



"Equal and Exact Justice to all Men, of Whatever State or Persuasion, Religious or Political."

VOLUME 8.

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 28, 1893.

NUMBER 38.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY THE

PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY

No. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.

Entered at the New York Post-Office.

EDITOR, - - - ALONZO T. JONES.
ASSOCIATE EDITORS, { CALVIN P. BOLLMAN.
WILLIAM H. MCKEE.

THE primary object of the Sabbath is not physical rest, but spiritual worship. Says the Lord: "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."

JUST as days are by men set apart to keep in memory important events, so the Sabbath was set apart by the Lord to keep in the minds of his people the fact that he was their Creator. And since the fall, the fact that God is the Creator is the assurance of his power to redeem; hence the Sabbath is a sign of God, both as the Creator and Saviour.

IN the struggle for existence, man forgets that his chief end is, not to perpetuate his life in this world, but "to glorify God and enjoy him forever." It is for this reason that the words of our Saviour, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," are so often wrested from their true meaning. The idea is not that the Sabbath was designed primarily, or that it is now, to minister first to man's physical necessities, but that it is for man's highest good; not as a burden to be borne, but as a friend to elevate and ennoble men by bringing them to a true knowledge of the true God.

THIS view of the Sabbath is not peculiar to those who observe the day enjoined in the fourth commandment. Many Sunday-keepers also see in the weekly rest, not a day of physical relaxation merely, but above and beyond all, a day of spiritual worship. On this point, the *Political Dissenter*, a Reformed Presbyterian paper, replying to something which appeared in another religious paper, says:—

You define the Sabbath as "a rest" in the sense of a mere cessation from work. You say that "many Christian clergymen and other Christians who work hard on Sunday observe their Sabbath

on Monday." But might not a Christian clergyman find his needed bodily and mental rest on Monday in fishing, hunting, or playing tennis? Would that "rest" be in harmony with the divine institution of the Sabbath? Does not that institution necessarily include the idea of "rest" in a higher sense—spiritual rest in the worship of God? Even the hardest worked clergymen and their most laborious helpers in Sabbath-school and mission work, enjoy the true rest of the Sabbath in exercises of divine worship. No day for mere bodily recreation could be to them the institution of the Sabbath of the Lord their God.

WHAT the *Dissenter* says is most emphatically true of the Sabbath, but is not true of Sunday. That has spiritual significance only as it is in imagination clothed with the character of the Sabbath. Sunday does not commemorate creation, nor is it a sign of God as the Sanctifier of his people. It is not the ancient Sabbath, nor is it the same institution transferred to another day. It has nothing in common with the Sabbath, except its weekly recurrence, and that the idea of rest has been associated with it.

SUNDAY is not observed for the reason assigned in the Sabbath commandment. To read Sunday into the fourth commandment is to read into it a falsehood; for God did not make the world in six days and rest on Sunday, neither did he for this reason hallow Sunday. But, "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." Not one word of this applies to Sunday, the first day, therefore Sunday is not the Lord's rest day; for the Lord did not rest upon it, neither did he bless nor hallow it; neither has he ever commanded it to be kept holy; and how could it be so kept since it was never made so?

AND because Sunday, the day falsely called "the Christian Sabbath," does not commemorate God's rest, because it is not enjoined by the fourth commandment, and because it has no reference to the finished creation, it is observed for entirely different reasons from the Sabbath, and is necessarily an entirely different institution. As well might the Mohammedan claim that Friday is the Sabbath of the Lord, merely transferred to the sixth day, as for the Christian to make that claim for Sunday.

Changing the day necessarily changes both the reason for observing it and the institution itself. And so we have in Sunday an institution commemorating, not creation and God's rest at its close, but an institution professedly commemorating the resurrection of Christ, and standing in opposition to the Sabbath of the Lord.

LET us illustrate this matter. Suppose that the Irish Catholics should become sufficiently numerous in this country to substitute the observance of the seventeenth day of March for the fourth of July, and celebrate it in the same manner but for a different reason. Could St. Patrick's day ever become Independence day? and could the law making the fourth day of July a legal holiday ever be applied, without change, to the seventeenth day of March? Certainly not; and no more can Sunday ever become the Sabbath of the Lord, enjoined by the fourth commandment of the Decalogue, a law which specifically points out the seventh day and requires its observance for reasons that never by any possibility can be true of any other day. For it always must be true that God rested on the seventh day, while it never can be true that he rested on the first day.

THE idea that the Sabbath is one thing and that the day upon which it is observed is quite another thing, has no foundation in the Scriptures. Turning to Gen. 2:3 we read: "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Nothing is said about blessing and sanctifying an institution; the blessing attaches to the definite day; with this conclusion agrees also the fourth commandment: "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." Here we are plainly told that "the seventh day is

the Sabbath." This is just as definite as that the fourth of July is Independence day. No day but the fourth of July can be Independence day; no more can any day but the seventh be the Sabbath.

THE Sabbath is not only a seventh day but it is *the* seventh day. Not merely the seventh day after six days of labor, but the seventh day of the week. That this is so will appear from Luke 23:56 and 24:1: "And they returned and prepared spices and ointments: and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them." Here the Sabbath is the day just before the first day of the week. (Cf. also Mark 16:1,2.) It inevitably follows that the Sabbath is the seventh day of the week. And the week is an ancient and well-established division of time. Of the week, the "Encyclopædia Britannica," article, "Calendar," says:—

The week is a period of seven days, having no reference whatever to the celestial motions. . . . It has been employed from time immemorial in almost all Eastern countries. . . . As it forms neither an aliquot part of the year nor of the lunar month, those who reject the Mosaic recital will be at loss, as Delambre remarks, to assign to it any origin having much semblance of probability.

The same authority, article, "Babylonia," says:—

The week of seven days was in use from an early period, indeed the names which we still give to the days can be traced to ancient Babylonia; and the seventh day was one of *sutum*, or rest.

This fact constitutes the week an imperishable monument to the original Sabbath. The Sabbath is the seventh day of the week, and it is evident it can never be lost as long as the week endures. And that it never has been lost, is attested by the fact that the weekly cycle has always been known by almost all nations; and it has been the same everywhere, even as it is to-day. Seventy-five out of one hundred and seven ancient languages reveal not only a knowledge of the week but of the Sabbath, the seventh day of the week. On this subject Rev. Dr. Lewis says:—

The nations that spoke many of these languages have long since gone from the earth. But the words of their mother tongue embalm their thoughts and practices as ineffaceable and unmistakable monuments showing the identity of the week and of the Sabbath. Tides of emigration have swept hither and thither over the earth. Empires have risen, flourished, and fallen, but the week has endured, amid all convulsions and changes. . . . Philology has done for the truth concerning God's eternal Sabbath, what cuneiform inscriptions, and mummy pits, are doing for general and national history.

Thus not only in the Scriptures but in all history, even among pagan peoples, the Sabbath has always and everywhere been identified with the definite seventh day of the week, a well-known and uniform division of time. God has declared, "The seventh day is the Sabbath," and has commanded it to be kept holy as he made it in the beginning, and that men may have no excuse for departing from this precept the Creator has so ordered by his providence, that in every nation the most familiar division of time, the weekly cycle, stands as an imperishable monument marking with unerring certainty the day of his sacred rest. C. P. B.

THERE are reformers who never think it worth while to work at their trade themselves.—*Ram's Horn*.

The Christian Sabbath.*

THE GENUINE OFFSPRING OF THE UNION OF THE HOLY GHOST AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH HIS SPOUSE. THE CLAIMS OF PROTESTANTISM TO ANY PART THEREIN PROVED TO BE GROUNDLESS, SELF-CONTRADICTIONARY AND SUICIDAL.

But faith, fanatic faith, once wedded fast
To some dear falsehood, hugs it to the last.
—Moore.

CONFORMABLY to our promise in our last issue, we proceed to unmask one of the most flagrant errors and most unpardonable inconsistencies of the biblical rule of faith. Lest, however, we be misunderstood, we deem it necessary to premise that Protestantism recognizes no rule of faith, no teacher save the "Infallible Bible." As the Catholic yields his judgment in spiritual matters implicitly and with unreserved confidence, to the voice of his church, so too, the Protestant recognizes *no teacher but the Bible*. All his spirituality is derived from its teachings. It is to him the voice of God addressing him through his sole inspired teacher. It embodies his religion, his faith and practice. The language of Chillingworth: "The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, is the religion of Protestants," is only one form of the same idea multifariously convertible into other forms such as, "The Book of God," "The Charter of our Salvation," "The Oracle of our Christian Faith," "God's Text-book to the Race of Mankind," etc., etc. It is, then, an incontrovertible fact that *the Bible alone* is the teacher of Protestant Christianity. Assuming this fact, we will now proceed to discuss the merits of the question involved in our last issue. Recognizing what is undeniable, the fact of a direct contradiction between the teaching and practice of Protestant Christianity (the Seventh-day Adventists excepted) on the one hand, and that of the Jewish people on the other; both observing different days of the week for the worship of God, we will proceed to take the testimony of the only available witness in the premises *viz*: the testimony of the teacher common to both claimants, the Bible. The first expression with which we come in contact in the sacred Word, is found in Gen. 2:2: "And on the seventh day He [God] rested from all his work which he had made." The next reference to this matter is to be found in Exodus 20, where God commanded the seventh day to be kept, *because* he had himself rested from the work of creation on that day; and the sacred text informs us that *for that reason* he desired it kept, in the following words: "Wherefore, the Lord blessed the seventh day and sanctified it." Again we read in the 31st chapter 15th verse: "Six days you shall do work; in the seventh day is the Sabbath, the rest holy to the Lord." Sixteenth verse: "*It is an everlasting covenant*," "and a perpetual sign," "for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and in the seventh he ceased from work."

In the Old Testament reference is made one hundred and twenty-six times to the Sabbath, and all these texts conspire harmoniously in voicing the will of God commanding the seventh day to be kept, because God himself *first kept it*, making it obligatory on all as "*a perpetual covenant*." Nor can we imagine any one foolhardy enough to question the identity of Saturday with the Sabbath or seventh day

seeing that the people of Israel have been keeping the Saturday from the giving of the law, B. C. 2514 to A. D. 1893, a period of 3,383 years. With the example of the Israelites before our eyes to-day, there is no historical fact better established than that referred to, *viz*: that the chosen people of God, the guardians of the Old Testament, the living representatives of the only divine religion hitherto, had for a period of 1490 years anterior to Christianity, preserved by weekly practice the living tradition of the correct interpretation of the special day of the week, Saturday to be kept "holy to the Lord," which tradition they have extended by their practice to an additional period of 1893 years more, thus covering the full extent of the Christian dispensation. We deem it necessary to be perfectly clear on this point for reasons that will appear more fully hereafter. The Bible—the Old Testament—confirmed by the living tradition of a weekly practice for 3383 years by the chosen people of God, teaches then, with absolute certainty, that God had himself named the day to be "kept holy to him," that the day was Saturday, and that any violation of that command was punishable with death. "Keep you my Sabbath, for it is holy unto you; he that shall profane it shall be put to death; he that shall do any work in it, his soul shall perish in the midst of his people." Ex. 31:14.

It is impossible to realize a more severe penalty than that so solemnly uttered by God himself in the above text, on all who violate a command referred to no less than one hundred and twenty-six times in the old law. The ten commandments of the Old Testament are formally impressed on the memory of the child of the biblical Christian as soon as possible, but there is not one of the ten made more emphatically familiar, both in Sunday-school and pulpit, than that of keeping "holy" the Sabbath day.

Having secured with absolute certainty the will of God as regards the day to be kept holy, from his sacred Word, *because* he rested on that day, which day is confirmed to us by the practice of his chosen people for thousands of years, we are naturally induced to inquire *when and where* God changed the day for his worship, for it is patent to the world that a change of day has taken place, and inasmuch as no indication of such change can be found within the pages of the Old Testament nor in the practice of the Jewish people who continue for nearly nineteen centuries of Christianity obeying the written command, we must look to the exponent of the Christian dispensation, *viz*: the New Testament for the command of God cancelling the old Sabbath, Saturday.

We now approach a period covering little short of nineteen centuries, and proceed to investigate whether the supplemental divine teacher—the New Testament—contains a decree cancelling the mandate of the old law, and at the same time substituting a day for the divinely instituted Sabbath of the old law, *viz*: Saturday; for inasmuch as Saturday was the day kept and ordered to be kept by God, *divine authority alone*, under the form of a cancelling decree could abolish the Saturday covenant, and another divine mandate appointing by name another day to be kept "holy" other than Saturday, is equally necessary to satisfy the conscience of the Christian believer. The Bible being the only teacher recognized by the biblical Christian, the Old Testa-

*This article is from the *Catholic Mirror* of September 9. It is none the less significant when it is remembered that the *Mirror* is Cardinal Gibbons' organ. This is the second of the *Mirror's* articles.

ment failing to point out a change of day and yet another day than Saturday being kept "holy" by the biblical world, it is surely incumbent on the reformed Christian to point out in the pages of the New Testament the new divine decrees repealing that of Saturday and substituting that of Sunday, kept by biblicals since the dawn of the Reformation.

Examining the New Testament from cover to cover, critically, we find the Sabbath referred to sixty-one times. We find too, that the Saviour invariably selected the Sabbath (Saturday) to teach in the synagogues and work miracles. The four gospels refer to the Sabbath (Saturday) fifty-one times.

In one instance, the Redeemer refers to himself as "the Lord of the Sabbath," as mentioned by Matthew and Luke, but, during the whole record of his life, whilst invariably keeping and utilizing the day (Saturday), *he never once hinted at a desire to change it.* His apostles and personal friends afford to us a striking instance of their scrupulous observance of it *after his death*, and whilst his body was yet in the tomb, Luke 23:56 informs us: "And they returned and prepared spices and ointments, and rested on the Sabbath day according to the commandment." "But on the first day of the week, very early in the morning [they came] bringing the spices they had prepared." The "spices" and "ointments" had been prepared Good Friday evening, because "the Sabbath drew near." 54th verse. This action on the part of the personal friends of the Saviour proves beyond contradiction, that *after his death* they kept "holy" the Saturday, and regarded the Sunday as any other day of the week. Can anything, therefore, be more conclusive than that the apostles and the holy women never knew any Sabbath, but Saturday, up to the day of Christ's death?

We now approach the investigation of this interesting question for the next thirty years, as narrated by the evangelist, St. Luke, in his Acts of the Apostles. Surely some vestige of the cancelling act can be discovered in the practice of the apostles during that protracted period.

But, alas! We are once more doomed to disappointment. *Nine times* do we find the Sabbath referred to in the "Acts," but it is the *Saturday* (the old Sabbath). Should our readers desire the proof, we refer them to chapter and verse in each instance. Acts 13:14, again same chapter 27v., again, 42v.; again 44v. Once more, 15c., 31v. again 17c., 2v.; again, 18c., 4v. "And he (Paul) reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." *Thus the Sabbath (Saturday) from Genesis to Revelation!!!* Thus it is impossible to find in the New Testament the slightest interference by the Saviour or his apostles with the original Sabbath, but on the contrary, an entire acquiescence in the original arrangement, nay a *plenary indorsement* by him whilst living and an unvaried, active participation in the keeping of that day and no other by the apostles, for thirty years after his death, as the Acts of the Apostles have abundantly testified to us.

Hence, the conclusion is inevitable, *viz:* that of those who follow the Bible as their guide, the Israelites and Seventh-day Adventists have the exclusive weight of evidence on their side, while the biblical Protestant has not a word in self-defense for his substitution of Sunday for Saturday. More anon.

The A. P. A. and the Papists.

TROUBLE is brewing between the American Protective Association and the Roman Catholics. At Topeka, Kan., on the 11th inst., the Secretary of State declined to file a charter for a council of the A. P. A. on the ground that the organization, which is anti-Catholic, "seeks to oppose, by the sanction and assistance of law, a religious body in a country where the Constitution forbids interference with the religious opinions of any one."

The object of the association, as stated in the charter, is "to protect our country and its free institutions against the secret, intolerant and aggressive efforts that are being persistently put forth by a certain religio-political organization to control the Government of the United States and destroy our blood-bought civil and religious liberty; to maintain our free public school system, and oppose the union of Church and State."

So far as the avowed purpose of the A. P. A. is concerned, there is certainly no reason why it could not be incorporated under the laws of any State in the Union. It does not propose to act contrary to law but in accordance with the law, and only to oppose the Roman Catholics, so far as they are seeking to subvert civil and religious liberty, and to overthrow the public school system. It is not hard to discern in the action of the Secretary of State of Kansas the fine hand of papal influence.

But in our judgment the A. P. A. and the Papacy differ more in the objects which they have in view than in either principles or methods. The A. P. A., a secret political organization, is opposed to the Papacy, which, so far at least as the Jesuits are concerned, is a secret, religio-political organization. And every secret, political organization of any considerable magnitude is a menace to the State and to the liberties of the people who compose the State. The Catholics, plotting to secure public money for the support of their denominational schools, are a menace to our free institutions. But is it any better for the A. P. A. to invoke the power of the State to compel the Catholics to educate their children in the State secular schools instead of in the parochial religious schools? We do not believe in Roman Catholic doctrines nor have we any sympathy with the popish demand for a division of the public school funds; but we do most sincerely believe in the sacred right of the parent to educate his child in the church school.

The objection that the parochial schools make children Catholics first and citizens afterwards is not valid. With the papist, to be a Catholic, is synonymous with being a Christian, and the Christian who is not such first and above all things else is not worthy of the name, nor is his Christianity worth the professing. Says the Author of Christianity: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness." This is Christianity; but the idea that patriotism should have the first place, that every man should be a citizen first and a Christian second, is not one whit better than paganism, which subordinated everything, to the State and the State to the emperor, and then clothed the emperor with divinity and worshiped him. We would as soon commit the keeping of our soul to the Papacy as to the State. We would as soon submit to the despotism of the Papacy as to despotism

that would compel us to educate our children to be citizens, or anything else, first and Christians afterwards. However much the Catholics may be astray in their understanding of divine truth, they are certainly right in putting their eternal interest first and in making everything subordinate to that.

But making religion the first concern and putting loyalty to Christ before loyalty to the State does not mean that the Church should usurp the functions of the State. Church and State should be entirely separate, and this for the very reason that while rendering "to Cæsar [the State] the things which are Cæsar's," the individual may be left perfectly free to render also "unto God the things that are God's." The papal scheme of making the State subordinate to the Church, destroys this liberty, for it places at the disposal of the Church the power of the State, and then the Church uses that power to coerce men, to compel them not only to render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, but also to force them to render "to God the things that are God's." But on the other hand, the A. P. A. scheme, which proposes to subordinate the Church to the State, would make it possible for the State to forbid the individual to render to God the things due him. The Catholic regards it as a religious duty—a service due to God—to educate his child in the parochial school; the A. P. A. would have the State say: You shall not educate your child in this way, but you shall send him to the public school in order that the State may have his first and best affections, and the Church and Him whom the Church represents the second place in his heart. The A. P. A. should see to it that in its efforts to preserve civil and religious liberty it does not destroy both. C. P. B.

Chicago Correspondence.

Some Earnest Dissenters.

THE Parliament of Religions has developed its distinctive characteristics, and they have proved to be Roman Catholic and pagan,—with but two dissenters, so far,—one a Seventh-day Baptist, and the other himself a pagan. With these two exceptions the entire Parliament bids fair to be a great council for the establishment of a man-made philosophy of religion. The method used is the same which was so effective in the degradation of Christianity in the early centuries, that is, compromise with paganism. As this Parliament progresses it becomes more and more evident that its projectors had but small comprehension of that which they were building, and that in reality another mind was planning the course and another hand was at the helm—the same which guided the union with paganism in the first great falling away. From that union resulted Roman Catholicism; it does not, therefore, do violence to its nature now by absorbing into itself the Protestantism which no longer protests, and the pagan stock from which it sprang in the beginning and again re-assimilating the scattered members into one family. In doing this Catholicism does not change,—it remains the same. That ancient boast of the Roman Catholic Church—that it never changes—has been gracefully reiterated here in the Catholic Congress and in the Parliament of Religions, and the progress of this cosmopolitan religious council has proved that it has no need to change,—

for it has bided its time until all professed orthodox Christianity is ready to return to the feet of "Mother Church," bringing the remainder of paganism with it.

But even among non-Christians an occasional dissenter is found and the Parliament listened to one, most nobly outspoken, in the person of the Japanese Buddhist, Kinza Ringe M. Harai. This gentleman, who is a man of learning and ability, speaking English with fluency and accuracy, and evidently well informed upon the civil and religious polity of English speaking people, declared unhesitatingly:—

If any person should claim that there are many people in Japan who speak and write against Christianity, I am not a hypocrite, and I will frankly state that I was the first in my country who ever publicly attacked Christianity—no, not real Christianity but false Christianity; the wrongs done toward us by the people of Christendom. If any reprove the Japanese because they have had strong antichristian societies, I will honestly declare that I was the first in Japan who ever organized a society against Christianity—no, not against real Christianity, but to protect ourselves from false Christianity and the injustice which we receive from the people of Christendom.

This fearless Japanese told of wrongs which Japan had suffered from the nations which claim to constitute "Christendom," and said:—

One of the excuses offered by foreign nations is that our country is not yet civilized. Is it the principle of civilized law that the rights and profits of the so-called uncivilized, or the weaker, should be sacrificed? As I understand it, the spirit and the necessity of law is to protect the rights and welfare of the weaker against the aggression of the stronger; but I have never learned in my studies of law that the weaker should be sacrificed for the stronger. Another kind of apology comes from the religious source, and the claim is made that the Japanese are idolaters and heathen. . . . Admitting, for the sake of argument, that we are idolaters and heathen, is it Christian morality to trample upon the rights and advantages of a non-Christian nation, coloring all their natural happiness with the dark stain of injustice? I read in the Bible, "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also;" but I cannot discover there any passage which says, "Whosoever shall demand justice of thee, smite his right cheek, and when he turns, smite the other also." Again, I read in the Bible, "If any man will sue thee at law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also;" but I cannot discover there any passage which says, "If thou shalt sue any man at the law, and take away his coat, let him give thee his cloak also."

We are very often called barbarians, and I have heard and read that Japanese are stubborn and cannot understand the truth of the Bible. I will admit that this is true in some sense, for, though they admire the eloquence of the orator and wonder at his courage, though they approve his logical argument, yet they are very stubborn and will not join Christianity as long as they think it is a Western morality to preach one thing and practice another.

This is a noble dissent. The conclusion which Mr. Harai has reached is the inevitable deduction from the theory that the peoples of so-called Christendom constitute "Christian nations," and therefore are exemplars, in their governmental policy, of Christianity. Thus it is that this theory antagonizes those whom the gospel should reach.

On Sunday, September 17th, Rev. A. H. Lewis, D.D., of Plainfield, N. J., spoke in the Parliament on "The Divine Element in the Weekly Rest Day." One strong paragraph from the Doctor's address is as follows:—

Another decided hindrance to the recognition of the divine element in the weekly rest day is reliance on the civil law for the enforcement of its observance. This point is worthy of far more careful and scientific consideration than it has yet received. The vital divine element in the weekly rest day is eliminated when it is made a "civil institution." The verdict of history on this point is unmistakable, uniform and imperative. Any argument is deceptive and destructive if it places

the rest day on a par with those civil institutions that spring from the relations which men sustain to each other in organized society. The fundamental difference is so great that the same treatment cannot be accorded to each. Civil institutions spring from earthly relations between men. But, as we have seen, duration is so essentially an attribute of God, that man's relations to it and to God are relations supremely religious. Hence it is that when civil authority is made the ground, or the prominent ground of obligation to observe the weekly rest day, the question ceases to be a religious one. It is taken out of the realm of conscience, and of spiritual relations, and put on an equality with things human and temporary. This brings ruin, and nothing good can be built thereon by any sort of indirection, or by compromise.

Men inevitably cease to keep the Godward side of the question in sight, when "the law of the land" is presented as the main point of contact. The ultimate appeal is not to Cæsar, but to God; to conscience, not to Congress. Here is the fatal weakness of "Modern Sabbath Reform." History sustains these conclusions with one voice. No weekly rest day has ever been religiously or sacredly kept under the authority of the civil law alone. On the contrary, the religious element is always destroyed by the supposed protection of civil law. When conscience, springing from the recognition of the divine element is wanting, nothing higher than holidayism can be reached. The weekly rest day loses its sacredness and its power to uplift and bless whenever divine authority and the sanctity which flows therefrom are separated from it.

Such dissent from error and outspoken expressions of truth as these two brave dissenters have voiced in this greatest religious council of the ages should be heard by some,—should cause some to stop and think,—to ponder whether or no the realities of truth are not really of the highest importance, and the theories of a man-made religious philosophy, with all its attendant evils and errors, to be antagonized with no less zealous effort than that to which the earnest Japanese pledges himself.

Chicago, Sept. 18.

No Moral Power but of God.

NOT only is the State powerless to control sin and enforce morality, but the individual is powerless to control sin in his own person. No person can by any exercise of strength, will, or resolution, break the power that sin has in his own life. Every human attempt to cope with sin has proved a failure and is destined to be so. How then can a State do for its citizens what no man can do for himself? How could a community of lepers legislate the disease out of their midst? As well may civil government undertake to counteract the evils of the human heart. They have tried it in years gone by, but the attempt has made martyrs or hypocrites of the subjects, and monsters of the zealots.

The only force that can oppose the power of evil is that represented by the gospel of Christ. "It is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom. 1:16. Only the power of God can match the power of Satan. But God works by different methods than those employed by the State. The latter accompanies its behests by no persuasions. It does not entreat obedience and respect. It lays its strong hand upon the offender with an unmistakable "come along," that has no savor of mercy or forbearance. But not such are the methods of divine goodness. Says Paul: "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." Says Christ: "Behold I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him and will sup with him, and he with me."

The Father says: "I have loved thee with an everlasting love; therefore with lovingkindness have I drawn thee." These words represent the spirit of the gospel. Moral principle can only be cultivated by moral influences. A good character can only be formed by a voluntary choice of the good, and then the will must be mightily assisted by the grace of God. Faith in Christ as the Saviour from sin brings the soul into connection with divine strength and breaks the bondage of sin.

G. C. TENNEY.

Religious and Civil Liberty in Pennsylvania.

[From the chapter on "Civil and Religious Liberty," in "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell."]

(Continued.)

As Mr. Campbell frequently visited his mother and the family, now living near Middletown, he soon became well acquainted with the facts and principles developed during the operation of these "Moral Societies;" but, though indignant at such invasions of personal and public freedom, he, for some time, forebore to notice them, as he lived in an adjoining State, where such things had no existence. As matters grew worse, however, and no one in Washington County seemed willing or able to undertake the matter, he determined at length to interfere, and on the 27th of April, 1820, he published an article, under the signature of "Candidus," in which he criticised an address previously issued by the "Moral Society of Middletown." In this piece he first satirized, in his peculiar way, the moral state of Middletown, which was thought to demand such remedies, and then exposed the conduct of some leading member of the Moral Society, who were themselves guilty of *raffling*, taking part in "shooting matches" for gain, etc. He then *attacks* the principle on which the societies acted, viz., that *fining men for their vices would make them moral*.

"When they pay dear for their sins," says he, "they will, from principles of *avarice*, become morally correct! . . . And what becomes of the fines? Oh! they are given to some pious clergyman to be applied to the education of young men for the ministry. Go on, therefore, in your misdeeds, ye profane, for the more you sin the more preachers we will have."

As may be readily supposed, this article created quite a sensation. The Society at Middletown immediately appointed a committee to make a reply to it, which was published in the *Reporter*, in which, instead of defending the principles of the society, raised against "Candidus" the cry of "a friend to immorality," etc., and attempted to browbeat and intimidate him. To this effusion, however, the latter very promptly replied, disavowing the improper motives attributed to him, and fully admitting and asserting the claims of morality. He boldly claims the right, however, to "animadvert on those who, unsolicited, mount the judgment-seat and presume to deal rash judgment round the land on every one they suppose able to pay for his transgression." He then goes on to show that such Moral Societies are "anti-evangelical, anti-constitutional and anti-rational;" he says he has as good a right to sit in judgment on them as they have on their fellow-citizens. His first position, that they are anti-evangelical,

he then goes on to prove by showing that the Bible gives no authority whatever for them. In another article, on the 5th of June, he continues the argument showing that Moral Societies are anti-evangelical, because "Christians are not at liberty to interfere with men of the world in any thing pertaining to God and conscience." He takes the ground, also, that if all members of society anywhere are Christians, they must go by the discipline given in the New Testament.

These assaults brought out a host of writers on behalf of the societies, and the paper was for some time crowded with articles, mostly of very poor quality, and filled with invectives against "Candidus." By way of variety, an essay then appears in defense of "Candidus," signed "V. A. Flint," corroborating the statement of "Candidus" in regard to the practical operation of the societies. In doing this, he details the case of a poor old Revolutionary soldier, who, at an election in Taylorstown, indulged too freely in liquor, and was consequently fined by the society members. The old man, being exasperated at having to pay the fine, began to swear, and continued thus to vent his passion for a considerable time, during which the *custodes morum* in attendance coolly kept an exact account of the particular number of oaths. As there was a fine in every oath, the aggregate amount finally became so great that, in order to pay it, the old man had to part with the entire store of corn on which his family depended for subsistence during the winter. On the 12th of June, there appears a weak piece against "Candidus," and in the same paper another article by V. A. Flint, in his defense. On the 19th, "Candidus" continued his exposition of principles. He shows that "the only system of pure morality is that of the Bible, especially of the New Testament, and that it must point out the only sure and efficient means of promoting it." Reaching down to the great basis on which all morality rests, the will of the Divine Lawgiver, he shows that a violation of this will in any one point is the violation of the whole law, as it is a rejection of the authority on which the whole rests. He quotes the declaration of James: "He that said thou shalt not commit adultery, said also, thou shalt not steal;" and, "If a man keep the whole law and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." He then remarks that the law enforced by the societies "values the profanation of the 'Sabbath' at four dollars; profanation of the Divine name at less than one dollar; drunkenness at so much, etc.," and asked why, in view of the true principles of morality, is each sin valued at a different price, and why any of them are valued at a fixed price, etc. At this juncture, a letter appears from Mr. Findley, attributing the authorship of "Candidus" to Mr. Campbell, and endeavoring to cast aspersions upon his character. In the next paper, a letter from Mr. Campbell, over his own signature, addressed to Mr. Findley, demanding the proof of his assertions, to which Mr. F. made no reply.

It was just at this time that Mr. Campbell became engaged in an oral debate on baptism with Mr. John Walker, a minister of the Secession, and which was held at Mt. Pleasant on the 19th and 20th of June. This debate, and the subsequent preparation of it for the press by Mr. Campbell, interrupted, for a time, on his part, the discussion in regard to the Moral Societies.

Returning to the charge, however, in the latter part of July, he resumes the train of argument he had introduced, which, in order to avoid breaking the connection, will be here pursued to the close. In this article on August 31, "Candidus" argues the unconstitutionality of the proceedings of the Moral Societies, because the Constitution gave the right to all to worship God according to their conscience, expressly declaring "no one can be compelled to erect, attend, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry against his consent," and that the observance of the Sabbath, or of any other day, is purely a right of conscience. In subsequent essays, he takes the ground that "officers of the church have no right to interfere with the execution of the law, or to supersede civil officers legally appointed, as, in presuming to do so, they assume that the civil officers are insufficient. It is, however, made the duty of the magistrates to be vigilant in enforcing the law, as they are appointed for the very purpose of maintaining the good order of society, being ordained of God for the punishment of evil-doers and the praise of those who do well." Continuing his essays during the winter, "Candidus" criticised Judge Rush's charge upon the institution of the "Sabbath," in Luzerne County, Pa., and shows that there is no law in the New Testament prescribing the first day of the week as the "Sabbath."

Hitherto the writers against "Candidus" had displayed so little ability that they had not offered even a plausible refutation of one of his arguments, and the cause of the Moral Societies seemed to be in quite a hopeless state. But on the 12th of February, there appeared against "Candidus" a new writer of a different stamp, who signed himself "Timothy," and whose articles were written in much superior style. They were clearer and argumentative, entering into the merits of the question and discussing the matters involved, with a manliness and vigor which formed quite a contrast with the feebleness which had heretofore characterized the writers upon that side. In these essays, "Timothy" referred to "Candidus" as "Mr. C.," and continued them for several weeks without any reply from the latter. The impression hence became general that, feeling himself unable to meet the reasoning of "Timothy," "Candidus" had abandoned the discussion; and it was then whispered round that "Timothy" was none other than Rev. Andrew Wylie, D.D., who had, some time before, become president of Washington College.

At length, upon the 16th of April, "Candidus" reappears, reviewing the progress of the discussion up to that time. To this "Timothy" replies, admitting that the previous opponents of "Candidus" had injured their cause. In the same paper, another article appears from "Candidus," who appears to be conscious that he has now an opponent worthy of regard, and therefore takes hold of "Timothy's" arguments with more than usual power. In subsequent numbers he ably exposes the plausible sophisms of "Timothy," and sustains the position he had himself taken, while the replies of "Timothy" become feeble and are at last discontinued. "Candidus," accordingly, on the 6th of August, 1821, sums up the controversy, and, supposing that "Timothy" had retired, challenges him to debate the whole question from beginning, either orally or in the *Reporter*. To this, on the 20th, "Timothy" replies, saying he

had not retired, but would continue to write as long as Mr. C. advanced anything worthy of notice, and endeavors then to show that Mr. C.'s reasoning was fallacious. This he followed up in two long articles, which were devoted to invective rather than argument, and treated side-issues rather than the main question. Resuming the subject on the 17th of September, "Candidus" addressed the public through the *Reporter*, apologizing for the discursive style of the previous discussion, during which he had been induced to follow his opponents into matters irrelevant. He charges "Timothy" with having pursued an improper course in his article, and with having written a scurrilous poem which had appeared in the *Reporter*. He further says that he has made an arrangement with his friend Mr. Sample to have the controversy conducted thenceforth in a proper style, and that he will now furnish a column regularly, as a new series of articles. The first of these accompanies this address, and states the argument (which, at this time was confined to the "Sabbath" question), as follows:—

The whole of the precepts or commands of the Christian religion are contained in the New Testament.

But there is no precept or command in the New Testament, to compel by civil law, any man who is not a Christian, to pay any regard to the Lord's day, any more than to any other day.

Therefore, to compel a man who is not a Christian to pay any regard to the Lord's day, more than to any other day, is without authority in the Christian religion.

The statement of his second argument is as follows:—

The gospel commands no duty which can be performed without faith in the Son of God. Whatever is not of faith is sin.

But to compel men destitute of faith to observe any Christian institution, such as the Lord's day, is commanding duty to be performed without faith in God.

Therefore, to command unbelievers or natural men to observe, in any sense, the Lord's day, is anti-evangelical or contrary to the gospel.

(Conclusion next week.)

A Lutheran Pastor on Sunday Laws.

367 Clinton Ave., Albany, N. Y.

EDITOR AMERICAN SENTINEL: The SENTINEL, on account of its independent tone, pure sentiment, and watchful character, well deserves a place at the fireside of every patriotic American citizen. Its avowed aim is to preserve intact the purity of the Constitution of this glorious Republic, and to reserve for the true Christian religion her rightful claim. That holy purpose can only be accomplished by keeping (as did our forefathers, the founders of this Government) forever separate State and Church. The separation of Church and State is both constitutional and biblical, as Christ's words prove, "My kingdom is not of this world." Therefore "render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Now, although I heartily indorse your articles, I cannot subscribe to an assertion made in the edition of September 14, vol. 8, No. 36, page 281, that the professed Protestant churches of the United States are completely apostate. The Lutheran Church, a potent factor in religious circles, did not go to Rome. It did not clamor for Sunday-closing at the Fair. It recognized the fact, that the display of progress to be exhibited at the Columbian Exposition, was an arrangement entered by the nations and governments of the world (hence the

name World's Fair). It was neither an exhibition of religious bodies, nor exhibition by churches, consequently without religion in its nature. Therefore it is ridiculous for any church to interfere with its opening or closing, week-day or Sunday. Another common foe of our country and religion, is the temperance movement. It endeavors to fix its foolish notions into State laws. By its source it is sectarian, in principle unchristian. They try to curse the wine which Christ blessed.*

The passage in Scripture, Col. 2:21, from which the temperance exponents gathered their force, condemns their own action. Paul criticised the motto as an ordinance of men, which was doomed to perish. The 16th verse offers the key to the explanation. No man has a right to judge us in respect to what we eat or drink, for every creature of God is good, if used rightly and moderately. The only scriptural advice, which temperance enthusiasts might use, is, "Be temperate in all things." But they disallow to be temperate in some things, by prohibiting them entirely. What is the difference between commanding to abstain from meats, and prohibiting drinks? Both are ungodly, satanical. Both are "American highways" that lead to Rome. In this respect, also, you will see at a glance the right, constitutional, and biblical stand taken and defended by the Lutheran Church. This much, please, in vindication of the Lutheran policy.

J. G. HENRY.

September 19.

Known by Works.

"CONGRESS shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof"—but they have. The effort of the Fifty-second Congress to close the gates of the World's Fair on Sunday is a plain violation of this part of our Constitution. The observance of Sunday is a religious custom, and to fix it by civil law is to establish a religion by law.

This part of our Constitution was intended to keep the Church and State forever separate, but now that it is made void, Church and State become united. The purpose of a union is too well known these days not to cause some alarm. All unions are to secure to the parties the power of united action in every thing that may advance their interest. All churches have taken more or less interest in the commandments of God and man. Usually they have taken more interest in the commandments of man and less in the commandments of God. At times serious disputes have arisen between them, and a union or combine with the civil power is no new or untried experiment, and has always been taken first by the party in error. A controlment by force, through the civil law or otherwise, can have no place in the mind of a Christian man. He "reproves, rebukes, exhorts with all long suffering and doctrine."

For many months there has been a serious dispute among the churches over the Sabbath question, or fourth command-

ment. Every person ought to know now who is right and who is wrong. Every person ought to know now that Sunday, as a religious day, is a man-made institution and not of God. Church history shows evil men and seducers have turned from the word of the Lord, the source of all power for good, to the civil law as a final resort.

By this alliance with the civil power, Seventh-day Adventists are persecuted to-day in Tennessee and Maryland, and many other places. By this alliance the Quakers and Baptists were persecuted. By this alliance Roger Williams and Anne Hutchison were banished. By this self-same alliance the Lord of glory was crucified. John 18:31, last clause.

P. A. REED.

More Sunday Cases in Maryland.

Ford's Store, Md., Sept. 11.

EDITORS AMERICAN SENTINEL: Yesterday, Sunday, September 10, Alexander Dodd and Joseph Warram, Seventh-day Adventists, were on Winchester Creek shore, quietly fixing their oyster rakes, preparing for the oyster season which is about to open, when, lo, and behold, our wide-awake constable (who aims, if possible, to be on hand on these occasions) appeared on the scene of action. This morning, at 9 o'clock, they were arrested and notified to present themselves before Justice Kerr at 10 o'clock. They were in time, and the justice opened with the case of Alexander Dodd. The defendant requested to look at the warrant upon which he was arrested; the justice refused that right. The defendant then requested that the writer appear as counsel for him; the justice refused this also. Defendant then requested that his case be postponed until he could get counsel that was legally sworn in court. Justice Kerr refused to allow such postponement, saying that Mr. Dodd was present at the trials of other Seventh-day Adventists, and they had counsel, and he knew the verdict; intimating that the same verdict would be rendered, counsel or no counsel. Seeing that their cases were already decided, Mr. Dodd and Mr. Warram, knowing that no justice would be shown them before *this so-called* justice, both waived an examination, and their cases will go before a jury at the November term of the Circuit Court. This makes a total of seven cases of Adventists to be tried in this court, in November.

CHAS. O. FORD.

True Sabbath Observance.

THE prevailing idea that Sabbath keeping is rest, is, to my mind, far from the truth. Nowhere in all God's Word do we find the Lord placing the obligation to regard the Sabbath upon the fact that man needs rest. To do so is to lower both the object and the proper observance of his holy day. Idleness from worldly employment is, of itself, far from Sabbath keeping. We do not keep the Sabbath that we may rest, but rest that we may keep the Sabbath. An individual might not do a stroke of worldly business on that day, and still be a Sabbath-breaker. Proper Sabbath keeping is that in which the person intelligently recognizes God's authority as the reason for keeping it, and not his own selfish interests. When he recognizes the divine presence with him on that day, and when he sees the special divine blessings placed upon that, above all other

days, he realizes that he not only has all the blessings that he has upon all other days, but, in addition to those, he enjoys the special blessing that was put upon that day above the other days. He lays aside his secular duties, and all thought and care of them, that he may, unhindered give himself time to meditate, as he could not do in his busy cares of life, upon the fact that it was his blessed Lord that made the heavens and the earth in six days and had himself rested, and has sanctified the day "because," not that man needed rest, but "that in it he had rested from all his work, which God created and made." He knows that Christ, the Son of God, made heaven and earth and that he was the one who blessed the Sabbath (Mark 2:27, 28, and Col. 1:15, 17); that he could not suffer the plan in creating the world to fail through man's fall, and so now he is carrying out the original plan in another way, by the work of redemption. And how can we say that redemption is greater than creation when it is only creation itself,—a new creation in Christ Jesus? See Eph. 2:10, 4:24; Isa. 65:17, 19. The Sabbath of the Lord is a memorial of both events, and he recognizes that fact. This, and this only, is true Sabbath keeping; and we make a serious mistake when we place anything lower than this as Sabbath keeping.—*E. W. Webster, in the Carolina Spartan.*

Monday Morning Newspapers.

APROPOS of the so-called Sabbath sentiment at the South, the New York *Evening Post* observes:—

The sentiment against Sunday opening of the World's Fair is exceptionally strong in the South, and yet in many Southern cities the newspapers appear on Sunday morning, but not on Monday, with the approval of the religious element in the community. A paper in Birmingham, Ala., has been trying the experiment of printing on Monday and given it up, and the *Montgomery Advertiser* recalls the fact that it went through the same experience a few years ago. There are some cities in the West, notably in Iowa, where the same system prevails. It seem a very strange thing to people in the East, whether saints or sinners, and illustrates afresh, that it takes all sorts of folks to make up a world.

We regard it as very unlikely that religious sentiment has anything to do with suspending the Monday morning issue in Birmingham, Montgomery, or elsewhere at the South. The "religious sentiment" that protests against the Monday morning issue and approves that of Sunday morning is manufactured, we fancy, in the counting-rooms of the newspapers chiefly concerned. We suspect that the suspension of the Monday paper has its real motive in a desire to get seven days' pay for six days' service, and that if newspaper publishers were paid by the day only they would soon moderate their religious ardor and find that progressive journalism calls for seven issues a week without fail.—*Washington Post.*

THE *Catholic Review* remarks that "we must not flatter ourselves that the Puritan spirit is dead. It is a restless, active, aggressive spirit that never ceases to agitate and plan and scheme until it has accomplished its object." This is true. But what is the spirit of Puritanism? Nothing in the world but the spirit of popery directed in so-called Protestant channels, that is, it is the principle of popery used in opposition to Roman Catholicism. Papists have no right to find fault with Puritanism; it is the legitimate child of popery.

*We do not believe that Christ blessed wine in the modern acceptance of the word—that cup which at the last "biteth like a serpent and stingeth like an adder." Certain it is that intemperance in all its forms is opposed to the teaching of Christ. No drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God; and a special woe is pronounced against the man who puts a bottle to his neighbor's lips. We do not, however, indorse the religious-political temperance movement which is in effect only an auxiliary to the National Reform movement. There is a substantial basis for State regulation or even prohibition of the liquor traffic, but we seldom hear it mentioned.—*Editor.*

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY LIBRARY.

The Religious Liberty Library is a monthly publication (with occasional extras) published by the International Religious Liberty Association. The following numbers have been issued:—

No. 1. Due Process of Law and the Divine Right of Dissent. An interesting and instructive work upon the "Process of Law," "Christianity and the Common Law," "Individual Right of Religious Belief," "The Divine Right of Dissent," etc., in review of Judge Hammond's decision in the King case. By A. T. Jones. 120 pages. Price 15 cts.

No. 2. Religious Intolerance in the Republic. A lucid and vivid portrayal of recent persecutions in Tennessee, written by the editor of the *Arena*. 16 pages. Price 2 cts.

No. 3. Church and State. A timely document upon the origin of Church and State union, with the arguments and excuses for Sunday laws exempting Church property from taxation, laws against blasphemy, religious tests, etc., all well considered. By James T. Ringgold, of the Baltimore Bar. 60 pages. Price 10 cts.

No. 4. The National Sunday Law. Arguments in behalf of the rights of American citizens, presented by A. T. Jones in opposition to the Blair Sunday Rest Bill. A thorough catechism upon the subject of Church and State. 192 pages. Price 25 cts.

No. 5. Sunday Laws in the United States. Their groundlessness and unconstitutionality exposed. By James T. Ringgold. 24 pages. Price 3 cts.

No. 6. The Captivity of the Republic. A Report of the Hearing on the Sunday Closing of the World's Fair, before the House Committee on Columbian Exposition, Jan. 10-13, 1893. 128 pages. Price 15 cts.

No. 7. Appeal and Remonstrance. Resolutions adopted by the General Conference of the Seventh-day Adventists, Feb. 24, 1893, with documentary evidence attached. 24 pages. Price 3 cts.

No. 8. Appeal from the U. S. Supreme Court Decision making this a "Christian Nation." A Protest. A review of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States declaring that "this is a Christian Nation;" a powerful protest against the union of Church and State involved in this decision; also the subsequent act of Congress closing the World's Fair on Sunday, and how it was secured. The work contains the text in full of this remarkable decision of the U. S. Supreme Court. By A. T. Jones, Editor AMERICAN SENTINEL. 86 pp. Price 15 cts.

No. 9. Shall Religion be Taught in the Public Schools? A lucid exposition of both the unconstitutionality and impracticability of connecting religion with our public school educational system. 12 pages. Price 2 cts.

No. 10. Religious Liberty and the Mormon Question. Is the Prohibition of Polygamy Religious Legislation? This tract is a dispassionate arraignment of polygamy as an invasion of natural rights, and a logical defense of the right of every man to keep any day or no day as a season of rest and worship. 20 pages. Price 2½ cts.

Annual subscription to the Library, \$1.00.

Address—PACIFIC PRESS PUB. CO.,
43 Bond St.,
New York City.

SOME VALUABLE BOOKS FOR YOUNG MEN.

We have secured the following books which we can recommend, not only as unobjectionable but as highly beneficial reading for young men:—

Moral Muscle and How to Use It, by FREDERICK ATKINS. A Brotherly Chat with Young Men.

"This is positively the best book for young men that we have seen. It looks the facts of young men's lives full in the face, and proclaims the gospel of industry, perseverance, self-control, and manly Christianity. We can certify that no one will find it stupid."—*St. Andrews Cross*.

First Battles and How to Fight Them, by F. A. ATKINS. Friendly Chats with Young Men.

"It is true in substance, attractive in its style, and admirable in its spirit. I heartily commend this little volume."—*Rev. John Hall, D.D.*

The Spiritual Athlete and How He Trains, by W. A. BODELL. Introduction by REV. B. FAY MILLS.

A work for young men, pithy, pointed and practical. "Its power and value lie in the consistent carrying out of the comparison between physical and spiritual training."—*The Independent*.

Brave and True, by J. THAIN DAVIDSON. Talks to Young Men.

"This is one of the books the wide distribution of which cannot be too greatly desired."—*Presbyterian Journal*.

Each of these books is complete in itself, and so can be sold separately at **fifty cents each**; but as they are all about equally good, and desiring to encourage the dissemination of such literature, we offer the **four for \$1.75**. They are all bound alike, and put up in a neat box present a very attractive appearance. They will form a valuable addition to any young man's or youth's library.

Address Pacific Press 43 Bond St., New York City.

WEST SHORE RAILROAD.

Excursion Tickets to World's Fair,
Good Ten Days..... \$17.00
Also Round Trip Tickets, Good
Until November 15.....\$28.00

Health, Pleasure, and Business Travel,

Via the famous Trunk Line and Picturesque

WEST SHORE ROUTE,

Along the famous Hudson River and through the Mohawk Valley.

Excellent Wagner Buffet Sleeping Cars on fast express trains between New York, Boston, Kingston, Albany, Utica, Syracuse, Rochester, Buffalo, Niagara Falls, Toronto, Detroit, Cleveland, Chicago, and St. Louis.

For tickets, time tables and information, apply to any West Shore ticket agent, or to

H. B. JAGOE, G. E. P. A. A. A. SMITH, N. E. P. A.
363 BROADWAY, N. Y. 300 Washington St., BOSTON, MASS.

E. J. WEEKS, G. A. F. J. WOLFE, G. A.
BUFFALO, NEW YORK. ALBANY, NEW YORK.

C. E. LAMBERT, Gen'l Passenger Agent.
5 Vanderbilt Ave. New York City.

THE MEDICAL MISSIONARY.

J. H. KELLOGG, M. D., Editor.

A twenty-four page monthly journal, devoted to the various phases of medical missionary and benevolent work. It contains each month also articles of general interest on mission fields, and items of missionary intelligence. Each number is illustrated.

Published by the S. D. A. Medical Missionary and Benevolent Association.

Price 25 cents per year.

Address Medical Missionary,
Battle Creek, Mich.

PRINTING OUTFIT 15¢
COMPLETE, 4 alphabets rubber type, typeholder, bottle In-
soluble Ink, Ink Pad and Tweezers. Put up in neat box with
directions for use. Satisfaction guaranteed. Worth 50c. Best
Linen Marker, Card Printer, etc. Sets names in 1 minute,
prints 500 cards an hour. Sent postpaid 15c; 2 for 25c, Cat. free.
R. H. INGERSOLL & BRO. 65 Cortlandt St. N. Y. City.

PRISON LIGHT Wants active agents everywhere.
Good pay. 15c.
Trial year. Indorsed by SENTINEL. Particulars free.
MYERS, PRISON LIGHT, Newfane, Vt.

THE BATTLE CREEK SANITARIUM HEALTH FOODS.

For more than sixteen years the Battle Creek Sanitarium has maintained a Health Food Department, at first for the benefit of its patients and patrons, later, and for more than a dozen years, with increased facilities, to supply the general public. Within the last year **More than 150 Tons** of the following named foods have been manufactured and sold:—

- Oatmeal Biscuit, Rye Wafers,
- Medium Oatmeal Crackers,
- Fruit Crackers, Carbon Crackers,
- Plain Oatmeal Crackers,
- No. 1 Graham Crackers, Avenola,
- No. 2 Graham Crackers, Granola,
- Plain Graham Crackers (Dyspeptic),
- Wheat Granola, White Crackers,
- Whole Wheat Wafers,
- Gluten Biscuit, No. 1, Gluten Wafers,
- Gluten Biscuit, No. 2, Infants' Food.

Granola, The Gem of Health Foods.

Our Granola, which has now been manufactured by us for nearly seventeen years, is unquestionably the finest health food ever devised, and is greatly superior to any of the numerous imitations to which its success has given rise.

TO THE PUBLIC: This certifies that the Battle Creek Sanitarium Health Foods, manufactured by the Sanitarium under the name of the Sanitarium Food Company, are made under my direction and supervision, and that Granola and the other special foods manufactured by this company, are not made or sold by any other firm or person except their duly authorized agents.

Our goods are shipped to every part of the world—to Australia, New Zealand, India, Persia, and other foreign countries, as well as to all parts of the United States; and in every instance they have demonstrated their wonderful keeping properties. The following are a few of the hundreds of testimonials received from persons who have for years made use of our foods.

I have for three years used the "Health Foods" in my family, and can heartily recommend them, both for purity and health-giving properties.

MICHIGAN.

C. F. PORTER, D. D. S.

INDIANA.

Your "Health Foods" are the wonder of the nineteenth century. I have used Granola but a short time, but have already experienced relief from indigestion and acid, or flatulent dyspepsia. I also find the Zwiebach nourishing and toothsome.

D. M. KAUFFMAN.

I have personally tested your excellent food known as Granola. It is highly pleasing to the taste, easy of digestion, and the most nutritive cereal production with which I am acquainted.

DR. R. W. BULA.

NEW YORK.

Your Granola is the best selling invalid food I have ever handled. I have already sold nearly two thousand pounds.

A. J. BROUGHTON.

CONNECTICUT.

We have used your "Health Foods" in our family for three years, and can not get along without them. Having been troubled with dyspepsia and chronic inflammation of the stomach, I find that your Granola, Avenola, Wheatena, and Gluten are the only foods that I can eat with safety.

WM. M. MERWIN.

OHIO.

Our baby is a testimonial to Sanitarium food. She is ten months old, weighs twenty-eight pounds, and is as ruddy and healthy a specimen as can be seen. She has actually gained flesh while cutting her last two teeth. Her flesh is firm and sound, and she is very strong.

FRED. L. ROSEMOND.

MINNESOTA.

We have twins, and the little fellows are thriving nicely. The food agrees with them perfectly, and I have recommended it to many who are bringing up babies "by hand."

D. W. McCOURT.

We are constantly improving our foods, and adding to our list as the result of experimental researches conducted in the Sanitarium Laboratory of Hygiene and our Experimental Kitchen. For the latest descriptive circular and price list, address,

SANITARIUM HEALTH FOOD CO., Battle Creek, Mich



NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 28, 1893.

ANY one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend, unless plainly marked "Sample Copy." It is our invariable rule to send out no papers without pay in advance, except by special arrangement, therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it simply because they take it from the post-office.

OUR "Chicago Correspondence" is exceptionally good this week. Do not omit it.

"RELIGIOUS and Civil Liberty in Pennsylvania," continued in this paper is interesting and instructive. It will be concluded next week.

IF you have neighbors or friends who do not believe that the Catholic Church claims to have changed the Sabbath to Sunday, don't fail to furnish them the numbers of the SENTINEL containing the *Catholic Mirror's* articles.

THE *Political Dissenter* is so far from agreeing with the *Christian Statesman* that "Sunday-closing of the Fair has been practically achieved," that it remarks in a recent issue that "already it is manifest that the battle for the Sabbath [Sunday, the *Dissenter* means] has been fought to very little purpose."

So many orders have been received for the SENTINEL of August 31, containing "A Warning from 'Father' Chiniquy," that we have had a number of extra copies printed, and can supply probably all that our friends require. Will those who ordered previously and still desire the papers please renew their orders at once?

THE World's Fair Directors have decided not to reduce the fee for admission to the grounds on Sunday. The Fair will therefore remain "practically closed" on Sunday, and the forty thousand or more people who persist in going on that day, many of them, probably, because they cannot afford the time on other days, will continue to pay full price for less than half the show.

THE question of closing the Midwinter Fair in San Francisco is getting warm. A paper published in that city remarks that the first nail is not yet driven in the buildings, and yet the Sunday "clergy already pass resolutions asking the directors to close the Fair on Sundays, and thereby exclude those people who have to toil six days in the week for a living. This is all wrong. Clergymen cannot set themselves up as judges of the conscience of men. If those fanatics had their way every person who refused to believe as they do would be put to death, for they called upon the President of the United States to send troops to Chicago to prevent the gates of

the Fair from being opened on Sunday. The question of morals and conscience should be relegated to moral and religious agencies, and no attempt should be made to legislate upon them. Nobody compels those ministers to visit the Fair on a Sunday."

THE Nashville *Christian Advocate* thinks that—

The Sabbath question will never find its proper place in the Nation until its discussion is brought more fully within the realm of conscience.

Very true; but how can it ever be brought within the realm of conscience when the Bible Sabbath is disregarded and a man-made institution set up in its stead? The divine law is the only authority that can bind the conscience. It is vain to apply the fourth commandment to Sunday; men know better.

THE *Truth Seeker* publishes an article entitled, "Everything Christian Trying to Shirk Taxes." The editor ought to know, if he does not, that some of the Baptists and all of the Seventh-day Adventists are opposed to the exemption of Church property from taxation. No. 43 of *The Sentinel Library*, written by a Baptist and published by Seventh-day Adventists, is an able argument against the exemption of Church property from taxation. Moreover, at the last session of the Seventh-day Adventist General Conference at Battle Creek, Mich., February 17 to March 7, 1893, the following preamble and resolutions were adopted:—

WHEREAS, In view of the separation which we believe should exist between the Church and the State, it is inconsistent for the Church to receive from the State pecuniary gifts, favors, or exemptions, therefore,

Resolved, That we repudiate the doctrine that the Church or other ecclesiastical property should be exempt from taxation, and further,

Resolved, That we use our influence in securing the repeal of such legislation as grants this exemption.

Everything Christian is not "trying to shirk taxes."

THE *Soldier*, a South Carolina National Reform organ, says:—

Now, brothers of the pulpit and tripod, why not take up your bugles and again sound the alarm until the marshalled hosts of the Lord shall make themselves felt against the Sunday running devil? It is right to close the Fair; it is wrong to leave the railroads free to grind their employes down to ceaseless toil. One victory should nerve the armies of righteousness for yet further conflict. Railroads, newspapers, street cars, and others should be taught the same salutary lesson so painfully learned by the Fair directors. Shall it be done? This *Soldier* is in the war, on the field of battle, and in the heat of conflict for victory. Let us hear from the editors and preachers. God calls us to conflict. Who is ready to act?

The friends of a legal Sunday will not be slow to act. Congress having yielded to the demand for legislation looking to the closing of the Fair, will be importuned to enact more stringent measures. The bribe having failed, mandatory laws will be asked for and secured. "As milder

measures fail, the most oppressive laws will be enacted." These words were written long before the controversy about the Fair arose. They are proving true.

THOSE who argue that Rev. 1:10 refers to Sunday have certainly never compared that text with Isa. 58:13; Ex. 20:10, 11; John 1:3; and Mark 2:28. The first of these texts shows plainly that the Lord has a day which he terms "My holy day." The second identifies that day as the seventh day. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." The third shows that the Son of God is the Creator of all things, and that, consequently, it was he who rested on the seventh day, and who blessed and sanctified it; while in the fourth, the Saviour himself declares that he "is Lord of the Sabbath day." In the light of these texts it is nothing short of a most unwarranted perversion of scripture to assert that John was in the Spirit on Sunday.

THE *Washington Post* remarks that "we have heard so long and so regularly about the coming European war that one is disposed to pooh-pooh anything like a gloomy view of any situation on that continent, no matter how threatening its superficial aspect. But really it does not seem possible for these taunts and hostile overtures to go much farther without calamitous results. A few more military manœuvres and naval demonstrations, a little more fist-shaking and face-making and the sparks must fly."

THE Russian authorities say to the Jews, "Become Christians or else leave the empire." The authorities of Tennessee and Maryland say to the Adventists, "Keep Sunday or else get out." We can discern little difference, except that one is said to Jews in Russia, the other, to Christians in America. The principle is exactly the same.

THE articles which we are now reprinting from the *Catholic Mirror* are valuable, and every Sabbath-keeper should have at least a few copies of the four numbers containing them to give to his friends and neighbors who do not believe that the Catholic Church claims that it changed the Sabbath. You can get nothing better. The first of these articles was published last week. We print another this week, and there are still two to follow. These papers will be furnished in small quantities at one cent per copy.

AMERICAN SENTINEL.

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.

Single copy, per year, - - - \$1.00.

In clubs of	5 to 24	copies to one address, per year,	- - -	90c
"	25 to 99	" " " " " "	- - -	80c
"	100 to 249	" " " " " "	- - -	75c
"	250 to 499	" " " " " "	- - -	70c
"	500 to 999	" " " " " "	- - -	65c
"	1000 or more	" " " " " "	- - -	60c
To foreign countries in Postal Union,			- - -	5 shillings

Address, AMERICAN SENTINEL,
43 Bond Street, New York City.