

If any Man Hear My Words, and Believe not, I Judge him not: for I Came not to Judge the World, but to Save the World. :

VOLUME 9.

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 6, 1894.

NUMBER 35.

American Sentinel.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE
PACIFIC PRESS PUBLISHING COMPANY,
No. 43 BOND STREET, NEW YORK.
Entered at the New York Post-Office.

ALONZO T. JONES, } EDITORS.
CALVIN P. BOLLMAN, }
A. F. BALLENGER, } ASSISTANT EDITOR.

LAST week we showed the absurdity of any suggestion of a "regency of God" as is not only suggested but *claimed* by the head of the Catholic Church, "Leo XIII., Pope."

THIS claim of a regency of God, however, is of the same piece with the suggestion, and claim that *man* is head of the body of Christ, which is his church, as is claimed by, and in behalf of, the pope of Rome; and which is indeed the foundation claim of the papacy.

IN the Scriptures the Church of Christ is described under the figure of the human body as God made it. The relationship between Christ and his church is shown and illustrated by the relationship that exists between the human body and its head; and the relationship between Christ and the members of his church is illustrated by the relationship between the members of the human body and the head of that body as God has placed it.

"THE church is his body." Eph. 1:22. "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." 1 Cor. 12:27. The members of his church are "members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones." Eph. 5:30. As with the members of the human body, the members of his church are also "members one of another" (Rom. 12:5); therefore "the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee: nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you." "For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? . . . But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased him." 1 Cor. 12:14. These

scriptures all speak of the Church of Christ.

Now, Christ is the head of this body, which is his church. He is the head of this church, which is his body. For "He is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead." Col. 1:18. "God raised him from the dead . . . and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body." Eph. 1:19-23. And it is Christ *himself*, too, who is head of this church. Not Christ by a representative; not Christ by a substitute, a vicar, or a regent; but Christ himself, in his own proper person. This is certainly true, because in stating this same thought under the figure of a *building*, the Word declares that Christ *himself* is the chief corner stone, "the *head-stone* of the corner." And here are the words: "Ye are God's building." 1 Cor. 3:9. In Christ "all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation [a dwelling-place] of God through the Spirit." "Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ *himself* being the chief corner stone." Eph. 2:21, 22, 19, 20. "This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:11, 12. Thus it is as certain as that the Scripture is true, that the head of the Church of Christ is "Jesus-Christ himself." Not Christ by a representative; not Christ by a substitute, a vicar, or a regent; but Christ himself in his own proper person.

YET the claim of the papacy is, that a *man* is head of the Church of Christ. The claim of the Catholic Church is, that the head of *that* church is the head of the Church of Christ. The claim of the church of Rome is, that the bishop of Rome is head of the Church of Christ—in the place of Christ—as the "representative," the "substitute," the "vicar," the

"regent," of Christ. Here is the authoritative statement, if any were needed in proof of a thing that is so notorious and undenied as is this. It is well to set it down here, however, for the sake of the contrast between this absurd claim and the truth as it is in Jesus Christ and his written word. So we quote from Cardinal Gibbons:—

Says the Council of Florence (1439), at which also were present the bishops of the Greek and the Latin Church, "We define that the Roman pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, and the true vicar of Christ, the head of the whole church, the father and doctor of all Christians; and we declare that to him, in the person of blessed Peter, was given by Jesus Christ our Saviour, full power to feed, rule and govern, the universal church."

The pope is here called the *true vicar* or representative of Christ in this lower kingdom of his church militant; that is, the pope is the organ of our Saviour, and speaks his sentiments in faith and morals.—*The Faith of Our Fathers*, pp. 154, 155.

It was the Council of Chalcedon, 451, that first addressed the bishop of Rome as "the head, of whom we are the members."

LET us look at this claim of the Catholic Church in view of the statements made in the Scriptures on this point. As we have seen, the Church of Christ is his body in this world, and he is its head. God is the builder of this body, the Church of Christ, as he was the builder of the human body in the beginning; for "God hath set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased him." Now, take a human body as God made it, with the head in its place as God set it. In the place of that head, which God gave to that body, you put a "representative" head—a substitute head. In the place of the true head, which God set to that body, you put a "regency" head—another head to occupy the place in the absence of the true head—then what have you? Take away the head from a human body, and you have left only a *dead body*. This is the very first and the only result of taking away the head. And even though you set another head on this headless body, it is still only a dead body.

Now this is precisely the case of the church of Rome. It was once the Church of Christ; its members were members of the body of Christ; and Christ was its head. It had life from Christ its living

head, the life which is by faith, so that its "faith was spoken of throughout the whole world." Rom. 1:8. But, there came "a falling away." 2 Thess. 2:3. The bishops and councils of the church put away Christ, the true head whom God had set, and put another, *a man*, in his place, as head of that church. The putting away of Christ, its living head, left it only a lifeless body; and the putting of another head in his place did not, and could not, give life to that lifeless body. So far as spiritual life is concerned—the real life of the Church of Christ—the church of Rome is as destitute of it as is a human body with its own head cut off and another head put on in its place. Thus the church of Rome is destitute of the life that vivifies the Church of Christ, and partakes only of the elements of death. The only hope for it, or for those that are connected with it, is to recognize that it is indeed spiritually dead, and have Christ the life-giver raise them from the dead, and connect them with himself as their living head, that thus they may live indeed.

WARNING was given against this very course of that church in the first days of the Church of Christ, and the same warning is yet given. In the second chapter of Colossians it is written: "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, *which is the head* of all principality and power. . . . Let no man beguile you of your reward in a *voluntary* humility and worshiping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind; and *not holding the head*, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God. Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, *why*, as though living in the world, *are ye subject to ordinances after the doctrines and commandments of men?* Which things indeed have a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and neglecting [punishing, margin] of the body; not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh."—Verses 7-10, 18-23. This is the divine warning against the spirit that made the papacy, against the papacy itself, against all its workings, and against its very nature. Men, fleshly-minded men, ambitious men, in the church, not being dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, holding the rudiments of the world and *not holding the head*—these were the men who put away from the people Christ the true and living head, and put a man, one of their own sort, in his place. And to supply the lack of Him and his life they imposed upon the people a host of forms and ordinances, and commandments and doctrines of men, and voluntary humilities, and will-worshiping, and punishings of the body in penances and pilgrimages, and worshiping of angels, and saints, and dead people called saints. And this is the body of which "Leo XIII., Pope," is the head. This is the church of Rome, with a man as its head, in the place of Christ. This is the Catholic Church. And this is how the bishop of Rome obtained his "regency of God on earth."

THERE is another figure used in the

Scriptures that forcibly illustrates the absurdity and iniquity of the claim of the church of Rome in this matter of the headship of the church. It is the relationship that exists between husband and wife in the marriage bond. In the fifth chapter of Ephesians, in speaking "concerning Christ and the Church," it is done under the figure of the marriage relation, with Christ in the place of the husband, and the church in the place of the wife. And the Word says, "The husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the Saviour of the body. Therefore, as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything. . . . This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the church."—Verses 23, 24, 32. The relationship of the church to Christ is thus plainly shown to be the same as that of the wife to her own husband. As the husband himself, and *not another man*, is the head of the wife; so Christ himself, and *not another*, is head of the church.

Now, suppose another man should propose to put himself in between a husband and his wife, to speak to her the sentiments of her husband in faith and morals (?), what would the loyal wife do?—Everybody knows that she would resent such an intrusion, and would promptly repudiate all such proffers. But, suppose another man should not only propose to put himself in the place of the husband to the wife, but that the wife should agree to the proposal and actually accept this other man in the place of her husband to speak to her the sentiments of her husband in faith and morals, then what is that but treason to her own husband, apostasy from her marriage vows, and adultery with this other man? And what kind of faith and morals have you in that case?—Everybody knows that that would be nothing but unfaithfulness and immorality.

Now, upon her own showing, upon her own claim, this is precisely the case of the Catholic Church. She claims to be "the bride of Christ." She claims that she is "the spouse of Christ." And yet she has accepted another, a man, as the "representative" of her husband, as the "substitute" for her husband, to occupy the place of her husband in his absence, to speak to her "his sentiments in faith and morals." She not only has accepted another in the place of her husband, but she openly boasts of it and actually proclaims it as the chiefest evidence of her faithfulness, her morality, and her purity. How could the unfaithfulness, the apostasy, the immorality, and the impurity, of that church be more plainly shown than in this which is her boast?

How could the complete abandon, and the essential wantonness, of a wife, be more clearly demonstrated than in citing the confirmed fact of another man's occupying the place of her husband to her, as evidence of her faithfulness and purity? Would not such a boast, and for such a purpose, be the strongest possible evidence that that woman's native modesty and moral sense had become absolutely deadened? Yet this is precisely the case of the Catholic Church. She has accepted another to occupy the place of her husband to her. She constantly boasts before the world that this fact is evidence

of her faithfulness, her morality, and her purity; and insists that all the world shall fall in with her in this course, in order that they may all be faithful and moral and pure! How could she more clearly demonstrate that all true sense of faithfulness, of morality, and of purity, has become completely obliterated from her consciousness? That a confirmed adulteress and harlot should boast of her iniquity as being the only way to righteousness, is certainly nothing else than the very mystery of iniquity itself. And such is the church of Rome.

SUCH is the merit, all that it has, of the claim that the Catholic Church is the true church; and that the bishop of Rome, the head of that church, is the head of the Church of Christ and "holds the regency of God on earth."

Consonant and Dissonant.

THE editor of the *Enterprise* of Dresden, Tenn., the city where Mr. Capps, a Seventh-day Adventist is serving a sentence of nine months in jail for doing common labor on Sunday, published Aug. 3, his opinion of the case which we print below. Our apology for publishing the matter is to call attention to the character of Mr. Capp's persecutors and to furnish an opportunity for introducing other and better opinions, which we do in the right-hand column.

WEAKLEY COUNTY has at last got 'em. The Seventh-day Adventists are upon us. A "martyr" is in jail for Christ's sake, and the faithful are beginning to flock here and distribute their literature and look humble and persecuted.

Yes, Weakley County escaped for a long time; but these persistent cranks at last succeeded in raising the wind, and we are destined to have a taste of what has plagued several neighboring counties for years.

The great distinguishing doctrine of the Seventh-day Adventists is, that all Christendom and all civilization are entirely "off" in their selection of Sunday as the Sabbath and the day of rest.

This sect has discovered a sort of Baconian cipher in the Bible that says Saturday is the day. With this wonderful scoop of views in their possession, the Adventists have set about to correct an erring world.

The consensus of universal opinion might have settled upon Wednesday as the day of rest, and it would have been satisfactory to everybody but a crank.

The Adventists have gained a great victory at last in Weakley County. They are untiring proselyters and as unremitting in their efforts to "convert"

"As for Saul, he made havoc of the church, entering into every house, and haling men and women committed them to prison. Therefore they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word." Acts 8:3, 4

"And when they found them not, they drew Jason and certain brethren unto the rulers of the city, crying, These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also; whom Jason hath received: and these all do contrary to the decrees of Cæsar." Acts 17:6, 7.

"Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:12. "And the dragon was wrath with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." Rev. 12:17.

"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." Ex. 20:8, 9.

"If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." Matt. 19:17.

"Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil." F 23:2. "Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather than men." Acts 5:29.

"Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine: for the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine." 2 Tim. 4:2, 3.

somebody as a Mormon missionary.

They at last got a convert. That is all they wanted. They converted a poor, weak, insensible, near Trezevant,

and the deluded creature at once set his plow to going on Sunday,

to the great scandal of the neighborhood and defiant violation of the civil law.

Of course, the poor fool had to be arrested, arraigned in court, fined a small sum,

and, to reach the goal of martyrdom, of course the convict refused to pay the fine or secure it, and the judge could do nothing else but send him to jail. Eureka! The Adventists had gained what they started in for; they now have at last a "martyr" in Weakley County. They now could scatter their measley literature over the country, announcing in tragic terms that in their land of boasted freedom, under a Constitution guaranteeing religious liberty, there was a man lying in a Weakley County jail because he insisted on worshipping God according to the dictates of his conscience.

That's the way the Adventists always present the matter, ever suppressing the fact that their "martyrs" are not in jail for their religious opinions, but simply because they are defiant violators of the civil law.

Numerically considered, these Adventist cranks are about the weakest sect in the Union, but they have a daring persistency and bold aggressiveness about them that have enabled them to kick up more devilment to the square inch than all the other religious fanatics combined.

All during election day one of these meek-looking apostles, who

"Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom?" James 2:5. "Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, . . . are called. . . . God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty." 1 Cor. 1:26, 27.

"Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work." Ex. 20:8.

"I have always understood that these people are peaceable and law-abiding citizens, and I have yet to learn that the acts for which they are indicted have injured or discommoded their fellow-citizens in any way, or interfered in the slightest with any substantial rights of others."—*Ex-Governor Porter, in Memphis Commercial, Feb. 3, 1893.* On this point see also Ex-Senator Tolley's article on this page.

The fine and costs in the Circuit Court amounted to \$51.80.

"The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," and the sign of his power. Sunday is the Sabbath of the Roman Catholic Church, and the sign of its power. — *Abridgment of Christian (Roman Catholic) Doctrine, p. 58.* "The imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists in several States . . . for performing bodily labor on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, proves that the Government assumes the right to enforce a religious dogma of the Catholic Church."—*George Pax, Catholic priest, of Sleepy Eye, Minn.* Seventh-day Adventists refuse to observe this "dogma of the Catholic Church," and further refuse to pay a fine on their loyalty to God.

"The rulers of Massachusetts put the Quakers to death and banished 'Antinomians' and 'Anabaptists,' not because of their religious tenets, but because of their violation of civil laws. This is the justification 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."—*Religion in America, p. 94.*

"Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." Luke 12:32. "Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Matt. 7:13, 14.

"Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth." Matt. 5:5. "But sanctify

appeared like he would very much enjoy being kicked for the Lord's sake so that he could get a place in the book of martyrs, stood at the polls and handed out to each man a pamphlet purporting to explain why his church would not observe our Sunday.

The literature is of the same kind that is so industriously sent out from the sect's headquarters at Battle Creek, Mich., every line of which is a vicious attack on our Christian Sabbath.

Judge Swiggart and Jno. Bond, who was then our attorney-general, had a bothersome experience with these fanatics in Henry and Obion counties for a number of years.

The organization at Battle Creek, known as the Religious Liberty Association, keep an eagle eye on all cases where their members are jailed for violations of our Sunday law, and they flock to the scene of manufactured martyrdom,

employ strong counsel for the defense, and vigorously contest every inch of ground in the courts. Where they lose in the lower they invariably make an appeal to the higher court.

In the case of King in Obion County, these resolute fanatics had carried their case to the Supreme Court of our State, which affirmed the decision of the lower court, and then the case was appealed to the United States Supreme Court, where further litigation was stopped by King dying.

Judge Swiggart has announced from the bench that no specious plea of religious liberty can influence him from strictly applying the plain statute of our civil law in these cases of willful and defiant violation of the Sabbath, and that every man so charged and convicted before him will be fined and sent to jail if he fails to pay the fine.

the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear." 1 Pet. 3:15.

Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine.

"We have wronged no man, we have corrupted no man, we have defrauded no man." 2 Cor. 7:2. And to all concerned we say with terrible earnestness, Count well the cost before taking upon yourselves the awful responsibility of attempting to force upon us, by pains and penalties, the sign of allegiance to Rome. Beware, 'lest haply ye be found even to fight against God.'" (Quoted from "literature" alluded to.)

"I believe that the action of our courts with reference to this question of compulsory Sunday idleness has hitherto been in contravention of the principles of American liberty as well as contrary to the expressed provision of the Constitution of our State."—*Ex-Governor Porter, in Memphis Commercial, Feb. 3, 1893.*

"The object of this Association shall be to protect the rights of conscience; to maintain a total separation between religion and the civil government; and by means of the platform and the press to educate the public mind on the relations that should exist between the Church and the State."—*Art. 2 International Religious Liberty Association Constitution.*

Though repeatedly charged Seventh-day Adventists with a desire to become "martyrs," "to reach the goal of martyrdom," "to get a place in the book of martyrs," etc., the editor now contradicts his own statements by declaring that instead of going to jail as soon as fined, they "employ strong counsel for defense and vigorously contest every inch of ground in the courts," and "invariably make an appeal to the higher court." "Consistency, thou art a jewel!"

"R. M. King, the victim of this persecution, is dead. He died as he had lived, a humble, harmless man, and a sincere Christian. He died condemned by the courts of Tennessee and the Circuit Court of the United States, and bound in \$1,000 bail on appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. By his death his case has passed from earthly courts, and stands appealed to the Supreme Court of the Universe."

"Will the Seventh-day Adventists 'make history,' as their prototypes did of old? Will their persistent and unhesitating choice between 'Diana and Christ' profitably compel the attention of those who lead public opinion and mold it into laws to the anomaly of the existence in free America of any statute which is simply the embodiment of a religious dogma, and which can be used by one sect to persecute another, so that there shall at last arise in every State, some prophet bold enough to propose, and strong enough to carry, the

repeal of the Sunday law? And, meantime, will the patient endurance, the 'sweet reasonableness,' the martyr spirit of those who when they are reviled revile not again, so prevail against the animosity of their neighbors, that very shame shall extinguish the ardor of 'Christian' mobs and public officials; and the Sunday laws, though not yet repealed, shall be permitted to lapse into 'innocuous desuetude?' Well, let us hope for each and all of these things."—*James T. Ringgold, of the Baltimore Bar, in "The Legal Sunday."*

So to our Adventist cranks we make the pleasing announcement that within Swiggart's jurisdiction they have the encouraging prospect of being able to manufacture a large quantity of first-class martyrdom.

"Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer: behold, the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; . . . be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." Rev. 2:10.

The Capps Case by a Tennessean.

THIS is but one of a series of cases tried in the courts of Tennessee, all involving directly and unmistakably the freedom of religion, the liberty of conscience. The bare statement of the case ought to be sufficient to startle every true Tennessean to a realization of the dangers that threaten our institutions. The idea of a peaceable, orderly citizen, being arraigned in our courts for no other offense than that of insisting on the right to worship as seemeth good to him in the sight of God, would have been a sufficient tocsin of alarm to have brought every Tennessean to his feet in manly protest against such an outrage as long as the spirit prevailed that inspired Jackson and his compatriots and their immediate successors to the deeds of valor in the cause of liberty, religious as well as political, that made this State, among all the States, the volunteer State. The inspiration that must have guided our sires in all these deeds of glory is surely fled the land. Their sons seem to have inherited none of it, else these shameful persecutions, under the forms of law, though it may be, could not transpire, and Tennesseans still have the hardihood to boast that our laws and institutions are founded on a love of liberty and fairness to all alike.

Instead of these things alarming our people to a realizing sense of their danger, they seem to look on with almost stoic indifference. Indeed, as long as such editorials, as appeared in a paper published in the immediate locality where this shameful persecution occurred, go unrebutted by the balance of the press of the State, it seems the spirit of liberty in the State is dead. No Puritan ever gloated with more fiendish or inhuman delight over a hapless victim consigned to jail or the stake in the days of bitterest and most shameful persecutions for conscience' sake in New England, than does this editor over the imprisonment of poor Capps.

According to this editor the gravamen of Capps' offense seems to be "the great scandal of the neighborhood," resulting from his "setting his plow to going on Sunday." Some narrow-souled, white-livered Puritan was always greatly scandalized if his neighbor was not altogether as pious as himself, or even if his piety took a different direction to his and led him to maintain any religious view different to his, the Puritan's. The organized, systematic crusade of the whole world by

the Jesuits to extirpate heresy was founded on and inspired by the same fiendish sentiment, the enforcement of which by civil law has drenched the fairest portions of earth in rivers of blood.

The imprisonment, the whipping at the post, and hanging on the gibbet, of Baptists and Quakers, by New England Puritans, had all, and just the same, justification that can be claimed for these Sunday persecutions and imprisonments. In the former, as well as these latter cases, the plea was to prevent the scandalizing the neighborhood, to maintain the *peace* and *dignity* of the State. It is a great scandal to the neighborhood, a great disturbance of the peace, and awfully against the dignity of the State, for a poor fellow to plow in his field, however remote it may be from any public road, or the public view in any way, on Sunday; though his necessities may forbid his losing more than one day out of seven from the work necessary to support himself and family; and what is more to him, his conscience forbids it also. For his law of conscience in the case commands that, "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work," Sunday being one of the six. This law, as he conceives, came directly from Jehovah at Mount Sinai, and was given to all mankind in all the ages. The same law commanded that he should "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." And it specifies, "But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." They, Sunday advocates, have quit denying that that is our Saturday.

To work on Sunday under these circumstances is a great offense to the neighborhood, so much so that in a similar case in Maryland a son actually had to play the part of a spy on his father, to detect the great scandal there is in Sunday work, so private and orderly was he proceeding about his business on that day. The questions of conscience involved matter nothing to these sleuth hounds in pursuing their hapless victims. In the Maryland case it mattered not to the son that his father regarded Sunday-keeping a Catholic institution and not a Bible command; for all the command there is on the subject makes Saturday the day to be kept. It matters not that all who do not believe in this Sunday mockery of a Sabbath do believe that to keep it is but receiving the "mark of the beast," which all professing Christians are solemnly warned against in the Scriptures, and which all anti-Catholics believe to be the observance of Catholic laws and institutions, of which Sunday-keeping is unmistakably one of the most prominent. Now from all this it is plain to be seen, so plain not even the fool need to err therein, that this Sunday question is purely and exclusively a religious question, a question of conscience. The question of disestablishing the State Church in Virginia and North Carolina and other States where the Episcopal Church was the established church, was no more religious and involved no more the rights of conscience and the freedom of religion, than does this Sunday question. The plea was then urged that the cause of religion required the support of the civil power, and that to remove it would demoralize society. It is the plea now urged to sustain the Sunday institution. It is a civil institution, necessary to the civil welfare of the community, they urge. That this is a lie, black and infamous, cowardly and mean, the subterfuge, the figment of religious

frenzy, and the spirit of religious intolerance, is seen in the fact that every civil statute to sustain Sunday predicates it on a recognition of the religious view of the case. Everyone recognizes it as the "Sabbath" or the "Lord's day." And so in all the court decisions on the subject. And as Crafts, the evil genius of all this Sunday deviltry, this legislation on the subject, remarked, "Take the religion out and you take the rest out." It could not be a rest-day if it were not a holy day, in his conception.

And so it is, this Sunday agitation involves necessarily the settlement of a purely religious controversy by the State, as to which is the day to be kept, Saturday or Sunday, or whether either or any is to be kept. The writer believes none is. The Christian's rest-day is every day, a perfect rest from all his own labors in the effort to save himself, and a perfect repose in the full faith that his Lord and Saviour, who came "to save his people from their sins," will carry on "the good work he hath begun in the heart until the day of Jesus Christ."

That the State has no jurisdiction in such controversies, and that all Sunday or other religious legislation is forbidden is settled clearly and conclusively by the language of our State Constitution, Article 1, Section 3—the Bill of Rights: "That all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own conscience; that no man can, of right, be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any minister, against his consent; that no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that no preference shall ever be given, by law, to any religious establishment or mode of worship." Only religious fanaticism of the worst type, that which always engenders persecution, could so becloud the public judgment and conscience as that there could be a moment's hesitancy in coming to a fixed conclusion that this article condemns all such legislation as these laws.

The latest indications are of a returning sense of justice and right in this matter. All hail the glorious omen! The Democratic Convention that met at Nashville last week to nominate a candidate for governor, adopted the following plank in its platform, bearing directly on the subject of religious liberty: "To the end that this land may forever remain a land of liberty, the Democratic party is opposed to all secret, political organizations, and to all political proscription on account of religious opinion." If language has any meaning this applies as much to Sunday laws as to the American Protective Association, whose movements lately in this State called it forth. There is some hope that all this madness may yet cease before a season of general religious persecution sets in in this country, the last refuge of religious liberty.

Hoping for the better, I am your brother in the fight for religious liberty to the end,
WM. P. TOLLEY.

Kelso, Tenn., Aug. 25.

Still Courting Rome.

THERE are "Protestants" and Protestants. The former are those who, while bearing the name, declare by their acts that Protestantism has no reason for existence, no excuse for being; that Rome is Christian, one of the "grand divisions of

the Redeemer's army," etc. Such "Protestants" have no use for the caution given by the Apostle John: "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God-speed." Rome comes bringing another doctrine, namely, salvation by penance instead of salvation by faith, and yet "Protestants" do, in effect, bid her God-speed, as witnesseth the following from the *Pilot*, the leading Catholic paper of Boston:—

Chautauqua Sends Greetings.

On Wednesday, August 8, a very interesting incident occurred. It was the receipt of a telegram by the Rev. Thomas J. Conaty, D. D., president of the Catholic Summer School, from Bishop John H. Vincent, the chancellor and founder of Chautauqua. It read:—

Chautauqua, N. Y., August 7.

By a vote of 5,000 Chautauquans to-night Chautauqua sends greeting and best wishes to the Catholic Summer School.

JOHN H. VINCENT.

Wednesday night, just before Father Pardow's lecture, Dr. Conaty read the telegram to a crowded audience, which received it with enthusiasm and loudly applauded this answer:—

The scholars of the Catholic Summer School of America are deeply grateful for Chautauqua's cordial greeting, and send best wishes to Chautauqua in return.

THOS. J. CONATY, President.

But this is only what we might expect. Years ago "Protestants" declared: "Whenever they [the Roman Catholics] are willing to cooperate with us in resisting the progress of political atheism we will gladly join hands with them." This Chautauqua gush is only a part of the programme.

A Righteous Decision.

SOME months since a Roman Catholic died in Buffalo, N. Y., leaving seven children. Previous to her death she divided among these children \$1,200. She then made a will by which she bequeathed the whole of her remaining estate, \$1,000 in trust to Nicholas Bashman, to be used by him in paying for "masses for the benefit of my poor soul, and for the benefit of the soul of my deceased husband." The seven children contested the will. Mr. Bashman had been left with discretionary power to pay the money for the masses to any church he chose. The attorney for the children appeared before the surrogate, and opposed the admission of the will to probate on the following grounds:—

1. That the trustee has too much discretion.
 2. That a soul has no standing in a temporal court.
 3. That the trust is illegal, not being for the benefit of any living human being.
- In arguing the case he set forth the following points:
- a. The very existence of the soul after death has never been proved.
 - b. That its alleged immortality has never been sustained by facts.
 - c. That the whole subject of a hereafter is a matter of pure speculation.
 - d. That the law requires that trusts should be for the benefit of living human beings, and this creates a trust for the benefit of a soul which may possibly be nonexistent.
 - e. Further, he raised the question whether the soul, if immortal, would derive any benefit from the masses said.

At the hearing of the case recently it was shown, in addition to the facts already stated, that the maker of the will was of sound mind and memory, and the will was properly made. She directed that all her debts, doctor's bills, and funeral expenses should be paid, and that the balance should be applied to masses, as already stated. In rendering his decision the judge said:—

The intent of the testator is the rule of construction. The most sacred duty the court can perform is to give

full force to the intentions of the deceased. . . . She had a right to appropriate her money as she deemed reasonable and proper, to offer masses for the remission of her and her dead husband's sins. The direction, "a Roman Catholic Church in Buffalo," is not indefinite.

The court very properly declined to consider the question of the immortality of the soul, dismissing it with the remark that it was enough to know that the testator believed it. The decision is just. The property of the testator was her own. She might have directed that it should be used in erecting a monument to her memory, or to providing a memorial window to some church, but instead she elected that it should be devoted to masses for herself and her deceased husband. It is true that the masses could be of no possible benefit to either herself or her husband, but that is a question outside the jurisdiction of any civil court.

The Clash Will Come.

JUST now the loose talk about the disarmament which comes to the surface every now and then seems to have appeared in Europe and found its way into the public press by whom it is being discussed. There is no question that the great armies are a great burden. But they are not kept up for the fun of the thing, but are maintained with a very distinct purpose in view—the maintenance of the national integrity, pending a war, and the advance of the national boundaries when war comes. Germany may be satisfied with the existing status, but if so she is the one satisfied power. France certainly wants Alsace and Lorraine back again; she wants also revenge for the last war, with the boundary line of the Rhine. Italy wants the Irridente provinces held by Austria; and Austria wants Servia and Herzegovina, while Russia wants Stamboul: she is determined to have a seaport for her navy and her commerce.

A few facts show how very serious is this work of maintaining an armament, and how little disposed, especially France and Russia are, to give up their work of providing for the national defense. In France the new enlistments are over 216,000 per annum; in Germany about 200,000. In France the percentage of men under arms to the whole population equals 1.465; in Germany it is 1.114. In Russia it is 1.037. France and Russia together can put into the field 1,000,000 men and 1,700 guns more than Germany and her allies. Now, the demand for reduction in the existing scheme of military service does not come from France, which bears the heaviest burden, nor from any section of the French people. On the contrary, the testimony is conclusive that the nation approves the state of things as it exists.

That France does not feel it such a burden to continue her armament as Germany does is shown by the condition of the French agriculturalists who have been able through import duties to secure for their staple a price no less than forty per cent. above that which most of the rest of the world had to accept. This single circumstance would seem sufficient to account for the difference of attitude between the French and the other continental nations toward the system of universal military service, which those others complain of as a burden, and which France seems to carry off as a species of patriotic picnic. The fact is disarmament has become a commercial and industrial ques-

tion, in which the interests of England and France seem well enough subserved by the state of things as they are. There will be disarmaments certainly. But before that day Europe will ring with the clash of arms and witness such fighting as she has not seen since the time of Napoleon the Great.—*Christian Work*

Papal Infallibility.

(Continued.)

This matter first appeared in an anonymous pamphlet published and circulated in Italy immediately following the Vatican council of 1870, which proclaimed the dogma of papal infallibility. The pamphlet purported to be a speech delivered in the council "by a bishop," against the dogma. However it is not published on the strength of its having been delivered "by a bishop," for this is denied, but it is reprinted solely on its own merits, scriptural, and historical.]

BUT I hear it said on all sides, was not St. Peter at Rome? Was he not crucified with his head down? Are the seats on which he taught, and the altars at which he said the mass, not in this eternal city? St. Peter having been at Rome, my venerable brethren, rests only on tradition; but if he had been bishop of Rome, how can you from that episcopate prove his supremacy? Scaligagero, one of the most learned of men, has not hesitated to say that St. Peter's episcopate and residence at Rome ought to be classed with ridiculous legends. (Repeated cries, "Shut his mouth; shut his mouth; make him come down from the pulpit.") Venerable brethren, I am ready to be silent, but is it not better, in an assembly like ours, to prove all things, as the apostle commands, and to believe what is good? But, my venerable friends, we have a dictator before whom we must all, even His Holiness, Pius IX., prostrate ourselves, and bow our heads, and be silent. That dictator is history. This is not like a legend which can be made as the potter makes his clay, but is like a diamond, which cuts on the glass words which cannot be cancelled. Till now I have only leaned on her; and if I have found no trace of the papacy in the apostolic days, the fault is hers, not mine. Do you wish to put me into the position of one accused of falsehood? You may do it, if you can. I hear from the right these words,—“Thou art Peter, and on this rock I build my church” (Matt. 16). I will answer this objection presently, my venerable brethren; but before doing so, I wish to present you with the result of my historical researches.

Finding no trace of the papacy in the days of the apostles, I said to myself, I shall find what I am in search of in the annals of the church. Well, I say it frankly—I have sought for a pope in the first four centuries, and I have not found him. None of you, I hope, will doubt the great authority of the holy bishop of Hippo, the great and blessed St. Augustine. This pious doctor, the honor and glory of the Catholic Church, was secretary in the council of Melvie. In the decrees of this venerable assembly are to be found these significant words,—“Whoever wills to appeal to those beyond the sea shall not be received by any one in Africa to the communion.” The bishops of Africa acknowledged the bishop of Rome so little that they smote with excommunication those who would have recourse to an appeal. These same bishops, in the sixth council of Carthage, held under Aurelius, bishop of that city, wrote to Celustinus, bishop of Rome, to warn

him not to receive appeals from the bishops, priest, or clerics of Africa; and that he should send no more legates or commissaries; and that he should not introduce human pride into the church. That the patriarch of Rome had from the earliest times tried to draw to himself all the authority, is an evident fact; but it is an equally evident fact that he had not the supremacy which the Ultramontanes attribute to him. Had he possessed it, would the bishops of Africa—St. Augustine first among them—have dared to prohibit the appeals of their decrees to his supreme tribunal? I confess, without difficulty, that the patriarch of Rome held the first place. One of Justinian's laws says, “Let us order, after the definitions of the four councils, that the holy pope of ancient Rome shall be the first of the bishops, and that the Most High Archbishop of Constantinople, which is the new Rome, shall be the second.” “Bow down then to the supremacy of the pope,” you will say to me. Do not run so fast to this conclusion, my venerable brethren, inasmuch as the law of Justinian has written in the face of it, “Of the order of the patriarchal sees,” precedence is one thing—the power of jurisdiction is another. For example, supposing that in Florence there was an assembly of all the bishops of the kingdom, the precedence would be given to the primate of Florence, as among the easterns it would be accorded to the patriarch of Constantinople, and in England to the Archbishop of Canterbury. But neither the first, nor the second, nor the third could deduce from the position assigned to him a jurisdiction over his colleagues.

The importance of the bishops of Rome proceeded not from a divine power, but from the importance of the city in which they had their seat. Monsignor Darboy is not superior in dignity to the Archbishop Avignon; but in spite of that, Paris gives him a consideration which he would not have if, instead of his having his palace on the bank of the Seine, he had it on that of the Rhone. That which is true in the religious order is the same in civil and political matters; the prefect of Cairo it is not more a prefect than he of Pisa; but civilly and politically he has a greater importance. I have said that from the very first centuries, the patriarch of Rome aspired to the universal government of the Church. Unfortunately he very nearly reached it; but he had not succeeded assuredly in his pretensions, for the Emperor Theodosius II. made a law by which he established that the patriarch of Constantinople should have the same authority as he of Rome (*Leg. cod. de sacr.*, etc.). The fathers of the council of Chalcedon put the bishops of the new and the old Rome in the same order on all things, even ecclesiastical (Can. 28). The sixth council of Carthage forbade all the bishops to take the title of Prince of the Bishops, or Sovereign Bishops. As for this title of universal bishop, which the popes took later, St. Gregory I., believing that his successors would never think of adorning themselves with it, wrote these remarkable words: “None of my predecessors have contented to take this profane name; for when a patriarch gives himself the name of *Universal*, the title of patriarch suffers discredit. Far be it then, from Christians to desire to give themselves a title which brings discredit on their brethren.” The words of St. Gregory are directed to his colleague of Con-

stantinople, who pretended to the primacy of the church.

Pope Pelagio II. calls John, bishop of Constantinople, who aspired to the high priesthood, "impious and profane." "Do not care," he said, "for the title of universal, which John has usurped illegally; let none of the patriarchs take this profane name; for what misfortunes may we not expect, if among the priests such elements arise? They would get what has been foretold for them, 'He is the king of the sons of pride'" (Pelagio II., lett. 13).

These are authorities, and I might add a hundred more of equal value. Do they not prove, with a clearness equal to the splendor of the sun at midday, that the first bishops of Rome were not till much later recognized as universal bishops and heads of the church? And, on the other hand, who does not know that from the year 325, in which the first council of Nice was held, down to 580, the year of the second Ecumenical Council of Constantinople, among more than 1,109 bishops who assisted at the six first general councils, there were no more than nineteen western bishops? Who does not know that the councils were convoked by the emperors without informing, and sometimes against the wish of the bishop of Rome?—that Hosius, bishop of Cordova, presided at the first council of Nice, and edited the canons of it? The same Hosius presided afterwards at the council Sardica, excluding the legates of Julius, bishop of Rome. I say no more, my venerable brethren, and I come now to speak of the great argument which you mentioned before—to establish the primacy of the bishop of Rome.

By the rock (*petra*) on which the holy church is built, you understand Peter (*pietra*). If this were true the dispute would be at an end; but our forefathers—and they certainly knew something—did not think of it as we do. St. Cyril, in his fourth book on the trinity, says, "I believe that by the rock you must understand the unshaken faith of the apostles." St. Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, in his second book on the trinity, says, "The rock (*pietra*) is the blessed and only rock of the faith confessed by the mouth of St. Peter;" and in the sixth book of the trinity, he says, "It is on this rock of the confession of faith that the church is built." "God," says St. Jerome, in the sixth book of St. Matthew, "has founded his church on this rock, and it is from this rock that the Apostle Peter has been named." After him, St. Chrysostom says in his fifty-third homily on St. Matthew, "On this rock I will build my church—that is on the faith of the confession." Now what was the confession of the apostle? Here it is, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Ambrose, the holy archbishop of Milan (on the 2nd chap. of the Ephesians), St. Basil of Seleucia, and the fathers of the council of Chalcedon, teach exactly the same thing.

Of all the doctors of Christian antiquity, St. Augustine occupies one of the first places for knowledge and holiness. Listen, then, to what he writes in his second treatise on the first epistle of St. John, "What do the words mean, 'I will build my church on this rock?' On this faith on that which said, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.'" In his 12th treatise on St. John we find this most significant phrase, "On this rock which thou hast confessed I will build my church, since Christ was the rock." The

great bishop believed so little that the church was built on St. Peter, that he said to his people in his thirteenth sermon, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock (*pietra*) which thou hast confessed, on this rock which thou hast known, saying, 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God,' I will build my church above myself, who am the Son of the living God: I will build it on me, and not me on thee." That which St. Augustine thought upon this celebrated passage was the opinion of all Christendom in his time. Therefore to resume, I establish, 1. That Jesus had given to his apostles the same power that he gave to St. Peter. 2. That the apostles never recognized in St. Peter the vicar of Jesus Christ, and the infallible doctor of the church. 3. That St. Peter never thought of being pope, and never acted as if he were pope. 4. That the councils of the first four centuries, while they recognized the high position which the bishop of Rome occupied in the church, on account of Rome, only accord to him a pre-eminence of honor—never of power or jurisdiction. 5. That the holy fathers, in the famous passage, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I build my church," never understood that the church was built on St. Peter (*super petrum*), but on the rock (*super petram*), that is, on the confession of the faith of the apostle.

I conclude victoriously with history, with reason, with logic, with good sense, and with a Christian conscience, that Jesus Christ did not confer any supremacy on St. Peter, and that the bishops of Rome did not become sovereigns of the church, but only by confiscating one by one all the rights of the episcopate. (Voices, "Silence, impudent Protestant! Silence!") No, I am not an impudent Protestant. History is neither Catholic, nor Anglican, nor Calvinistic, nor Lutheran, nor Arminian, nor schismatic Greek, nor Ultramontane. She is what she is—that is, something stronger than all confessions of faith of the canons of the Ecumenical Councils. Write against it if you dare! but you cannot destroy it, no more than taking a brick out of the coliseum would make it fall. If I have said anything which history proves to be false, show it to me by history, and without a moment's hesitation I will make an honorable apology; but be patient and you will see that I have not said all that I would or could; and even were the funeral pile waiting for me in the place of St. Peter's, I should not be silent, and I am obliged to go on.

(Conclusion next week.)

Too True.

THE hidden aim of the advocates of church taxation is disclosed by the Boston *Congregationalist*, which says: "The amount of property in the United States in church buildings and equipment is very large, being in 1890, according to the census report, \$679,694,439. But of this amount Roman Catholics control only \$118,069,746. If an attempt by Protestants to weaken the power of Catholics were wise under any circumstances, it evidently would not be wise for Protestants to advocate, for that purpose mainly, the taxation of church property." The *Congregationalist* does not condemn the attempt to injure the Catholics, it only calls attention to the fact that this ought not to be done in a way that will hurt the Protestant sects more than it will the Cath-

olic Church. But to weaken the Catholics—that is the object of the champions of church property taxation.—*Catholic Review*.

It is too true that much of the opposition on the part of so-called Protestants to State aid to religious institutions is not because of adherence to a principle but with the view of injuring Rome. Such "Protestants" are always ready to avail themselves of State aid in any way that offers. Several denominations saw no impropriety in accepting money from the Government for the support of mission schools among the Indians until they discovered that the Catholics were getting the lion's share. Then they refused to accept further bounties from the civil power and demanded that Rome should support her own schools also. The reason for the change of front was too obvious. The time to have protested successfully was when the evil was in its infancy, and before they had themselves eaten of the Government's pottage. But the birthright has been sold, and now they find no place for repentance though they seek it carefully with tears.

Seventh-day Adventists and the Authorities of Basle.

As our readers are aware, for some time in the past the police authorities of Basle, Switzerland, have been endeavoring to compel H. P. Holser, the manager of the Seventh-day Adventists' publishing house in that city, to suspend operations on Sunday. Mr. Holser has been arrested several times, and fines have been imposed and finally collected by the sale of his household effects; he refusing to pay voluntarily.

Subsequent to the seizure of his goods, Mr. Holser was again arrested, and August 16 he was fined 200 francs and sentenced to three weeks' imprisonment. If the fine is not paid, as it will not be, the term of imprisonment will be sixty-one days. Mr. Holser, who is a minister, writes thus to a brother minister in London, of his trial:—

Basle, August 18, 1894.

DEAR BROTHER WAGGONER:—

I had much more time than at former hearings, and could state our position more fully than ever, though not as fully as I should like. When I opened my Bible to read some passages, they did not seem to relish that sort of argument.

This being the sixth offense, they did not seem much inclined to hear from me. The president acted as uneasy as though he were sitting over a hornet's nest; but as I had been shut off too soon at other times, I insisted on stating our position, and succeeded in getting much more time than on former occasions. After I made my plea the State's attorney spoke, stating that the law was very plain, that I had been punished repeatedly and still insisted on working, instead of appealing to the higher authorities to settle the question as to whether the police authorities were doing us injustice, but instead had circulated a pamphlet in the city to bring the police authorities in disrepute. He would not advise imprisonment, for this would only be furnishing us an advertisement; but would propose a higher money fine—300 francs. He also stated that I seemed to be ignorant of the fact that the State had no creed! *i. e.*, nothing to do with religion.

Time was then allowed me, in which I replied to the points which he made, showing that Sunday is a religious day, and if the religion were taken away, our difficulty would soon cease. Sunday is to be found only where Christianity is found. And when the French Revolutionists rejected so-called Christianity, they rejected the Sunday as a part of it. Also that our work in itself was not of a nature to disturb people if they were not influenced by religious prejudices. On the green in front of our house is ten times as much noise as our work makes; there is shooting, football, companies of soldiers drilling, and officers shouting, so that the little noise which we make is entirely drowned. Yet all this does not disturb people. This proves that it is not the noise that disturbs

people, but it is our religion; it is because we don't believe as they do; and their being disturbed on such grounds is purely papal; and for us to yield to their demands under such circumstances would be the same as bowing to the papacy; God expressly warns us against doing this. So, although Sunday may be called a purely civil day, it does interfere with our religious rights. I intended to make more points, but the judge interrupted me, and closed the hearing. After having been out about ten minutes, I was called back to hear the sentence. The judge closed with the statement that if we did not stop work he would next order that the house be closed altogether. The reports in the papers were quite fair. One point they made particularly clear, for which I am glad, and that is, we declared that we could never obey Sunday laws, as that was the same to us as obeying man rather than God.

An appeal has been taken to a higher court, and the result is awaited with interest. It is evident that the prosecution of Seventh-day Adventists for refusing to obey laws enforcing obedience to a dogma of the Roman Catholic Church, is becoming world-wide. But this state of things is just what they have been expecting for more than forty years. They have declared that the governments of earth would attempt to cause all men to worship the papacy or a system made in the image of the papacy, and that this would be done by attempting to force all men to observe Sunday, the mark of Roman Catholic power. Events are multiplying on every hand showing the fulfillment of these predictions. These events have, for forty years, been expected through faith in the prophetic word of God, but it has been only recently that they have seen the persecutions which are a fulfillment. They have, for more than forty years, declared that the Sunday Sabbath was exclusively a Roman Catholic institution, and now in 1893, Cardinal Gibbons' paper, the *Catholic Mirror*, comes forward declaring the "Christian Sabbath" (Sunday) to be the "genuine offspring of the Catholic Church," without scriptural authority for its support; and further that the observance of it by Protestants who profess to take the Bible for their guide, is "indefensible, self-contradictory, and suicidal;" and further still, challenges the whole Protestant world to disprove its position.

For more than forty years Seventh-day Adventists have declared that Sunday laws were an attempt to enforce obedience to this Roman Catholic dogma, and now in 1894 a Roman Catholic member of the Canadian Parliament, in a speech against a Sunday law, declares that by the bill the author "seeks to compel a great number of his fellow-citizens to disobey the Word of God, and obey the words of a church, (Roman Catholic) of which they (Seventh-day Adventists) do not approve." Again only a few days ago Mr. Pax, a Catholic priest, of Sleepy Eye, Minn., declared in a published letter, that "The imprisonment of Seventh-day Adventists. . . for performing bodily labor on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, proves that the Government assumes the right to enforce a religious dogma of the Catholic Church."

There is no doubt of the correctness of the position. And now let Seventh-day Adventists in all the world, with one heart and one mind, stand resolutely and refuse to "worship the beast and his image and receive his mark."


John Liederman,

389 Flushing Ave., - - - Brooklyn, N. Y.

REAL-ESTATE—LOANS—INSURANCE
EFFECTED THROUGHOUT UNITED STATES.

COAL AND WOOD LOCAL TRADE.

SNAP A CLIP



on your papers and get a handsome bound volume.

Trial dozen, 75 cents. Agents wanted. Price-list Free.

H. H. BALLARD, 193, Pittsfield, Mass.

NEW HISTORICAL ATLAS AND GENERAL HISTORY—By Robert H. Labberton. This is the only atlas that has a map for every period. A map for any particular date can instantly be found by any one. It contains, now made for the first time, maps of the Chaldean, Elamitic, Egyptian, Kossean, Armenian, Hittite, and Assyrian Empires. It contains 198 maps, printed in colors, 30 genealogical charts, and is complete in one volume. 4to, 312 pages. Sent by mail or express, post-paid. Half law sheep, \$2. 75; half morocco, \$3. 00.

SIBERIA AND THE NIHILISTS.—Why Kennan went to Siberia. By William Jackson Armstrong. This is one of the most intensely interesting and thoroughly reliable contributions to literature on Russia and the Nihilists ever published. Everybody should read this book, because no one can be intelligent upon the subject of which it treats without familiarity with its contents. 160 pages, paper covers, 25 cents.

MEMOIRS OF EDWIN BAINBRIDGE.—The subject of this memoir is the young English tourist who met his death at the dreadful volcanic eruption of Tarawera, New Zealand, on the 10th of June, 1886. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75c.

THE POCKET ATLAS OF THE WORLD—A comprehensive and popular series of maps, illustrating physical and political geography, with geographical statistical notes, 54 double maps, cloth, \$1. 00.

THOMAS J. COMBER, Missionary Pioneer to the Congo—By Rev. J. B. Myers, Association Secretary Baptist Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, price, 75 cents.

ROBERT MORRISON, the Pioneer of Chinese Missions—By Wm. J. Townsend, Sec. Methodist New Connexion Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

WILLIAM CAREY, the Shoemaker who became a Missionary—By Rev. J. B. Myers, Association Secretary Baptist Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra. 75 cents.

JAMES CHALMERS, Missionary and Explorer of Raratonga and New Guinea—By Wm. Robson, of the London Missionary Society. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

SAMUEL CROWTHER, the Slave Boy who became Bishop of the Niger—By Jesse Page, author of "Bishop Patterson." 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

GINN'S CLASSICAL ATLAS—4to, cloth, \$2. 50. This work contains 23 colored maps, which were projected and executed by the late A. Keith Johnson, with a complete index.

BISHOP PATTERSON, the Martyr of Melanesia—By Jesse Page. 12mo, 160 pages, fully illustrated, cloth extra, 75 cents.

Address Pacific Press,
43 Bond Street, New York City.
Kansas City, Mo. Oakland, Cal.

IS THE PAPACY IN PROPHECY?

BY THE

Rev. Thomas W. Haskins, M. A.,
Rector Christ Church, Los Angeles, Cal.

The above is the title of a treatise written by the author, at the request of the Ministerial Union of Los Angeles, California. It grew out of a discussion upon the present aspect and aims of

The Roman Catholic Church in the United States, the author taking the ground that the rise, progress, present and future condition of the temporal power known as the Papacy, or Vaticanism,

Is Outlined in the Prophecies of Holy Scriptures,

with sufficient accuracy to determine what the "Papacy" is, and what is to be its future development and ultimate end.

Paper Covers, - - - 25 Cents.
Cloth Covers, - - - 60 Cents.

Mailed, post-paid, on receipt of price.

The Law of God as Changed by the Papacy

Is the title of a large Chart just issued, which shows in a striking manner the blasphemous pretensions of the Papal power. The testimony of the *Best Catholic Authorities* is given, and shows, by quoting their own words, that Sunday is a child of the Catholic Church. These quotations, together with admissions from standard Catholic works, are arranged in parallel columns on either side of this Chart, while the center column contains the Ten Commandments as taught by the Catholic Church. The whole forms a collection of extracts of incalculable value for every Bible student.

The Charts are three by four feet in size, and are printed on heavy map cloth in bold type, easily read across the largest room.

Price, Post-paid, \$1.00.

A fac-simile edition on thin paper, size 5½ x 7½ inches, suitable for missionary distribution, has been prepared, and will be sent post-paid at 50 cents per hundred, or \$4.00 per thousand.

Apples of Gold Library

ENVELOPE SERIES

THIS is the title of a little monthly publication recently started by the Pacific Press, and is designed especially for use in personal correspondence. It is printed on thin paper, and one or two numbers can be put in a No. 6 envelope, with an ordinary letter, without increasing the postage. The following numbers have already been issued:—

- No. 1. Looking unto Jesus.
- " 2. The Christian's Privilege.
- " 3. The Sure Promises of God.
- " 4. How to Get Knowledge.
- " 5. The Church and the World. (Poetry.)
- " 6. The Elect of God.
- " 7. How Esther Read Her Bible.
- " 8. The Thief on the Cross.
- " 9. The Eleventh Hour.
- " 10. Benefits of Bible Study.
- " 11. Righteousness; Where Is It to be Found?

Five copies for one year, postpaid, 50 cents; or 12 copies for \$1.00. Single subscriptions are not desirable, for two reasons: (1) The numbers being so small they are liable to be lost in the mails. (2) If they are used in correspondence, as recommended, more than one copy would be necessary.

Single or assorted numbers of the *Library* will be mailed in quantities at the following rates: 50 cents per hundred, or \$4.00 per thousand copies. Always order by the NUMBER.

Any of the above may be obtained post free on receipt of price by addressing Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal.; 18 W. Fifth Street, Kansas City, Mo.; 43 Bond Street, New York City. Works on all phases of Bible truth. Send for catalogue.



NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER 6, 1894.

ANY one receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL without having ordered it may know that it is sent to him by some friend. Therefore, those who have not ordered the SENTINEL need have no fears that they will be asked to pay for it.

THE fight against Sunday excursionists still continues in Whitestone, L. I., and the order of the court has been so modified that parties cannot land there on Sunday. The litigation continues.

THE heading given the article on page 274 is descriptive of its character as the reader will discover by perusing it. We have set over against some of the intolerant utterances of the *Enterprise*, consonant denunciations directed against the apostles by the implacable Jews; and again we have contrasted the bitter, intolerant words of that paper with dissonant opinions from others, notably from Ex-Governor Porter and Ex-Senator Tolley, both native Tennesseans; and gentlemen who have been honored by the suffrages of their fellow-citizens, and who have in turn honored their State. The contrasts and parallels in this article are alike instructive, and that they do no credit to the *Enterprise* is no fault of ours. We would that all men should love and defend liberty of conscience.

HON. WILLIAM P. TOLLEY, Ex-Senator of Tennessee, gives his opinion, in this issue, of the imprisonment of Mr. Capps in his State for doing farm labor on Sunday. Read it. It will convince you that there are Tennesseans whose hearts are in the right place, and who are not only not ashamed, but willing and anxious to speak out in words of righteous indignation at the cruel treatment of a fellow-citizen. Mr. Tolley, while a staunch Jacksonian Democrat in politics, a Primitive Baptist in faith, and withal a loyal Tennessean, and while differing with Mr. Capps and the SENTINEL as to the binding force of the fourth commandment, does not hesitate to make the cause of this solitary, humble citizen his cause, and to cry aloud and spare not in an effort to awaken his fellow-citizens to a realization of the injustice perpetrated. Mr. Tolley is conscientiously and unselfishly in earnest, and has devoted his time and talents, free of charge, to attending the trials of these persecuted people, with the hope of persuading their persecutors to desist. By his heroic words and earnest acts he is saying to his fellow-citizens in the language of James Russell Lowell:—

“Is true freedom but to break
Fetter for our own dear sake
And with laden 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.”

A KENTUCKY woman who opposes the renomination of Col. W. C. P. Breckinridge for Congress, has written a letter “To the Men and Women of the Blue Grass,” in which she says: “What we need from the Ashland district is a clean, pure man, with brains enough to know that it is a man’s actions and not his religious twaddle that make for righteousness, and not brains enough to fool a whole community for half a century into thinking him a Christian gentleman when he is directly the reverse.” This is unkind to National Reform, the stock in trade, of which is high profession; not that many engaged in this movement are not highly moral men, but they are—unwittingly, it is true, but none the less really—doing all in their power to commit the whole nation to a course of hypocrisy similar to that pursued by the father of the Breckinridge Sunday bill. To dub the nation “Christian” will no more make it such than did years of false profession make a Christian gentleman of the “hero” of the worst scandal that has ever shocked Washington society.

It is stated that Cardinal Gibbons has received a letter from the pope “couched in very affectionate terms,” inviting him to visit Rome. This he proposes to do, it is said, probably before the close of the present year. It is supposed that the pope wishes to consult the cardinal about matters of importance relative to the interests of “the church” in America. It is intimated that Satolli is to be clothed with still greater authority by the pope, and that the cardinal’s visit to Rome may have something to do with the contemplated enlarging of the powers of the papal delegate. Protestants who sneeze when papal dignitaries take snuff, will of course feel flattered that the pope is paying so much attention to this country; but others will watch to see what new phase of the popish conspiracy against American institutions will unfold next. It will not be forgotten that according to the pope himself, “what the church has done in the past for others she will do for the United States;” and until this dire threat has been retracted Americans cannot feel otherwise than apprehensive, and start at every new evidence of the pope’s affection for, and interest in, this country.

WE gave in these columns last week the main facts in the case of Private Cedarquist, who refused on conscientious grounds to engage in rifle practice on Sunday, even when directed so to do by his superior officer. It will be remembered that Cedarquist was finally released by order of the President; and the War Department directed the trial of Major Worth, the officer who ordered the Sunday target practice.

Major Worth’s trial has been had, and he has been found not guilty. It is evidently not the outcome expected by the

War Department and there may be further interesting developments. The freeing of Private Cedarquist may have been, probably was, at least partly, out of respect to his conscientious convictions and in deference to the rights of conscience; but the trial of Major Worth could scarcely have been for any other purpose than to rebuke him for disregard of Sunday—the day declared by act of Congress to be the Sabbath, and not only so, but the Sabbath enjoined by the fourth commandment. What the next step of the Government will be in honoring this man-made Sabbath nobody can tell, but we know that the end is not yet.

THE New York *Observer* has this to say about how Sunday is observed by Roman Catholics in Japan:—

The Romanists in Japan have a special dispensation from the pope, allowing them to labor half of the Sabbath day and attend to their religious services the other half. But in spite of these concessions, Romanism does not receive the favor given Protestantism. A half-breed religion wins no one’s respect. Even the Japanese can see through the hollow sham which the pope offers them and despise it.

Why should the Japanese “see through the hollow sham which the pope offers them and despise it,” any more than so-called Protestants in other countries? It seems that the Japanese take only half of this papal sham—a false Sabbath—while the *Observer*, and with it nearly all the Protestant world, has greedily swallowed the whole of it, even though warned by Rome herself that it rests only on the authority of the church, and that the Protestants have no right to any part of it.

But if the Japanese are to accept Sunday at all, why not take it just as the pope gives it to them? As a “Christian” institution it was made by the papacy, and what authority other than the papacy can so well tell how it ought to be observed. The intent of the lawmakers is the law; and who better than the Roman Catholic Church can tell the meaning of her own law for the observance of the false Sabbath which she has given, not alone to her own votaries, but to the world? The *Observer* has in this matter of Sunday observance not a leg to stand upon in opposition to Rome. If Protestants would only teach the heathen that which the Bible says about the Sabbath, teach them to keep the Bible Sabbath instead of a base counterfeit, then might they properly criticise this dispensation granted by the pope to Japanese Catholics; but so long as they adhere to the papal day, they should keep silence as to the papal manner of observing it. Let Rome do what she will with her own.

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.