

# THE ADVENT REVIEW

## And Herald of the Sabbath.

"Here is the patience of the Saints: Here are they that keep the Commandments of God, and the Faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:12.

VOLUME 39.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1872.

NUMBER 9.

### The Review and Herald

IS ISSUED WEEKLY BY

The Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association,  
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

ELDER JAMES WHITE, PRESIDENT.

TERMS: - - - - - See Last Page.

Address REVIEW & HERALD, BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

#### ADVENT HYMN.

Lo! THE Advent cry is sounding,  
Christians, rouse ye from your sleep!  
Cast away the works of darkness,  
O'er your sins and follies weep.  
Gird ye with your Christian armor,  
In this time of mortal life;  
Wake! to do your Master's service,  
He will aid you in the strife.

Sleep no longer! Life is passing,  
Soon the warfare will be done;  
Work! while yet the day is lasting,  
Night is coming quickly on.  
Watch and pray! the Bridegroom cometh!  
Trim your lamps! be ready all;  
Go ye out, prepared to meet him,  
When ye hear the midnight call.

Stir us up, Lord, we beseech thee,  
Give us grace thy work to do,  
So that, bearing fruit in plenty,  
Thou shalt thus reward us too.  
Then, on that great day of Judgment,  
When in majesty he come,  
We shall rise to life immortal  
In our glorious, heavenly home.

—Sel.

### EXAMINATION OF T. M. PREBLE'S FIRST-DAY SABBATH.

BY ELDER J. N. ANDREWS.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN.

#### THE LORD'S DAY NOT THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK, BUT THE SEVENTH.

It is the misfortune of the first-day Sabbath that all the texts quoted in its support are embraced in one of these two classes: 1. Texts which plainly mention the first day of the week, but which do in no case connect any idea of sacredness there with; or, 2. Texts which contain references, more or less distinct, to the sacredness of some day or period, but which do in no instance designate the first day of the week as the day to which this sacredness pertains.

We have proved the first of these statements true by actual test, and we will now carefully examine the second. We quote from Eld. P. as follows:—

"THE LORD'S DAY THE TRUE CHRISTIAN SABBATH. About sixty-two years after the resurrection of Christ—or after the Christian Sabbath began—the beloved John, who was our brother and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, while he was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ, said, 'I was in the Spirit on THE LORD'S DAY,' etc. Here shines the clear, blazing light of the Christian Sabbath, according to the gospel of THE LIVING JESUS; notwithstanding so many are trying, with a 'vail upon their hearts,' to throw a dark cloud over the whole thing by saying that the 'Lord's day' here spoken of 'is the Sabbath of the fourth commandment' as found in Ex. 20: 8-11. But how many, through ignorance, or something worse, 'pervert the gospel of Christ.'

"The word here rendered 'Lord's' is in the Greek *kuriakos*, and it is found elsewhere in the New Testament but *once*; and it there refers to the Lord's (*kuriakos*) supper. 1 Cor. 11:20. The question now arises, Whose 'supper' is here referred to? Is it the Lord JEHOVAH's supper? or is it the Lord JESUS CHRIST's supper? All must confess that it is the Lord Jesus Christ's supper. Then is the 'Lord's (*kuriakos*) DAY' (Rev. 1:10) the Lord JESUS CHRIST's day? Thus we have the plain word of God to establish this long-disputed truth. Here, then, we have the proof that 'the passover' had, as its substitute, the Lord's (*kuriakos*) supper; and as a substitute for 'the seventh-day Sabbath,' the 'Lord's (*kuriakos*) day,' as I have above stated: the *passover* to have its complete fulfillment in 'the kingdom of God;' (Luke 22:16); and just so of the *Sabbath*. Heb. 4: 3; Rev. 20: 4." pp. 39, 40.

The only point which Eld. P. attempts to prove in the present quotation is that the Lord, whose day is here mentioned, is the Son and not the Father. Even this

point is not conclusively proved; for the adjective *kuriakos* (of, or pertaining to, the Lord) is derived from the noun *kurius* (Lord) which is applied to the Father as well as to the Son. There is, therefore, nothing in the nature of the word which causes it necessarily to pertain to the Son rather than to the Father. But Eld. P. supposes that if the Son be here intended, then the Lord's day of this text is certainly the first day of the week. Had he succeeded in proving that Christ ordained the first day of the week to be a day sacred to himself or to his Father, as a "substitute," as he elsewhere terms it, for the Sabbath, then we should not hesitate to declare that the Lord's day of Rev. 1:10 must necessarily be the first day of the week, whether the Lord to whom the day pertains be the Father or the Son. But having thoroughly sifted the subject by a careful examination of all the passages of Scripture in which the first day is mentioned, we are able to state in the most decisive terms that there is not upon record one particle of testimony that the first-day Sabbath was ever ordained in the sacred Scriptures. If, therefore, this text, which makes no mention of the first day of the week, be used to prove the existence of the so-called Christian Sabbath—which institution we have hitherto in vain sought to find—the argument will stand thus:—

1. The Lord's day here mentioned by John must be the first day of the week because Christ consecrated that day to the Christian Sabbath.

2. Though no such act of Christ is upon record, yet it must be true that he did thus consecrate the first day of the week because John here calls it the Lord's day.

So the first of these propositions is proved by the second, and then the second is proved by the first! And this is a fair specimen of the logic by which the first-day Sabbath is maintained.

Our friend, Eld. P., finds in the Lord's day of Rev. 1:10 "the clear blazing light of the Christian Sabbath, according to the gospel of the living Jesus." p. 39. Yet this text does not in any way intimate that the first day of the week is entitled to the sacred name of "Lord's day." The text proves the existence of the Lord's day in A. D. 96, but other passages must define the day intended by this term. Undoubtedly the Spirit of God, by the use of this appellation as well as by the selection of this day for giving the book of Revelation to John, designed to honor the day; and this very fact evinces that the day itself may be clearly identified. The several views taken of the term "Lord's day" may be classified under two general heads:

1. The Lord's day is a mystical, figurative, or symbolical day.

2. The Lord's day is one of the seven days of the week.

Those who adopt the first of these views are not agreed in the selection of a mystical day to which this term Lord's day should be applied. Some say that it is the gospel dispensation—which is Christ's day that Abraham saw in vision (John 8:56)—that John here calls the Lord's day. Others confidently affirm that by the Lord's day is intended the great day of Judgment, which in many passages is called the day of the Lord. 1 Thess. 5:2; 2 Pet. 3:10; and many other texts.

Yet to apply Rev. 1:10 to the first of these mystical or figurative days is a manifest absurdity; and to apply it to the second of them is to make John utter a falsehood. For he wrote the book of Revelation near the close of the first century of the Christian era; and it would reflect little credit upon the inspired apostle to represent him as gravely informing the churches of Christ, to whom he wrote, that this vision was given to him in the gospel dispensation, when every individual addressed could not but know perfectly that if he had a vision at all, it must of necessity be given him in the existing dispensation.

The application of this term Lord's day to the gospel dispensation is therefore unworthy of our acceptance. But, when we apply these words of John to the day of Judgment, we involve the apostle in falsehood. John could indeed have a vision CONCERNING the day of Judgment; but that he should have a vision ON that day, when it was nearly two thousand years in the future, is as impossible as it is that God should lie. It is certain, therefore, that the Lord's day of Rev. 1:10 does not signify some mystical day, whether that day be the gospel dispensation, or the day of Judgment.

The Lord's day is mentioned by John in his record of the *time* and *place* of his great vision: "I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ. I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet." Rev. 1:9, 10. Three things concerning this vision are here distinctly noted:—

1. The *person* who saw it: "John."

2. The *place* where it was seen: "The isle that is called Patmos."

3. The *time* when it was seen: "The Lord's day."

We cannot, therefore, doubt that the day on which this vision was revealed to John was as literal and definite as is the isle where it was given, or, as was the person to whom the vision was shown. But, though it is manifest that one of the seven literal days of the week is here intended by the term Lord's day, the question still remains for serious consideration, Which of the seven is entitled to this honorable and sacred name? Our friend, Eld. P., thinks he has established the claim of the first day of the week to the name of "Lord's day" by simply adducing a doubtful inference in proof that not the Father, but the Son, is the Lord here intended. This seems to be sufficient to raise his mind to an ecstatic condition. But there must be more solid ground for our faith than such uncertain inferences; for our duty toward God is directly involved. We may use six of the days as our own in the proper performance of our secular labor. But we cannot thus employ that day which is claimed by the Lord as his. If one of the seven days belongs to God or to Christ, we must know which it is. We may lawfully use for secular purposes the days which are given us for that intent; but the Lord has called one day his own, and we must render to him the things that are his.

Between this day which he has honored as his peculiar treasure, and the six days which he has given to man, there is an inherent and essential difference. If we treat the Lord's day as we do the six working days, we commit a trespass in holy things. Now it is not a light matter to disregard those distinctions which are made by the Spirit of God in the Holy Scriptures. If we appropriate the Lord's day to our worldly business, we are guilty of sacrilege in that we rob God of that which he has claimed as his own. And we cannot mend this matter by observing in its stead one of the six days which he has given to us. Our offering to God is then precisely like that of Nadab and Abihu; for we present to God strange fire, instead of that which he has kindled. Nor does it better the case that, in so doing, we follow the custom of the religious world; for we are not at liberty to make void the commandments of God to keep the traditions of the elders.

One part of our duty toward God must, therefore, certainly consist in the proper observance of the Lord's day: 1. It will not do to rob God by using the Lord's day in our own business. 2. It will not do to offer strange fire by hallowing a day of our own choice, instead of honoring that day which the Lord has hallowed. 3. Moreover, the Lord's day cannot be simply one

day in seven, but must be a definite day which man ought religiously to honor.

This text recognizes the existence of the Lord's day, but says not one word by way of defining the day. But, as this passage stands near the very close of the Holy Scriptures, there is a manifest reason why no explanatory statement was made as to the day intended; and also why no precept was here given to govern our conduct concerning it. It was not because these things were of no consequence, but because they had already been given in the Scriptures. The Lord's day must be understandingly and rightfully honored by man. And, that man may do this, three things must be found in the Bible:—

1. What day the Lord claims as his.  
2. The ground of that claim.  
3. The proper method of observing the day.

A knowledge of these facts is absolutely essential to the proper maintenance of divine worship; for it must be one part of our duty to honor that day which the Lord claims as his, and the Scriptures must define the nature and ground of that obligation, and must specify the day which is the holy of the Lord and honorable. These statements are reasonable and just. And now in their light how stands the first day of the week?

1. Christ never claimed the day as his.  
2. He never observed the day as a Sabbath or as a sacred day.

3. He never conferred on it any title of sacredness.  
4. He never gave any precept concerning the day.

5. He never did anything to the day.  
6. He never—so far as recorded—even mentioned the day so much as once.

A very remarkable record indeed in the case of a day which asserts an exclusive title to the name of Lord's day! But though these six things are certainly true, does not the resurrection of Christ on the first day of the week prove that day to be the Lord's day? The Scriptures do not say any such thing. But may we not be certain that it is the Lord's day, though the Bible says nothing of the kind? It seems that many think thus. But is it not a day so prominent in our Lord's history as to justify men in taking the responsibility of giving it this title? The multitude indeed have done it; but the fact that the Lord has never done this leaves the day with no valid claim to this sacred honor. And this is not all. The day of Christ's resurrection has not so undoubted a pre-eminence over all the other days of his history as to constitute, even so far as they are concerned, a decisive probability in its favor. Let us name some of the eventful days of his life.

1. The day of his birth, honored by the proclamation of a mighty angel announcing that event, and by the revelation of a multitude of the heavenly host ascribing "glory to God in the highest." Luke 2:7-17.

2. The day of his baptism, when the sixty-nine weeks terminated with his anointing and his manifestation to Israel; and the Holy Ghost descended upon him in bodily shape as a dove; and the Father addressed him with an audible voice from Heaven. Matt. 3:13-17; Mark 1:9-15; Dan. 9:25.

3. The day of his transfiguration, when his glory and majesty shone forth as they will at his second advent; and Moses and Elias came and conversed with him; and God the Father again spoke to him from Heaven. Matt. 17:1-5; 2 Pet. 1:16-18.

4. The day of his crucifixion, embracing the institution of the Lord's supper; the betrayal of Christ, his agony in the garden, his apprehension; his trial before the chief priests and elders; his condemnation by Pilate; his mocking, scourging, and crucifixion; his dying anguish, with the Father's face turned from him, and the curse of the law having its course upon him, while the sun was veiled in darkness, and the earth was shaken, and the rocks were rent. Matt. 26:20-75; 27:1-66; Gal. 3:13.

5. The day of his resurrection, when there was a great earthquake, and the angel of the Lord rolled away the stone from the sepulcher, and our Lord arose from the dead, and many saints also came out of their graves and appeared to many; and our Lord showed himself to the Marys, to those on the way to Emmaus, and then to the eleven, Thomas excepted. Matt. 28: 1-10; Luke 24: 1-40.

6. The day of his ascension, when he led his disciples to the mount of Olives, to the very spot on which he shall hereafter stand (Zech. 14: 3, 4), and in the act of blessing his disciples he was parted from them, and, accompanied by the "many brethren" who were raised with him, he ascended to his Father in the same manner that he shall descend at his second advent. Luke 24: 50, 51; Acts 1; Rom. 8: 29; Eph. 4: 8, margin.

The first three of these days, memorable as they are in our Lord's history, are for wise reasons concealed from our knowledge, so that we cannot identify them. But not so with the last three. The Saviour was crucified the day before the Sabbath (Mark 15: 42, 43); and he was raised the day after it (Mark 16: 1-6); and he ascended on the fortieth day from his resurrection. Acts 1: 3. The day of our Lord's ascension is scarcely less memorable than that of his resurrection, and it is in some respects even more glorious than that day; but the day on which the Son of God tasted death for sinful man witnessed events incomparably more memorable than any other in all the history of our Lord.

We do not teach that either of these days should be observed; for there is no such direction in the Bible. The crucifixion and the resurrection have each their appropriate memorials. 1 Cor. 11: 23-26; Rom. 6: 3-5; Col. 2: 12. But the days on which they occurred were not set apart for sacred purposes. The Scriptures give the title of Lord's day to neither of these days. Were we to confer this on either of them as indicative of our love for Christ, certainly that day should have the preference on which, above all other days, he showed his love for us.

Christ's great act for man was not his resurrection, but his death. Matt. 20: 28; Rom. 5: 6-8; 2 Cor. 5: 14, 15. His great humiliation was in his death; his exaltation was not at his resurrection, but at his ascension; his resurrection being treated as an act necessary to his glorification, but not that glorification itself, which could only come by his ascending to the throne of his Father. Compare Phil. 2: 6-11; Eph. 1: 7, 20-23; Ps. 24: 7-10. Should we therefore give the title of Lord's day to that day which witnessed our Lord's glorification, it will be conferred upon the day of his ascension, and not upon that of his resurrection; but should it be conferred upon that day in which infinitely above all other days he showed his love for man, that day will be the one in which he poured out his soul unto death, being made a curse for us. Isa. 53: 10-12; Gal. 3: 13.

But is not the first day of the week eight times mentioned in the New Testament? And does not this indicate that it should be called the Lord's day? It is true that the first day of the week is mentioned six times in the records of Christ's resurrection, and twice afterward. But if it is entitled to this sacred name, why was it not called Lord's day in even one of these eight instances? If the Spirit of God mentioned the day eight times, and did not in a single case give it a sacred title of any kind, is it not a strong proof that it has no right to the name of Lord's day, and indeed that it is not by divine right a sacred day? Suppose that after the crucifixion of Christ—where the anti-Sabbatarians assert that the Sabbath was abrogated—we should find in the New Testament eight instances in which that day is mentioned, and that in each case it is simply called "the seventh day," but no sacred title is given to it, would they not urge this as a powerful argument that it had ceased to be a sacred day? And would it not be just that they should so use it?

If in every instance in which the ancient Sabbath is mentioned in the New Testament after the death of Christ, it were called simply "the seventh day," that fact would be urged as conclusive proof that it ceased to be the Sabbath at the crucifixion; and the greater the number of instances in which it should be mentioned, the stronger the argument against the sacredness of the seventh day. But what shall be said in the case of the first day of the week, which never had a sacred title in the Old Testament, and

which, being eight times mentioned in the New, never once gets such a title therein? Nor is this all. The ancient Sabbath retains its honorable and sacred name after the time of its alleged abolition or change; whereas that day which is supposed to have taken its place by divine authority, though eight times mentioned in the New Testament, is called by no higher title than plain "first day of the week." Do such facts constitute a valid title to the name of Lord's day for the first day of the week? Rather are they not absolutely fatal to its pretensions?

But was it not the day which the apostles devoted to religious assemblies? And ought it not to be awarded this title for this reason? Many persons so assert. And yet the day itself is not even alluded to in the book of Acts till eight years after the apostles as a body are dismissed from its record; and then a single instance is all that occurs, and this was an all-night meeting, held on the night following the Sabbath, because Paul was to leave on first-day morning on his journey to Jerusalem. Surely we have not yet discovered a valid title to the name of Lord's day for the first day of the week.

But did not Paul give a precept in 1 Cor. 16: 2 respecting the first day of the week? And does not this show that the Lord has claimed this day as his, and that he has given instruction concerning its proper observance? And have we not here discovered the title of Sunday to the name of Lord's day? Unfortunately this argument will not bear examination.

1. The precept relates to the day as a secular, and not as a sacred, day. The Corinthians were to examine the previous week's earnings, or income, and to lay aside such portions for charity as they could afford.

2. They were to do this not in the house of God, but at their own homes.

3. The precept did not cover the entire day, but only a few minutes' time.

4. The precept was given only for a limited period, viz., till the arrival of Paul at Corinth, and for a transient purpose only, viz., the relief of the poor saints at Jerusalem.

We have stated the kind of evidence necessary to determine what day is the Lord's day. But our search for testimony to establish the claim of Sunday to this sacred title, has failed to bring out one fact of that kind, so that as yet we have nothing to prove it the Lord's day except the unsupported assertion of those who "love to have it so."

One of two things must be true. 1. By the term Lord's day, John designated a divinely established institution which needed not to be identified, there being only one such institution in existence, and no more; or, 2. By the term Lord's day he designated a new day which up to this point had never borne this sacred name.

But the first day of the week cannot come under the first of these two heads; for it is certain that prior to John's vision on Patmos no sacred writer had given to the first day the name of Lord's day or any other name implying sacredness in the day; and we have searched in vain for any fact that can justly establish the claim of the first day to this high honor. Besides the apostle John, there are four inspired men who mention the first day of the week; and none of them give it a sacred name. Yet three of them mention it at the very time when it is said to have become the Lord's day; and they record the very event which is claimed to have made it such. Matt. 28: 1; Mark 16: 1, 2, 9; Luke 24: 1-3. And if it be said that they could not abruptly give the day a name so sacred, because up to that point another day had been honored by the Lord as his, we reply that two of these four writers mention the day some thirty years after the time when it is said to have become Lord's day, and they still call it plain first day of the week. Acts 20: 7; 1 Cor. 16: 2. It is therefore certain that if by the term Lord's day John meant to designate an existing divinely-established institution, he could not mean the first day of the week; for it certainly was not such when John had his vision.

The first day can therefore be intended only in case John took it up as a new day, or as a new institution which up to that point (A. D. 96) had never been entitled to that sacred name. But if John took it up thus, he must specify which one of the six days he intended to honor, for besides the ancient day, which from the beginning the Lord had claimed as his, there were six

days which man for all rightful secular purposes could call his own. Now it is possible to bring this matter to a decisive test. The Spirit of God has not trifled with us in this thing. If the ancient day is intended, there is no need of defining or identifying it. But if one of the six secular or working days is meant, it is necessary to state that fact, and to say which one of them is henceforward to be the sacred day.

But John did nothing of this kind. If the Spirit of God designed through him to confer a sacred title upon one of the six days which from the beginning of the world had been secular days, was it not necessary that he should name the day? And was he not capable of doing it? If he was commissioned of God to establish first-day sacredness by giving that day the title of Lord's day, he certainly did not go very far toward executing that commission, inasmuch as he in nowise connected the sacred title with what had been till then a secular day.

But we have now an important fact to notice which brings this matter to a decisive test. If John was not commissioned to confer this sacred title upon the first day of the week, then it has no case at all. But if he was thus commissioned, he failed to execute it while in Patmos. But two years after his return from Patmos he wrote his gospel. (For proof of this fact beside the testimonies cited in the History of the Sabbath pages 189, 190, see Elliot's *Horæ Apocalypticæ*, vol. 1, pages 31-46.) Now notice two things:

1. His commission—if he ever had one—to give to Sunday the title of Lord's day was not executed in Patmos.

2. But in writing his gospel he must mention the day, and that in connection with the very event which is said to have given it a right to this sacred name; and his unexecuted commission to confer the name of Lord's day upon it could leave him no option.

Now, then, we shall be able to learn the truth with absolute certainty. If John was chosen by the Spirit of God to do a work which Mathew, Mark, Luke and Paul, who were each led by that Spirit to mention the day, were not worthy to do, viz., to confer upon it the honorable and sacred title of Lord's day, his work was unfinished—not to say untouched—and now he must do it. The first day of the week is twice mentioned by him (John 20: 1, 19) after he wrote Rev. 1: 10. If he here applies the term Lord's day to it, then we shall know that this was the day intended in Rev. 1: 10. If he does not give it this name, then we shall be certain that the Spirit of God did not undertake to give it that name in Rev. 1: 10. Here are the words of John's gospel, and the peculiar circumstances of the case make them absolutely decisive:

John 20: 1: "The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre."

Verse 19: "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut, where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you."

Here then is the case: When John speaks of the Lord's day he gives us no reason to believe that he means by it the first day of the week; while there are decisive reasons for believing that he does not. And when, some two years afterward, he speaks twice of the first day of the week and that too in describing the very thing which is said to have made the day worthy of the name, he absolutely omits even the most distant reference to the honorable and sacred name of Lord's day. The conclusion is therefore inevitable that John did not use the term Lord's day concerning the first day of the week; but did use it concerning a divinely-established institution which needed not to be identified, there being one such in existence, and no more.

It is certain therefore that there is in the gospel dispensation one day which the Lord claims as his own. And this day must be one which in one of the latest books of the Bible needed no identification, because on the authority of the entire Scriptures, to it alone belongs the entire field. Moreover for reasons already given, it must be a day which can bear the following decisive tests:

1. To be the Lord's day, there must be in its history some act of the Lord whereby it was set apart for him.

2. There must be, for the intelligent action of man, a plain and sufficient reason assigned for its institution.

3. There must be divine authority for its name.

4. There must be a divine precept stating man's duty respecting the day which belongs to the Lord.

5. The day must be one which is claimed both by the Son and the Father.

Certainly the standard here set up is reasonable, and scriptural, and just. If any object to the tests proposed, let them show cause for so doing. Now it is a remarkable fact that not one of these things is true in the case of the first day of the week. And it is no less remarkable that every one of them is true to the letter in the case of the seventh day. As this can be said of no other day, we say to our first-day friends, Come, see a day which bears every mark of being the one we both seek; is not this indeed the Lord's day?

1. Here is the act of the Creator by which the day was set apart: "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." Gen. 2: 3.

2. Here is a definite statement of his reason for hallowing it, *i. e.*, for appointing it to a holy use: "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." Ex. 20: 11.

3. Here is divine authority for calling it the Lord's day: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on MY HOLY DAY; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord," etc. Isa. 58: 13, 14.

4. Here is the divine precept defining man's duty respecting the Lord's holy day: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Ex. 20: 8.

5. The Father and the Son both claim the day as theirs. The Father's claim: "But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Ex. 20: 10. The Son's claim: "For the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day." Matt. 12: 8; Mark 2: 28; Luke 6: 5.

Nor is this all that should be said concerning the title of our Lord Jesus Christ to that day which was set apart in the beginning when the other six were given to man. The following texts establish the Saviour's claim to this day, even by virtue of its original institution.

Gen. 1: 1. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."

Gen. 2: 2. "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made."

John 1: 1-3. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made.

Verse 10: "He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not."

Eph. 3: 9: "And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ."

Col. 1: 15, 16: "Who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature; for by him were all things created," etc.

Heb. 1: 2: "Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds."

These texts clearly establish the fact that the Son was associated with the Father in the work of creation. And they also teach that whereas the Father was the original source of creative power, he exercised that power through his Son. It is certain, therefore, that the Son wrought directly in the work of creation, and that the Father wrought through him. Now the seventh day was first the rest day of the Creator; and second, it was by his appointment set apart to the Lord from all secular purposes to be his holy day in memory of his rest from that creative work. We do not exclude the Father from participation in the acts by which the Sabbath was made in Eden; but we do maintain that the Son must have been directly concerned in the performance of those acts. For it would be absurd to teach that the Son was the one by whom

the Father wrought the work of creation, and then to assert that the rest from that work was by the Father himself without the participation of his Son; and that the Sabbath as a memorial commemorated the part taken in creation by the Father, but not that part which was taken therein by the Son.

But there is no rivalry between the Father and the Son; for they are one in interest and one in heart and work. John 10: 30. "All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore, said I, that he shall take of mine and shall show it unto you." John 16: 15. And it is certain that as the Son of God, by virtue of his share in the creative work, he has an original and inherent right to claim the Sabbath as his own holy day.

Nor is this all. As the Son of Man he has also an interest in this day which dates from the beginning. Observe what he has said concerning this: "The Sabbath was made for man [Greek, 'the man.' i. e., Adam] and not man [Greek 'the man'] for the Sabbath: therefore the Son of Man [Greek, the 'son of the man'] is Lord also of the Sabbath day. Mark 2: 27, 28. The term 'the Son of Man' is in every case in the Greek Testament but four—where the reason for the exception is obvious—the son of *the man*." This is in marked distinction from the similar term so often used in the case of Ezekiel. See the Septuagint. Now, Mark 2: 27, 28 gives us the key to this. The original creation of man, and the original institution of the Sabbath are mentioned in verse 27. These two acts were in close connection at the beginning. Gen. 1: 26-31; 2: 1-3. In the case of man the Father and the Son, consulted together.

Now we can readily understand why the Saviour said the Sabbath was made for "the man." He pointed to Adam the head and representative of the human family. And we can also understand why he uses the peculiar term concerning himself—"the son of the man." It is in direct reference to the fact that he is the son of Adam. Indeed he seems here to claim the Sabbath as Adam's heir—for he is remembered though Adam lost Eden he did not lose the Sabbath. "The man" for whom "the Sabbath was made" was Adam. "The son of the man," is the second man Adam, and it is as "this son of man" that he claims to be "Lord also of the Sabbath."

But it is objected that "Lord's day" is a new term, and that a new day must be intended thereby. To which we answer. 1. The name is not properly speaking a new one inasmuch as it is the same in substance with that used in Isa. 58: 13: "My Holy day." 2. If the term relates to a day never before bearing a sacred title, and never elsewhere claimed by the Lord as his, that new day must be specified in this text; but it is not: a positive proof that such day cannot be intended. 3. The term as we have seen is exactly adapted to that institution which was set up by the Father and the Son at the beginning. 4. As there was one day holy to the Lord from the beginning, there cannot be a new Lord's day unless either the Lord have put away his holy day and chosen another, or else there are now two days claimed by him. But as he has never divorced his holy day and chosen another, and has never taken a second in addition to the first, the day sacred alike to the Father and the Son is the very one hallowed in Eden. 5. A new Lord's day implies the annulling of that act which set apart the seventh day for God, before any of the days of the week had been given to man for secular purposes; and it also implies the selection in its stead of a day which God at the beginning gave to man for the affairs of this life, and which for 4000 years man thus used. No such change is to be found in the Holy Scriptures.

But may not John recognize as the Lord's day the first day of the week, though it be but a mere human institution? Hereafter we shall see what can be said in its behalf as such out of the traditions of the elders. But we here only remark that John would not tell a lie by calling a certain day the Lord's day when it had no right to that sacred name, and by denying the title to that day which has been claimed both by the Father and the Son.

Adam, the second, will restore Paradise, and will establish his kingdom under the whole heaven. Dan. 7: 13, 14, 17, 18, 22, 27; 2 Pet. 3; Rev. 21 and 22. And as a final and decisive proof that the day which belongs to "the Lord from Heaven" is the Sabbath and not the first day of the

week, we mention the fact that when his kingdom shall fill the whole earth, the redeemed shall assemble on each successive Sabbath to worship before him, while not one word is thus spoken concerning the first day of the week. Isa. 66: 22, 23; We submit that the evidence is decisive that by the Lord's day of Rev. 1: 10 is meant not the first day of the week, but the seventh. And so it is seen that it pleased the Lord of the Sabbath to place a signal honor upon his own day, in that he selected it as the one on which to give that revelation to John, which himself alone had been counted worthy to receive from the Father.

LET GOD DIRECT.

Lord, if thou direct, I will advance.  
In thy wisdom and thy strength  
I will advance.

If I but really know, my duty is to go,  
I will not wait for friend or foe,  
But will advance.

Lord, if thou direct, I will stand still.  
Intrenched behind thy shield  
I will stand still. [sit still,]  
If from my lack of skill, "my strength is to  
If it should be thy holy will,  
I will stand still.

Lord, if thou direct, I will retire.  
In obscurity to rest,  
I will retire. [been won,  
If my mortal race is run, and the victory has  
I can say, Thy will be done,  
And retire.

"New Lights."

FROM the "Life of Eld. Benjamin Randall," by Eld. John Buzzell, I copy the following, which was from Eld. R's diary. He says, in reference to George Whitefield:

"But oh! how disgusting to me was the news of his arrival; for I was much opposed to all traveling preachers, who in those days were called 'new lights;' and in short to all except the settled clergy, and to everything but form, so that the power of God was even a torment to me. Where there was any power in the preaching, I thought it was all delusion and enthusiasm; and that all such preachers were turning the world upside down, breaking up churches, frightening the people, that their earnest and loud preaching was all affected and disposed to make the people cry out, and make a noise; and that they preached only because they would not work.

"I felt enough of persecution to have had all such preachers whipped out of town; though I should not liked to have been seen in it myself I should have been willing to have seen others do it.

"Believing there are many others of the same disposition, I mention this with grief and shame, that if any such should ever read it, they may take warning, and cry to God to change their hearts, and give themselves no rest, till they feel the disposition removed. Oh! how dreadful to a profession of religion, a form of godliness, yet denying the power, to belong to a church, eat and drink in Christ name, yet hate his spiritual appearing. \* \* \* O, persecuting Pharisees, Christian professors, take warning, I pray you before it be too late."

We feel that if Randall were living now, he might, without much trouble, find many to whom this appeal could with propriety be made. Free-will Baptists, I ask you, was the founder of your society wrong in regard to his spirit of persecution? So he confessed. Well, will you, who may feel something of this persecuting spirit, receive this good man's earnest counsel? "Take warning before it be too late."

Are there any "new lights" within your ken? Do you see them to your mind, "turning the world up-side down?" "breaking up churches?" "frightening the people?" Remember the words, *How dreadful* to belong to a church, eat and drink in Christ's name, yet hate his personal appearing. (Excuse me for changing one word.) And here you may with propriety question if the writer of this article styles your society the church having a "form of godliness," &c. We would hope that it is not; yet from further extracts from the same source, we infer that Eld. Randall feared it might become so, and in all kindness we urge you candidly to consider his words below quoted. Are they prophetic? Will they become so? In his farewell to the New Durham quarterly meeting, with a fatherly love and gentle admonition, Randall writes:

"There is in some branches and in some members in this connection, I think, a great inclination to mingle with the world; and this I fear will cause a great deal of trouble. Oh! beware of it, I pray you; for we are

called out from among the world and from every people under heaven; and our prosperity wholly depends on our following our heavenly leader; and if we do not, God will raise him up another people, and we shall sink as others have done before us." We give the italics.

We conclude from the history of the past, and the evidences of the present time, that if God calls out a people from the world and the different denominations, they will exhibit a marked dissimilarity to those from whom they have been called out. Therefore if Methodists or Baptists who have evidently been called out, present a favorable contrast in their spirituality, their dress, and their labor for souls, to senior denominations, it is very good evidence that they are still the people of God. But if there is a striking similarity between orthodox, Baptist, Methodist, &c., aside from form and ceremony, two things are very evident; either they have not continued in favor with Him who called them out, or they were called out to be a "peculiar" people for a season only, to relapse again into the old ruts.

Do you, Baptists, or Methodists, desire to know whether you are the "peculiar people," "zealous of good works"? Do not decide the matter yourself; you are in danger of being prejudiced. Ask the world's people, the sinner, the scoffer, and skeptic, if they see your good works. If there is a contrast they will know it.

"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good, and despise not prophesyings."

And let us who think we, as Seventh-day Adventists, are called out, take to ourselves the warning of a Randall—to beware how we "mingle with the world" lest we lose our crown. F. A. BUZZELL.

The Password.

ONE day, having to go down to St. Katherine's Docks from the city, I thought I should save a little journey by going through the Tower of London. So I entered the gates at the west end, and walked along some little distance, passing through archways, and over draw-bridges, till at last I approached the high wall that runs along the eastern boundary of the Tower precincts. The place where I had to go, was only just the other side of this wall, and I had but to pass through the gateway before me, and I should arrive at my destination. But at this gateway I found a policeman stationed, who opened and shut the door as the people passed to and fro; and I noticed that he spoke to each person, as he came up, before he let him through.

On coming up to the gateway, the policeman stopped me and thus accosted me: "The password, if you please, sir." "The password? I have no password to give you," I replied. "Then I cannot allow you to pass," said he. "But my business is urgent, and I have but to go to these docks; you'll let me pass surely?" "No, sir, I can not." I tried to persuade him, but he was inflexible. "It is more than my place is worth," said he; "I dare not let any one through without the password."

Seeing that all expostulation was useless, I turned round with no other alternative than that of going all the way back, and walking round—altogether a walk of some distance. As I returned, my mortification was not a little increased at seeing others coming up, and on giving the password, at once allowed to go through.

In this simple incident, what an illustration we have, thought I, of another journey, and the gateway at the entrance of the Heavenly City!

How important that we should know the password!

Let us try to picture the scene. The gate is guarded, people are coming to seek for admittance. Here is one who, with confidently step, marches up to the gate, and, loudly knocking, demands an entrance. The password is required. "Oh," says he, "don't you know who I am? why, I am well known as a man of generosity. I have made good use of my wealth in relieving distress, promoting the cause of religion, and establishing churches. And, thank God, I can say, I have never offended either against the laws of my country, or the commands of my God. I am not one of those who have sunk in sin. So open the gates, and let me enter."

But the answer is—"The gates can not be opened, as you have not given the password."

Then up comes another. He is not so respectable a man as the former. "No," says he, "I can not justify myself for I am

a sinner indeed, my soul is guilty, and I have no good works to bring; but I've repented of my sins: behold my tears, my sighs, my groans, my prayers! Oh, sir, are not these enough to gain for me an entrance into the celestial city?"

Ah! the gates are still fast closed, because he can not give the password.

But look again. There is one coming with trembling step and eyes cast down—he is afraid almost to approach the gate. At last he gives a gentle rap. It is asked, "Who art thou?" "I'm a poor, undone sinner," saith he; "I come for mercy." "What is your plea? Do you know the password?" "JESUS ONLY," cries the penitent. And no sooner do the words escape his lips, than the portals fly open, and ten thousand voices fill the air, "Come in, come in, dear soul, thrice welcome!"

Thus it is, dear reader; until we have been enabled to say from our inmost soul, "Jesus only," we have not yet learned "Heaven's password." It is not merely taking these words upon our lips, or even having a head knowledge of the fact that Jesus only can save the soul, that will admit us into Heaven; but it is a real heart-felt experience of the truth, that we, as sinners, can do nothing, either to cleanse from sin, or to clothe with righteousness; but that for all this we must trust in "JESUS ONLY."

Ground to Powder.

"I REMEMBER away up in a lonely Highland valley, where beneath a tall black cliff, all weather-worn and cracked and seamed, there lies at the foot, resting on the green sward that creeps round its base, a huge rock, that has fallen from the face of the precipice.

"A shepherd was passing beneath it; and suddenly, when the finger of God's will touched it, and rent it from its ancient bed in the everlasting rock, it came down, leaping and bounding from pinnacle to pinnacle, and it fell; and the man that was beneath it is there now! 'ground to powder.'

"Ah, my brethren, that is not my illustration; that is Christ's. Therefore I say to you, since all that stand against him shall become 'as the chaff of the summer threshing-floor,' and be swept utterly away, make him the foundation on which you build; and when the storm sweeps away every 'refuge of lies,' you will be safe and serene, builded upon the Rock of Ages."—M'Laren.

Errata.

THERE are readers who are never happier, as mere readers, than when they light upon a typographical error in their favorite author or journal. No beauty in the blemished page gives quite so much of a certain kind of satisfaction as the blemish itself, for that enables the reader to rise for a moment superior to the writer, however learned, brilliant, or graceful he may be. The reader seems to have the impression, more or less vague, that he is himself an exceedingly clever fellow, and straightway sends a note to the editor, pointing out the error that was in his last issue. Every journalist knows this kind of a note, and has dropped hundreds of such missives, half read, into his waste paper basket, for it is only people unfamiliar with types who think it worth their while to make an ado about an inverted letter or a misplaced comma.

Typographical perfection is impossible even in works slowly and carefully prepared. It is unreasonable to demand it in a newspaper, the writing and printing of which are naturally done in haste. The wonder is, that there are so few mistakes. Let readers reflect for a moment that every letter on this page is produced by a separate piece of metal, so small that only the most skillful fingers can handle it dexterously. The slightest displacement of one of these slender strips of lead would inevitably cause a blunder. How easy it is to drop a type, or misplace, or dent it. Even after the proof-reader has corrected his proof-sheet, all the chances, and a hundred others, are possible. In correcting one error in the types, it is easy for the compositor to disarrange a word in another part of the next.

Then, proof-readers are mortal. There is nothing easier in this world—lying not excepted—than not to see a misprint until it is too late to amend it, and then the blunder that escaped the keenest eye always has the faculty of becoming the most prominent thing on the page, and making the proof-reader wonder how in the world it escaped him. An author or proof-reader may revise and revise, and at the end find that he has overlooked some serious flaw. Then, again, in "making up" a form, the printer may let a type fall out, and in replacing it, he may put it in the wrong place—or again, he may not notice its absence, and then a blank is left. This is true of books as well as newspapers. There has never yet been produced a volume of any considerable size, free from typographical blemishes.—Every Saturday.

## The Review and Herald.

"Sanctify them through Thy truth; Thy word is truth."

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, FEB. 13, 1872.

ELD. JAMES WHITE,  
" J. N. ANDREWS,  
" J. H. WAGGONER,  
URIAH SMITH, EDITORS.  
RESIDENT EDITOR.

### The United States in the Light of Prophecy.

#### CHAPTER XII (CONCLUDED).

A VERY marked and rapid change is taking place in public opinion relative to the proposed religious amendment of the Constitution. We have learned of instances of men who were at first openly hostile to the movement, now giving their influence for its advancement, and clamoring loudly for a Sunday law. And some who at first regarded it with indifference, are now becoming its warm partisans. As a sample of this change of feeling, the following paragraph from the *Christian Press* of Jan., 1872, may be presented. The *Christian Press* is the organ of the Western Book and Tract Society, Cincinnati, Ohio, and the editor, speaking of the National Association above referred to, says:—

"When this Association was formed, while we were prepared to bid it God-speed, we did not then feel that there was any pressing need for the object sought; and, as our mission was specially directed to the Christianizing, enlightening and elevating the masses of the people, we have said little in our columns on the subject, being assured that if the people are right, it is easy to set the government right. The late combined efforts, however, of various classes of our citizens to exclude the Bible from our schools, repeal our Sabbath laws, and divorce our government entirely from religion, and thus make it an atheistic government—for every government must be for God or against him, and must be administered in the interests of religion and good morals, or in the interests of irreligion and immorality—have changed our mind, and we are now prepared to urge the necessity for an explicit acknowledgment in the National Constitution of the authority of God and the supremacy of his law, as revealed in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments."

With the anti-Sunday movements of the present day, considering their associations, and the manner and object in and for which they are carried forward, we have no sympathy. They aim at utter no-Sabbathism, freedom from all moral restraint, and all the evils of unbridled intemperance—ends which we abhor with all the strength of a moral nature quickened by the most intense religious convictions. And while the indignation of the better portion of the community will be aroused at the lack of religious principle and the immorality attending the popular anti-Sunday movements, a little lack of discrimination, by no means uncommon, will, on account of our opposition to the day, though we oppose it on entirely different ground, easily associate us with the class above mentioned, and subject us to the same odium.

Meanwhile, some see the evils involved in this movement, and raise the voice of alarm. The *Christian Union*, Jan., 1871, said:

"The friends of the measure are not likely ever to agree among themselves. The Convention which met in Philadelphia on the 18th inst. to consider this subject, refused to accept a phraseology which simply recognizes the Deity, and insisted upon including in the emendation the name of Jesus Christ as well. A party, in behalf of the Holy Spirit, which is so conspicuously slighted, will be next in order; and then the way will be open for a proposition to recognize the 'Vicegerent of Christ on earth,' as the true source of power among the nations! If the proposed amendment is anything more than a bit of sentimental cant, it is to have a legal effect. It is to alter the status of the non-Christian citizen before the law. It is to affect the legal oaths and instruments, the matrimonial contracts, the sumptuary laws, &c., &c., of the country. This would be an outrage on natural right."

The *Janesville (Wis.) Gazette*, at the close of an article on the proposed amendment, speaks thus of the effect of the movement, should it succeed:—

"But, independent of the question as to what extent we are a Christian nation, it may well be doubted whether, if the gentlemen who are agitating this question should succeed, they would not do society a very great injury. Such measures are but the initiatory steps which ultimately lead to restrictions of religious freedom, and to commit the government to measures which are as foreign to its powers and purposes as would its action be if it should undertake to determine a disputed question of theology."

The *Weekly Alta Californian* of San Francisco, March 12, 1870, said:—

"The parties who have been recently holding

a convention for the somewhat novel purpose of procuring an amendment to the Constitution of the United States recognizing the Deity, do not fairly state the case when they assert that it is the right of a Christian people to govern themselves in a Christian manner. If we are not governing ourselves in a Christian manner, how shall the doings of our government be designated? The fact is that the movement is one to bring about in this country that union of church and State which all other civilized nations are now trying to dissolve."

The *N. Y. Independent*, Feb., 1870, spoke of the movement as having the same chance of success that a union of church and State would have.

The *Champlain Journal* speaking of incorporating the religious principle into the Constitution and its effect upon the Jews, said:—

"However slight, it is the entering wedge of church and State. If we may cut off ever so few persons from the right of citizenship on account of difference of religious belief, then with equal justice and propriety may a majority at any time dictate the adoption of still further articles of belief, until our Constitution is but the text-book of a sect beneath whose tyrannical sway all liberty of religious opinion will be crushed."

For a union of church and State, strictly so-called, we do not look. In place of this we apprehend that what is called "the image," a creation as strange as it is unique, comes in—not a State controlled by the church, and the church in turn supported by the State, but an ecclesiastical establishment empowered to enforce its own decrees by civil penalties; which in all its practical bearings amounts to exactly the same thing. The direct aim of the movement is undoubtedly a union of church and State; a result which it will so nearly accomplish as to secure, by way of compromise, the erection of the image.

Some one may now say, As you expect this movement to carry, you must look for a period of religious persecution in this country; nay, more, you must take the position that all the saints of God are to be put to death; for the image is to cause that all who will not worship it shall be killed.

There would, perhaps, be some ground for such a conclusion, were we not elsewhere informed that in this dire conflict God does not abandon his people to defeat, but grants them a complete victory over the beast, his image, his mark, and the number of his name. Rev. 15:2. We further read respecting this earthly power, that he causeth all to receive a mark in their right hand or their foreheads; yet chapter 20:4 speaks of some who do not receive the mark nor worship the image. If, then, he could cause all to receive the mark, and yet all not actually receive it, in like manner his causing all to be put to death who will not worship the image, does not necessarily signify that their lives are actually to be taken.

But how can this be? Answer: It evidently comes under that rule of interpretation in accordance with which verbs of action sometimes signify merely the will and endeavor to do the action in question, not the actual performance of the thing specified. George Bush, Professor of Hebrew and Oriental Literature in N. Y. City University, makes this matter plain. In his Notes on Ex. 7:11, he says:—

"It is a canon of interpretation of frequent use in the exposition of the sacred writings that verbs of action sometimes signify merely the will and endeavor to do the action in question. Thus Eze. 24:13: 'I have purified thee, and thou wast not purged;' i. e., I have endeavored, used means, been at pains, to purify thee. John 5:44: 'How can ye believe which receive honor one of another;' i. e., endeavor to receive. Rom 2:4: 'The goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance;' i. e., endeavors, or tends, to lead thee. Amos 9:3: 'Though they be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea;' i. e., though they aim to be hid. 1 Cor. 10:33: 'I please all men;' i. e., endeavor to please. Gal. 5:4: 'Whosoever of you are justified by the law;' i. e., seek and endeavor to be justified. Ps. 69:4: 'They that destroy me are mighty;' i. e., that endeavor to destroy me. Eng. 'That would destroy me.' Acts 7:26: 'And set them at one again;' i. e., wished and endeavored. Eng. 'Would have set them.'"

So in the passage before us: He causes all to receive a mark, and all who will not worship the image, to be killed; that is, he wills, purposes, and endeavors, to do this; he makes such an enactment, passes such a law, but is not able to execute it; for God interposes in behalf of his people; and then those who have kept the word of Christ's patience, are kept from the hour of temptation, kept from falling, according to

Rev. 3:10: then those who have made God their refuge, are kept from all evil, and no plague comes nigh their dwelling, according to Ps. 91:9, 10; then all who are found written in the book, are delivered, according to Dan. 12:1; and being victors over the beast and his image, they are redeemed from among men, and raise a song of everlasting triumph before the throne of God. Rev. 14:4; 15:2.

Another objector may say, You are altogether too credulous in supposing that all the skeptics of our land, the spiritualists, the German infidels, and the irreligious masses generally, can be so far brought to favor the religious observance of Sunday, that a general law can be promulgated in its behalf.

We answer, The prophecy must be fulfilled; and if the prophecy requires such a revolution, it will be accomplished. But we do not know that it is necessary. Permit us to suggest an idea, which, though it is only conjecture, may show how enough can be accomplished to fulfill the prophecy, without involving the classes mentioned. This movement, as has been shown, must originate with the churches of our land, and be carried forward by them. They wish to enforce certain practices among all the people; and it would be very natural that, in reference to those points respecting which they wish to influence the outside masses, they should see the necessity of first having absolute conformity among all the evangelical denominations. They could not expect to influence non-religionists to any great degree on questions respecting which they were divided among themselves. So, then, let union be had on those views and practices which the great majority already entertain. To this end coercion may first be attempted. But here are a few who cannot possibly attach to the observance of the first day, which the majority wish to secure, any religious obligation; and would it be anything strange for the sentence to be given, Let these few factionists be made to conform, by persuasion if possible, by force, if necessary. Thus the blow may fall on conscientious commandment-keepers, before the outside masses are involved in the issue at all. Thus much by way of conjecture, to which every one is left to attach as much or as little weight as may seem to him proper.

To receive the mark of the beast in the forehead, is, we understand, to give the assent of the mind and judgment to his authority in the adoption of that institution, which constitutes the mark. By parity of reasoning, to receive it in the hand, would be to signify allegiance by some outward act.

The number over which the saints are also to get the victory, is the number of the papal beast, called also the number of his name, and the number of a man, and said to be six hundred three score and six. The pope wears upon his pontifical crown in jeweled letters, this title; "Vicarius Filii Dei," "Vicegerent of the Son of God;" the numerical value of which title is just six hundred and sixty-six. The most plausible supposition we have ever seen on this point is that here we find the number in question. It is the number of the beast, the papacy; it is the number of his name; for he adopts it as his distinctive title: it is the number of a man; for he who bears it is the "Man of Sin." We get the victory over it, by refusing those institutions and practices which he sets forth as evidence of his power to sit supreme in the temple of God, and by adopting which we should acknowledge the validity of his title, by conceding his right to act for the church in behalf of the Son of God.

And now, reader, we leave with you this subject. We confidently submit the argument as one which is invulnerable in all its points. We ask you to review it carefully. Take in, if thought can comprehend it, the wonderful phenomenon of our own nation. Consider its location, the time of its rise, the manner of its rise, its character, Satan's masterpiece of lying wonders which he has here sprung upon the world, and the elements which are everywhere working to fulfill in just as accurate a manner every other specification of the prophecy. Can you doubt the application? We know not how. Then the last agents to appear in this world's history are on the stage of action, the close of this dispensation is at hand, and the Lord cometh speedily to judge the world. Then an issue of appalling magnitude is before us. It is no less than this: To yield to unrighteous human enactments soon to be made, and thus expose ourselves to the unmingled wrath of an insulted

Creator, or to remain loyal to our God and brave the utmost wrath of the dragon and his infuriated hosts.

In reference to this issue the third angel now utters his solemn and vehement warning. Do aid in sounding over the land this timely note of alarm, to impress upon hearts the importance of a right position in the coming issue, and the necessity of pursuing such a course as will secure the favor of God in the season of earth's direst extremity, and a share at last in his glorious salvation, is the object of this effort. And if with any it shall have this effect, the prayer of the writer will not be utterly unanswered, nor his labor be wholly lost.

### The Dress Question—A Puzzled Woman.

A SISTER writes to me, asking me the following question:

"Why do the Adventist brethren dress so much like other gentlemen, and require the sisters to dress so peculiarly singular? I must confess I have been a little puzzled over the matter sometimes, when I could not tell one of our ministers from other well-dressed men in a crowd."

1. It is necessary to a proper understanding of any question, that all irrelevant statements should be set aside. In the above question there is a material error in the statement. It charges that the "brethren" "require the sisters to dress peculiarly singular." Who are the brethren who require this? If there are any such, I would be pleased to be informed thereof. Now, I would invite all the sisters who are in any way perplexed on this subject, to stop and consider anew the reasons of their action. How was this Dress Reform introduced among us? Do our sisters adopt it as a duty, as a matter of conscience, or because the "brethren require it?"

2. Is there any objection to our ministers' dressing like "well-dressed men" so long as they pay no deference to any prevailing fashion? The truth is, that fashion has but a slight hold on the male portion of the community. The cities are infested with a class called "fops" who are as much a standing advertisement of their tailors, as ordinary fashionable women are of their milliners. But, while very many of our sisters are ever inclining toward the latest fashions, our ministers, and our brethren generally, would be ashamed to be seen on the street in the style of a fop or a dandy.

It is a fact beyond dispute that women, more than men, are inclined to run after fashion, finery, and show. Whether it is something peculiar to their nature as "the weaker vessel," or whether it is the result of education, I cannot say. But no one will deny the fact. Except dandies, the men will not submit to an uncomfortable compression of the waist; but how many women in any community can be found whose dresses around the waist are fitted for comfort and health? What lady will wear a hat or bonnet for protection in a cold day, when fashion requires that only a slight covering shall be stuck on the top of the head? How many females can be found on the streets of any city or even village, with good, heavy-soled shoes on the feet even in very wet weather? Or how many can be found with good, comfortable clothing around their ankles who can walk the streets so clad without a sense of shame? Shame for what? For daring to appear before people in a comfortable, healthful style of dress, which is not in fashion. When large, unsightly hoops were in fashion, well-meaning Christian women would insist that they were necessary for convenience, for comfort, and even for health. When they go out of fashion, neither convenience, comfort, nor health will induce those same women to wear them. For myself, I should be a hopeless invalid on account of rheumatism before one winter passed over me, if I had to dress as the great majority of females dress. And is it any wonder that women are weakly, pale, consumptive, and subject to almost unnumbered complaints known to the medical profession as "female complaints," the majority of which are truly "fashion and folly complaints?" If females are subject to more complaints than men, by their constitution and nature, why do they not dress so as to avoid them, and to guard their health as far as possible, instead of so dressing as to induce them? Why not? Because they dare not! Fashion holds them with an iron grasp.

Now as long as women are slaves to fashion and to the fear of the world, so long they must bear a cross in dressing comfortably, healthfully, or, sometimes, even decently. When they eman-

cipate themselves from this slavery, then the heavy cross will cease and they can begin to enjoy life.

I cannot see that it is our duty to be singular for the sake of singularity. Some love to appear eccentric, but I have always thought that it impaired their influence and usefulness. But where fashion rules, and duty demands a departure from its rules, there should be no hesitation. Let the sisters encourage and assist each other by consistency, and modest independence in the way of right, and they will soon reap the benefit of reform, in comfort and the enjoyment of better health, and in the blessing of Heaven, which requires that we "be not conformed to this present world."

J. H. W.

To Correspondents.

M. A. CONRAD: You ask if the Gentiles to whom Paul preached, used pork. Undoubtedly they did; and whether or not the apostle undertook to reform them in reference to this practice, except on the general principles of temperance, and the abstaining from things hurtful, we are not informed.

J. M. G.: The most reliable chronologers make the world to be, at the present time, about six thousand years old.

Please inform me through the REVIEW what the Greek word is from which "at hand" is translated in Matt. 4:17 and 2 Thess. 2:2.

In Bro. White's tract, "The Kingdom," he says the first is "engizo," and the second is "enistemi," while in the book, entitled "Prophecy of Daniel, Four Kingdoms, Sanctuary, and Twenty-three Hundred Days," it is given in Matt. 4:17, to be "eggikee," in 2 Thess. 2:2 is given "enisteecken."

Now can it be both, or which is correct?

W. W. S

Ans. Both are correct, essentially. They are but different forms of the same words.

In the REVIEW of Jan. 16, under the heading Question Answered, I find an exposition of Rom. 10:4: "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." I shall not object to the exposition, only I think the phrase, "Law for righteousness," refers particularly to the Levitical priesthood law of sacrifices, by which the people received atonement, and consequently, justification, or righteousness, in believing in the Messiah to whom these sacrifices pointed. The Levitical priesthood, in which all those rites were administered, being typical of the sufferings and death of Christ by which we receive the atonement and justification. Therefore, Christ is not only the scope and design of that law, but also the termination of it. Col. 2:14: "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." For further evidence of this fact, I refer the reader to the whole epistle of Paul to the Hebrews, wherein he portrays the similarity of the priesthood of Aaron to that of Christ, and wherein he describes the greater excellency of that of Christ to that of the former.

T. P. STILLMAN.

Ans. All that is here said about the relation of the priesthoods of Aaron and Christ is correct. But that Heb. 10:4 refers to the priesthood of Aaron cannot be correct. See the exposition to which you refer, on the latter part of the verse. Your theory would have some show of plausibility if you could make it appear that Christ was the termination of any law to the believer and not to the unbeliever. But, as such an idea is absurd, your view must be wrong.

QUES. Is it right to raise swine to sell?

Ans. We are disposed to leave this question to be answered by Rom. 14: "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." We cannot consent to bind people's consciences in matters concerning which we have no direct order in the Scriptures.

1. Please give an exposition of 1 Cor. 15:45.

2. A man here belonging to the M. E. church, claims, from what is recorded in Gen. 2, that man and woman were not created until after God's six days of labor were ended. Will you give us light on the subject?

T. D. W.

1. On the second part of this verse there can be no query. Christ is the second Adam, a quickening, or life-giving spirit. The first is a quotation from Gen. 2:7: man, the first Adam, became a "living soul." Clarke, in commenting on Gen. 1:24, says of the phrase "living creature" "nephesh chayyah; a general term to express all creatures endued with animal life, in any of its infinitely varied gradations, from the half-reasoning elephant, down to the stupid potted." But Clarke does not mention the fact that the words *living soul* in Gen. 2:7, applied to man, are exactly the same as in chap. 1:24,

there rendered "living creature." Our confidence in his commentary might sometimes be heightened if he had told the whole truth on some important points. His remarks on the formation of man, and the difference between his body and soul, are entirely out of harmony with his comment on the same words in chap. 1:24. The true idea of chap. 2:7, may be found as follows: "Man became a living soul"—text: "A general term to express all creatures endued with animal life."—Clarke.

2. We do not know what object, or what reason, he can have for making such a statement. Gen. 1 shows the order of God's work of creation; and the making of man is set down as part of the work of the sixth day. In chap. 2 the making of man is referred to in order to show how he was made, and to introduce the narrative of his probation. But it does not contradict the definite statement of chap. 1, or say that man was made on any other than the sixth day of the first week.

J. H. W.

No Gift in Prayer.

PROFESSORS of religion excuse themselves from taking part in the prayer-meeting, because, as they say, they have no gift in prayer. It would seem, from such confession, that if they really felt that they were gifted, so that they might be proud of their prayers, they would pray to be heard of men. The Pharisee, in the parable, was gifted in prayer; but the publican prayed. Should a man see himself in danger of sudden death, he would not be very apt to neglect to call aloud for help because he was not particularly gifted in making his wants known. His voice might be far from musical, and his expressions rude and broken, but the sense of danger and the strong desire for help would cause these things to be utterly forgotten. He would not think of excusing himself or making any apologies.

The publican felt his pressing need. And when these persons that have no gift in prayer feel theirs, and see themselves in their true light, instead of excusing themselves because they have no gift, they also will cry, "God be merciful to me a sinner." And being justified by grace, and cherishing a feeling sense of God's great goodness and their own unworthiness, they could cheerfully pay their vows to the Most High in the presence of all his people; and say, in the language of the Psalmist, "Because he hath inclined his ear unto me, therefore will I call upon him as long as I live."

Let a person see his lost condition, and he can pray. Let him be truly converted and he can pray and praise in the congregation. The want of a gift originates in the pride of an unconverted heart. When self is humbled, and God exalted, we can glorify God in the use of just such gifts as he has given us.

R. F. COTTRELL.

The Reformed Mormons.

EVIDENTLY the reign of Brigham Young in Utah is waning. The influx of Gentiles, and Gentile thought, has done much to weaken his power; but a worse calamity than this has befallen Mormonism. A reform, or liberal, party has lately broken off from the regular Mormon church. It opposes Brigham's rule, polygamy, &c. It starts off quite strong, publishes a paper, &c. It numbers among its leaders and supporters many who were prominent among the Mormons, as elders, preachers, missionaries, merchants, writers, &c.

The religious principles, held by this party, are somewhat striking, showing what Mormonism ultimately leads to. Really, it is only another phase of spiritualism. Mr. Harrison, in a speech reported in the Salt Lake Tribune, July 15, says:—

"I bless God that in my early days I joined the Methodist church, and in later years, the church of the Latter Day Saints; both were to me a means of growth. Christ, I then considered an indispensable means of salvation. Now, I feel that a man has the means of growth within himself, and that he could attain to salvation even though he never heard of Jesus Christ; yet Christ has made many men know God. But all of truth is not included in the church, nor all knowledge of God found in the Bible. We are not so dependent upon Jesus as we have been taught. We are our own saviours. Where did the Nazarene get truth? He had no Christ to go to. He found it, where we too can get it, in our own souls."

"An Old Mormon," in the same paper of the same date, says:—

"Thou exaltest the man above the hour of ignorance and vile servitude, to know that he is a god. Yes, man is a god—man in this, and in his more exalted spheres—and the only personal god we shall ever know. Man himself is a living, breathing proof of this, and the highest authority in existence. What living being is greater than man? Those who have passed to spirit life are men disembodied; and men in all spheres are greater than each other only as they are better and wiser, and not because they hold

the keys of a certain undefinable power called "priesthood," or because they suppose themselves specially appointed by some unseen and unknown power they worship as God. These specially appointed priests ask the sanction of the people to their imaginary appointments; then who gives them their seat of power? The people—the gods."

Then the editor, in the same paper, says:—

"It is now inquired how many people there are in our Movement. We reply, 'Quite a few.' In the first place, there are about eleven millions in one section of the Progressive Movement alone, known as spiritualists; then there are all the anti-slavery advocates in the world; then all the republican overthrowers of king-craft and despotism in Europe; then all the believers in woman's right to equality before the law; then the millions of rationalists and freethinkers of Europe and America, together with all the philosophers whose scientific demonstrations are upsetting the superstructures of the world, and, finally, all the progressive members of the churches, led by such men as Beecher, Chapin, and others, who, one by one, and as quietly as possible, are dropping their old hell-fire, devil, and literal resurrection dogmas, and adapting their faith to geology and other sciences. Fifty millions would not sum up this army of Progress. This is the Movement to which we belong. It is about as large as Mormonism already. It is the 'new' Movement only to Utah; if it is 'new' here the more the shame for Utah."

This will suffice to give us a pretty fair idea of the doctrines of this party. No personal God, no hell, no resurrection of the body, rejection of Christ and the Bible, and, finally, man is a god, the only God.

It is astonishing how these ideas are spreading of late. We well know that the whole ten or eleven millions of spiritualists hold these points as prominent parts of their doctrine; but who would ever have supposed that a Jew would deny the existence of a personal God? Yet in their late Rabbinical Conference, prominent Jewish Doctors introduced resolutions denying the existence of a personal God. Dr. Myer said, "That he is opposed to any stereotyped form of prayer, because prayers are addressed to a personal God in whom he does not believe."

"Dr. Wise put his belief in this form, 'The idea of a personal God, accepted in theology as a technical term, is not Jewish at all. The God of the Bible is the Jehovah, i. e., the Infinite and Absolute, the Substance and Essence of all that is, was, and will be. This Cause of all causes, this Understanding supreme, Love, Justice and Holiness universal, cannot be thought or even imagined as personal. Theology bases the idea of a personal God upon the doctrine of incarnation.' With this statement *The Jewish Messenger*, while asserting that 'these conventions are mischievous,' are animated by 'a migratory desire,' tend to weaken all religion, and lead the young to become infidels,' is nevertheless so far in accord, as to declare that 'every child in Israel is aware of' its truth. *The Jewish Times*, also, though a bitter opponent to the Convention, says delightedly of Dr. Wise's definition, 'This time he is logical.'

It is true that this new doctrine is opposed by many of the Jews, probably by the majority; yet it shows which way they are drifting. I notice also that the more radical of the Unitarians are talking the same style—no personal God, only a principle.

Faith in a living, personal God, in Jesus Christ as the only Saviour of man, and in the Bible as an infallible book, is fast dying out from this generation. A sort of refined atheism is taking its place. This fact is becoming so prominent that Mr. Greely has noticed it in the *Tribune*, and justly condemned it. We are painfully reminded of the words of our Lord, "Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Very little, indeed, at this rate, if time lasts much longer. We are also reminded of the prophecy of Jude, that certain men would "deny the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ." Jude 4.

Indeed, these are perilous times. Nothing but the truth, and a close walk with God, can save us from falling.

D. M. CANRIGHT.

The National Reform Convention at Cincinnati.

FROM the Detroit *Post's* concluding report of the Cincinnati Convention, we give the following extracts, in addition to what was given last week:—

CINCINNATI, Feb. 1. The National convention in favor of a religious amendment to the Constitution met this morning; Dr. Browne of Titusville, in the chair. The Committee on business reported in favor of allowing the remonstrance of F. E. Abbott to be read. Mr. Abbott did not read his remonstrance, but made a few remarks indicating its character, to which the Rev. A. D. Mayo briefly replied. The discussion was then stopped by a motion to have the remonstrance referred to Dr. Mayo with instructions to present it with his reply for publication. The resolutions presented last evening were then taken up *seriatim*, discussed, and passed with slight amendments. In the third resolution the word State was stricken

out so as not to limit it to State laws. The discussion on the resolution in regard to the Bible in schools was somewhat extended. The Rev. H. H. George made the point that the question of the legality of the requirement to have the Bible read in public schools was now pending in the Supreme Court of Ohio, and would, if possible, be taken to the Supreme Court of the United States where, although Justice Strong was chairman of the convention, and other Christian men were on the bench who were desirous of giving the Bible to the children of the country, yet they would be obliged to decide the matter according to constitutional law, and in the Constitution of the United States there is no law recognizing religious morality, and therefore the enemies of the Bible have much to hope when the question comes before that court.

The substance of Mr. Abbott's remonstrance was that this proposed amendment would have a tendency to create an aristocracy of Christians; would incite persecution; would render incapable of holding office all citizens who could not subscribe to the principles of Christianity, and warned the delegates that the surest way to secure the ruin of the country and of the Christian religion itself was to ingraft a creed into the constitution of a State.

The Rev. A. D. Mayo replied to Mr. Abbott. He said this protest contained the gist of popular objection to this movement; that the Nation will be bound to deny all political rights to all who do not believe in Christianity, and it will cause persecution, and finally a bloody war. It seemed strange that such calamities should be foretold, for what this convention asks is but to put in the Federal Constitution, what is already incorporated in nearly all the State constitutions.\*\*\* Missouri, after the Rebellion, formed a new constitution, and put in its preamble a more full acknowledgment of the dependence on God than any State. It even thanked God for saving them from the Rebellion. They did not disfranchise disbelievers, but enfranchised the very rebels they thanked God for delivering them from. No union of church and State followed, for they gave a most tremendous guarantee of religious liberty. Thus the people of the United States will finally do. They will persecute no man save him who seeks to destroy the inheritance of American freedom, and he will be destroyed. [Applause.]

The Committee on Enrollment reported more than 250 delegates from 10 different States, viz.: Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Kentucky, Kansas, and West Virginia.

Evening session.—Before the final adjournment a committee on nomination of officers was appointed, as follows: The Rev. J. F. Morton, W. H. French and H. Martin. Addresses were made by Prof. Stoddard on the relation which the character of a State bears to a written constitution, and by T. P. Stevenson, editor of the *Christian Statesman*, of Philadelphia, on the practical value and effect of the proposed amendment.

The Committee on officers reported the following for the ensuing year, and the report was adopted: President, Judge Wm. Strong, of the United States Supreme Court; Vice Presidents, Gov. Washburn, of Massachusetts; Gov. Harvey, of Kansas; Gov. Padelford, of Rhode Island; Ex-Gov. McClurg, of Missouri; Lieut. Gov. Cumback, of Indiana; Judge Murray, of the New York Supreme Court; Judge Hogan, of the Superior Court of Cincinnati; Felix R. Brunnot, of Pennsylvania; John Alexander, of Philadelphia; Charles G. Nazro, of Boston; Thomas W. Bicknell, Commissioner of Public Schools of Rhode Island; James W. Taylor, of New York; Prof. Lewis, of Union College, New York; Edward S. Toby, of Boston; Bishop Eastburn, of Ohio; Bishop Cummins, of Kentucky; President Finney, of Oberlin College, Ohio; President Merrick, of the Ohio Western University; President Cummings, of the Western University; the Rev. A. D. Mayo of Cincinnati; Bishop Morris, of Ohio; the Rev. Dr. McIlvain, of New Jersey; Professor Stoddard, of the Wooster, Ohio, University; Bishop Simpson, of the Methodist Episcopal church; Dr. Blanchard, President of Wheaton College, Illinois; Dr. Hart, principal of the State Normal School, of New Jersey; Bishop Kerfoot, of Philadelphia; Bishop Huntington, of New York; Dr. Cuyler, of Brooklyn; Bishop Scott, of Delaware; Prof. Seely, of Amherst College; Bishop McIlvaine, of Ohio; President Miner of Tufts College, and the Rev. Dr. Edwards, of Illinois; General Secretary, the Rev. D. McAllister, of New York; Corresponding Secretary, the Rev. T. P. Stevenson, of Philadelphia; Recording Secretary, the Rev. W. W. Barr, of Philadelphia; Treasurer, Samuel Agnew, of Philadelphia. The Executive Committee, in addition to the Secretary and Treasurer, are the following: B. P. Sterling, Joshua Cowpland, John Alexander, James S. Martin, the Rev. Dr. Wylie, Robert Taylor, Wm. McKnight, Thomas Walker and Thomas Brown, of Philadelphia; the Rev. Wm. L. Owens, of Pennsylvania; Henry Harrison, Geo. Silver, Robt. B. Maxwell, Wm. Neely, Walter T. Miller, James Wiggins, Henry O'Neill, Hugh Carlisle and James Spence, of New York; D. Chestnut, of Pittsburgh; Henry Martin, of Cincinnati. The usual vote of thanks followed, after which the convention adjourned *sine die*.

## CONFORMITY TO THE WORLD.

To THIS vile world be not conformed, in holy writ we read,  
We find no license to adorn where there exists no need.  
Shall we for naught spend time and means, but like the world 't appear,  
And yet profess that we have done with all things needless here?

We must account for what we spend in all this extra show;  
And whose approval shall we gain? Not that of God, we know;  
Nor yet the world's; its just remarks reproach us for the same;  
So we add naught in Heaven or earth, by this, to our good name.

The good name Solomon describes, no artificial flowers  
Nor rarest tint can e'er enrich—be this name ever ours.  
The bands of velvet, taste, and braid, but for a moment please;  
And can we ask the Lord to bless, while working over these?

The way exact we may not find, so narrow and so strait;  
But useless trimming never will a heavenly peace create.  
Says one, I feel reproved for this: would you, if it were right?  
True freedom we can only know, while walking in the light.

By heedless wandering from the light, we fall into the snare;  
But conscience will, if we'll obey, all condemnation spare.  
We give our souls the wounds they feel, by self-indulgence here,  
Self-conquest is the only path, unto a holier sphere.

By this keen process let us be, refined, exalted too,  
And with the King of kings at last the city's gates go through.  
Our high of glory there will be as here our works have been;  
Each self-denying act of love will be rewarded then.

REBEKAH SMITH.

West Wilton, N. H., Dec. 27, 1871.

## Progress of the Cause.

He that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him.

## Monthly Meeting in Jackson.

THIS was the best meeting I ever attended in Jackson County.

1. The difficulties in Leslie, which have so long perplexed and oppressed this church, have been amicably settled, so far as time and opportunity have allowed, and the meeting in Jackson ratified the action of the branch in Leslie taken when Bro. Van Horn was there. This, we sincerely hope, may be permanent; and if it shall be, it will be a great relief to the whole church.

2. Some who have newly come to the Advent faith in Grass Lake were present, and added much to the interest of the meeting. Bro. and sister Casselman have great reason to rejoice that the Spirit of the Lord has led them, by the study of the Bible alone, into the full faith of the present truth. Truly the Lord is working for his cause and people. "Light is sown for the righteous;" and if we are humble and devoted, he will bring us to the knowledge of saving truth, even as he did Cornelius.

3. There are some earnest, honest souls who are inquiring the reasons of our hope, and gladly receiving the truth as they learn it from the word of the Lord. Some, who are looking for the Lord, and have been taught that the "everlasting gospel" message of Rev. 14 was given in the great Advent movement of 1844, and that the fall of Babylon indicates the declension of piety in the churches of the present day, cannot see why the "third angel," which "followed them," just before the Son of Man comes on the white cloud, must not now be in order of fulfillment. And we can but approve their judgment.

An incident related to me there reminded me of a similar one in Maine. Said a brother, "I asked one of our preachers what the 'third angel's message' was, and if it must not be fulfilled before the Lord comes; and he turned away with the reply, 'I don't know anything about it; go to the seventh-day folks; they claim to know what that is.'" "And," said the brother, "I did go to them, and am happy to say I found out what it is."

The incident in Maine was as follows: A sister in Richmond asked Israel Damman, some two years ago, what the mark of the beast was, in the third angel's message of Rev. 14. Turning away, he only said, "That's a political question." We can have no doubt that his word is fast coming true; and it is a political question in which all have a deep interest who love God's commandments, and desire to escape the seven last plagues.

My visit to Jackson was a season of constant labor, public and private, early and late; but it was an opportunity for which I feel grateful, and I pray that the inquiring souls may find all the truth, and that mourning ones may soon find the comfort the Saviour promised to such.

One thing I had an opportunity to notice which is worthy of remark. As soon as persons become interested in the third angel's message they begin to talk of the great work of preparation for the Lord's coming. Immedi-

ately they begin to search their hearts, and to humble themselves before God; while they, who deny this message, talk with great confidence of their own readiness to meet their coming Lord. When we consider what the Scriptures teach concerning the coming persecution and time of trouble, we greatly fear they will meet a sad disappointment in that day. But the Lord will "avenge his own elect that cry unto him day and night." May he, by his own Spirit, give us a spirit of crying before him.

J. H. WAGGONER.

## California.

IN my last I made some reference to the Jenks' tract which has lately appeared from Petaluma, in which an effort is made to establish Sunday keeping on the authority of the fathers. I gave also a couple of extracts, showing how the tract was spoken of in the prints here. The *Pacific Churchman* is the organ of the Episcopalian denomination on this coast, and is the paper through whose columns Mr. Jenks' articles first appeared. It comes out against the article of the *Pacific* with the following in its Number of Dec. 7, 1871:—

"Mr. JENKS' tract upon the 'Lord's Day in the Early Church' is meeting with favorable reception almost everywhere, as it deserves. The *Pacific* has a long and on the whole favorable notice of it, but the following extract is somewhat peculiar:

"We are glad that Mr. Jenks has met the Sabbatharians on their own ground, and yet we cannot avoid expressing the opinion that the root of the matter lies deeper, and that what is wanted is an entire abandonment of the Old Testament standpoint, and a firm adherence to the evangelical platform, from which all "dead" works and "rudiments of the flesh" are swept away, and where faith and love take the place of all ceremonies, observances, and prohibitions, whatever. "He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." Romanism is a return to the Jewish standpoint so complete and extensive that it makes the attempts of the Protestant sects to do the same look very small indeed."

"Surely the *Pacific* does not mean that the moral law as given in the decalogue is to be 'abandoned.' We knew that the 'Plymouth Brethren' advocate some such notion, but did not quite look for it from a Congregationalist. It is true that 'Romanism is a return to the Jewish standpoint,' but it is not so much a return as the Puritans undertook to make;—these last, in fact, are the most inveterate Judaizers of the latter days. The word 'Sabbath' which is constantly upon their tongues is a standing witness of this, and the whole terminology and temper of Congregationalism are essentially that of the Old Testament rather than of the New. This is what puzzles us in the above criticism. The fact evidently is that the *Pacific* does not like the *mode* of the argument. It is a two-edged sword, and one Congregationalist does not like. *Mutatis mutandis*, let Mr. Jenks or any one apply it to the Episcopacy and there will be a flutter in the Congregationalist camp. There is not one argument, we believe, for the 'first day,' but is equally good for the three-fold ministry. It should seem scarcely necessary to add, that St. Paul, in the above text, alludes to the Jewish and not to the Christian 'Sabbath.'

The force of this expression concerning the three-fold ministry will be apparent, when it is remembered that the strong fort of Episcopalianism in their ideas of the Episcopacy, is the testimony of the fathers.

I am glad to learn that Bro. Andrews will give this tract some attention ere long. It is strange how people are willing to leave the plain word of God for human traditions, but we must patiently and earnestly strive to show them the difference between the Lord's word and that of men.

When I was writing my last report we were having the first heavy rain of the season, but it has continued to rain more or less for the last twenty-six days, and the fall of rain up to this writing is about thirty inches. It has been quite difficult getting about, and is getting to be more muddy every day. With all this I have had some very interesting and encouraging meetings.

Dec. 22, I was at Bloomfield. Had a good meeting in the evening. We parted, expecting to meet the next day (Sabbath); but at 5 A. M., Sabbath morning, I was awakened by Bro. Palmer, in whose house I was stopping, by the words: "Bro. Loughborough, will you let me take your gum coat, to go out and see to the cow and horses? We are all afloat. The town is the worst flooded I ever saw it." Sure enough; I found on looking out of the window that Bloomfield looked more like a vast lake with houses anchored in it than anything else. The poor cow stood frightened, the water nearly up to her back. No meeting that day. Sunday, at 11 o'clock, the water had so subsided that we got together and had a meeting over three hours long. In this meeting we commenced the organization of a church with eleven members. Others will unite who were not able to get there at that time. We also organized a missionary society on the plan proposed in the REVIEW, Vol. xxxviii, No. 18. Our meeting was encouraging to those who could attend. I succeeded in reaching Santa Rosa, a distance of fifteen miles, by Tuesday noon.

The week following, at Green Valley, I lost three appointments out of four by violent rain.

I had opportunity for one meeting, which was solemn and interesting, and I trust may be of lasting benefit to those who were permitted to assemble. I had opportunity to converse with some on first-day; but the rain was so violent as to prevent meeting.

On my return from Green Valley, I went to San Francisco, where I held four meetings, besides some extra business sessions. I found the company there of good courage, united, and though subjected to some business perplexities, some of them, in consequence of keeping the Sabbath, their faith and trust is in God; and he smiles upon them in their effort to make "a covenant with him by sacrifice."

I found Bro. Cornell with improving health, in good spirits, and trying to do his part in the work there. Our first meeting, on the evening of Jan. 4, was a business meeting, and our first business was to hear the report of a committee who were previously appointed to receive and dispose of jewelry that members had on hand, so as to use the means in advancing the cause of truth. The committee made a substantial report. Some nineteen dollars in coin were laid on the stand, and a bar of bullion composed of the balance of the jewelry, which had been melted, and assayed by a Christian assayer gratis. The bar bore his stamp as worth over fifty-two dollars in coin. So the proceeds of their jewelry fund was over seventy dollars.

According to previous arrangements some twelve dollars of this was appropriated to purchasing articles necessary for the ordinances, and the balance reserved to be attached to the funds of the missionary society when it should be organized.

We then proceeded to organize a missionary society, adopting the constitution recommended in Review, Vol. xxxviii, No. 18, fixing upon \$1.00 as the price for memberships. Over thirty have already given in their names as members of this missionary society.

I had also three solemn and interesting meetings for preaching and religious worship. At the close of the discourse on the Sabbath we had our first communion season. The season was solemn and impressive. While Bro. Cornell was gone to Healdsburg on Sunday to attend the funeral of sister Annie Poole, the married daughter of the wife of Bro. Kellogg. I gave two more discourses to interested and attentive audiences. Four more members were united with the church while I was in San Francisco, and two others request baptism and admission into the church. Next week, the meetings are to be moved back to the Harrison Street Church, as we now have the privilege of occupying it part of the time on Sunday, which we could not do when we had it before. It is a much more comfortable and convenient place than the hall we have been occupying.

Systematic Benevolence pledges for the church in San Francisco, already amount to over \$1100.00 per year in coin. We expect more will be added to this by others who contemplate uniting with the church. Bro. Cornell is writing some important and interesting articles during this rainy time, and speaking twice a week in the city. Union and harmony prevail in the meetings of the church. May God keep, bless, and add to their graces, and add to their numbers such as shall be saved.

Since returning to Santa Rosa I have received a letter from Bro. Otis, of Gilroy, who, with his wife, are non-resident members of the San Francisco church. Without knowing what we were doing in San Francisco, he and his companion were moved upon to dispose of their gold jewels, and have done so. They report eighteen dollars coin as the proceeds of their sale, to be used as tract fund.

There seems, on the whole, to be a desire in the hearts of the Lord's people on this coast to get nearer and still nearer to the Lord. For the fostering and encouragement of such desires, and for the further spread of the truth, I will patiently and earnestly strive to labor, the Lord being my helper. Without him, our efforts are vain.

J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

Santa Rosa, Jan. 12, 1872.

## New England.

JAN. 11, in company with Bro. Andrews, I left Battle Creek for the East. Spent the following Sabbath and first-day in Western New York. Was much pleased in seeing the spirit manifested to systematically enter into the missionary work. If the tract societies are entered upon in the right manner, I do not believe there will be one single failure. There may be local churches that will organize themselves into tract societies and be successful; but, if the different State Conferences will take hold of the matter, select proper persons, and unitedly make one general rally, it will not only result in spreading the truth into every nook and corner of the land, and thus prove the salvation of many, but will prove the salvation of hundreds who are now withering spiritually for want of activity.

Let there be a system in which all can act a part, and those of experience and judgment instruct those who are anxious to do something, how to take hold, that all who have the cause at heart may feel that they are doing something to advance the cause of their divine Lord; and it will give life to every part of the body.

Jan. 20 and 21, was at the quarterly meeting

in Rhode Island. Our meetings were accompanied with some degree of God's Holy Spirit. The tract-society meeting spoke well for that State. Most of the brethren and sisters manifested an interest to get hold of the work in such a manner as to work in harmony, and not only spread the truth, but free the cause from reproach.

As we were gathering for meeting on first-day evening, our hearts were made sad by the news that our Bro. Holloway was drowned. In conversation with him, as he left for home Sabbath afternoon, with a cheerful countenance he spoke of his hope and bright prospect for the kingdom, not thinking that in less than two hours his life record would be closed up for the final examination in the court of Heaven.

On the evening of the 25th, met with the church at Exeter, Rhode Island. Continued with them over the following Sabbath and first-day. We trust our meetings were profitable. It is our prayer that God will be with those who have a spirit to labor in harmony with present truth, and crown their efforts with success.

In the work of God, no effort put forth from a heart prompted by love is lost, but Christian simplicity, ever possessing a teachable spirit, is a state of mind that is highly prized in the court of Heaven. When the burden of this work is so felt that we individually take an especial interest in every branch of it, Health Reform, Systematic Benevolence, and every enterprise connected with it, we shall be strong. This spirit is getting hold of some here, for which we feel thankful.

S. N. HASKELL.

January, 1872.

## New York.

My last report of meetings was from Texas, N. Y., Dec. 18, 1871. I had then given two discourses in the Union meeting house. Bro. Wilcox joined with me in labor. The house being occupied a part of the time by the Methodists, and the weather being very stormy, the circumstances were unfavorable. But I held meetings as often as I could for about two weeks, when, during the progress of the Methodist quarterly meeting, the house took fire from the stove and was burned down. Some of the friends kindly opened their dwelling houses to us for meeting, and we occupied the school-house a few times. We held about twenty meetings in all, and visited much from house to house, and distributed and sold some tracts.

As the result of our effort, two families decided to keep the Sabbath, and others were much interested, and quite a number confessed their belief in the Sabbath and the near coming of the Lord, some of whom we hope will obey the truth. We also held several interesting meetings in a school-house about one mile from Texas village. The people generally were much interested. But one man manifested his opposition by ordering the house closed for all purposes but for school. And thus the house was closed, much against the wishes of most of the inhabitants. I believe there are those there who will yet obey the truth, and hope the way will open for further meetings.

F. WHEELER.

VERMILION, N. Y., JAN. 31, 1872.

## A PRAYER.

Oh, my Father!  
Take me,  
Make me  
Pure and holy, all thine own;  
May each changing moment find me  
At thy foot-stool,  
Near thy throne.

Oh, my Saviour!  
Cleanse me,  
Fill me  
With thy precious love divine;  
May no earthly idol lure me  
From the sacred  
Cross of thine.

Holy Spirit,  
Woo me,  
Win me,  
By the gentle cords of love;  
Guide me, guard me, safely lead me  
To my heavenly  
Home above.

—Sel.

## Worldliness.

WATCH against it. There is danger of its stealing upon us unawares. You may love the world, without being rich. No matter how poor you are, you will drink in the spirit of the world unless you absolutely guard against it. Remember that, respectable as worldliness is, even in the church, it is nevertheless a damning sin. The Bible says, *If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.* This is plain. Again it is affirmed, that *no covetous man who is an idolater hath eternal life abiding in him.* But no one can doubt but that the love of the world is common among professors. We are liable to be carried away by the current. How may we know whether we love the world or not?

If worldly motives exert a stronger influence over us than love for God and his cause does, it is a sure sign that we love the world. Why will the invalid leave family and friends, and at

a great expense visit some famous physician, and submit to take unpleasant remedies, and endure great self-denial? It is because life and health are prized more than ease or money. So, if one will give money for the rent of a pew which he would not give to have the gospel preached freely to all, it is because he loves social distinction more than he does the souls of his fellow-men. So, church festivals are justified, on the ground that more money can be raised in that way than in any other. What is this but an acknowledgment that professed Christians love their own appetites more than they do the cause of God?

We always seek most earnestly for that which we love most. So, if you find yourself seeking after gain more intensely than you do after God, you may rest assured that you love the world. If you are ready to make sacrifices of ease and convenience to promote worldly interest, which you would not make to promote the cause of God, without doubt you love the world. If you will take risks and assume responsibilities for the prospect of gain, which you would not take in the cause of God, it is because you love the world. God is a sure paymaster; but the worldling, whether in the church or out of it, does not trust him.

Again; you may know whether you love the world, by the gratification which you feel at its possession. If worldly prosperity elates you, and adversity depresses you, if your religious enjoyment fluctuates with your outward circumstances, you are evidently a stranger to the joys of salvation. If you grieve more over the loss of property than you do over the withdrawal of the favor of God, it is of no use for you longer to profess religion. You need convicting and converting.

Examine yourselves carefully, then, at this point. It is a point likely to be overlooked. But it is, nevertheless, of the utmost importance. You cannot afford to lose your soul for the baubles of earth, which endure but for a season. Remember, then, that Jesus says, *Ye cannot serve God and mammon.*

### The Reform Dress.

THAT a reform in the dress of females, as worn at the present time, is necessary, few will be found ready to deny. The almost unanimous verdict of those who have given attention to this subject is, that many of the fashions in vogue at present are not only in the highest degree ridiculous, but that they are also, in many respects, destructive to life, and therefore criminal.

In view of these facts, a style of wearing apparel has been adopted by many ladies, which, obviating the difficulties alluded to above, meets the demands of the case in the most satisfactory manner.

While, by a change of material employed in its manufacture, it can easily be adapted to the rigors of a cold, or the greater heat of a warm latitude, should the wearer see fit to imitate the example of those females of the continent, who, despite the annoying and inconvenient appendages which society has imposed upon them, are in the habit of seeking health and enjoyment upon the highway, or in the fields, she will find that that which hitherto has appeared like an irksome task, has now become a pleasant pastime.

Should she, on the contrary, from necessity or choice, devote herself exclusively to the honorable discharge of home duties—clothed as she is in a dress which descends to a point not less than eight inches from the floor, and neatly fitting pants, which shield the ankles from the gaze of the vulgar, and protect them from the injurious effects of the snow, rain, and dew—she moves about the house or farm with a facility equal to that of her more stalwart brother, who, in the sturdier independence of his more resolute sex, has stoutly repudiated every custom calculated to hamper him in his movements, as made in the pecuniary interest of its inventor.

In fine, she has at a single bound, leaped every barrier in this direction which has hitherto separated her from a proper relation to the laws of life.

That activity which is so indispensable to health, and yet which is so distasteful to very many of her sex, because of the artificial impediments in the way of easy and natural movement, now becomes a source of satisfaction, since by her own constitution—other things being equal—there is a spring of joy to be found in motion, similar to that which, in the animal kingdom, impels the unfettered lamb to skip upon the lawn, or the unrestrained bird to cleave the air with apparently tireless wing.

With such advantages in favor of the proposed innovation, we should naturally anticipate for it a speedy and complete triumph. This, however, judging from its history hitherto, is not to be experienced.

The same dogged opposition which changes—even in the highest degree beneficial—have ever met with, already characterizes this contest.

One is reminded of the long, and on the one side disgraceful, struggle of the last, and the first portion of the present, century, between the friends of the old-fashioned, clumsy, and bungling wooden plow, and those of its more modern and highly useful iron rival. When demonstration had been made complete, and it had been shown again and again, by actual ex-

periment, that the new invention was superior, both as it regarded the character of the work which it performed and the amount which it was capable of executing in a given time, the opposers of the latter, unwilling to leave the field of debate, upon which they had been fairly vanquished, suddenly discovered satisfactory evidence for the retention of the old and the rejection of the new article, in the fact that the iron surface of the latter imparted a poison to the furrow which it so handsomely laid in its proper place!

Thus the more modern adherents to the old style of dress, when at last compelled to give way before the practical and sound arguments presented by the friends of the new one, are in the habit of falling back upon one or the other of the following positions: Say they, on the one hand, It is immodest; or, on the other, It is out of taste.

To the first of these objections, we have only to say that he who could discover, in a properly dressed foot and neatly panted ankle, that which would shock his conception of propriety, presents an acuteness of moral sense which is only to be compared with the chemistry which could detect in the soil through which the polished metal surface of the modern steel or iron plow had passed, the evidences of the subtle poison which it had imparted.

In other words, so far as the objection under consideration is concerned, it might be shown that the facts are overwhelmingly in favor of the new system; but the same morbid conception of what is proper and what is not in these matters which has led the objector to oppose the reform from the standpoint taken above, would induce him to regard as indecorous an exposition in print of the indecent exposures which necessarily result from his own favorite system.

As regards the other position, it is worthy of some consideration. However, before we allow it to turn the scale in the argument, it is highly proper to determine just how much weight—if true—it ought to have in this contest.

Suppose we admit, for the moment, that it is in every respect sound, does that necessarily lead to the conclusion that the change should not be made? To our mind, it is very far from doing so.

To illustrate: We are generally agreed that a prunella slipper furnishes a more graceful and becoming covering for a lady's foot than a heavy bootee or an arctic over-shoe.

But who, as a consequence, would think of insisting for a moment that she should be compelled, in cold as well as hot weather, to wear the former and reject the latter for fear of offending some one's ideas of taste?

By this it will be seen that we all recognize the fact that considerations of taste should never be regarded as primary, but are always looked upon as of a secondary nature.

Before, therefore, the above argument is taken as being conclusive in its authority, it must be shown that it is supported by advantages of a more substantial character. But this, as we have already shown, cannot be done.

Again: Before the objection urged should be regarded as final, it would be well to remember that it is one thing to assert, and another, and entirely different thing, to prove the accuracy of its statement.

Who does not know that nothing is more contradictory and variable than the opinions of individuals in regard to such things?

The diversity arises from the fact that there is, in matters of taste, no uniformly acknowledged standard to which the differences of individuals may be brought, and by the measurement of which they may be decided.

Instance the nations who, differing widely from those among us who—apparently taking the wasp as their model, persist in girding themselves to such an extent as even to shorten life—have, on the contrary, gone to the opposite extreme, and for the purpose of enlarging rather than compressing the waist as a mark of symmetrical proportion are in the habit of winding themselves in numerous wrappings of cloth.

As a better exemplification of this idea, and one which is not open to the objection that it represents the views of a rude class of people, since it is drawn from the history of the Greeks—a nation the accuracy of whose artistic conceptions will not be questioned—take the statue of Venus de Medici. This wonderful production of art, about two thousand years old, was originally regarded as a perfect model of female proportions. And yet, so decided has been the change in such matters, from that time to this, it has been stated by a recent writer that while in nearly every respect it would answer the demands of modern taste, so great is the size of the waist as compared with the rest of the form, that a critic of our time would be shocked at the departure, in this particular, from what to him would seem to represent a perfect model.

Once more: Not only is it true that men look upon these things in different lights, but it is also a fact which many will recognize, that the same person at different periods in his own life, finds his likes and dislikes materially changed, and not unfrequently entirely reversed from what they formerly were.

To-day, a gentleman appears in society for the first time with a fashionable, but unusually long-skirted, dress-coat. At first, we are not favorably impressed with its appearance. In process of time, however, the style is uniformly adopted,

and the eye, as a consequence, becoming accustomed to it, we wonder that we could have ever admired the old fashion, now gone into disuse, and when occasionally seen, regarded as decidedly unbecoming.

Again: A lady purchases that which is determined by her friends to be in every way a neat and becoming hat, which from its ample size covers and protects the whole head, and upper portion of the face. But three months pass, and it gives way to another, constructed upon an entirely different model, and which, while not attaining to half the size of the former, is pronounced by all beholders a perfect paragon of beauty.

As the result of facts of this character, some have decided that the line of taste is purely an imaginary one, which each is at liberty to locate for himself.

Without adopting this view, however, we think that we shall be safe in concluding that, whenever found, it will establish the proposition that, in matters of dress, conformity to the outlines of the human form, as given to man originally—and, as a consequence of its divine origin, necessarily perfect in beauty and symmetry—will furnish the rule in these matters, which should be strictly followed, except when limited by the necessities and proprieties of our fallen condition.

But we have already seen that these harmonize perfectly with the one which is presented by the dress reform. And, as it has the additional advantage of approximating more nearly in the outline which it presents, to that of the individual, we must also conclude that it is really, at one and the same time, the style of dress which—while answering all the demands of comfort, health, and ease in locomotion—is also the most nearly in accordance with a just standard of taste. In view of these facts, it seems to us that it is worthy of universal adoption.

That this can be brought about in a brief space of time, would be too much to expect. But we shall confidently look for progress in this direction so long as those females who are thoroughly convinced of the soundness of the views advanced in this article, shall continue to put them in practice in their respective communities, until they shall have either lived down, or shamed into silence, an unreasoning opposition. W. H. LITTLEJOHN, in *Health Reformer*.

### Light.

LIGHT moves at the rate of twelve thousand miles a minute. Men have long been puzzled to understand its nature and origin. Is it an original creation of God, or does it emanate from heavenly bodies created by his power? Does the sun send forth rays of light, or do a combination of circumstances among the works of God develop it. Philosophers will continue to theorize on the subject, yet will be compelled to receive the simple words of revelation, "God said, Let there be light, and there was light."

Light is universally expanded through space; it is the source of vision; without it, all would be darkness and gloom. Why light continually flows from the sun and moon and stars, is another mystery; we only know it is an inexhaustible blessing to man.

Light vivifies all nature, and gives beauty and loveliness to every object; mankind and all animal life love its presence. The flowers and plants and leaves turn their faces to its first dawn, and follow the sun to his evening retreat. Light decks the earth in beauty; it shades the grass and foliage of trees in living green; it gives the varied tints to the flora of earth; it perfumes the rose; it makes the gardens and fields and deserts fragrant with richest odor. The plumage of birds, the down of the butterfly, the scales of fishes, are but the reflections of light.

But while God surrounds us with so many beauties and charms from light, he has revealed a light of transcending beauty and glory. It is called the "True Light," the "Light of the world," the "Light unapproachable," the "Light that shines in darkness," a "Light for those who sit in darkness." The King of Israel said of this light: "The Lord is my light;" "Thy word is a light to my path." God's people are promised that "Christ will give them this light;" that "God's saints shall partake of this light;" that Christians are the "children of this light;" that in Heaven there will be "no night, no need of a candle, or of the sun, or moon, for God himself will be the light."

Men receive and believe the truths of natural light without fully understanding them, and at the same time will not believe in God and his revelation, because they cannot comprehend the great truths connected therewith. Men see the flowers and leaves turning their faces to the sun and basking in his earliest and latest rays,

and without comprehending the truths, believe them; yet when they see the sinful soul turning to Christ and rejoicing in the glorious light of God's countenance, because they cannot tell whence it comes they will not believe. Men will believe any truths relating to science, or governments, or money, quicker than they will believe anything relating to their salvation.

They stubbornly reject the offers of this light when they know it can change the sinful heart to one of peace and joy and hope; that it has caused the burdened soul to cast all its sins and cares on Jesus Christ; that thousands of those who were bowed down beneath a weight of sin have been enabled to rejoice in the triumphs of pardon, and the prospects of a glorious resurrection.

As the light of the sun is inexhaustible, so is the mercy of God inexhaustible to the chiefest of sinners. As light is expanded through all space, so do offers of salvation extend to all the world. As light inexhaustibly flows from the sun, and moon, and stars, so is the mercy of God inexhaustible to sinners.

When pilgrims have no home nor abiding place, this light leads to one. When days and nights of sorrow come, this light brings joy and hope; in poverty, it brings wealth; to the oppressed, relief; to the sick, health; to the friendless, a friend; to the blind, light; to the deaf, words of comfort; to the people of God, the prospect of a glorious immortality.—*Am. Messenger*.

### Godliness Makes the Gray Hairs of Age Beautiful.

"THE hoary head is a crown of glory, if it be found in the way of righteousness." Age invests many things with peculiar attractiveness. An aged oak, gnarled, wide-spreading, lichen-covered; an ancient castle, weather-worn and storm-swept, moss-grown and ivy-clad—both are beautiful exceedingly; but of all the attractive pictures old time can draw, no sight is so beautiful as the silver locks and radiant features of godly and joyous old age—an aged sire, a venerable mother seated in "the old arm-chair," looking placidly back along the line of trodden years, looking hopefully forward across the bright borders of the Beulah-land, to catch a glimpse of the jasper walls which belt the city of the saints!—*J. Jackson Wray*.

It is not required that a man shall always be perfect in order to be a true Christian. But it is required that he should be a sincere seeker after perfection. It is required that he should be moving forward, and advancing up the straight and narrow way of life.

### Obituary Notices.

Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth.

DIED, at Waterloo, Grant Co., Wis., Dec. 7, 1871, sister Mary Ann Robinson, wife of Winthrop Robinson, aged thirty-five years, eleven months, and thirteen days. She leaves a husband and eight children. She embraced the third message about three years ago through the labors of Eld. I. Sanborn, and was beloved by all who knew her. Remarks by the writer from Rev. 14:13. C. W. OLDS.

DIED, in Canaan, Maine, Dec. 14, 1871, of consumption, sister Mary G. Salisbury, wife of Nathaniel K. Salisbury, aged twenty-eight years, and nine months.

Sister S. embraced the Sabbath, in the light of the third angel's message, about four years since, and lived from that time the life of the righteous. Discourse by the writer to a large and candid congregation from Ps. 23:4.

ABRAM BARNES.

DIED, in Berkshire, Vt., Jan. 17, 1872, of consumption, Alida I. Kellogg, aged twenty-one years and eight months. Sister Kellogg had entertained religious impressions from childhood until about two years ago when she publicly embraced Christ as her Saviour, was baptized, joined the church, and from that time gave strong evidence that she was a sincere and devoted Christian. During her entire sickness she was perfectly resigned to the will of the Lord, and in her last moments entertained a submissive spirit, and expressed that all was well with her. All her relatives and friends present could but say, "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints."

Funeral services were held the next Sunday at the new Methodist meeting-house in Richford. About five hundred were in attendance. Text, 1 Cor. 15:21. A. C. BOURDEAU.

## The Review and Herald.

Battle Creek, Mich., Third-day, Feb. 13, 1872.

W. H. Littlejohn will commence a series of meetings in Hillsdale, Mich., Feb. 20, 1872, commencing at 7 P. M.

In the last General Conference report, the figures, representing the standing of the Wisconsin Conference, belong to Iowa. The Wis. Conference, according to the report submitted by the secretary of that Conference, stands as follows: Ministers 3; Licentiate 5; Number of churches 19; Number of members 535; Amount of s. b. Funds \$2113.86; Pledges to General Conference \$300.00; Funds on hand \$250.00.

The P. O. address of John Lindsey and S. A. H. Lindsey, is changed from Ulysses, Pa., to Beaver Dams, Schuyler Co., N. Y.

### A Request.

WILL Elds. A. C. Bourdeau, I. D. Van Horn, R. F. Andrews, and D. M. Canright please send me at once to Elizabethtown, Ky., each twenty-five or fifty copies of Eld. Andrews' tract on the Two Covenants, as this work is out of print and I need it very much to hand out in meeting opposition. Will return the money immediately. D. T. BOURDEAU.

### European Opinion of American Morality.

Correspondence of the Cincinnati Gazette.

LONDON, January 11, 1872.  
Another opinion which is just now freely expressed concerning us in Europe is that of our national immorality. The New York scandal over-spreading the Republic like a dark and baleful cloud, and now the murder of Fisk, fitting end to such a career, has heightened the interest and deepened the concern which prevails with reference to the moral aspects of American society. "In the great cities of the United States," we are told, "the web of human life is woven in colors so glaring and diversified as to strike with painful effect on eyes accustomed to the more subdued tints and graduated shades of European existence." Nowhere is luck more boasted of or believed in. "The thin crust of epicurean wantonness and florid prosperity covers a chaos of bad passions, lawlessness, and restless vice, which now and then breaks through to startle the world from its stupor."

Only in the city where the Tammany ring so long ruled with unresisted sway was such a career as that of Fisk possible—"a career so marvelous in its successful defiance of law, and order, and honor, that although in this country it is not only impossible, but inconceivable, it deserves to be estimated as a diseased product of modern civilization."

Our papers bristle daily with telegrams and paragraphs illustrative of our bankruptcy in morals and our decadence in virtue and sobriety.

The marriage of Minister Sickles, at Madrid, is the text of a sermon on his unsavory antecedents, rewarded by his being made a representative of his country at a foreign court.

The dishonesty of a member of the Chicago Relief Committee leads to the inquiry whether any official in America can be depended on for common honesty. Telegrams from America read thus:—

PHILADELPHIA, Sunday Night.

This afternoon, in New York, James Fisk, of Erie fame, was assassinated in the corridor of the Grand Central Hotel. Edward Stokes, who opposed Fisk in the Mansfield case, and superseded him in that lady's affections, fired three pistol shots at Fisk, one of which inflicted a mortal wound in the abdomen. Fisk died to-day.

NEW ORLEANS, January 9.

A party riot in the Louisiana Legislature has resulted in the violent death of one of the members, who was endeavoring to prevent another's arrest by his opponents. Another regiment has been ordered to this city.

And so on, and so forth.

In the present, or rather the now subsiding discussion of the question of Republicanism vs. Monarchy, the public scandals which fill the American papers are made the most of, I can assure you, with prodigious effect. "What would we gain," says one Conservative, "in two important particulars—the burden of taxation and the honesty of public men? As to the first, the New York Taxation Commissioners are quoted as saying, 'There is a larger per capita taxation in America than any modern nation has ever before been subjected to in time of peace.' As to the honesty of public men, look at the recent revelations in New York, in the Pension Bureau, in the Indian Department, in the custom-houses, etc., and look at this resolution, passed at a meeting at Boston, 'that the recent developments in the municipal affairs in New York have demonstrated that the republican form of government is a failure.'"

A Virginia paper is brought upon the stand to testify that "the North is ripe for military government. Its capitalists feel insecure, and will welcome any change which will secure their pockets. If Grant could raise an army of 200,000, he could reign for life." In an adjoining column, and immediately alongside of this, we have Mrs. Woodhull on the platform, proclaiming herself ready to love and unlove any man, at any time and for any time that suits her, followed by a "shudder over the future of American society."

Curiously enough, here come, all in a batch, beside the Micawbar republic of France dripping with putrescence, a defalcation by a high official of the Swiss Republic, another by the President of the Republic of Liberia, a civil war in the Mexican Republic, ditto, as always, in the republics of South America, and all the huge pile of blacknesses and darkneses from our great and model Republic.

American defalcations, frauds, venalities, vices, and licentious audacities, are served up in the most palatable sauces in the way of monarchical English. We hear of committees in Chicago to see whether the drunkenness of the firemen was not the cause of the fire, and to see whether the English funds had not gone to the wrong "sufferers," and committees in the Senate to detect frauds in the Revenue Depart-

ment, and committees in the House to uncover the defalcations in the Treasury Department, and committees in South Carolina to look up the overissue of bonds by the State government.

North Carolina and Arkansas are quoted as similarly deficient in honesty and sorrow over the deficiency.

The Ku Klux devilities alternate among the American items with the "frenzy of delight of Yankee Democrats over the younger son of a mighty autocrat."

A drunken speech of the Governor of Virginia follows a tit-bit from Massachusetts, where "a number of daring burglaries were traced to a member of a school committee, who held other offices of trust." The homicides in the United States for 1872 are quoted from American papers at 2,060, as a side remark to the tragedies at Los Angeles and the tragedy of the Westfield ferry-boat explosion, for which Jacob Vanderbilt was incarcerated in the Tombs.

Now you must remember that all these items, with a multitude more of the same sort, are taken from American papers. I leave you to imagine, for I can give you no idea of their effect upon the estimation in which we are held in Europe. The estimation was never lower. In a word, all our officials are believed here to be utterly venal, and everybody here has made up his mind that our love of money has ruined us, and that we are going straight to the devil.

## News and Miscellany.

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

THE relations of our government with England seem to be assuming a serious phase. There are grave apprehensions of trouble on both sides, as the following dispatches will show:

LONDON, Feb. 3.—Chief Justice Cockburn has officially counseled the Cabinet that England must recede immediately from the treaty of Washington, leaving America to decide between a new treaty or war. The council is now discussing the terms in which this resolution shall appear in the Queen's speech at the opening of Parliament.

NEW YORK, Feb. 5.—The Herald's Washington special says that the excitement among high officials in that city, in consequence of our relations with England, is very great, and there has been constant conferences between the representatives of the American Government and the English Embassy.

The situation in England, as represented by the English legation at Washington, is of the gravest character. The Tory party, although represented by Stafford Northcote in the Joint High Commission, is desirous of forcing the Alabama question upon Parliament, and compelling such a vote as would declare its want of confidence in the Gladstone Ministry, and the Gladstone Ministry, in consequence, is seeking a reconsideration of the Alabama case to parry the assaults of the Tories.

Dispatches have been received at Washington urging the Administration to withdraw its claims for consequential damages, but the President is firm in his determination that the case, as presented by our Government, shall not be amended or withdrawn. He regards the Geneva Commission as a court, and feels that America has a right to go before that court like any other party to an action, and leave the question to its decision; and if our case shows any surprising features the fault will be with the English, who permitted themselves, for their own gain, to become parties to acts of war upon the United States. The President also feels that the necessities of any English Cabinet must not be permitted to force this Administration into a false position.

The Cabinet to-day discussed in an informal manner the recent reports from England with reference to the treaty of Washington. There was an unanimity of sentiment to adhere to the position assumed by our Government relative to the so-called Alabama claims. At that time the reference to the subject in the Queen's speech was not known. There was, through the day, many inquiries in all circles as to the tone of the speech toward the United States, and general satisfaction was expressed when it was ascertained to be friendly. There is no disposition, however, in any quarter, to consent to a modification of the position the Government has taken.

A dispatch has been received from Minister Schenck to the effect that the excitement in London is intense, but no recommendations are made.

Secretary Fish does not see how any claim can be withdrawn, but if, in his judgment, Sir Alexander Cockburn, should withdraw, there would be no hope of an amicable settlement.

The Herald editorially says the fact that the British representative at Washington has been instructed to make proposals of accommodation and compromise of the Alabama claims with our Government is an insult to our Nation. If Great Britain is liable for the loss to our commerce, and the prolongation of our civil war, the damages awarded must be paid peaceably, or will be collected at the point of the bayonet.

The Times says the action of the British government will be a matter of surprise to the Americans.

The Tribune says if the popular clamor in England should compel a withdrawal from the Treaty of Washington, it is not the United States that will be the heaviest loser by such a course.

The World says it looks as if the Administration has overshot the mark in trying to make party capital out of this controversy, and if the treaty is repudiated the public verdict will be that the President and his advisers have bungled the great question instead of settling it.

HALIFAX, N. S., Feb. 5.—The intimation by the English press of the intention of the British government to repudiate the Treaty of Washington excites much comment. It is believed that such a violent course would be almost a certain signal for war, and the English government, it is thought, will not follow public opinion so far as to take so decisive a step. The merchants of Halifax are deeply interested in the treaty.

PARIS, Feb. 5.—Great interest is felt here in the discussion of the Alabama claims, now going on in England, and the result is awaited with much anxiety.

It is reported that the American Government has ordered a large number of sea-torpedoes of English manufacturers.

It is reported that the Navy Department intends to ask Congress for authority to build ten 13-gun sloops-of-war and seven steam propellers.

## Appointments.

And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of Heaven is at hand.

### Quarterly Meetings in Minn.

At Concord, Feb. 17, 18.  
Greenwood Prairie, " 24, 25.  
Pleasant Grove, March 2, 3.  
Maiden Rock, " 9, 10.  
Saint Cloud, " 16, 17.  
We hope to see the brethren and sisters of Pine Island at the Concord meeting. One of us expect to be at Maiden Rock at their quarterly meeting.  
WM. S. INGRAHAM.  
HARRISON GRANT.

THE Lord willing, I will hold a two weeks' meeting in Ithaca, Gratiot Co., Mich., commencing Friday evening, Feb. 16, 1872. Hope for a general attendance of the brethren in the county.  
I. D. VAN HORN.

I DESIGN to hold meetings at Brighton, Iowa, commencing Thursday evening, Feb. 23, and continuing over Sabbath and Sunday, and longer if the interests of the cause demand it. I expect Eld. Canright will be with me. I desire a general attendance of all the church Thursday evening. We hope these meetings will be largely attended by all the brethren and sisters who can come from abroad, as it is the last meeting I shall be permitted to enjoy with them probably till camp-meeting, as I expect soon to go East.  
GEO. I. BUTLER.

SIGOURNEY, Iowa, Feb. 17, 18.  
Osceola, " 24, 25.  
Knoxville, March 2, 3.  
This last will be our regular quarterly meeting for that district. The Tract Society is expected to meet and report at this meeting. Let every member have something to report, and have the report ready. We expect Eld. Butler to be there with us.  
D. M. CANRIGHT.

## Business Department.

Not Slothful in Business. Rom. 12:11.

### RECEIPTS

For Review and Herald.

Annexed to each receipt in the following list, is the Volume and Number of the REVIEW & HERALD to which the money received pays—which should correspond with the Numbers on the Pastors. If money to the paper is not in due time acknowledged, immediate notice of the omission should then be given.

\$1.00 EACH. James E Lilley 40-9, M S Lathrop 41-3, E A Nutting 40-3, L B Hoyt 40-1, John Cole 40-1, J Ralston 40-9, D R Seely 40-1, A Zellers 41-1, P Miller 39-1, J C Morehouse 40-9, Wm Morehouse 40-9, Mrs Lucy Decker 39-1, S Burdick 39-1, W Jeffrey 40-9.

\$1.50 EACH. Thomas Lett 41-9, J L Westover 41-9, R Curtis 41-1, Willard Carter 41-9, C Brotherton 41-9, Mrs M Allen 41-9, F Kittle 40-23, Mary J Rees 39-20, M E Chamberlain 41-9, E L Lane 40-1, Mary E Jamison 41-9, Mrs W E Dawson 41-9, M Johnson 39-7, Alden Brigham 41-9.

\$2.00 EACH. John Town 41-1, L E Warren 41-1, Wm H Graham 41-1, D W Rice 41-1, Charles S Rice 41-9, Mrs D Lackey 41-9, Horace Bowen 41-7, Nason Hoyt 41-8, A Hazeltine 41-1, E W Farnsworth 41-9, Charles Goodrich 41-9, W P Andrews 41-1, H Grant 41-1, J G Lamson 41-9, P W & A J Saxby 41-9, George Stone 41-1, Amelia Nellis 41-1, J B Scoville 41-18, John A Hardy 38-1, Elliott VanSyoc 41-2, J Sutton 41-1, A Coryell 41-1, M Dow 40-1, C P Buckland 41-7, J S Farnsworth 41-17, John Hurd 41-1, S N Mead 41-1, Mrs T Terry 41-9, W J Wilson 41-1, A Noyes 41-1, Geo Brown 41-1, J Barrows 41-12, S D Rogers 41-1, R F Phippeny 41-7, D Gorton 41-1, Wm Hill 38-18, J Dorcas 41-6, R L Ainsworth 41-9, S Cummings 41-1, W W Parrott 41-1, C Clay 41-12, J J Parrott 41-1, Joseph Hesser 41-21, C Schaupt 41-1.

MISCELLANEOUS. R Bartlett \$2.25 39-1, J Boyd 4 00 39-9, Mrs I G Soule 2.62 40-15, C E Miller 1.32 39-9, Nancy Davis 1.32 39-9, E Tarbox 9.00 40-1, Maria M Rencher 4.00 40-1, F J Goodrich 3.00 38-1, J M St John 2.50 40-1, P Southwick 5.00 40-1, Mrs C Toeb 5.00 40-24, E Howard 2.50 39-16, M A Hayward 3.75, 45-20, S J Tving 4.36 43-1, Mrs S Perkins 2.50 41-18, M B Doud 5.00 40-1, Wm French 6.00 38-1, Mary Parmenter 2.50 41-14, Ann Adams 75c 40-1.

### Books Sent by Mail.

J R Brown \$1.00, G S Honeywell 2.84, R Hutchins 50c, C Clay 1.00, E D Waters 10c, U G Hussey 15c, A Marshall 10c, A H Stevens 25c, M M Stowell 50c, C Gibb 1.00, M D Merrill 1.05, A W Carpenter 10c, R C Sykes 10c, C E Peter 20c, E M Prantiss 1.00, H Bowen 25c, L Stedman 10c, Mrs E Sanborn 10c, A Oren 10c, A N Spaulding 30c, Wm Livingston 1.30, J C Thorpe 4.40, C A Eckert 2.90, V Null 1.15, A N Hobson 80c, Geo B Utter 1.50, J Nielsen 10c, B P Chase 10c, J W Blake 75c, H S Guilford 3.00, C Schaupt 50c, B F Belieu 25c, Wm Cottrell 2.10, M A Stiles 45c, Wm Lawton 1.10, E Capman 1.00, D A Smith 25c, O P Bird 10c, Chas Ashley 75c.

### Books Sent by Express.

S N Haskell, So. Lancaster, Mass., \$29.25, S B Whitney, No. Coker, Warren Co., N. Y. 12.00, James M Palmer, Worth, Tuscola Co., Mich., 20.00.

### Michigan Conference Fund.

Church in Jackson \$60.00, Oakland per R J Lawrence 38.00, Greenville 50.00, Tuscola 20.00, Orleans 50.00.

### Review to the Poor.

C Bowen \$2.00.

### General Conference Fund.

Church in Greenville, Mich. \$50.00.

### Shares in the Health Institute.

L O Stowell \$25.00.

### Donations to S. D. A. P. Association.

M J Eastman \$5.00, Asa Lockwood (thank-offering) 5.00.

### Shares in S. D. A. P. Association.

A J Nelson \$5.00, Lane 10.00, R J Lawrence 30.00, Geo Lowree 10.00.

## Books, Pamphlets, Tracts, &c.,

ISSUED BY THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION, AND FOR SALE AT THIS OFFICE.

Hymn Book. This is a book of 320 pp. of Hymns, and 96 pp. of Music. In plain morocco, \$1.00; in extra binding, \$1.50.

Thoughts on the Revelation, critical and practical. By Uriah Smith. This is a work of 328 pp., of great value to the student of prophecy. \$1.00.

History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week. By J. N. Andrews. 342 pp., \$1.00.

Life Incidents, in connection with the great Advent Movement. By Eld. James White. 373 pp., \$1.00.

The Spirit of Prophecy, Vol. I. By Ellen G. White; 416 pp. Vol. II, will be ready soon. Each \$1.00.

Autobiography of Eld. Joseph Bates, embracing a long life on shipboard, &c., with a brief account of the author's experience in the great Advent Movement of 1840-44, with author's portrait. 318 pp., \$1.00.

How to Live; comprising a series of articles on Health, and how to preserve it, with various recipes for cooking healthful food, &c. 400 pp., \$1.00.

Sabbath Readings; or Moral and Religious Reading for Youth and Children. 400 pp., 60 cts. The same in five pamphlets, 50 cts.

Appeal to Youth; Address at the Funeral of Henry N. White; also a brief narrative of his life, experience, and last sickness, with his mother's letters, &c. 96 pp., muslin, 40 cts. Paper covers, 10 cts.

The Game of Life Illustrated, with Explanatory Notes, and Introduction by Eld. James White. This is one of the most instructive and impressive little works ever published. It has three illustrations, 6x8 inches each, representing Satan playing with man for his soul; 1. The game in progress; 2. The game lost; 3. The game won. In board, 50 cts.; in paper, 30 cts.

The Advent Keepsake; comprising a text of Scripture for each day of the year, on the Second Advent, the Resurrection, &c. Muslin, 25 cts; do., gilt, 40 cts.

A Solemn Appeal relative to Solitary Vice, and the Abuses and Excesses of the Marriage Relation. Edited by Eld. James White. Muslin, 50 cts.; paper, 30 cts.

Sermons on the Sabbath and Law; embracing an outline of the Biblical and Secular History of the Sabbath for 6000 years, and a refutation of the Sunday-seventh-day theories of Mede, Jennings, Akers, and Fuller. By J. N. Andrews. 25 cts.

Our Faith and Hope, No. 1. Sermons on the Millennium, Second Advent, the Kingdom, the Judgment, the Time, the Sanctuary, and Saving Faith. No. 2 will be ready soon. 20 cts. each.

The Atonement; an Examination of a Remedial System in the light of Nature and Revelation. By J. H. Waggoner. 20 cts.

The Nature and Tendency of Modern Spiritualism. By J. H. Waggoner. 20 cts.

The Bible from Heaven; or, a Dissertation on the Evidences of Christianity. 25 cts.

History of the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul. By D. M. Canright. 25 cts.

Review of Objections to the Visions. 20 cts.

Discussion on the Sabbath Question, between Elds. Grant and Cornell. 20 cts.

The Ministration of Angels; and the Origin, History, and Destiny, of Satan. By D. M. Canright. 15 cts.

The Three Messages of Rev. 14, and the Two-Horned Beast. By J. N. Andrews. 15 cts.

Which? Mortal or Immortal? An Inquiry into the Present Constitution and Future Condition of Man. By Uriah Smith. 15 cts.

The Resurrection of the Unjust; a Vindication of the Doctrine. By J. H. Waggoner. 15 cts.

The Seventh Part of Time; a Sermon on the Sabbath Question. By W. H. Littlejohn. 10 cts.

The Truth Found; the Nature and Obligation of the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. By J. H. Waggoner. 10 cts.

Review of Gillilan, and other authors, on the Sabbath. By T. B. Brown. 10 cts.

Vindication of the True Sabbath. By J. W. Morton. 10 cts.

The Date of the Seventy Weeks of Dan. 9; an Explanation of the Commandment to Restore and Build Jerusalem. By J. N. Andrews. 10 cts.

The Seven Trumpets; an Exposition of Rev. 8 and 9. 10 cts.

Matthew Twenty-Four; a full Exposition of the chapter. By James White. 10 cts.

Key to Prophetic Chart. The symbols of Daniel and John explained, and the periods determined. 10 cts.

The Position and Work of the True People of God under the Third Angel's Message. By W. H. Littlejohn. 10 cts.

An Appeal to the Baptists, from the Seventh-day Baptists, for the Restoration of the Bible Sabbath. 5 cts.

Milton on the State of the Dead. 5 cts.

Three-Cent Tracts: The Second Advent—The Millennium—The Kingdom—The Law and the Gospel—The Seventh Part of Time—Much in Little—The Sin of Witchcraft—Perpetuity of Spiritual Gifts—Celestial Railroad—Scripture References.

Two-Cent Tracts: The Sufferings of Christ—Seven Reasons for Sunday-Keeping Examined—Who Changed the Sabbath?—Sabbath by Elishu—The Rich Man and Lazarus—Institution of the Sabbath—Popular Objections to the Resurrection of the Body—Positive Institutions.

One-Cent Tracts: Appeal on Immortality—Brief Thoughts on Immortality—Thoughts for the Candid—Judson on Dress—Personality of God—Sign of the Day of God—Time Lost; Old and New Style—The Two Laws—What is Truth?

Half-Cent Tracts: God's Answers to Man's Excuses for not Keeping His Sabbath—The Heavenly Meeting—Some Features of our Times—Which Day do You Keep, and Why?

CHARTS: The Prophetic and Law of God Charts, the size used by our preachers; varnished and mounted, each \$2.00.

The two Charts, on cloth, by mail, with Key, without rollers, \$2.50.

\* \* \* Address REVIEW & HERALD, BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

## The Review and Herald.

TERMS:

If paid in advance,.....\$2.00 a year.  
If not paid in three months,.....\$2.50 a year.  
When ordered by others for the poor,.....\$1.50 a year.  
When ordered by friends, for their friends on trial, \$1.50 year.  
Address REVIEW & HERALD, BATTLE CREEK, MICH.