contest, only from a different point of view, likewise arose in the State of New York at this time, and shows the endless difficulties and evils to which the introduction of the reading of the Bible or religious instruction in the public schools subjects them. Following is the account:—

“There is commotion in Waterford, this county, over the reading of the Bible in the public schools. Father Emmett, of St. Mary’s Church, of Waterford, demanded of Superintendent Falconer that he order the teachers to cease reading the Bible, on the ground that to do so was against the law. The superintendent declined, saying he could only act on the orders of the Board of Education. Then Father Emmett went to some of the teachers and ordered them to discontinue reading the Scriptures in school; and they stopped doing so. Last evening the priest sent a letter to the Board, calling their attention to the fact that the Bible was read in the schools, with a request that its reading be ordered discontinued. The Board deemed the demand of Father Emmett ‘discourteous and impudent’ and entitled to no consideration, as this priest is not even a legally qualified voter in the school district. The Board passed a resolution instructing the teachers not to obey any orders or instructions except those of the Board and the school superintendent, and threatening instant dismissal if orders from ‘outsiders’ were obeyed. *The Protestant clergymen of Waterford have held a union meeting.*”

The family, the Church, and the denominational school afford a proper and ample field for the religious education of the youth. The attempt to force such instruction into the public schools is not only dangerous but altogether needless. It is one which should awaken the vigilance, and call forth the united opposition of all true American citizens.

PAPISTS GETTING THE ADVANTAGE.

That the National Reform idea of government is distinctly papal is evident. That the success of this movement also means the success of the papacy in the United States government the following will show.

In the *Christian Statesman* of Feb. 21, 1884, Rev. J. M. Foster, a prominent National Reformer, stated as one of the ways by which a “performance of the na-

tion's duty to guard and protect the Church" should be discharged was—

"By providing her funds out of the public treasury for carrying on her aggressive work at home and in the foreign fields."

National Reformers had not long to wait for a realization of the plan and a fulfillment of the national "duty" here indicated. In 1885, the first year of President Cleveland's administration, there was established at Washington a "Bureau of Catholic Missions," the chief design of which was to "push Catholic schools upon the government as earnestly as possible." In September of this same year this Bureau secured from the Commissioner of Indian affairs, Mr. Adkins, the following statement:—

"The government should be liberal in making contracts with religious denominations to teach Indian children in schools established by those denominations. It should throw open the door and say to all denominations, 'There should be no monopoly in good works. Enter, all of you, and do whatever your hands find of good work to do, and in your efforts the government will give you encouragement out of its liberal purse.' In other words, the government, without partiality, should encourage all the churches to work in this broad field of philanthropic endeavor."—*Printed in Congressional Record of July 25, 1890, p. 8341.*

The door was thrown open without delay, and the Catholic Church and a number of professed Protestant churches entered to secure the governmental "encouragement" thus offered, and in the five succeeding years made the following record of drafts upon the public treasury, as printed in the *Congressional Record* just referred to:—

"The appropriations in this regard have run, from the year 1886, as follows: For Catholic schools in 1886, \$118,343, as against \$109,916 for all others; in 1887, \$194,635 as against \$168,679 for all others; in 1888, \$221,169 for Catholic schools, and \$155,095 for all others; in 1889, \$347,672 for Catholic schools, as against \$183,000 for all others; in 1889-90, as I have said, \$356,967 for Catholic schools, as against, for all other demoninations and all other schools, \$204,993."

The following tabulated statement of appropriations

made by Congress for the support of denominational Indian mission schools, was secured by the New York *Independent* and printed in its issue of Sept. 11, 1891:—

	1886	1887	1888	1889	1890	1891
Roman Catholics.....	\$118,343	\$194,635	\$221,169	\$347,672	\$356,957	\$347,689
Presbyterians.....	32,995	37,910	36,500	41,825	47,650	44,856
Congregational.....	16,121	26,696	26,080	29,310	28,459	27,271
Maintains, Pa.....	5,400	10,410	7,500	Drop'd		
Alaska Training School.....		4,175	4,175			
Episcopal.....		1,890	3,090	18,700	24,726	29,910
Friends.....	1,960	27,845	14,400	23,383	23,383	24,743
Mennonite.....		3,340	2,500	3,125	4,375	4,375
Middletown, Cal.....		1,523	Drop'd			
Lutheran, Wittenberg, Wis.....			1,350	4,050	7,560	9,180
Unitarian.....		1,350	5,400	5,400	5,400	5,400
Methodist.....				2,725	9,400	6,700
Miss Howard.....				275	600	1,000
Appropri'n for Lincoln Inst.....	33,400	33,400	33,400	33,400	33,400	33,400
Appropri'n for Hampton.....	20,040	20,040	20,040	20,040	20,040	20,040
Totals.....	\$228,259	\$363,214	\$376,204	\$529,905	\$561,950	\$554,558

When President Harrison came into office, with General Thomas J. Morgan as Commissioner of Indian affairs, he proposed to put a stop to these appropriations, and let the churches support their own missionary and church work. But it was not long before his administration was forced openly to make the following confession before the United States Senate, by Senator Dawes:—

"The present management was in favor of divorcing the government absolutely from them all, but it found it impossible to do that. Perhaps it would have been better had the Indian education set out upon this principle, but it had gone so far and got so interwoven with the whole system of Indian education, that it was utterly impossible to retrace the step, and to avoid the precipitation upon the country of such a discussion as that, which could do no good anywhere."—*Congressional Record, July 25, 1890.*

This being the case, the next best thing was attempted — to allow no *increase* of appropriations to any of the churches. The "Protestant" denominations appeared to be satisfied with this. But the Catholic Church ignored the administration, went directly to the House of

Congress, and got the increase she desired for 1890 — \$44,000.

No sooner was this done than the "Protestant" denominations, which, together with the Catholic Church had been getting this governmental "encouragement" right along, began to raise the cry of "raid upon the public treasury," and "perversion of public money to sectarian uses"! But this cry of "stop thief!" from such a source amounted to nothing. The precedent had been established, and they had approved of it by taking advantage of the offer made. They began to retrace their steps when it was too late. The Methodist General Conference held at Omaha, Neb., in May, 1892, decided to accept no more public money for the support of their Indian schools. The Episcopalians followed suit in their General Assembly at Baltimore. Some leading ministers of the Presbyterian Church have been laboring to secure the same action from their Church.

In contrast with this, the Catholic Church keeps steadily on entering and reëntering the door of the national treasury thrown open to her by Protestants of the National Reform sort, receiving for 1892 \$369,535, as opposed to \$156,346 for all others. More than this, she proposes to keep this door open, and to fight all attempts to shut it. From the first effort made by President Harrison's administration to stop or curtail this unconstitutional procedure, she began and kept up a continual warfare upon it, as the following editorial in the New York *Independent* of Sept. 1, 1892, well shows:—

"A STILL HUNT.

"A curious feature of the present campaign is the still hunt now in progress among the Catholics. Our readers know with what persistency the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions at Washington has pursued General Morgan, Commissioner of Indian Affairs, ever since he entered upon his office. They attempted to induce the President to withdraw his nomination, and failed; they tried to defeat his confirmation, and failed; they endeavored to frustrate his purposes by legislation, and failed; they sought to induce the Secretary of the Interior to overrule him, and failed; they appealed again to the

President, but without success. They attempted to destroy General Morgan's reputation and influence by newspaper attacks, which only reacted in his favor, and served to create a strong public sentiment against both them and their cause. It is seldom that non-Catholics of the country have been so united on any subject as on this. An effort was made in their behalf to defeat the renomination of the President at Minneapolis, which met with a most signal failure, and now a supreme effort is being made to defeat his re-election.

"A pamphlet signed by one of the officers of the Catholic Bureau, Father Stephan, and addressed to Bishop Marty, another officer of the Bureau, assailing President Harrison, Secretary Noble, and Commissioner Morgan for the Indian policy of the administration, has been printed and is being secretly circulated, we are informed, especially among the Catholic priests, with a view of defeating Harrison and electing Cleveland.

"We believe this to be a blunder on the part of our Catholic friends. It is an attempt to carry into politics a sectarian question which does not belong there. There are great national issues of supreme importance to our public welfare, which alone should decide

This section was cut from the page
we apologise for the inconvenience

"THE STILL HUNT.

"Our statement two weeks ago that there was a still hunt in progress among Catholics designed to prejudice the present administration with voters, is denied with some warmth by the *Catholic Standard*, Archbishop Ryan's organ. It calls our statement 'a slander,' and says that the document to which we refer as being circulated secretly has never reached the office of the *Catholic Standard*. That may be. And yet it has reached this office; and that it is exactly what we said it was, and that it was designed to be circulated secretly, the document itself clearly shows. It is a pamphlet of thirty-two pages, from the press of Gedney & Roberts Company, Washington.

It is signed by J. A. Stephan, Director, and is addressed to the Rt. Rev. M. Marty, 'President of the Board of Catholic Indian Missions.'

"Though made in the form of a report to the president of the Bureau, the document is a bitter arraignment of the administration of President Harrison, Secretary Noble, and Commissioner Morgan. It refers to the 'bigoted Commissioner,' and to the 'not much less bigoted President.' The Commissioner is also charged with falsehood; and the old accusations, which were promptly met and refuted at the time, are repeated, and all is written for secret circulation."

Everyone knows the result of the political campaign of 1892. *Mr. Cleveland was elected*, which quite clearly indicates that the Catholics already hold the balance of power in the United States.

The following from "Great Controversy," p. 581 (edition 1888), clearly sets forth the outcome of this Protestant apostasy: —

This section was cut from the page
we apologise for the inconvenience

The Boston *Daily Traveler* of Aug. 4, 1891, under heading, "What a Catholic Majority Could do in America," well said: —

"A Catholic majority, under spiritual direction, will forbid liberty of conscience and will try to forbid liberty of worship. It will control education, it will put the press under surveillance, it will punish opposition with excommunication, and excommunication will be attended with civil disabilities."

CHAPTER XIII.

THE MILLENNIUM.

ITS EARLY ADVOCATES.

BELIEVERS in the doctrine of a temporal millennium, in some of its phases, have been in the Church all through the Christian dispensation. In the time of the early Fathers, they were known as Chiliasts, from the Greek word *chilioi*, translated "a thousand" in the New Testament. Justin Martyr, Papias, Tertullian, Irenæus, and others believed in a general peace and good-will among men for the period of a thousand years, though they were not by any means agreed as to time and events. At first, Origen opposed these views. "But as the gospel made rapid progress, the possibility and probability of a peaceful victory of the Christian cause over all its adversaries, by the might of truth and of the Spirit" found favor with many; Origen himself yielded, and wrote in defense of the view. He is believed to have been the first of the ancient ecclesiastical writers to affirm the practicableness of such a triumph of the gospel. See *Mc Clintock and Strong's Encyclopedia*, art. *Millennium*.

This view is believed to be the outgrowth of an article of faith held by the Jews. Thus Kitto says: —

"The Jews supposed that the Messiah at his coming would reign as king on the earth, and would reside at Jerusalem, the ancient royal city. The period of his reign they thought would be very long, and it was therefore put down as a thousand years, which was at first understood only as a round number. This period was conceived by the Jews as a sort of golden age to the earth, and every one formed such a picture of it as agreed with his own disposition, and with the views of the highest felicity, which were dictated by the

degree of intellectual and moral culture to which he had attained. With many these views were very low, being confined to sensual delights, while others entertained better and more pure conceptions of that happy time. This notion was taken up by many of the Judaizing Christians; Jesus had not yet appeared as an earthly king, and these persons were unwilling to abandon an expectation which seemed to them so important. They therefore allowed themselves to hope for a second advent of Christ to establish an earthly kingdom, and to this they transferred most if not all of that which in their unconverted state they had expected of the first."—*Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature, art. Millennium.*

Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho, when speaking of the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and the reign with Christ said:—

"I and many others are of this opinion, and (believe) that such will take place, as you assuredly are aware; but on the other hand, I signified to you that many who belong to the pure and pious faith, and are true Christians, think otherwise. . . . But I and others, who are right minded Christians on all points, are assured that there will be a resurrection of the dead, and a thousand years in Jerusalem, which will then be built, adorned, and enlarged, (as) the prophets Ezekiel and Isaiah and others declare."—*Anti-Nicene Christian Library, vol. 2, pp. 199, 200.*

Quite a controversy grew out of the advocacy of the doctrine, until a bishop of the Eastern Church in order to overthrow the view, succeeded in having the book of Revelation on which the doctrine was founded dropped from the canon of the Greek Church, to which it was only restored after many centuries. On this point the "Encyclopedia Britannica" has the following:—

"During this controversy Dionysius became convinced that the victory of mystical theology over 'Jewish' chiliasm would never be secure so long as the Apocalypse of John passed for an apostolic writing and kept its place among the homologoumena of the canon. He accordingly raised the question of the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse; and by reviving old difficulties, with ingenious arguments of his own, he carried his point. At the time of Eusebius the Greek Church was saturated with prejudice against the book and with doubts as to its canonicity. In the course of the fourth century it was removed from the Greek canon, and thus the troublesome foundation on which chiliasm might have continued to build was got rid of."—*Art. Millennium.*

Owing to other controversies which soon followed, the doctrine of the millennium was in a measure lost

sight of until, near the close of the seventeenth century, Daniel Whitby, a graduate of Trinity College, Oxford, became an advocate of the doctrine as held by Origen and Augustine. Later, in 1740, the same views were defended by John A. Bengel in his commentary on the book of Revelation. Since then, the doctrine has found several prominent supporters among the various Protestant sects. But the question naturally arises, On what hypothesis have these men rested their faith in a temporal millennium? Was it because they saw the gospel preached with more power than by Christ and his apostles? That could hardly be; for the record of the work done by the apostles proves that they were accompanied by a power that none have yet shown in the last few centuries. Could it have been from Bible testimony? Here are a few scriptures touching the condition of the world in the last days, which are but an index of the general tenor of the Bible on that point:—

"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, . . . lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." 2 Tim. 3:1-5.

"Because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold." Matt. 12:24.

"Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived." 2 Tim. 3:13.

"When they shall say, Peace and safety; then sudden destruction cometh upon them." 1 Thess. 5:3.

"But as the days of Noe were, so shall the coming of the Son of man be. For as in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying, and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came, and took them all away: so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Matt. 24:37-39.

"Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts." 2 Pet. 3:3.

THE DECLARATIONS OF EMINENT MEN.

Dr. A. Clarke says:—

"Probably no such time shall ever appear, in which evil shall be wholly banished from the earth, till after the day of Judgment, when the earth having been burned up, a new heaven and a new earth

shall be produced out of the ruins of the old, by the mighty power of God : [and] righteousness alone shall dwell in them."—*Notes on Rev. 20: 2.*

Matthew Henry, on Luke 18 : 8, says :—

"Even to the end of time there will still be occasion for the same complaint : the world will grow no better, no, not when it is drawing toward its period. Bad it is, and bad it will be, and *worst of all* just before Christ's coming."

THE RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD CLASSIFIED.

The following, upon examination, seems to be the most accurate list of the various religions, though some classifications differ essentially from it in some particulars :—

Jews and Parsees.....	15,470,000
Greek Catholics.....	84,136,000
Protestants.....	114,815,500
Brahminical Hindoos.....	120,000,000
Mohammedans.....	122,400,000
Roman Catholics.....	255,000,000
Pagans.....	227,000,000
Buddhists.....	482,000,000
Unclassified.....	51,050,000

Concerning the very small proportion of this number classed in the list of Christians, Bishop Foster has very aptly said :—

"There are some who too fondly anticipate a millennium. There is a lack of information on the progress of Christianity. The facts are misstated daily in pulpits all over the country. Ministers hesitate to present the worst side for fear of causing discouragement, and they create hopes that are never realized. We are not at the dawn of a millennium. Compared with the work to be done, the past is nothing. Our children's children for ten generations to come must labor harder than we are doing, to accomplish the conversion of the world. The world's population is 1,500,000,000. Of these, Christians number less than a third ; and half of that third belongs to the Roman Catholic Church. The Protestants number 114,000,000. They are divided into 500 sects. And this number of their strength includes, also, all the thieves, ex-convicts, the debased, besotted, and the speckled and streaked in Christendom."—*Northwestern Christian Advocate of Dec. 2, 1885.*

Further on in the same article the Bishop said :—

"Before us we have the great problem—the 1,100,000,000 of pagans to convert to Christianity. That is the solid rock that looms

up in our path. Look at it ; see what work has been done in 1800 years, and how much is yet to be accomplished. In India, after more than a hundred years of mission work, we have 600,000 native converts and 2,000,000 Christians among 260,000,000 heathen. Can we remove that solid boulder that is as old as the hills? . . . Our Methodist Church we think the most divine and ineffable. We boast that we are going to conquer the world, and come from our palaces and princely farms to subscribe fifty cents a head for the undertaking ! It is a burning disgrace that excites pity and disgust."

With reference to the prospect of the world's conversion, Rev. T. De Witt Talmage says of the work in civilized lands :—

"I simply state a fact when I say that in many places the Church is surrendering, and the world is conquering. Where there is one man brought into the kingdom of God through Christian instrumentality, there are ten men dragged down by dissipations. . . . Within the last twenty-five years the churches of God in this country have averaged *less than two conversions a year* each. There has been an average of four or five deaths in the churches. How soon, at that rate, will this world be brought to God? We gain two ; we lose four. Eternal God ! what will this come to?"

A late writer speaks thus concerning the work of the gospel in the world at large :—

"A statistical expert declares that there are about 1,450,000,000 human beings living on the earth to-day. In Asia, where the race was first planted, there are 800,000,000, in Europe there are 320,000,000, in Africa there are 210,000,000, and in North and South America 110,000,000. In the islands of the sea there are probably 10,000,000 more. Three fifths of the whole are barbarous or savage, two thirds are heathen, and three fourths are anti-Christian. Not less than 1,050,000,000 souls are as yet unacquainted with their Saviour—a fact which shows that there is still some work left for the missionary to do."—*Illustrated New England Magazine, Aug. 7, 1886.*

Mr. W. E. Blackstone of Oak Park, Illinois, at the Prophetic Conference held in Farwell Hall, Chicago, Nov. 16-21, 1886, said in reference to the boasted work of missions :—

"There has come to be a great difference between Christ and Christianity. Christianity is a term which now embraces more than 100,000,000 of Protestants and 250,000,000 of Greeks, Orientals, and Catholics, who profess no change of heart, but simply because they are not Mohammedans or Buddhists, are regarded as servants

of Christ. Surely this is Satan's arithmetic. The true Christians of all denominations are a comparatively little handful of witnessing disciples 'holding forth the word of life,' in the midst of the world's masses who are plunging on the broad road to destruction. 'Ah! what a dark picture,' says one. Indeed it is, but it's true, for it was painted by Jesus in answer to the question, 'Are there few that be saved?' — *Prophetic Studies*, p. 199.

On the same page he says: —

"While Christian missions in 100 years have gained 600,000 converts from Mohammedans and heathen, representing with their families a possible population of 3,000,000, the population of the latter has increased 200,000,000, or about seventy to one. Think, as you read your Holy Bible, that every chapter, nay, every verse, nay, every letter, stands for over 230 of the heathen. What a throng of aching hearts one single precious promise would thus represent. It is an awful fact that in these closing years of the nineteenth century 15,000,000, possibly 30,000,000, are serving Christ, while 1,200,000,000, are serving Satan — 'children of the devil taken captive at his will.' And so it has been in past generations. Every thirty-three years a new host floods the road to darkness. Ah, you say this is discouraging! So it is in the false assumption that all living are to be converted in this dispensation. How long, how long at this rate shall we be in 'bringing the world to Christ?'"

In showing the trend of the popular mind in reference to expenditures, the same speaker said: —

"For the annual support of the gospel, education, and charities: sixty-five thousand clergymen, including Catholic priests, \$1000 each, \$65,000,000; public schools, \$103,949,528; universities and colleges, \$5,124,189; charities estimated, \$24,426,283; missions, home and foreign, \$5,500,000; total, \$204,000,000.

"Thousands of ministers in the West and South do not receive \$200 apiece, and it is a little objectionable about including public schools, in many of which the Bible is prohibited; but we wish to make the total liberal and large, and \$204,000,000 does seem a grand sum to be annually expended in the service of Christ. But look at the other side.

"Our nation spends for liquor, \$900,000,000; for tobacco, \$600,000,000; luxuries and frivolities, \$100,000,000, the latter including \$25,000,000 for kid gloves and \$500,000 for ostrich feathers, making a total of \$1,600,000,000. One dollar for Christ, to \$8 for self and Satan! But let us look at an aggregate for ninety years. Dr. Dorchester gives the total receipts of all foreign missionary societies in the United States since their origin until 1880, at \$57,628,946; home missionary societies, \$72,676,801; religious publication houses including Sunday-school and tract societies, \$109,483,436; support

of clergymen and churches for ninety years, \$3,154,950,000; total, \$3,394,339,183. This is a very great sum, and it might fill us with admiration for the Christian consecration of our nation. But behold the appalling sum on the other side! . . . Christian nations are said to have spent for war in the nineteenth century over \$15,000,000,000, and for missions \$300,000,000. One dollar for the sword of the Spirit to \$50 for the gods of war! — *Ibid.*, p. 198.

And this result is after more than eighteen and one half centuries of Christianity. It is not, however, because missionary work is neglected; for during the past hundred years, great efforts have been put forth in this direction. It is, however, a fact, according to statistics, that the annual birth-rate among the heathen is largely in excess of the converts among them to Christianity. Take, for instance, the population of India, 250,000,000. Allowing the birth-rate to be five per cent, which is a moderate estimate, the annual increase of inhabitants would be 12,500,000. If the converts to Christianity were to count up 100,000 a year in that country, it would be considered almost a miracle of grace. But even then the excess of births over the converts would be 12,400,000 every year. Lest these figures should seem appalling, we will make the estimate ten times more favorable toward evangelizing the heathen world. Suppose that each year there is but one birth for every 100 inhabitants of India, and that only one half of this number live to grow up. The native increase would then be 1,250,000, or 1,150,000 births in excess of the annual conversions to Christianity.

Taking the whole heathen world as estimated at 1,000,000,000, and allowing one birth annually to every 200 inhabitants, it would give a yearly increase of inhabitants of 5,000,000. Reckoning the converts from all these, in the same proportion as from among the natives of India, we would receive into Christianity each year, 400,000, which would be considered an immense number. This would give, of heathen children each year, an excess of 4,600,000 over the converts to Christianity. At this rate the prospect of converting the world before the Lord comes, so that all shall know

him from the least unto the greatest, is certainly not very flattering.

That this is not considered an extreme view of the matter by those who have studied the subject is shown by the following from Rev. James Johnson, F. S. S., in "*A Century of Christian Missions*," published in 1886. He says:—

"The heathen and Mohammedan population of the world is more by 200 million than it was a hundred years ago; while the converts and their families do not amount to three million. The numbers now generally accepted as accurate and quoted by the church, missionary, and other societies, are 173 millions of Mohammedans and 874 millions of heathen, 1047 [million] in all. . . . We mourn over the sad fact that the increase of the heathen is numerically more than seventy times greater than that of the converts."

This also, from Rev. Arthur T. Pierson, in the *Missionary Review of the Word* for May, 1889:—

"If for the conversion of the world we labor and look, the present prospect is, it must be confessed, somewhat disheartening. The Christian Church has nineteen centuries as her working period, and out of 1,500,000,000 of inhabitants, has only about 30,000,000 Protestant church members. After a century of modern missions, with over one hundred missionary societies, some 300 translations of the Gospels, some 6000 missionaries in the field, and an annual expenditure of over ten millions of dollars, we have but a million and a half of converts to show. The territory of Brahminism and Buddhism has been invaded, but never pervaded. As yet, Confucianism mocks our efforts, and Islamism defies us at its central strongholds. We are making very slow progress in converting the world; and even 'Christian nations' do such unchristian things that they are sometimes, by their traffic in rum and opium, and in the bodies and souls of men, the chief hinderances of the missionary. Meanwhile, the increase of population far outruns us, and leaves our proselytism and propagandism hopelessly in the rear. No wonder the 'pessimists' are triumphant."

THE INCREASE OF CRIME.

Henry Ward Beecher spoke as follows from the pulpit of Plymouth church, Nov. 15, 1868:—

"The want of indignation at flagrant wickedness is one of the alarming symptoms of our times. We are living in the midst of an amount of corruption second only to that of Sodom and Gomorrah."

At the National Convention of the Association for the Amendment of the Constitution, at Philadelphia, 1871, the Rev. Mr. McAllister said:—

"The dishonesty, the profanity, the drunkenness, the licentiousness, of a large proportion of our public men are simply notorious. They are the most tangible point of our political malady. They are the outward manifestations, to which we cannot be blind, of a diseased system."

The *Watchman and Reflector*, of March, 1872, under the head of "The Era of Crime," says:—

"Bank robberies, ring-despotisms, official corruptions, domestic tragedies, garrotings, burglaries, suicides,—these come in upon us like tidal waves, so constant and regular in their visitation that we are no longer startled by them. But of late there seems to have been a change. The sea of crime, always beating and surging and roaring around us, has lifted itself to an unusual height, and is deepening its thunderings. . . . There can be no doubt that much of this revolting wickedness is but the outgrowth of the low moral sentiment which pervades our entire communities."

The *Christian Union*, of Nov. 4, 1874, says:—

"Not infrequently do we hear it said that the present is an exceptionally wicked generation, that society is becoming rapidly demoralized, and that the prospect in regard to the future is very dark and discouraging. And indeed it is not to be denied that corruption, both in private and public life, is lamentably frequent, that crime of every grade abounds, and that men in all the relations of life exhibit a degree of selfishness which shows that the millennium is yet afar off."

The *California Christian Advocate* (Methodist), of Nov. 5, 1874, says:—

"An observer of public morals at the present day cannot fail to see the effort being made to blend or obscure the line of distinction between right and wrong in all matters where the pleasures of the world or the gratification of the passions are interfered with."

The *Des Moines Leader*, of Nov. 18, 1886, says:—

"Crime is on the increase. The fact itself can hardly be denied. Every source of statistical information confirms it. And the increase is enormous."

PREPARATIONS FOR WAR.

The following is the latest compiled list of men, horses, and cannon held in readiness for war emergen-

cies by the powers of Europe. The figures given represent the regular standing armies of the countries mentioned. In case of war these numbers could be swelled indefinitely : —

Russia	1,519,810 men.	Austria	856,980 men.
Russia	181,000 horses.	Austria	58,125 horses.
Russia	2,084 cannon.	Austria	1,600 cannon.
Germany	835,000 men.	England	478,800 men.
Germany	96,000 horses.	France	300,000 men.
Germany	2,022 cannon.		

The remaining states of Europe make up with the above a total of about 5,000,000 men.

Concerning the use of dynamite in war, *Harper's Weekly*, of March 29, 1884, had an article in which it described a newly invented gun designed for throwing dynamite. It describes the gun as a brass tube four inches in diameter, and forty feet long, operated by compressed air, which obviates the danger of premature explosion by the use of powder. It further says : —

“It consists of a cartridge of dynamite inclosed in a case of soft metal. Attached to the base is a wooden sabot, the frustum of a cone designed to act like the feather on an arrow to guide the projectile in its flight. A percussion fuse in the front explodes the cartridge when it strikes. One shot would destroy any ship afloat, and dropped into a battalion of men, would act upon them like the explosion of a powder-mill.

“The gun can be made at any well-equipped machine shop, rapidly and cheaply. It is so light that it can be easily transported by sea or land, and promises to make a most formidable weapon in future warfare.”

The San Francisco *Chronicle*, of Jan. 30, 1875, thus comments on the warlike aspect of the world at that time : —

“A careful survey of the existing European situation seems almost sufficient to justify a belief in the prediction of the enthusiasts who declare that the true interpretation of John's apocalyptic vision shows that ‘the battle of the great day of God Almighty at Armageddon’ is actually at hand. All Europe is at present one vast camp. The nations are arming from the British Channel to the Ural Mountains; from the Mediterranean to the Baltic, as if with a prophetic understanding that a terrible and portentous crisis is at hand. The nations are becoming armies; the general masses of the people

are being turned into soldiers. The arsenals are busy shaping more deadly weapons of destruction than ever before known. The foundries are casting colossal cannon, compared with which those heretofore used in warfare are but children's toys.”

The outlook at the present writing (1893) is no better, but rather worse. Look at the view that presents itself : —

Russia intriguing to gain control of India and all the East.

Germany and France each hating the other and watching a favorable opportunity to fly at each other's throat.

Tumults in Ireland.

Anarchist demonstrations in every country.

CHAPTER XIV.

BAPTISM.

“WE are buried with him by baptism into death.” Rom. 6 : 4.

“Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.” Col. 2 : 12.

“For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.” Rom. 6 : 5.

The principal object of the ordinance of baptism is to show the faith of the recipient in the operation of God in raising Christ from the dead. After repenting of his transgressions of God’s law, one must have faith in the power of Christ to save. In other words, he must believe that although Christ died for sin, he was again made alive, to plead in the sinner’s behalf. Then the ordinance of baptism is received to show to others that the candidate really believes in what is claimed to be necessary — the burial and resurrection of Christ. The ordinance also shows one’s faith in the resurrection of all the dead, based on the resurrection of Christ.

HOW EARLY TEACHERS UNDERSTOOD THE SUBJECT.

Bishop Bossuet says : —

“We are able to make it appear, by the acts of councils, and by the ancient rituals, that for *thirteen hundred years* baptism was thus [by immersion] administered throughout the whole Church, as far as possible.”— *Stennett’s Answer to Russen*, p. 176.

Stackhouse says : —

“Several authors have shown and proved that this immersion continued, as much as possible, to be used for thirteen hundred years after Christ.”— *Hist. of the Bible*, p. 1234, sec. 8.

[278]

COMMENTS OF LATER SCHOLARS.

“That the baptism of John was by *plunging* the body (after the same manner as the washing of unclean persons was) seems to appear from those things which are related of him ; namely, that he baptized in the Jordan, that he baptized in Ænon, because there was much water there, etc.”— *A. Clarke’s comments following the book of Mark*.

“From these words [John 3 : 23] it may be inferred that baptism was administered by John and Christ by *plunging the whole body under water*.”— *Calvin’s Ped. Exam.*, vol. 1, p. 194.

“It is certain that in the words of our text [Rom. 6 : 3, 4] there is an allusion to the manner of baptism, which was by immersion, which is what our own church allows,” etc.— *Whitefield’s Eighteen Sermons*, p. 297.

John Wesley says : —

“Buried with him — alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion.”— *Note on Rom. 6 : 4*.

“But as they received baptism as an emblem of death in voluntarily going under the water, so they receive it as an emblem of the resurrection unto eternal life, in coming up out of the water ; thus they are baptized for the dead, in perfect faith of the resurrection. The three following verses seem to confirm this sense.”— *Dr. Clarke, on 1 Cor. 15 : 29*.

“It is needless to add that baptism was (unless in exceptional cases) administered by immersion, the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water to represent his death to the life of sin, and then raised from this momentary burial to represent his resurrection to the life of righteousness. It must be a subject of regret that the general discontinuance of this original form of baptism (though perhaps necessary in our northern climates) has rendered obscure to popular apprehension some very important passages of Scripture.”— *Conybeare and Howson’s Life of Paul*, pp. 401, 402, *people’s edition*.

CHAPTER XV.

THE NATURE OF MAN.

“THE immortality of the soul is rather supposed, or taken for granted, than expressly revealed in the Bible.”—*Bishop Tillotson's Sermons, vol. 2, A. P. 1774.*

Olshausen, the commentator, says :—

“The doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and the name, are alike unknown to the entire Bible.”—*Comments on 1 Cor. 15 : 19, 20.*

In Gen. 2 : 7, the original word for living soul is *nephesh chayah*. Dr. A. Clarke says of this :—

“A general term to express all creatures endued with animal life, in any of its infinitely varied gradations, from the half-reasoning elephant down to the stupid potto, or lower still, to the polyp, which seems equally to share the vegetable and animal life.”

Prof. George Bush in his “Notes on Genesis,” says of this text :—

“The phrase ‘living soul’ is in the foregoing narrative repeatedly applied to the inferior orders of animals, which are not considered to be possessed of a ‘soul’ in the sense in which that term is applied to man. It would seem to mean the same, therefore, when spoken of man, that it does when spoken of beasts; viz., an animated being, a creature possessed of life and sensation, and capable of performing all the physical functions by which animals are distinguished, as eating, drinking, walking, etc. . . . Indeed, it may be remarked that the Scriptures generally afford much less *explicit* evidence of the existence of a sentient, immaterial principle in man, capable of living and acting separate from the body, than is usually supposed.”

“There is no word in the Hebrew language that signifies either soul or spirit in the technical sense in which we use the term, as implying something distinct from the body.”—*Dr. McCulloch, Credibility of the Scriptures, vol. 2, p. 466.*

“That the soul is naturally immortal . . . is contradicted by the Scripture, which makes our immortality a gift dependent on the will of the giver.”—*Watson's Theological Institute, vol. 2, part 2, chap. 18.*

H. H. Dobney, Baptist minister of England, says :—

“If in these days of multiplied infallibilities, it may be allowed us to prefer an apostolic and inspired exposition of the original record, we shall respectfully take leave to affirm that there is *no expression* on the opening page of a progressive revelation, which teaches the unutterably grand prerogative of an *uncontingent immortality* for all mankind.”—*Future Punishment, p. 120.*

In enumerating the faith of the “General Baptists” who flourished in England in the sixteenth century, Mosheim says :—

“They believe that the soul, from the moment that the body dies, until its resurrection at the last day, remains in a state of perfect insensibility.”—*Church History, cent. 16, chap. 3, sec. 3, part 2, par. 23.*

The following words purport to be those of Luther himself, and express the views he held in 1522 on the nature of man and the state of the dead :—

“As to purgatory, I think it a very uncertain thing. It is probable, in my opinion, that, with very few exceptions indeed, the dead sleep in utter insensibility till the day of Judgment. As to purgatory itself, I do not agree with the sophists in thinking it a determinate place. Who will venture to give an assured opinion on the subject? On what authority can it be said that the souls of the dead may not sleep out the interval between earth and heaven, or hell, or purgatory, in the same way that the living pass in profound slumber the interval between their downlying at night and their uprising in the morning?”—*Michelet's Life of Luther, Bohn's edition, p. 133.*

The Catholic author, Duperron, in writing against the reformers and their work asserts that—

“Luther held that the *soul died with the body*, and that God would hereafter raise both the one and the other.”—*Historical View, p. 344.*

In attempting to refute this statement, a Lutheran writer admitted the following :—

“The origin of this calumny is a letter he [Luther] wrote to Amsdorf in the year 1522; in which he appears much inclined to

believe that the *souls* of the just *sleep* to the day of Judgment, *without knowing where they are*. He does not pretend to say they are dead in this interval, but only lie in a *profound rest and sleep*, in which opinion he followed many fathers of the ancient Church."—*Ibid.*, p. 347.

"Among Christians I know of but one [S. Drew] who has regarded the immortality of the soul as susceptible of demonstration. Should we believe with this ingenious writer that the soul, metaphysically considered, is so formed as naturally to be immortal, we must still acknowledge, because it cannot be denied, that its existence *may terminate at death*, or any other supposable period. Whatever has been created, can certainly be annihilated by the power which created it."—*Dwight's Sermons*, vol. 1, p. 163.

John Milton, author of "Paradise Lost," was not a believer in the immortality of the soul. He said:—

"The death of the body is the loss or extinction of life. The common definition, which supposes it to consist in the separation of soul and body, is inadmissible. . . . For what could be more just than that he who had sinned in his whole person, should die in his whole person? Or, on the other hand, what could be more absurd than that the mind, which is the part principally offending, should escape the threatened death; and that the body alone, to which immortality was equally allotted before death came into the world by sin, should pay the penalty of sin by undergoing death, though not implicated in the transgression?—*The State of the Dead*, pp. 14, 15.

Rev. Charles H. Oliphant in the introduction to a new work entitled, "The Extinction of Evil," says:—

"We believe that immortality must be sought at the feet of Him 'who only hath' it. The traditional dogma that endless life is the inherent and necessary attribute of every human soul, is repudiated; and with it the two mischievous corollaries to which it lends support,—the doctrines of eternal torment and of universal salvation."—*Page 13*.

ORIGIN OF THE NATURAL IMMORTALITY THEORY.

"The serpent said unto the woman, *Ye shall not surely die*, . . . your eyes shall be opened, and *ye shall be as gods*." Gen. 3:4, 5.

Mr. Darby, the leading spirit among the "Plymouth Brethren," England, makes this singularly frank acknowledgment:—

"I would express the conviction that the idea of the immortality of the soul,* although recognized in Luke 12:5 and 21:38, is not in general a gospel topic; that it comes on the contrary from the Platonists; and that it was just when the coming of Christ was denied in the Church, or at least began to be lost sight of, that the

doctrine of the immortality of the soul came in to replace that of the resurrection. This was about the time of Origen. It is hardly needful to say that I do not doubt the immortality of the soul. I only assert that this view has taken the place of the doctrine of the resurrection of the Church as the epoch of its joy and glory."

In a foot-note to the above, Mr. D. makes this further concession:—"* In the expression 2 Tim. 1:10, 'Brought life and immortality to light'—immortality signifies the incorruptibility of the body, and not the immortality of the soul,"—*Hopes of the Church*, pp. 47, 48. London.

Herodotus, a Greek, born B. C. 484, regarded as the first and one of the most reliable of profane historians, says:—

"The *Egyptians* were also the *first* who asserted the doctrine that the soul of man is immortal."—*Herod. Euter.* 2., par. 123.

Bunsen, in his work on Egypt, says:—

"The *Egyptians* were the *first* who taught the doctrine of the immortality of the soul,—a fact mentioned by all the Greek writers from Herodotus to Aristotle, and one brilliantly confirmed by the monuments."—*Egypt in Universal Hist.*, vol. 4, p. 639.

Balfour testifies:—

"Mr. Stanley says the *Egyptians* were the first who asserted that the soul of man was immortal, and cites in proof, *Eusebius, Diodorus, Siculus, and Halicarnassus*."—*Inter. State*, p. 73.

Bishop Warburton says:—

"The *Egyptians* as we are assured by the *concurrent testimony of antiquity*, were among the first who taught that the soul survived the body, and was immortal."—*Divine Lega. of Moses Dem.*, vol. 2, p. 239.

GREEKS AND ROMANS LEARN IT FROM THE EGYPTIANS.

"It seems plain that the Greeks derived many of their notions concerning the fate and state of the dead from Egypt."—*Alger's Doctrine of a Future Life*, p. 101.

In the "Elements of Mythology," p. 36, we find the following:—

"The ancient *Egyptians* are considered as the original inventors of the arts, science, and religion of Greece."

Warburton, speaking of Pythagoras, says:—

"He and Plato with others, traveled into Egypt, like their predecessors. . . . The ancients tell us of their long abode there; their hard condition of admittance into the sacred colleges; and their *bringing away with them all the secret science of the priesthood*."—*Div. Lega.*, vol. 2, pp. 108, 109.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE ORDINANCE OF HUMILITY.

"If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an *example*, that ye should do *as* I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. *If ye know* these things, happy are ye *if ye do them*." John 13: 14-17.

The word "*ought*" in this scripture is from the Greek *ὀφείλω*, and, according to Greenfield, means, "to be bound to the performance of some duty, be obliged, be under obligation." The lexicons are agreed that it has the full strength of command, duty, or binding obligation. It is so translated in the common version. See Luke 17: 10; Rom. 15: 27; 2 Thess. 1: 3; 2: 13.

Dr. Wayland says:—

"*'Ought'* puts us under obligation to act."—*Moral Science*, p. 54.

"The word is of binding force, and imposes duty."—*J. Winebrenner, in Practical Sermons*.

"To be held or bound in duty or moral obligation."—*Webster*.

"Some have understood this *literally*, and have thought these words amount to the institution of a standing ordinance in the Church; that Christians, should, in a solemn, religious manner, *wash one another's feet*, in a token of their condescending love to one another. St. Ambrose took it so, and practiced it in the church of Milan."—*Matthew Henry's comments on John 13: 14*.

"Feet-washing became, as might be expected, a part of the observances practiced in the early Church. The real signification, however, was soon forgotten, or overloaded by superstitious feelings and mere outward practices. Traces of the practice abound in ecclesiastical history."—*Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, art., *Washing of Feet*.

"We confess that feet-washing is an ordinance of Christ, which he himself administered to his disciples, and recommended by example to the practice of believers."—*Waldensian Confession of Faith*, p. 12.

In the "Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature," vol. 3, p. 616, we find the following:—

"The act thus performed by Christ at the institution of the supper, suggests to believers at every communion this lesson of humility. It is also an *example* of humility, patience, forbearance, and charity. . . . In the post-apostolic times, the command, 'Ye also ought to wash one another's feet,' came to be observed, not only after the spirit, but also after the letter. . . . In the Greek Church, feet-washing came to be even considered as a sacrament."

"The Church of England at first carried out the letter of the command."

"The Anabaptists continued the practice of feet-washing, which in consideration of the passages, John 13: 24, 1 Tim. 5: 10, they considered as a sacrament instituted and recommended by Christ." [See the "Confessio" of the United Baptists or Mennonites of 1660.]

Mr. C. Schmidt, Professor of theology of Strasburg, Alsace, France (now Germany), in his "History and Doctrine of the Sect of the Cathares, or Albigenses," p. 26, says:—

"They had adopted the custom of washing one another's feet, in imitation of the example of the Saviour, who had washed the feet of his disciples to give them a lesson of humility."

CHAPTER XVII.

BIBLE PLAN OF SUPPORTING THE MINISTRY.

"TITHE,—a tenth. The proportion of a man's income devoted to sacred purposes (Gen. 14:20; 28:22), prescribed by the Mosaic law (Num. 31:31). A two-fold tithe was required of each citizen. The first consisted of one tenth of the produce of his fields, trees, and herds, to be given to God (Lev. 27:30-32). The Levites paid a tenth part of what they received to the priests (Num. 18:26-28). The second tithe required of each landholder one tenth of the nine parts of his produce remaining after the first tithe, to be used at the temple in entertaining the Levites (Deut. 12:17-19, 22-29). Every third year a special provision was made for the poor, either out of this second tithe, or in addition to it (Deut. 14:28, 29). The system of tithes was renewed both before and after the captivity (2 Chron. 31:5, 6, 12); but they were not always regularly paid, and then the divine blessing was withheld (Mal. 3:8-12)." — *Prof. A. L. Rawson, D. D., LL. D., Pronouncing Bible Dictionary, printed in Holman's Family Bibles.*

Cunningham Geikie, D. D., in his "Life of Christ," p. 175, says:—

"A tithe for them [the priests] and the Levites, was required each year from every kind of farm or garden produce, even the smallest, and from all live stock, and property of any kind; and a second tenth each third year for the poor."

Malcom's "Bible Dictionary" testifies thus:—

"By the Jewish law, the tenth of the product of corn, cattle, etc., was assigned to the Levites. Of what remained to the proprietor, another tithe was levied, and in value or kind sent to the service of the tabernacle and temple, and the ministers thereof, at the solemn feasts. On every third year a *third tithe* was levied, for the use of the Levites, and the fatherless, widows, and strangers."

Smith's "Comprehensive Bible Dictionary" says:—

"From all this we gather, (1) That one tenth of the whole produce of the soil was to be assigned for the maintenance of the Levites; (2) that out of this the Levites were to dedicate one tenth

to God, for the use of the priests; (3) that a tithe, in all probability a second tithe, was to be applied to festival purposes; (4) that in every third year, either this festival tithe or a third tenth was to be eaten in company with the poor and the Levites." — *Art. Tithes, p. 1211, 1122.*

Josephus bears witness as follows:—

"Let there be taken out of your fruits a tenth beside what you have allotted to give to the priests and Levites. This you may indeed sell in the country, but it is to be used in those feasts and sacrifices that are to be celebrated in the holy city. . . . Besides those two tithes which I have already said you are to pay every year, the one for the Levites, the other for the festivals, you are to bring every year a tithe to be distributed to those that want; to women also that are widows, and to children that are orphans." — *Antiquities of the Jews, book 4, chap. 8, sections 8 and 22.*

"Horne's Introduction" says:—

"Another important privilege enjoyed by the poor was what were called second tithes and second firstlings. Besides the tenth received by the Levites, the Israelites were required to set apart another tenth of their garden and field produce, and in like manner of their cattle, a second set of offerings for the purpose of presenting as thank-offerings at the high festivals. Of these thank-offerings, only certain fat pieces were consumed on the altar; the remainder, after deducting the priest's portion, was appropriated to the sacrifice feasts, to which the Israelites were bound to invite the stranger, the widow, and the orphan." — *Vol. 2, part 2, chap. 8.*

John Gill, in his Comments on Deut. 26:12, says:—

"Every year a tithe was paid to the Levites; and besides that a second tithe, which was carried to Jerusalem and eaten there; and every third year it was eaten at home, in their towns and cities in the country instead of it, with the Levite, poor, and stranger, and was called the poor's tithe."

Richard Watson's "Bible Dictionary" says:—

"Of those nine parts that remained to the proprietors after the tithe was paid to the Levites, they took still another tenth part, which was either sent to Jerusalem in kind, or, if it was too far, they sent the value in money. . . . This tenth part was applied toward celebrating the festivals in the temple. The third year it was not brought to the temple, but was used upon the spot by every one in the city of his habitation." — *Page 913.*

Christian Missions, home and foreign, \$5,500,000 or £1,136,570.
Clergymen's Salaries, \$12,000,000, or £2,479,338.
Public Education, \$96,000,000, or £19,834,704.
Sugar and Molasses, \$155,000,000, or £32,024,798.
Boots and Shoes, \$197,000,000, or £40,702,479.
Cotton Goods, \$210,000,000, or £43,388,429.
Sawed Lumber, \$233,000,000, or £48,119,834.
Woolen Goods, \$237,000,000, or £48,966,942.
Iron and Steel, \$296,000,000, or £61,157,024.
Meat, \$303,000,000, or £62,603,305.
Bread, \$505,000,000, or £104,338,843.
Tobacco, \$600,000,000, or £123,966,942.
Liquor, \$900,000,000, or £185,950,463.

Comparative Cost of Liquor and Tobacco in the United States.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE WORLD'S CURSE.

INTEMPERANCE IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

"It is a wasting consumption, fastening upon the vitals of society; a benumbing palsy, extending to the extremities of the body; a deep and rapid torrent, bearing the wreck of nations in its course, and undermining rapidly the foundations of our own."—*Rev. Lyman Beecher, in 1812.*

The sum expended in the United States for alcoholic drinks, tobacco, tea and coffee, and opium, amounts to nearly \$1,600,000,000 (£330,578,512), more than \$30 (£6.4) annually for each man, woman, and child in the country. The sum expended is nearly \$250,000,000 (£51,652,892)—more than is expended for bread, meat, clothing, education, and Christian missions. The accompanying diagram shows the relative amount expended in the United States of America for intoxicating drinks, provisions, clothing, education, etc. It is based on the report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for 1887. The showing as therein set forth needs no comment. But this is for only one nation. Considering what farther appears in this reading, regarding the liquor traffic of other countries, one can see what an enormous evil intemperance has everywhere become.

According to statistics collected at Washington, \$900,000,000 (£185,950,463) are annually spent in this country for malt and spirituous liquors. In Chicago the estimate is one baker for every *four hundred and seventy families*, one grocer for every *eighty-nine families*, and one liquor saloon for every *thirty-five families*.

During the past six years the population of Chicago has increased twenty-five per cent. During the same time the consumption of beer in that city has increased ninety-seven per cent, and arrests have increased thirty-eight per cent.

According to Dr. B. W. Richardson, if all the public houses in the United States were grouped together, they would make a city of 180,000 houses, with 900,000 inhabitants, which, with attendants and frequenters, would equal London in size.

During the first month after the closing of the wholesale liquor houses in Sioux City, Iowa, the arrests numbered one hundred and thirty less than in the previous month.

It is stated that 75,000 gallons of aniline dye were shipped into California in 1887, to be used in the adulteration of wine made in that State.

During the presidential campaign of 1884, there were held in New York City, 1002 political conventions, — congressional, assembly, aldermanic, etc. Two hundred and eighty-three of these conventions were held *apart from saloons*, ninety-six *next door* to saloons, and six hundred and twenty-three *in* saloons. How long shall such politicians be allowed to mould public sentiment?

Col. Switzer, of the National Bureau of Statistics, states that at the request of the National Druggist's Association, he has just concluded an investigation to ascertain what proportion of the liquor consumed yearly in this country, is used in the manufactories of the Association. He finds that this percentage, instead of being 50, as had been claimed, or even 30, was only 7.2 per cent. Col. Switzer also said that the annual consumption of strong drink in the United States, averaged an annual cost of \$47 (£9.14.4) to every man, woman, and child.

The amount of liquor consumed in the United States for thirteen years, from 1860-1872 inclusive, was 2,762,-962,066 gallons. The cost to the consumers was \$6,-780.161,805 (£1,400 859,877). If put in wagons, ten

barrels to the wagon, they would extend 45,560 miles — nearly twice around the earth.

At a Conference of distillers recently held in Chicago, it was declared that the business was never in a better condition, and that the trade did not need any legislation at the hands of Congress. *They protested against the reduction of the present high license*, in which action they were supported by the representatives from Nebraska, where a \$1000 (£206) saloon license was required.

INTEMPERANCE IN GREAT BRITAIN.

"I am so horrified at intemperance and the consumption of alcohol in this country that sometimes I feel like giving up everything, and going forth in a holy crusade, preaching to all men, Beware of the enemy of the race." — *Dr. Andrew Clarke, physician to Queen Victoria.*

Archdeacon Farrar returned to England a warm supporter of the Maine prohibitory law, reporting that America was far ahead of England on the temperance question. Figures support his observation.

The consumption, *per capita*, of malt liquors in England, is thirty-five gallons, against eleven gallons in the United States. Reliable statistics show that the latter country ranks the eleventh among the nations of the earth in the consumption, *per capita*, of alcoholic liquors, and sixth in the corresponding consumption of malt liquors.

The distilleries of Edinburgh, Scotland, produce annually over 4,000,000 gallons of whisky.

The *London Christian*, commenting upon "Ireland's drink bill," says: —

"It is rather a startling fact that the poorest country in the world should be spending annually eleven million pounds upon an absolutely unproductive luxury."

When speaking of the world's curse, tobacco must not be forgotten. In 1841, when the population of Great Britain was twenty-six million, twenty-three million pounds of tobacco were used. In 1887, with a population of thirty-seven million, fifty-three million pounds were used.

INTEMPERANCE IN OTHER COUNTRIES.

It is estimated that for every missionary who goes to Africa, seventy-five thousand gallons of liquor are sent to that country.

Wm. Hewitt, speaking of the "Revenues of Russia," attributed the wide-spread intemperance to the influence of the government.

"The tax on brandy forms the most important item in the revenue of Russia; it amounts to more than fifty millions of rubles."

A writer in the *Nation* (New York City) says:—

"In Belgium the consumption of alcohol since 1840 has increased from eighteen to forty-three millions of francs, and in the industrial counties there is one dram-shop for every six or seven persons. Thus in Belgium the working classes spend between fifty and sixty millions of francs for alcohol."

The *Work-a-Day World*, of France, draws the following alarming picture of the French industrial centers:—

"Drunkenness is the beginning and ending of life in the great French industrial centers. Against this vice what can the salaries of women and children do? The woman's labors help the drunken husband on the road to ruin. The child is born with disease in his bones, and with evil example before him. There are manufacturing towns (Lille, for instance) where the women have followed the example of the men, and have added drunkenness to their other vices. It is estimated that at Lille, twenty-five out of every one hundred men, and twelve out of every one hundred women, are confirmed drunkards."

A recent Swiss document states:—

"In little less than nine months, from April 12 to Dec. 31, 1876, there were 349 arrests in the city of Geneva, of individuals found in a state of intoxication on the public streets, and carried to the police station: and from Jan. 1 to Oct. 2, 1877, there were 610 arrests of the same character. The reports of the cantonal hospital from 1865 to 1873, indicate 224 cases of delirium tremens, 402 of chronic alcoholism. From 1874 to 1876, there were 26 cases of alcoholic pneumonia, 114 of delirium tremens, 52 of chronic alcoholism, 11 of absintheism, and 4 of 'vermouthism'—207 in three years, or 67 a year, not including some cases of drunkenness."

Mr. Labaree, a missionary in Persia, writes:—

"If I had any sentiments favorable to the use of wine when I left America, my observations during the seven years I have resided in this paradise of vineyards, have convinced me that the principle of total abstinence is the only safeguard against the great social and religious evils that flow from the practice of wine-drinking. . . . There is scarcely a community to be found where the blighting influences of intemperance are not seen in families distressed and ruined, property squandered, character destroyed, and lives lost."

From the "Encyclopedia Britannica," we learn that while Germany (including Alsace-Lorraine) made 1,000,000,000 gallons of wine and 857,000,000 gallons of beer, in the same year the Prussian provinces east of the Elbe, including Mecklenburg and Saxony, with a population of 19,000,000, produced 72,000,000 gallons of spirits; and the rest of Germany, with 24,000,000 people, produced 25,000,000 gallons. Of these spirits no appreciable quantity was exported. Here is a total average of 20 gallons of beer and $2\frac{1}{3}$ gallons of spirits *per capita*.

While it is true that great good has been accomplished by thousands of noble workers in the ranks of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Good Templars, the American Health and Temperance Association, and other organizations laboring to protect the innocent and uplift the fallen, yet the statistics here given show that much remains to be accomplished. The most direct and deadly blow that can be given this monster evil is to PROHIBIT instead of *licensing* its existence.

CHAPTER XIX.

SCRIPTURE CRITICISMS.

GENESIS 2:17.

“BUT of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.”

Dr. Adam Clark has the following interesting comment upon this passage:—

“‘Thou shalt surely die.’ *Moth tamoth*, literally, a death thou shalt die, or dying, thou shalt die. . . . From that moment thou shalt become mortal, and shalt continue in a dying state till thou die. This we find literally accomplished; every moment of man’s life may be considered as an act of dying till soul and body are separated. Other meanings have been given of this passage, but they are in general either fanciful or incorrect.”

LUKE 23:43.

“And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.”

J. H. McCulloch, M. D., in *Our Rest*, treats on the above subject as follows:—

“Persons unaware of the manner in which the ancient Greek manuscripts were written, must be informed that the Scriptures were originally written, not only without points, but also without separation of the words from each other. The following is a literal translation of the passage in question, which to prevent any cavil, I have taken from the ‘Triglott Evangelist’s Interlinear Translation,’ and which I have copied in the manner in which the ancient Greek manuscripts were written:—

“‘And he said to Jesus remember me Lord when thou shalt come in thy dominion and said to him Jesus Verily I say to thee today with me thou shalt be in paradise now it was about the third hour,’ etc.

“Question.—‘Remember me when thou comest *in* thy kingdom.’ So the ‘Revised Version’ and ‘Emphatic Diaglott.’

“Response.—Original Greek, *Αμην λεγω σοι σημερον μετ’ εμου εση εν τω παραδεισω*.

“Separated.— *Αμην λεγω σοι σημερον μετ’ εμου εση εν τω παραδεισω*
 “Meaning.— *Αμην λεγω σοι σημερον μετ’ εμου*.
 Indeed I say to thee to-day with me.

“Rendered.— ‘Indeed I say to thee to-day thou shalt be with me in paradise.’”

Marsh’s “Ecclesiastical History” says:—

“The Greek manuscripts were written in capital letters, and without any separation of words.”—*p. 264*.

Smith’s “Comprehensive Bible Dictionary” thus states it:—

“But though no fragment of the New Testament of the first century still remains, the Italian and Egyptian papyri, which are of that date, give a clear notion of the caligraphy of the period. In these the text is written in columns, rudely divided, in somewhat awkward capital letters, without any punctuation or division of words.”—*Art. N. T., p. 2113, ed. 1870*.

Johnson’s “New Universal Cyclopaedia,” art. Punctuation, says:—

“Greek codices up to the eighth century, although beautifully written and illuminated, show no spaces between the words, and the punctuation is merely a period placed at the end of a sentence and above the line.”

Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary, art. Punctuation, says:—

“The ancients were unacquainted with punctuation; they wrote without any distinction of members, periods, or words. The modern points came into use very gradually after the invention of printing. The first printed books have only arbitrary marks here and there, and it was not until the sixteenth century that an approach was made to the present system by the Manutii of Venice.”

“American Encyclopedia,” art. Punctuation, has the following:—

“The modern points came into use very gradually after the invention of printing, the comma, parenthesis, note of interrogation, and period being the earliest introduced, and the note of exclamation, the last. The first printed books have only arbitrary marks here and there, and it was not until the sixteenth century that an approach was made to a regular system by the Manutii of Venice.

Quackenbos's "Rhetoric," p. 82, says:—

"The modern system of punctuation was invented by Manutius, a learned printer who flourished in Venice at the commencement of the sixteenth century. To him we are indebted for developing the leading principles of the art, though in some of their details they have since that time undergone considerable modification."

Hayden's "Dictionary of Dates," art. Punctuation, says:—

The ancients do not appear to have had any system, and doubtless employed arbitrary signs to distinguish the parts of a discourse. Of our points the period (.) is the most ancient; the colon (;) was introduced about 1485; the comma (,) was first seen about 1521; and the semicolon (;) about 1570. In Sir Philip Sidney's 'Arcadia' (1587) they all appear, as well as the note of interrogation (?) asterisk (*) and parenthesis ()."

The importance of the proper use of punctuation may be illustrated by the following: A young actor attempted to quote the passage from Shakespeare which says: "There's a divinity that shapes our ends, rough hew them how we will," but having partly forgotten its construction he blundered through it thus: "There is a divinity which shapes our ends rough, hew them as we will." By throwing the comma forward one word, the sense of the passage was entirely changed, which caused much laughter in the audience.

ACTS 13:42.

"And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath."

Bloomfield comments as follows:—

"The words *eis to metaxu sabb.* are by many commentators supposed to mean 'on some intermediate week day.' But that is refuted by verse 44, and the sense expressed in our common version is, no doubt, the true one. It is adopted by the best recent commentators, and confirmed by the ancient versions." . . .

Cranmer's translation reads, "The next Sabbath;" the Geneva translation, "The next Sabbath;" Rheims Testament, "The Sabbath following;" Taverner's ver-

sion, "The Sabbath following;" the Bishop's Bible, "The next Sabbath;" the Syriac Testament says, "The next Sabbath-day;" the "Comprehensive Commentary" says, "It appears (verse 44) that it was the next Sabbath-day that they came together." And after stating the names of some who dissent, it adds, "Erasmus, Glass, Kype, Krebs, Morus, Heiner, Kuin., also Syriac, Vulgate, Arabic, and Ethiopic, coincide with the English version; confirmed by verse 44." Dr. Tischendorf's translation, founded on the Sinaitic codex, the Vatican and the Alexandrian, is the same as our common version. Prof. Hackett, in his "Commentary on the Acts," says, "The next Sabbath. The Jewish Sabbath is of course here meant, corresponding to our Saturday." Dr. Owen on the Acts reads thus, "The next Sabbath."

1 CORINTHIANS 6:1-3.

"Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world?"
1 Cor. 6:2.

"Know ye not that we shall judge angels?" 1 Cor. 6:3.

Albert Barnes, in his notes on this text, says:—

"The common interpretation, that of Grotius, Beza, Calvin, Doddridge, etc., is that it refers to the future judgment, and that Christians will, in that day, be employed in some manner in judging the world. That this is the true interpretation is apparent for the following reasons: 1. It is the obvious interpretation, that which will strike the great mass of men, and is likely, therefore, to be the true one; 2. It accords with the account in Matt. 19:28 ('In the regeneration, ye shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel') and Luke 22:30 ('I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel'); 3. It is the only one which gives a fair interpretation to the declaration that the saints shall judge angels, in verse 3."

1 CORINTHIANS 16:2.

"Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come."

The whole question turns upon the meaning of the expression 'by him;' and I marvel greatly how you can imagine that it means

in the collection-box of the congregation.' Greenfield, in his Lexicon, translates the Greek term, *κατ' εαυτο*, 'with one's self, i. e., at home.' Two Latin versions, the Vulgate and that of Castellio, render it, '*apud se*,' with one's self at home. Three French translations, those of Martin, Osterwald, and De Sacy, '*chez soi*,' at his own house, at home. The German of Luther, '*bei sich selbst*,' by himself, at home. The Dutch, '*by hemselven*,' same as the German. The Italian of Diodati, '*appresso di se*,' in his own presence, at home. The Spanish of Felipe Sico, '*en su casa*,' in his own house. The Portuguese of Figueiredo, '*de parte alguma somma em sua casa*,' aside a certain sum, in his own house. The Swedish, '*nair sig sjelf*,' near himself.

"Let him designate a certain portion; let him do this by himself, when he is at home, when he can calmly look at the evidence of his prosperity." — *Barnes*.

"Some are of the opinion that the sums thus set apart were brought to the treasury of the Church at the time; but the words do not seem to admit of that interpretation; and if each separately laid by the sum which he proposed to give, the whole would be brought together at once, when necessary, without any trouble in soliciting contributions." — *Comp. comments on 1 Cor. 16:2*.

"Every one was to lay by in store (verse 2), have a treasury or fund with himself for this purpose. . . . Some of the Greek Fathers rightly observe here that this advice was given for the sake of the poorer among them. They were to lay by from week to week, and not bring in to the common treasury, that by this means their contributions might be easy to themselves, and yet grow into a fund for the relief of their brethren." — *Matthew Henry, comments on 1 Cor. 16:2*.

"The apostle only meant that there should be no private and petty gatherings, then first to be made, when he came, but only one *sunetiphora* [joint contribution] formed, containing all the sums which had been gradually laid up by each in private." — *Bloomfield, in Notes on Greek Text*.

"Certainly it may not be inferred from this passage that collections took place among the congregations on the Sabbath; for it was Paul's intention that each should make a suitable contribution." — *Olshausen's Com.*

"Lay by him in store; at home." — *Justin Edwards's Notes*.

"Let every one of you put aside at home, and lay vppe what ever he thinketh mete." — *Tyndale*.

"Par' heauto at one's home or house." — *Liddell and Scott's Lexicon*.

"Let each one of you lay by himself in store." — *Sawyer*.

"Let each one of you lay by him and treasure up." — *Anderson (Disciple)*.

"Let every one of you lay aside and preserve at home." — *Syriac*.

2 CORINTHIANS 3:6.

"Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the Spirit; for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life."

Thus Dr. Clarke says:—

"The apostle does not mean here, as some have imagined, that he states himself to be a minister of the new testament in opposition to the old; and that it is the old testament that kills, and the new that gives life. . . . The gospel has both its letter and its spirit; and multitudes of professing Christians, by resting in the letter, receive not the life which it is calculated to impart."

COLOSSIANS 2:16.

"Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath-days."

The complete use of the Greek word *heortee* (feast, here incorrectly translated *holy*), in the New Testament, as given in the "Englishman's Greek Concordance," is as follows:—

Matt. 26:5, they said, not on the *feast* (day).

Matt. 27:15, at (that) *feast* the governor was.

Mark 14:2, they said, not on the *feast* (day).

Mark 15:6, Now at (that) *feast* he released unto.

Luke 2:41, at the *feast* of the passover.

Luke 2:42, after the custom of the *feast*.

Luke 22:1, at the *feast* of unleavened bread.

Luke 23:17, release one unto them at the *feast*.

John 2:23, at the passover, in the *feast* (day).

John 4:45, at Jerusalem at the *feast*; for they also went unto the *feast*.

John 5:1, there was a *feast* of the Jews.

John 6:4, a *feast* of the Jews was nigh.

John 7:2, the Jews' *feast* of tabernacles was.

John 7:8, Go ye up unto this *feast*: I go not up yet unto this *feast*.

John 7:10, went he also up unto the *feast*.

John 7:11, Jews sought him at the *feast*.

John 7:14, About the midst of the *feast*.

John 7:37, The great (day) of the *feast*.

John 11:56, He will not come to the *feast*?

John 12:12, were come to the *feast*.

John 12:20, to worship at the *feast*.

John 13:1, before the *feast* of the passover.

John 13:29, need of against the *feast*.

Acts 18 : 21, by all means keep this *feast*.
Col. 2 : 16. or, in respect of an *holy day*.

Dr. Adam Clarke, says of this text : —

“The apostle speaks here in reference to some particulars of the handwriting of ordinances, which had been taken away; viz., the distinction of meats and drinks, what was clean and what unclean, according to the law; and the necessity of observing certain holy days or festivals, such as the new moons, and particular sabbaths, or those which should be observed with more than ordinary solemnity; all these had been taken out of the way and nailed to the cross, and were no longer of moral obligation. There is no intimation here that the *Sabbath* was done away, or that its moral use was superseded, by the introduction of Christianity. I have shown elsewhere that, ‘Remember the sabbath-day to keep it holy,’ is a command of perpetual obligation, and can never be superseded but by the final termination of time. . . . Besides, it is not clear that the apostle refers at all to the Sabbath in this place, whether Jewish or Christian; his *σαββατων*, of sabbaths or weeks, most probably refers to their feasts of weeks, of which much has been said in the notes on the Pentateuch.”

Dr. Albert Barnes says of it : —

“Or in respect of a *holy day*. . . . The word rendered ‘holy day’—*ἑορτή*—means properly a feast or festival, and the allusion here is to the festivals of the Jews. . . . ‘Or of the sabbath-days.’ Gr. ‘of the sabbaths.’ The word *sabbath* in the Old Testament is applied not only to the seventh day, but to all the days of holy rest that were observed by the Hebrews, and particularly to the beginning and close of their great festivals. There is, doubtless, reference to those days in this place, as the word is used in the plural number. . . . There is not the slightest reason to believe that he meant to teach that one of the ten commandments had ceased to be binding on mankind. If he had used the word in the singular number,—*the Sabbath*,—it would then, of course, have been clear that he meant to teach that that commandment had ceased to be binding, and that a Sabbath was no longer to be observed. But the use of the term in the plural number and the connection, show that he had his eye on the great number of days which were observed by the Hebrews as festivals, as a part of their ceremonial and typical law, and not to the moral law or the ten commandments. No part of the moral law—no one of the ten commandments, could be spoken of as ‘a shadow of good things to come.’ These commandments are, from the nature of moral law, of perpetual and universal obligation.”

“New Testament with Notes” by the American Tract Society, says : —

“Judge you: pronounce you good or bad, according to your treatment of the ceremonial law. A holy-day—sabbath-days: in the original, a festival sabbath. The days referred to are those required to be observed in the ceremonial law—days associated by God with meats, drinks, and new moons. The passage does not refer to the Sabbath of the moral law, associated with the commands forbidding theft, murder, and adultery. The weekly Sabbath was never against men or contrary to them, but was always for them, and promotive of their highest good. The observance of it caused them to ride upon the high places of the earth, and to possess the heritage of God’s people. Isa. 58 : 13, 14; Jer. 17 : 21–27.”

REVELATION 6 : 9, 10.

“And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held. And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?”

Dr. Adam Clarke makes the following comment : —

“A symbolical vision was exhibited in which he saw an altar. . . . The altar is upon the earth, not in heaven. ‘They cried,’ . . . that is, their blood, like that of Abel, cried for vengeance; for we are not to suppose that there was anything like a vindictive spirit in those happy and holy souls.”

Lightfoot, on Luke 16 : 19, says : —

“And that it was a parable, not only the consent of all expositors may assure us, but the thing itself teaches it.”

Whitby says on Luke 16 : —

“That this is only a parable, and not a real history of what was actually done, is evident.”

Theophylact, on Luke 16, says : —

“But this parable can only be explained in the way of allegory.”

Dr. A. Clarke, on Matt. 5 : 26, says : —

“Let it ever be remembered that by the general consent of all (except the basely interested) no metaphor is ever to be produced in proof of any doctrine. In the things that concern our eternal salvation, we need the most pointed and express evidence on which to establish the faith of our souls.”

THE JEWS ON "FOREVER."

On the word "forever" the learned Jews say:—

"Your critics insist on the words 'for ever,' in sempiternum, to 'the end of all ages.' We may answer them that the Hebrew words which are thus rendered, signify only a long and indefinite space of time; there are numberless instances of this in Scripture."—*Jew's Letters to Voltaire*, p. 423, ed. 1848.

TWO EVENINGS.

"The Hebrews reckoned two evenings; so in the phrase הערבין (between the two evenings), as making the interval or portion of the day during which the paschal lamb was to be killed (Ex. 12:6; Lev. 23:5; Num. 9:3, 5), and also the evening sacrifice was to be offered (Ex. 29:39, 41; Num. 28:4). The time thus marked was regarded by the Karaites and Samaritans as being the interval between sunset and dark. But the Pharisees and Rabbinites, according to the Mishnah (pesach 5:3), held the first evening to commence with the declining sun, and the second evening with the setting sun. This latter view was the prevailing one in the time of our Lord, the hour of evening sacrifice and prayer being then the ninth hour, or 3 P. M. (Acts 3:1), and the paschal lamb being regularly killed between the ninth and eleventh hours (Jos. B. J. 6. 9. 3). A like distinction of two evenings was made by the Greeks. In the New Testament ἡ ὄψις, marks: a) the former evening in Matt. 14:15 (comp. 5:23 and Mark 6:35). Matt. 27:57; Mark 4:35; 15:42; b) the latter evening in Matt. 8:16 and Mark 1:32; Matt. 14:23 comp. 15. Matt. 16:2; 20:8; 26:20; Mark 6:47; 14:17; John 6:46; 20:19."—*Robinson's Greek Lexicon to the New Testament*, p. 538.

"Ὀψις, evening, two of which were reckoned by the Hebrews: one from the ninth hour (3 o'clock) until sunset (Matt. 8:16; 14:15); and the other from sunset until dark (Matt. 14:23; 16:2), et al.; cf. Ex. 30:8; Lev. 23:5."—*Greenfield's Greek Lexicon*.

Wm. Mead Jones says:—

"The following was verified during my residence in the Holy Land, 1854-1861: not any of the nations, whether Jew or Arab, name the days of the week, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, etc.; nor do they call the first day of the week 'Lord's day,' nor do they ever give to the seventh day the name *Saturday*. But this I noticed constantly; the notation of time is by hours—twelve hours for the night, and twelve hours for the day, and both are called a day, *i. e.*, a complete or perfect day. The evening before the day belongs to that day, or the night precedes the day. Beginning with our Saturday night at sundown, they call it *layl-tel-had*—night of the first—the day being understood. Sunday night is called *layl-tel-itneen*—

night of the second—the day being understood, and rarely if ever expressed. . . . Never do they count the day from midnight to midnight, but always from sundown to sundown. The first hour of the night is one hour from and after sundown; and the first hour of the day-time is reckoned from and after the expiration of twelve complete hours of the night. The first hour of the morning of June 21, it will be seen, begins sometime after sunrise, and so ending the twelve hours of the day precisely at sundown. When an evening appointment is made for a meeting or business, the language used is 'night of the first,' 'night of the second,' etc. The only exception is where the appointment or event is soon after sundown, or in the early part of the evening, when the language is 'such a day at evening;' but the former mode of speech is the general one; yet in no case do they understand the expression, 'the same day at evening,' to mean that that evening belongs to that day, but to the day following."—*Review*.

ACTS 2:1-4.

"And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place."

H. B. Hackett, D. D., Professor of Biblical Literature in Newton Theological Institute, thus remarks:—

"It is generally supposed that this Pentecost, signalized by the outpouring of the Spirit, fell on the Jewish Sabbath, our Saturday."—*Comments on Acts 2:1*.

Dr. Albert Barnes says:—

"If the views of the Pharisees were followed, and the Lord Jesus had with them kept the passover on Thursday, as many have supposed, then the day of Pentecost would have occurred on the Jewish Sabbath, that is on Saturday.—*Kühn's Lightfoot*. It is impossible to determine the truth on this subject; nor is it of much importance. The day of Pentecost was kept by the Jews also as a festival, to commemorate the giving of the law on Mount Sinai."—*Notes on Acts 2:1*.

Jennings, in "Jewish Antiquities," p. 359 says:—

"Since Christ ate his last passover on the same day with the rest of the Jews, as we have already proved, namely, on the fourteenth of Nisan, which was Thursday, the next day, on which he was crucified, must be the first day of the feast of unleavened bread; therefore, the sixteenth day, the Saturday, was the first day of the seven weeks betwixt that and the Pentecost; consequently the fiftieth day, or the morrow after the seventh Sabbath or week, which was the day of Pentecost, must fall on the Saturday, or the Jewish Sabbath."

Olshausen, the well-known German commentator, says:—

“Now since, according to the accounts given regarding the time of the feast, the passover, in the year of our Lord’s death, fell so that the first day of the feast lasted from Thursday evening at six o’clock till Friday evening at the same hour, it follows of course that it was from Friday evening at six o’clock that the fifty days began to be counted. The fiftieth day fell, therefore, it appears, upon Saturday.”—*Comments on Acts 2:1.*

Dean Alford, in his “New Testament for English Readers,” says on this text:—

“The question on what day of the week this day of Pentecost was, is beset with the difficulties attending the question of our Lord’s last passover. (See notes on Matt. 26:17 and John 18:28.) It appears probable, however, that it was on the Sabbath, *i. e.*, if we reckon from Saturday, the 16th of Nisan.”

ACTS 20:7.

“And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow, and continued his speech until midnight.”

Elder Wm. Sheldon, a leading First-day Adventist, says:—

“We are driven to the conclusion that when Paul preached to the disciples at Troas, who ‘had come together to break bread’ upon ‘the first day of the week’ (there being many lights in the upper chamber, Paul continuing his speech till midnight), this ‘first day of the week’ having commenced at sunset on our Saturday night, the breaking of bread was on Saturday night, there being no other night on ‘the first day of the week,’ as the Jews counted time; nor will it change this conclusion if we conjecture that they were then counting time as the rest of the people did at Troas, instead of keeping the Jewish count; for it turns out that Troas was inhabited by the ancient Greeks, who always began their day at sunset, just like the Jews. Acts 20:7. If they had gathered to break bread on Sunday night, that would have been on the second day of the week, the first day having ended at sunset on Sunday, and the second day beginning at the same point.”—*World’s Crisis.*

Prof. H. B. Hackett, on Acts 20:7, says:—

“The Jews reckoned the day [in its broad sense, Gen. 1:5] from evening to morning, and on that principle the evening of the first day of the week would be our Saturday evening. If Luke

reckoned so here, as many commentators suppose, the apostle then waited for the expiration of the Jewish Sabbath, and held his last religious service with the brethren at Troas at the beginning of the Christian Sabbath, *i. e.*, on Saturday evening, and consequently resumed his journey on Sunday morning.”—*Commentary on Acts.*

But he endeavors to shield the first-day Sabbath from this fatal admission by suggesting that Luke probably reckoned time according to the pagan method, rather than by that ordained in the Scriptures.

Dr. John Kitto says:—

“It has, from this last circumstance [that this was an evening meeting], been inferred by some that the assembly commenced after sunset on the Sabbath, at which hour the first day of the week had commenced, according to the Jewish reckoning (Jahn’s ‘Biblical Antiquities,’ sec. 398), which would hardly agree with the idea of a commemoration of the resurrection.”—*Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature, art., Lord’s Day.*

William Prynne thus states the point:—

“Because the text saith there were many lights in the upper room where they were gathered together, and that Paul preached from the time of their coming together till midnight, . . . this meeting of the disciples at Troas, and Paul’s preaching to them, began at evening. The sole doubt will be what evening this was. For my own part, I conceive clearly that it was upon Saturday night, as we falsely call it, and not the coming Sunday night. . . . Because St. Luke records that it was upon the first day of the week when this meeting was. . . . Therefore it must needs be on the Saturday, not on our Sunday evening, since the Sunday evening in St. Luke’s and the Scripture account was no part of the first, but of the second day, the day ever beginning and ending at evening.”—*Dissertation on the Lord’s-day Sabbath, pp. 34-41, 1633.*

Prof. Mc Garvey, of the Disciple (Church of Christ) denomination, says:—

“I conclude, therefore, that the brethren met on the night after the Jewish Sabbath, which was still observed as a day of rest by all of them who were Jews or Jewish proselytes, and considering this the beginning of the first day of the week, spent it in the manner above described. On Sunday morning Paul and his companions resumed their journey, being constrained, no doubt, by the movements of the ship, which had already been in the harbor of Troas seven days.”—*Commentary on Acts.*

ROMANS 14: 5.

"One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."

Dr. Adam Clarke says: —

"*One man esteemeth one day above another.*' Perhaps the word ἡμέραν, day, is here taken for time, festival, and such like, in which sense it is frequently used. Reference is made here to the Jewish institutions, and especially their festivals; such as the passover, pentecost, feast of tabernacles, new moons, jubilee, etc. The converted Jew still thought these of moral obligation; the Gentile Christian, not having been bred up in this way, had no such prejudice. . . .

"*Another.*' The converted *Gentile esteemeth every day*, — considers that all time is the Lord's, and that each day should be devoted to the glory of God, and that those festivals are not binding on him. We add here *alike*, and make the text say what I am sure was never intended, viz., that there is no distinction of days, not even of the Sabbath; and that every Christian is at liberty to consider even this day to be holy or not holy as he happens to be persuaded in his own mind.

"That the Sabbath is of lasting obligation may be reasonably concluded from its institution (see note on Gen. 2: 3), and from its typical reference. All allow that the Sabbath is a type of that rest in glory which remains for the people of God. Now, all types are intended to continue in force till the antitype, or thing signified, takes place; consequently the Sabbath will continue in force till the consummation of all things. The word *alike* should not be added; nor is it acknowledged by any MS. or ancient version."

APPENDIX A.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

ARTICLE I.

SECTION 1. All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

No person shall be a representative who shall not have attained to the age of twenty-five years, and been seven years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State in which he shall be chosen.

Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other persons. The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct. The number of representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty thousand, but each State shall have at least one representative; and until such enumeration shall be made, the State of New Hampshire shall be entitled to choose three; Massachusetts, eight; Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, one; Connecticut, five; New York, six; New Jersey, four; Pennsylvania, eight; Delaware, one; Maryland, six; Virginia, ten; North Carolina, five; South Carolina, five; and Georgia, three.

When vacancies happen in the representation from any State, the executive authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies.

The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other officers, and shall have the sole power of impeachment.

SEC. 3. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two senators from each State, chosen by the legislature thereof, for six years; and each senator shall have one vote.

Immediately after they shall be assembled in consequence of the first election, they shall be divided as equally as may be into three classes. The seats of the senators of the first class shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year; of the second class, at the expiration of the fourth year; and of the third class, at the expiration of the sixth year, so that one third may be chosen every second year; and if vacancies happen by resignation, or otherwise, during the recess of the legislature of any State, the executive thereof may make temporary appointments until the next meeting of the legislature, which shall then fill such vacancies.

No person shall be a senator who shall not have attained to the age of thirty years, and been nine years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen.

The Vice-President of the United States shall be president of the Senate, but shall have no vote, unless they be equally divided.

The Senate shall choose their other officers, and also a president *pro tempore*, in absence of the Vice-President, or when he shall exercise the office of President of the United States.

The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose, they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief-Justice shall preside. And no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two thirds of the members present.

Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend farther than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States; but the party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment, according to law.

SEC. 4. The times, places, and manner of holding elections for senators and representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing senators.

The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall be on the first Monday in December, unless they shall, by law, appoint a different day.

SEC. 5. Each house shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and be authorized to compel the attendance of absent members, in such manner and under such penalties as each house may provide.

Each house may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its members for disorderly behavior, and with the concurrence of two thirds, expel a member.

Each house shall keep a journal of its proceedings, and from time

to time publish the same, excepting such parts as may in their judgment require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the members of either house on any question shall, at the desire of one fifth of those present, be entered on the journal.

Neither house, during the session of Congress, shall, without the consent of the other, adjourn for more than three days, nor to any other place than that in which the two houses shall be sitting.

SEC. 6. The senators and representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law, and paid out of the treasury of the United States. They shall in all cases, except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either house they shall not be questioned in any other place.

No senator or representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased, during such time; and no person holding any office under the United States shall be a member of either house during his continuance in office.

SEC. 7. All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments, as on other bills.

Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve, he shall sign it; but if not, he shall return it, with his objections, to that house in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their journal, and proceed to reconsider it. If after such reconsideration, two thirds of that house shall agree to pass the bill, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other house, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered; and if approved by two thirds of that house, it shall become a law. But in all such cases, the votes of both houses shall be determined by yeas and nays, and the names of the persons voting for and against the bill shall be entered on the journal of each house respectively. If any bill shall not be returned by the President within ten days (Sunday excepted) after it shall have been presented to him, the same shall be a law in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the Congress by their adjournment prevent its return; in which case it shall not be a law.

Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and the House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or, being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill.

SEC. 8. The Congress shall have power—

To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the

debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies, throughout the United States;

To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures;

To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States;

To establish post-offices and post-roads;

To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing, for limited times, to authors and inventors, the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries;

To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;

To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations;

To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water;

To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years;

To provide and maintain a navy;

To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such district (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings; and—

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other power vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

SEC. 9. The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding ten dollars for each person.

The privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* shall not be suspended,

unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it.

No bill of attainder or *ex post facto* law shall be passed.

No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration hereinbefore directed to be taken.

No tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State.

No preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to the ports of one State over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to or from one State, be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another.

No money shall be drawn from the treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States, and no person holding any office of profit or trust under them, shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office, or title, of any kind whatever, from any king, prince, or foreign state.

SEC. 10. No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit; make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts; pass any bill of attainder, *ex post facto* law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts, or grant any title of nobility.

No State shall, without the consent of the Congress, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports, except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws; and the net produce of all duties and imposts laid by any State on imports or exports, shall be for the use of the treasury of the United States; and all such laws shall be subject to the revision and control of the Congress.

No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty on tonnage, keep troops or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.

ARTICLE II.

SECTION I. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and, together with the Vice-President chosen for the same term, be elected as follows:—

Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of senators and representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress; but no senator or representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector.

The Congress may determine the time of choosing the electors, and the day on which they shall give their votes; which day shall be the same throughout the United States.

No person, except a natural-born citizen, or a citizen of the United States at the time of the adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the office of President; neither shall any person be eligible to that office who shall not have attained to the age of thirty-five years, and been fourteen years a resident within the United States.

In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice-President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice-President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

The President shall, at stated times, receive for his services a compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that period any other emolument from the United States, or any of them.

Before he enters on the execution of his office, he shall take the following oath or affirmation:—

“I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.”

SEC. 2. The President shall be Commander-in-Chief of the army and navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States; he may require the opinion, in writing, of the principal officer in each of the executive departments, upon any subject relating to the duties of their respective offices, and he shall have power to grant reprieves and pardon for offenses against the United States, except in cases of impeachment.

He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two thirds of the senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint, ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they think proper in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments.

The President shall have power to fill up all vacancies that may happen during the recess of the Senate, by granting commissions, which shall expire at the end of their next session.

SEC. 3. He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient; he may, on extraordinary occasions, convene both houses, or either of them, and in case of disagreement between them, with respect to the time of adjournment, he may adjourn them to such time as he shall think proper; he shall receive ambassadors and other public ministers; he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed, and shall commission all the officers of the United States.

SEC. 4. The President, Vice-President, and all civil officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

ARTICLE III.

SECTION. 1. The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The judges, both of the supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services a compensation which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.

SEC. 2. The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority; to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls; to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; to controversies to which the United States shall be a party; to controversies between two or more States; between a State and citizens of another State; between citizens of different States; between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants of different States and between a State, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens, or subjects.

In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers, and consuls, and those in which a State shall be party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury; and such trial shall be held in the State where the said crime shall have been committed; but when not committed within any State the trial shall be at such place or places as the Congress may by law have directed.

SEC. 3. Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.

No person shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act, or on confession in open court.

The Congress shall have power to declare the punishment of treason, but no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood, or forfeiture except during the life of the person attainted.

ARTICLE IV.

SECTION 1. Full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State. And the Congress may by general laws prescribe the manner in which such acts, records, and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof.

SEC. 2. The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.

A person charged in any State with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice, and be found in another State, shall on demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the State having jurisdiction of the crime.

No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.

SEC. 3. New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned, as well as of Congress.

The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

SEC. 4. The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion, and, on application of the legislature or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened), against domestic violence.

ARTICLE V.

The Congress, whenever two thirds of both houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which in either case, shall be valid, to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided, that no amendment which may be made prior to the year

one thousand eight hundred and eight, shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first Article, and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

ARTICLE VI.

All debts contracted and engagements entered into before the adoption of the Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution as under the Confederation.

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

The senators and representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

ARTICLE VII.

The ratification of the conventions of nine States shall be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution between the States so ratifying the same.

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION.

ARTICLE I.

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

ARTICLE II.

A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

ARTICLE III.

No soldier shall, in time of peace, be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

ARTICLE IV.

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated; and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

ARTICLE V.

No person shall be held to answer for a capital or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service, in time of war and public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb, nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself; nor to be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.

ARTICLE VI.

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

ARTICLE VII.

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise re-examined in any court of the United States than according to the rules of the common law.

ARTICLE VIII.

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines be imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

ARTICLE IX.

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

ARTICLE X.

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

ARTICLE XI.

The judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by citizens of another State, or by citizens or subjects of any foreign state.

ARTICLE XII.

The electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same State with themselves. They shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-President; and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit, sealed, to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the president of the Senate. The president of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates, and the votes shall then be counted; the person having the greatest number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers, not exceeding three, on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two thirds of the States, and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice. And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President, whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, before the fourth day of March next following, then the Vice-President shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other Constitutional disability of the President. The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-President shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice President; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of two thirds of the whole number of senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. But no person Constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.

ARTICLE XIII.

SECTION 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

SEC. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

ARTICLE XIV.

SECTION 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the State in which they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

SEC. 2. Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States, representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State being twenty-one years of age, and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State.

SEC. 3. No person shall be a senator or representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice-President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may, by a vote of two thirds of each house, remove such disability.

SEC. 4. The validity of the public debt of the United States authorized by law, including debts incurred by payment of pensions and bounties for services in suppressing insurrection or rebellion, shall not be questioned. But neither the United States nor any State shall assume or pay any debt or obligation incurred in aid of insurrection or rebellion against the United States, or any claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations, and claims shall be held illegal and void.

SEC. 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

ARTICLE XV.

SECTION 1. The right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

APPENDIX B.

FOLLOWING is the full text of the Supreme Court decision of Feb. 29, 1892:—

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

NO. 143.—OCTOBER TERM, 1891.

The Rector, Church Wardens, and Vestrymen of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Plaintiffs in Error, vs. The United States.	}	In error to the Circuit Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.
---	---	---

[February 29, 1892.]

Mr. Justice Brewer delivered the opinion of the Court.

Plaintiff in error is a corporation, duly organized and incorporated as a religious society under the laws of the State of New York. E. Walpole Warren was, prior to September, 1887, an alien residing in England. In that month the plaintiff in error made a contract with him, by which he was to remove to the city of New York and enter into its service as rector and pastor; and, in pursuance of such contract, Warren did so remove and enter upon such service. It is claimed by the United States that this contract on the part of the plaintiff in error was forbidden by chapter 164, 23 Stat. 332, and an action was commenced to recover the penalty prescribed by that act. The Circuit Court held that the contract was within the prohibition of the statute, and rendered judgment accordingly (36 Fed. Rep. 303); and the single question presented for our determination is whether it erred in that conclusion.

The first section describes the act forbidden, and is in these words:—

“Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That from and after the passage of this act it shall be unlawful for any person, company, partnership, or corporation, in any manner whatsoever, to prepay the transportation, or in any way assist or encourage the importation or migration of any alien or aliens, any foreigner or foreigners, into the United States, its Territories, or the District of Columbia, under contract or agreement, parol or special, express or implied, made previous to the importation or migration of such alien or aliens, foreigner or foreigners, to perform labor or service of any kind in the United States, its Territories, or the District of Columbia.”

It must be conceded that the act of the corporation is within the letter of this section, for the relation of rector to his church is one of service, and implies labor on the one side with compensation on the other. Not only are the general words "labor" and "service" both used, but also, as it were to guard against any narrow interpretation and emphasize a breadth of meaning, to them is added "of any kind;" and, further, as noticed by the circuit judge in his opinion, the fifth section, which makes specific exceptions, among them professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, and domestic servants, strengthens the idea that every other kind of labor and service was intended to be reached by the first section. While there is great force to this reasoning, we cannot think Congress intended to denounce with penalties a transaction like that in the present case. It is a familiar rule, that a thing may be within the letter of the statute, and yet not within the statute because not within its spirit, nor within the intention of its makers. This has been often asserted, and the reports are full of cases illustrating its application. This is not the substitution of the will of the judge for that of the legislator, for frequently words of general meaning are used in a statute, words broad enough to include an act in question, and yet a consideration of the whole legislation, or of the circumstances surrounding its enactment, or of the absurd results which follow from giving such broad meaning to the words, makes it unreasonable to believe that the legislator intended to include the particular act. As said in *Plowden*, 205: "From which cases, it appears that the sages of the law heretofore have construed statutes quite contrary to the letter in some appearance, and those statutes which comprehend all things in the letter they have expounded to extend to but some things, and those which generally prohibit all people from doing such an act they have interpreted to permit some people to do it, and those which include every person in the letter, they have adjudged to reach to some persons only, which expositions have always been founded upon the intent of the legislature, which they have collected sometimes by considering the cause and necessity of making the act, sometimes by comparing one part of the act with another, and sometimes by foreign circumstances."

In *Pier Co. vs. Hannam* (3 B. & Ald. 266) C. J. Abbott quotes from Lord Coke as follows: "Acts of Parliament are to be so construed as no man that is innocent or free from injury or wrong be, by a literal construction, punished or endangered." In the case of the State *vs. Clark* (5 Dutcher, 96, 99) it appeared that an act had been passed making it a misdemeanor to wilfully break down a fence in the possession of another person. Clark was indicted under that statute. The defense was that the act of breaking down the fence, though wilful, was in the exercise of a legal right to go upon his own lands. The trial court rejected the testimony offered to sustain the defense, and the Supreme Court held that this ruling was error. In its opinion the Court used this language: "The act of 1855, in terms, makes the wilful opening, breaking down, or injuring of any fences belonging to or in the possession of any other person a misde-

meanor. In what sense is the term "wilful" used? In common parlance, wilful is used in the sense of intentional, as distinguished from accidental or involuntary. Whatever one does intentionally he does wilfully. Is it used in that sense in this act? Did the Legislature intend to make the intentional opening of a fence, for the purpose of going upon the land of another, indictable, if done by permission or for a lawful purpose? . . . We cannot suppose such to have been the actual intent. To adopt such a construction would put a stop to the ordinary business of life. The language of the act, if construed literally, evidently leads to an absurd result. If a literal construction of the words of a statute be absurd, the act must be so construed as to avoid the absurdity. The court must restrain the words. The object designed to be reached by the act must limit and control the literal import of the terms and phrases employed." In *United States vs. Kirby* (7 Wall. 482, 486) the defendants were indicted for the violation of an act of Congress providing "that if any person shall knowingly and wilfully obstruct or retard the passage of the mail, or of any driver or carrier, or of any horse or carriage carrying the same, he shall, upon conviction, for every such offense pay a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars." The specific charge was that the defendants knowingly and wilfully retarded the passage of one Farris, a carrier of the mail, while engaged in the performance of his duty, and also in like manner retarded the steambot General Buell, at that time engaged in carrying the mail. To this indictment the defendants pleaded specially that Farris had been indicted for murder by a court of competent authority in Kentucky; that a bench warrant had been issued and placed in the hands of the defendant Kirby, the sheriff of the county, commanding him to arrest Farris and bring him before the court to answer to the indictment; and that, in obedience to this warrant, he and the other defendants, as his posse, entered upon the steambot General Buell and arrested Farris, and used only such force as was necessary to accomplish that arrest. The question as to the sufficiency of this plea was certified to this court, and it was held that the arrest of Farris upon the warrant from the State court was not an obstruction of the mail, or the retarding of the passage of a carrier of the mail, within the meaning of the act. In its opinion the court says: "All laws should receive a sensible construction. General terms should be so limited in their application as not to lead to injustice, oppression, or an absurd consequence. It will always, therefore, be presumed that the Legislature intended exceptions to its language which would avoid results of this character. The reason of the law in such cases should prevail over its letter. The common sense of man approves the judgment mentioned by Puffendorf, that the Bolognian law which enacted 'that whoever drew blood in the streets should be punished with the utmost severity,' did not extend to the surgeon who opened the vein of a person that fell down in the street in a fit. The same common sense accepts the ruling, cited by Plowden, that the statute of Ist Edward II., which enacts that a prisoner who breaks prison shall be guilty of felony, does not extend to a prisoner who breaks out when

the prison is on fire, 'for he is not to be hanged because he would not stay to be burnt.' And we think that a like common sense will sanction the ruling we make, that the act of Congress which punishes the obstruction or retarding of the passage of the mail, or of its carrier, does not apply to a case of temporary detention of the mail caused by the arrest of the carrier upon an indictment for murder." The following cases may also be cited: *Henry vs. Tilson* (17 Vt. 479); *Ryegate vs. Wardsboro* (30 Vt. 746); *Ex parte Ellis* (11 Cal. 220); *Ingraham vs. Speed* (30 Miss. 410); *Jackson vs. Collins* (3 Cowen, 89); *People vs. Insurance Company* (15 Johns. 358); *Burch vs. Newbury* (10 N. Y. 374); *People ex rel. vs. Comrs. &c.* (95 N. Y. 554, 558); *People ex rel. vs. Lacombe* (99 N. Y. 43, 49); *Canal Co. vs. Railroad Co.*, (4 Gill & Johnson 152); *Osgood vs. Breed* (12 Mass. 525, 530); *Wilbur vs. Crane* (13 Pick. 284); *Oates vs. National Bank* (100 U. S. 239).

Among other things which may be considered in determining the intent of the Legislature is the title of the act. We do not mean that it may be used to add to, or take from, the body of the statute (*Hadden vs. The Collector*, 5 Wall. 107), but it may help to interpret its meaning. In the case of *United States vs. Fisher* (2 Cranch, 358, 386), Chief Justice Marshall said: "On the influence which the title ought to have in construing the enacting clauses, much has been said; and yet it is not easy to discern the point of difference between the opposing counsel in this respect. Neither party contends that the title of an act can control plain words in the body of the statute; and neither denies that, taken with other parts, it may assist in removing ambiguities. *Where the intent is plain, nothing is left to construction. Where the mind labors to discover the design of the legislature, it seizes everything from which aid can be derived*: and in such case the title claims a degree of notice, and will have its due share of consideration." And in the case of *United States vs. Palmer* (3 Wheaton, 610, 631), the same judge applied the doctrine in this way: "The words of the section are in terms of unlimited extent. The words 'any person or persons' are broad enough to comprehend every human being. But general words must not only be limited to cases within the jurisdiction of the State, but also to those objects to which the legislature intended to apply them. Did the legislature intend to apply these words to the subjects of a foreign power, who in a foreign ship may commit murder or robbery on the high seas? The title of an act cannot control its words, but may furnish some aid in showing what was in the mind of the legislature. The title of this act is, 'An act for the punishment of certain crimes against the United States.' It would seem that offenses against the United States, not offenses against the human race, were the crimes which the legislature intended by this law to punish."

It will be seen that words as general as those used in the first section of this act were by that decision limited, and the intent of Congress with respect to the act was gathered partially, at least, from its title. Now, the title of this act is, "An act to prohibit

the importation and migration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labor in the United States, its Territories, and the District of Columbia." Obviously the thought expressed in this, reaches only to the work of the manual laborer, as distinguished from that of the professional man. No one reading such a title would suppose that Congress had in its mind any purpose of staying the coming into this country of ministers of the gospel, or, indeed, of any class whose toil is that of the brain. The common understanding of the terms labor and laborers does not include preaching and preachers; and it is to be assumed that words and phrases are used in their ordinary meaning. So whatever of light is thrown upon the statute by the language of the title, indicates an exclusion from its penal provisions of all contracts for the employment of ministers, rectors, and pastors.

Again, another guide to the meaning of a statute is found in the evil which it is designed to remedy; and for this, the court properly looks at contemporaneous events, the situation as it existed, and as it was pressed upon the attention of the legislative body. (*United States vs. Railroad Company*, 91 U. S. 72, 79.) The situation which called for this statute was briefly but fully stated by Mr. Justice Brown when, as district judge, he decided the case of *United States vs. Craig*, (28 Fed. Rep. 795, 798:) "The motives and history of the act are matters of common knowledge. It has become the practice for large capitalists in this country to contract with their agents abroad, for the shipment of great numbers of an ignorant and servile class of foreign laborers, under contracts by which the employer agreed, upon the one hand, to prepay their passage, while, upon the other hand, the laborers agreed to work after their arrival for a certain time at a low rate of wages. The effect of this was to break down the labor market, and to reduce other laborers engaged in like occupations to the level of the assisted immigrant. The evil finally became so flagrant that an appeal was made to Congress for relief by the passage of the act in question, the design of which was to raise the standard of foreign immigrants, and to discountenance the migration of those who had not sufficient means in their own hands, or those of their friends to pay their passage."

It appears, also, from the petitions, and in the testimony presented before the committees of Congress, that it was this cheap, unskilled labor which was making the trouble, and the influx of which Congress sought to prevent. It was never suggested that we had in this country a surplus of brain toilers, and, least of all, that the market for the services of Christian ministers was depressed by foreign competition. Those were matters to which the attention of Congress, or of the people, was not directed. So far, then, as the evil which was sought to be remedied interprets the statute, it also guides to an exclusion of this contract from the penalties of the act.

A singular circumstance, throwing light upon the intent of Congress, is found in this extract from the report of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, recommending the passage of the bill: "The general facts and considerations which induce the com-

mittee to recommend the passage of this bill are set forth in the report of the committee of the House. The committee report the bill back without amendment, although there are certain features thereof which might well be changed or modified, in the hope that the bill may not fail of passage during the present session. Especially would the committee have otherwise recommended amendments, substituting for the expression, 'labor and service,' whenever it occurs in the body of the bill, the words 'manual labor' or 'manual service,' as sufficiently broad to accomplish the purposes of the bill, and that such amendments would remove objections which a sharp and perhaps unfriendly criticism may urge to the proposed legislation. The committee, however, believing that the bill in its present form will be construed as including only those whose labor or service is manual in character, and being very desirous that the bill become a law before the adjournment, have reported the bill without change." (6059 Congressional Record, 48th Congress.) And referring back to the report of the Committee of the House, there appears this language: "It seeks to restrain and prohibit the immigration or importation of laborers who would have never seen our shores but for the inducements and allurements of men whose only object is to obtain labor at the lowest possible rate, regardless of the social and material well-being of our own citizens, and regardless of the evil consequences which result to American laborers from such immigration. This class of immigrants care nothing about our institutions, and in many instances never even heard of them; they are men whose passage is paid by the importers; they come here under contract to labor for a certain number of years; they are ignorant of our social condition, and that they may remain so, they are isolated and prevented from coming into contact with Americans. They are generally from the lowest social stratum, and live upon the coarsest food, and in hovels of a character before unknown to American workmen. They, as a rule, do not become citizens, and are certainly not a desirable acquisition to the body politic. The inevitable tendency of their presence among us is to degrade American labor, and to reduce it to the level of the imported pauper labor." (Page 5359 Congressional Record, 48th Congress.)

We find, therefore, that the title of the act, the evil which was intended to be remedied, the circumstances surrounding the appeal to Congress, the reports of the committee of each House, all concur in affirming that the intent of Congress was simply to stay the influx of this cheap, unskilled labor.

But beyond all these matters no purpose of action against religion can be imputed to any legislation, State or national, *because this is a religious people. This is historically true. From the discovery of this continent to the present hour, there is a single voice making this affirmation.* The commission to Christopher Columbus, prior to his sail westward, is from "Ferdinand and Isabella, by the grace of God, King and Queen of Castile," etc., and recites that "It is hoped that by God's assistance some of the continents and islands in the ocean will be discovered," etc. The first colonial grant that was made to

Sir Walter Raleigh in 1584, was from "Elizabeth, by the grace of God, of England, Fraunce and Ireland, queene, defender of the faith," etc.; and the grant authorizing him to enact statutes for the government of the proposed colony, provided that "they be not against the true Christian faith nowe professed in the Church of England."

The first charter of Virginia, granted by King James I, in 1606, after reciting the application of certain parties for a charter, commenced the grant in these words: "We, greatly commending and graciously accepting of, their Desires for the Furtherance of so noble a Work, which may by the Providence of Almighty God, hereafter tend to the Glory of his Divine Majesty, in propagating of Christian religion to such People as yet live in Darkness and miserable Ignorance of the true Knowledge and Worship of God, and may in time bring the Infidels and Savages, living in those parts, to human Civility, and to a settled and quiet Government; DO, by these our Letters-Patents, graciously accept of, and agree to, their humble and well-intended Desires."

Language of similar import may be found in the subsequent charters of that colony, from the same King, in 1609 and 1611; and the same is true of the various charters granted to the other colonies. *In language more or less emphatic is the establishment of the Christian religion declared to be one of the purposes of the grant.* The celebrated compact made by the Pilgrims in the Mayflower, 1620, recites: "Having undertaken for the Glory of God, and Advancement of the Christian Faith, and the Honor of our King and Country, a Voyage to plant the first Colony in the northern Parts of Virginia; Do by these Presents, solemnly and mutually, in the Presence of God and one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil Body Politick, for our better Ordering and Preservation, and Furtherance of the Ends aforesaid."

The fundamental orders of Connecticut, under which a provisional government was instituted in 1638-1639, commence with this declaration: "Forasmuch as it hath pleased the Allmighty God by the wise disposition of his diuine prudence so to Order and dispose of things that we the Inhabitants and Residents of Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield are now cohabiting and dwelling in and vpon the River of Conectecotte and the Lands thereunto adioyning; And well-knowing where a people are gathered together the word of God requires that to mayntayne the peace and vnion of such a people there should be an orderly and decent Gouernment established according to God, to order and dispose of the affayres of the people at all seasons as ocaation shall require: doe therefore assoiate and conioyne our selues to be as one Publike State or Commonwealth; and doe, for our selues and our Successors and such as shall be adioyned to vs att any tyme hereafter, enter into Combination and Confederation together, to mayntayne and presecrue the liberty and purity of the gospell of our Lord Jesus w^{ch} we now p^{fe}esse, as also the discipline of the Churches, w^{ch} according to the truth of the said gospell is now practised amongst vs."

In the charter of privileges granted by William Penn to the province of Pennsylvania, in 1701, it is recited: "Because no People can be truly happy, though under the greatest Enjoyment of Civil Liberties, if abridged of the Freedom of their Consciences, as to their Religious Profession and Worship; And Almighty God being the only Lord of Conscience, Father of Lights and Spirits; and the Author as well as Object of all divine Knowledge, Faith, and Worship, who only doth enlighten the Minds, and persuade and convince the Understandings of People, I do hereby grant and declare," etc.

Coming nearer to the present time, the Declaration of Independence recognizes the presence of the Divine in human affairs in these words: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness." "We, therefore, the Representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare," etc. "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the Protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor."

If we examine the constitutions of the various States, we find in them a constant recognition of religious obligations. Every constitution of every one of the forty-four States contains language which either directly or by clear implication recognizes a profound reverence for religion, and an assumption that its influence in all human affairs is essential to the well being of the community. This recognition may be in the preamble, such as is found in the Constitution of Illinois, 1870: "We, the people of the State of Illinois, grateful to Almighty God for the civil, political, and religious liberty which He hath so long permitted us to enjoy, and looking to Him for a blessing upon our endeavors to secure and transmit the same unimpaired to succeeding generations," etc.

It may be only in the familiar requisition that all officers shall take an oath closing with the declaration "*so help me God.*" It may be in clauses like that of the Constitution of Indiana, 1816, Article XI, Section 4: "The manner of administering an oath or affirmation shall be such as is most consistent with the conscience of the deponent, and shall be esteemed the most solemn appeal to God." Or in provisions such as are found in Articles 36 and 37 of the Declaration of Rights of the Constitution of Maryland, 1867: "That as it is the duty of every man to worship God in such manner as he thinks most acceptable to Him, all persons are equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty; wherefore, no person ought, by any law, to be molested in his person or estate on account of his religious persuasion or profession, or for his religious practice, *unless, under the color of religion, he shall disturb the good order, peace, or safety of the State, or shall infringe the laws of morality, or injure others in their natural, civil, or religious rights;* nor ought

any person to be compelled to frequent or maintain or contribute, unless on contract, to maintain any place of worship, or any ministry; nor shall any person, otherwise competent, be deemed incompetent as a witness, or juror, on account of his religious belief; *Provided, He believes in the existence of God, and that, under His dispensation such person will be held morally accountable for his acts, and be rewarded or punished therefor, either in this world or the world to come.* That no religious test ought ever to be required as a qualification for any office of profit or trust in this State, *other than a declaration of belief in the existence of God;* nor shall the legislature prescribe any other oath of office than the oath prescribed by this Constitution." Or like that in Articles 2 and 3, of Part 1st, of the Constitution of Massachusetts, 1780: "It is the right as well as the duty of all men in society publicly and at stated seasons, to worship the Supreme Being, the great Creator and Preserver of the universe. . . . *As the happiness of a people and the good order and preservation of civil government essentially depend upon piety, religion, and morality, and as these cannot be generally diffused through a community but by the institution of the public worship of God and of public instructions in piety, religion and morality:* Therefore, to promote their happiness and to secure the good order and preservation of their government, the people of this commonwealth have a right to *invest their legislature with power to authorize and require, and the legislature shall, from time to time, authorize and require, the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies-politic or religious societies to make suitable provision, at their own expense, for the institution of the public worship of God and for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion, and morality in all cases where such provision shall not be made voluntarily.*" Or as in sections 5 and 14 of Article 7, of the Constitution of Mississippi, 1832: "*No person who denies the being of a God, or a future state of rewards and punishments, shall hold any office in the civil department of this State. . . . Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government, the preservation of liberty, and the happiness of mankind, schools, and the means of education, shall forever be encouraged in this State.*" Or by Article 22 of the Constitution of Delaware, 1776, which required all officers, besides an oath of allegiance, to make and subscribe the following declaration: "I, A. B., do profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ his only Son, and in the Holy Ghost, one God, blessed for evermore; and I do acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration."

Even the Constitution of the United States, which is supposed to have little touch upon the private life of the individual, contains in the First Amendment a declaration common to the constitutions of all the States, as follows: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," etc. And also provides in Article 1, Section 7 (a provision common to many constitutions) that the Executive shall have ten days (Sun-

days excepted) within which to determine whether he will approve or veto a bill.

There is no dissonance in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning: they affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious nation. These are not individual sayings, declarations of private persons; they are organic utterances; *they speak the voice of the entire people.* While because of a general recognition of this truth, the question has seldom been presented to the courts, yet we find that in *Updegraph vs. the Commonwealth* (11 Serg. & Rawle, 394, 400) it was decided that, "*Christianity, general Christianity, is, and always has been, a part of the common law of Pennsylvania; . . . not Christianity with an established church, and tithes, and spiritual courts; but Christianity with liberty of conscience to all men.*" And in the *People vs. Ruggles* (8 Johns. 290, 294, 295) Chancellor Kent, the great commentator on American law, speaking as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New York, said: "The people of this State, in common with the people of this country, profess the general doctrines of Christianity, as the rule of their faith and practice; and to scandalize the author of these doctrines is not only, in a religious point of view, extremely impious, but, even in respect to the obligations due to society, is a gross violation of decency and good order. . . . The free, equal, and undisturbed enjoyment of religious opinion, whatever it may be, and free and decent discussions on any religious subject, is granted and secured; but to revile, with malicious and blasphemous contempt, the religion professed by almost the whole community, is an abuse of that right. Nor are we bound, by any expressions in the Constitution, as some have strangely supposed, either not to punish at all, or to punish indiscriminately, the like attacks upon the religion of *Mahomet* or the *Grand Lama*; and for *this plain reason*, that the case assumes that we are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply ingrafted upon Christianity, and not upon the doctrines or worship of those impostors." And in the famous case of *Vidal vs. Girard's Executors* (2 How. 127, 198), this court, while sustaining the will of Mr. Girard, with its provision for the creation of a college into which no minister should be permitted to enter, observed: "It is also said, and truly, that the *Christian religion* is a part of the common law of *Pennsylvania*."

If we pass beyond these matters to a view of American life as expressed by its laws, its business, its customs, and its society, we find everywhere a clear recognition of the same truth. Among other matters note the following: The form of oath universally prevailing, concluding with an appeal to the Almighty; the custom of opening sessions of all deliberative bodies and most conventions, with prayer; the prefatory words of all wills "In the name of God, amen;" *the laws respecting the observance of the Sabbath; with the general cessation of all secular business, and the closing of courts, legislatures, and other similar public assemblies on that day; the churches and church organizations which abound in every city, town, and hamlet; the multitude of charitable organizations existing everywhere*

under Christian auspices; the gigantic missionary associations, with general support, and aiming to establish Christian missions in every quarter of the globe. *These, and many other matters which might be noticed, add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian nation.* In the face of all these, shall it be believed that a Congress of the United States intended to make it a misdemeanor for a church of this country to contract for the services of a Christian minister residing in another nation?

Suppose in the Congress that passed this act, some member had offered a bill which in terms declared that if any Roman Catholic Church in this country should contract with Cardinal Manning to come to this country and enter into its service as pastor and priest; or any Episcopal Church should enter into a like contract with Canon Farrar; or any Baptist Church should make similar arrangements with Rev. Mr. Spurgeon; or any Jewish synagogue with some eminent Rabbi, such contract should be adjudged unlawful and void, and the church making it to be subject to prosecution and punishment,—can it be believed that it would have received a minute of approving the thought, or a single vote? Yet it is contended that such was in effect the meaning of this statute. The construction invoked cannot be accepted as correct. It is a case where there was presented a definite evil, in view of which the legislature used general terms with the purpose of reaching all phases of that evil, and thereafter, unexpectedly, it is developed that the general language thus employed is broad enough to reach cases and acts which the whole history and life of the country affirm could not have been intentionally legislated against. It is the duty of the courts, under those circumstances, to say that, however broad the language of the statute may be, the act, although within the letter, is not within the intention of the legislature, and therefore cannot be within the statute.

The judgment will be reversed, and the case remanded for farther proceedings in accordance with this opinion.

True copy.

Test:

Clerk Supreme Court U. S.

THE AMERICAN SENTINEL.

An Eight-page Weekly Journal,

Set for the defense of Liberty of Conscience, and therefore uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward a union of Church and State, either in name or in fact. The "Sentinel" holds to the **Preservation of the United States Constitution as it now is**, and the maintenance of

CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS RIGHTS.

This is the ONLY JOURNAL OF THE KIND PUBLISHED. It is the unswerving advocate of Liberty of Conscience and Religious Freedom for every citizen of this Republic.

Every issue of the SENTINEL is full of important matter concerning the National Reform Party, their clamors for a national Sunday law, and a religious "Amendment to the Constitution of the United States."

 **Every Lover of Religious Freedom
Should have this Paper.**

PRICE, PER YEAR, ONE DOLLAR.

Address,—

AMERICAN SENTINEL, 43 Bond St., New York City.

The Two Republics.

BY A. T. JONES.

Of special importance to every American Citizen. This work is a Comparative History of the two greatest republics,

ROME AND THE UNITED STATES.

The study of years and the elaboration of numerous volumes are here presented in a concise and pleasing manner. In reviewing the history of the Roman Republic,

**THE ROCKS UPON WHICH SHE STRANDED
ARE CLEARLY POINTED OUT.**

TWO REPUBLICS contrasts the principles underlying enforced religious observances with the true principles of

Religious Freedom for Every Man,

As guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. This excellent work comprises **896 octavo pages**, and is beautifully printed on fine paper, and put up in five styles of binding, with **67 full-page engravings.**

PRICES range from \$2.50 to \$4.75.