

Wedding ring

1913

C-E-1

J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH

Lodi, California
P. O. B. 13.
October 24, 1913.

H. M. Kelley
Herrin, Ill.

Dear Brother,

Your letter of the 16th is received. I am glad to learn that our ministers are raising their voices against "gold adornings".

My position on the subject I have tried to frame in harmony with the Lord's instructions on the subject as delineated in the Testimonies.

See Vol. III. p 366 middle of second paragraph. p 367, first paragraph, at the top of the page. Also page 376, second paragraph.

In some countries it is the established custom of society for the married woman to wear a plain finger ring. If she is travelling with a man, and has no ring she is considered at once "a wild woman." Sister White said to them in Australia, "Where such custom prevails I have no light against the plain ring;" but she said there was "no call for it" in countries where that, like America -

is not an established custom".
In cases where I have married
persons I have claimed that
Marriage Certificate signed by the
Minister and two witnesses, was
better proof of marriage than a
gold ring on a certain finger.

A few years ago, on the Pacific
Coast, a woman who had a young
son and daughter, had the ring
on her finger, and was living
with a man, whom all the citizens
recognized as her husband. She
embraced the message, was soundly
converted to God. She said to the
man, "Gone get a marriage cer-
tificate and have a marriage per-
formed or I leave you". He, a
wicked man, would not thus hum-
ble himself. She left him, lived
a faithful godly life, and died
in the faith last year. So, you
see a gold ring may not always
tell the truth.

Gone in the blessed hope
J. W. D. neighborhood