

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 40.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, OCTOBER 29, 1872.

NUMBER 20.

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.

SLEEP.

"So He giveth his beloved sleep."—Ps. 127:2.

He sees when their footsteps falter, when their hearts
grow weak and faint,
He marks when their strength is failing, and listens
to each complaint;
He bids them rest for a season, for the pathway has
grown too steep;
And folded in fair green pastures,
He giveth His loved ones sleep.

Like weary and worn-out children, that sigh for the
daylight's close,
He knows that they oft are longing for home and its
sweet repose;
So he calls them in from their labors ere the shad-
ows around them creep,
And silently watching o'er them,
He giveth His loved ones sleep.

He giveth it, oh! so gently, as a mother will hush to
rest
The babe that she softly pillows so tenderly on her
breast;
Forgotten are now the trials and sorrows that made
them weep;
For with many a soothing promise
He giveth His loved ones sleep.

He giveth it! friends the dearest can never this boon
bestow:
But he touches the drooping eyelids, and placid the
features grow;
Their foes may gather about them, and storms may
round them sweep,
But, guarding them safe from danger,
He giveth His loved ones sleep.

All dread of the distant future, all fears that oppres-
sed
to-day,
Like mists that clear in the sunlight, have noise-
lessly passed away;
Nor call nor clamor can rouse them from slumber so
pure and deep,
For only His voice can reach them
Who giveth His loved ones sleep.

Weep not that their toils are over, weep not that
their race is run;
God grant we may rest as calmly when our work,
like theirs, is done!
Till then we would yield with gladness our treasures
to Him to keep,
And rejoice in the sweet assurance,
He giveth His loved ones sleep.
—Golden Hours.

DISCUSSION ON THE SABBATH QUESTION

BETWEEN ELDER PETER VOGEL, DISCIPLE,
AND ELDER J. H. WAGGONER, S. D. ADVENTIST.

SECOND PROPOSITION.

"Do the Scriptures teach that the seventh day was
made a Sabbath after the Exodus of the Israelites
out of Egypt?"

ELDER VOGEL, affirms; ELDER WAGGONER, denies.

ELDER PETER VOGEL'S THIRD AFFIRMATIVE.

THAT my charge of Bro. W.'s "begging the question" is just, is simply a matter of fact which every reader has the means to verify. And Eld. W.'s verdict, "he [I] most signally failed," does not in the least disturb me. I write for the masses; yet I am not without hope, faint though it be, that, when the heat of battle is over and he takes a calm survey of the field, he may conclude differently. It is easy to say "he draws on his imagination" for facts, but the proof of this would be in better taste, and perhaps not so cheap. Understand, however, gentle reader, Eld. W. does not write for effect! But Mr. V., who is but a young man, knows no better than to do just so naughty a thing. His untamed blood makes him accept a system of such "lawless tendency" as to make killing no crime; and in his crudity he does things that "no scholar will claim!"

1. Ex. 16.—(1) The section which Eld. W. quotes from Crosby, with reference to the article, that author printed in small type to show that it figures but little in the case. (2) Ex. 16 does not come under that section, since it is neither poetry nor impassioned prose, but legal information, which demands "perspicuity." (3) The

fact that the last mention of the Sabbath in this chapter, the only instance of "renewed mention" in it, has the article, shows that the rules I quoted apply, and are strictly followed. (4) The Hebrew, concerning which Eld. W. maintains a respectful silence, has no such exceptions as he would force on the Greek text, and this places my position beyond all dispute. I rather think this "mine" is still (a) mine.

That I have not drawn upon my imagination for facts as to "mutual understanding" or "general notoriety," is clear from the facts adduced at the close of my first affirmative. I know not how to account for Eld. W.'s charge of manufacturing facts.

So also his assertion that the yearly sabbaths "were never mentioned in any other manner" than indefinitely was made without sufficient attention to facts. (1) Nearly every mention of them by Moses was either a first mention or a re-mention, for the purpose of additional legislation, which is nearly an equivalent. (2) If this were even not the case, the absence of the article would be adequately accounted for, by the weekly Sabbaths taking it by "emphatic distinction." (3) But in this matter of fact, Gesenius, whose ability Eld. W. has pronounced as "beyond dispute," testifies against his universal negation and in my favor. "The Sabbath is a name for the great day of atonement in the seventh month. Lev. 23:32." Lex. under Sab. (4) See also Isa. 1:13. What "an element of weakness" my statement is!

Eld. W. "appeals to the reader whether it is reasonable to suppose that the people gathered a double portion of manna on the sixth day according to the order of the Lord, see verse 5, and 'all the rulers' were entirely ignorant of the reason of their so doing." This appeal will be in order whenever I say that the rulers knew nothing of the command in verse 5. I simply said that they were ignorant of a Sabbath to follow, as is clear from the manner in which Moses introduced it to their notice. "Is it not rather reasonable," continues Eld. W., "that the rulers, as faithful overseers, reported to Moses that the will of the Lord had been done?" That is to say, every time the people turned round in obedience to a command, "all the rulers" put off, post haste, to inform Moses! How reasonable! But what is conjecture as compared with facts?

To say that "the rulers were informed the day before" the seventh, and the people on the seventh, is not equivalent to saying that the people were not informed till "Sabbath morning." The day began with the evening among the Jews (Lev. 23:32), and orders for the day are usually issued when the day begins. There is no limit to absurd conclusions that can be drawn for an opponent by manufacturing premises for him.

"How long refuse ye to keep my commandments" by no means necessarily "implies a continued desecration of the Sabbath." Is the Sabbath commandments? That it is one of many, I grant; and this new and test commandment was no better kept than others had "long" been. That's all.

2. Eld. W. thinks that "the passover was given to Israel expressly to commemorate their deliverance from Egypt," and that therefore the Sabbath cannot be commemorative of that event. But, strictly speaking, the passover commemorated only one item of their deliverance, the passing-over of the death angel, while the Sabbath covered their deliverance in general. So baptism commemorates the death, burial, and resurrection, of Christ, in general (Rom. 6), and the Lord's Supper, his death in particular.

Notwithstanding Bro. W.'s labored efforts to show that Deut. 5:15, was not written on the two tables of stone, Moses still insists that it was (Deut. 5:22), and I am inclined to believe him. "Forgive me this wrong." Nor is Ex. 20:3-17, the original

copy, Eld. W.'s assertion to the contrary notwithstanding, since Deut. 5 testifies that it is defective. The original was written on tables of stone.

The rest of Deut. 12:9, was a promise, and is the rest of Caanan; it has nothing to do with the rest of Deut. 5:12-15, which is a command, and refers to the seventh day. "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks."

Now let us see how my "therefore" "must fail" me. "Every moral obligation," says Eld. W., "was enforced upon them [the Israelites] by the same special reason—with the same 'therefore' as the Sabbath in Deut. 5:15; and this, he thinks, proves too much for me. Compare Lev. 19:35-37.

God deals with the human race somewhat as parents have to deal with their children. A son old enough to grasp it needs only to be told that it is morally wrong to steal, and it suffices; but it is a waste of words to endeavor to impress the immorality of such a deed upon a five-year old. He obeys, either simply because it is forbidden by the authority of the parent, or because he fears the penalty. A moral basis is too abstract for him; he needs to have it given in a concrete or tangible form, i. e., as a positive command. Now before the fall, man's ability to grasp moral relations was all that God made it; after the fall, it was somewhat blunted, but not yet so degraded by a course of sin as to be incapable of receiving moral relations on their proper basis; hence God annexed no temporal penalties, not even to murder. I know well what use some make of Gen. 4:14, and 23, 24, but know also that a proper construction of those passages establishes no temporal penalty for murder.

After the race had shown itself unfit to be governed in this way, God swept it from the earth, and gave to the survivors some moral relations, as the unlawfulness to kill, Gen. 9:5, 6, in a kind of positive form.

Finding this still insufficient, or rather, mankind in general failing to regard much as sin which stood merely on a moral basis, God took Israel, and placed for them moral obligations generally on a positive basis (see Deut. 28, et al.), that in this school they might be prepared for the gospel (Gal. 3:24) which governs by general principles (Phil. 4:8), restoring all moral obligations to their moral basis simply. (Here is my prohibition of killing without "direct enforcement.") Hence Paul says, The law "was added [to the promises made to the fathers] because of transgression, till the seed should come" (Gal. 3:19); and (Rom. 5:20), "The law entered, that the offense might abound;" not that mankind might sin more, but that they might see sin where before they did not; nor that the law disclosed new moral principles, but that it put old ones on a legal basis, i. e., gave them in a concrete or positive form, as to children. Hence we find moral obligations enforced under Moses as if they were new, because they were new in that form, "the law entered," "was added;" and in this form other nations did not have these principles.

Where, then, is the absurdity of Eld. W.'s 1st and 2d conclusions from my premises, when fairly understood? And how does my "therefore" fail me? If the Sabbath were a moral institution it would always have existed, and then Deut. 5:15, would only have placed it upon a new or legal basis "till the Seed should come." But it is, as has been shown, a commemorative, and therefore positive, institution; hence the word, "therefore," points to its origin. Here I feel the ground so solid under me, that I would be willing to risk both the first and second propositions on this single text, Deut. 5:15

The "therefore" of Lev. 19:37, does not make commemorative institutions of moral precepts, but only places them on a positive basis, since no moral principle can ever be commemorative; but the "there-

fore" of Deut. 5:15, makes the Sabbath commemorative of deliverance from Egypt, because it is a positive institution, just as the paschal feast is made commemorative by the "therefore" of Ex. 12:17, according to my brother's own reasoning.

3. Neh. 9:13-15. (1) I did not say that "madest known" is a full equivalent for "gavest" or "commandedst," but that it is "a kind of equivalent;" i. e., it means all that they do with the additional thought of giving or commanding for the first time. Let the reader remember this, also, when Eld. W.'s strictures on John 7 are read. (2) But, says my brother, the Lord "came down on Mt. Sinai, &c.," and I have the Sabbath made known in the wilderness. Are you sure, brother, that the text says He made known the Sabbath on Sinai? By the same course that you prove this, I engage to prove that He then and there gave them the manna in "the Wilderness of Sin," and water from the rock "in Rephidim!" Do you see how "Eld. Vogel undermines his own theory?" (3) Eze. 39:7 (and he might have added 20:5-9), "So will I make my holy name known in the midst of my people Israel," does not in the least disturb me. (a) Grant, for argument's sake, that "make known" here denotes a recalling attention to things formerly known. Have I not admitted that it sometimes has this force? And did I not prove that in Neh. 9 it cannot have this meaning? But suppose I had not, is the first meaning of a word to be rejected for a secondary one without an imperative necessity? (b) But even in these instances, "make known" is used in its primary sense. "The Lord is known by the judgments which he executeth." Ps. 9:16. And did he not, as I have shown, make pre-existent moral principles (his judgments) known in a legal or new form? Consider also the import of Ex. 6:3-7. "I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty; but by my new name, Jehovah [i. e., in my new character] was I not known to them. . . . I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God, and ye shall know that I am the Lord your God.

4. Let us now look after those "colored sentences" respecting John 7:22, 23. I have somewhere seen a quotation from the king's translators to the effect that parallels (||) denote parallel marginal readings, and a dagger (†), an equivalent reading, i. e., a reading in different words but the same sense. If it becomes necessary, I will seek and produce their own language. That my statement is true, any reader can satisfy himself by examining a common reference Bible. The substance of my statement is found in the following quotation from the preface of Dr. Geo. Campbell to his Gospels, as an apology for a new translation: "Has the margin in the English Bible, which in a very great number of passages gives the reader his choice of different translations, ever been found to endanger the faith of the people?"

Eld. W. quotes from various translators in favor of the reading in the body of the Bible; but they all hold the Sabbath to be a moral institution, and so, when there was a choice of rendering, so far as the mere words were concerned, they translated in harmony with their convictions, and left it for commentators to harmonize the context. Many commentators come to this passage with the same prepossession and labor to explain; but such explanations! I do not deny that *hina mee* ordinarily signifies that not, but it is also true that *hina* is often used for other particles, and by no N. T. writer more freely than by John, and at times it is even redundant, or so nearly so that its force cannot be readily indicated in English. If its use were simple and uniform, why should the best N. T. lexicographers devote a page or more to its discussion? The marginal reading cannot, therefore, be condemned, if the connection demands it. And that it does this, I at-

tempted to show in my last paper. I invite Eld. W.'s attention to my argument.

That there is a contrast between circumcision and the Sabbath cannot be evaded in view of the expression, "not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers." It implies that one is of Moses and the other not. True, they are *both* of God, he spoke them both into existence—in this sense there is no contrast. But one originated *before* the time of Moses, and the other—when? Here is a contrast, and one fatal to my brother's theory.

It makes no practical difference on what day Jericho was spoiled; there was marching or work for a whole week, and of course on the Sabbath. But did Eld. W. ever consider that by adopting his reasoning I could show that he cannot tell what day of true time the Jews observed as a Sabbath? It was the seventh day after the first falling of the manna, but on what day did the manna first fall? Here the record is silent, just as silent as on what day the march about Jericho began.

Tholuck's paraphrase, Eld. W. says, "was evidently used for effect—not for its relevancy." This is equivalent to saying that I designedly deal dishonestly. Did you see my heart, Bro. W.? I regret that so unchristian an expression should stain your piece. I recommend to your perusal Matt. 7:1, 2. But so far as the paraphrase is concerned, you will, upon repentance, allow me to think it in accordance with the marginal reading. "Ye transgress the law," in Tholuck's view, means that they transgressed in the same sense that Jesus did, which was simply no transgression, *i. e.*, "without breaking the law of Moses." But Eld. W. will hear from this passage again.

5. The Sabbath a type. That *heorte* ("holy day") may refer to a feast which has no Sabbaths connected with it, is true, but does it refer exclusively or even mainly to such feasts in Col. 2:16? As certainly as it there refers to those feasts which had Sabbaths connected with them, so certainly does it include the yearly sabbaths, and the expression, "Sabbath days," the weekly Sabbaths. And so often as the 27 N. T. occurrences of *heorte* refer to such feasts as had yearly sabbaths connected with them, just so often is it an instance confirmatory of my position. Suppose, then, that Acts 18:21, refers to the passover feast rather than to Pentecost, how does this help Bro. W.? Or suppose the passage is spurious, does it not show the *use of heorte*? In this connection, I also said something concerning Lev. 23; let Eld. W. remember it, for it stands sadly in his way.

When I said that the Sabbath's being a type stripped Eld. W. of the last vestige of difference between the weekly and annual sabbaths, I, of course, did not mean that I had proved the weekly Sabbaths to be annual, and the annual sabbaths to be weekly; these are mere accidents. But that it destroys every vestige of *moral* basis for the Sabbath, and places it in the category of *positive* institutions, I meant and still insist upon. *Moral institutions are not typical, nor typical institutions moral.*

But, says Eld. W., the Sabbath pointed back, and therefore cannot point forward! The passover also pointed back, and yet was a type. 1 Cor. 5:7.

6. The Sabbath pre-eminently Jewish. Much under this head needing a reply has been considered while speaking of Deut. 5:15.

That the Sabbath is a sign "between God and the children of Israel" is expressly asserted. Nor is it a sign of creation. Ex. 31:17, when fairly construed, simply refers to the facts of creation *for the frequency* of the Sabbath. The Sabbath is a sign of God's having singled out the Israelites as his special people: "It is a sign between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you." Verse 13; see also Eze. 20:12, 20. This fixes the matter, and forbids Bro. W.'s construction of verse 17.

And here I must notice the wrong use made of "peculiar." In Scripture, this word is not used in the sense now popular, but as Webster defines it, "Belonging solely or especially to an individual." This did not prevent other people *as individuals* from becoming Jews, but it demanded of them a renunciation of their nationality and naturalization as Israelites.

7. The Sabbath not given to the Gentiles. That Isa. 56 predicts a new day under the name of Sabbath, will be shown in its proper place. Until then, I have not

a word of reply to what Eld. W. says on this head. But his attempt to annihilate the distinction I showed to exist between Jews and Gentiles, as such, respecting the keeping of the Sabbath, fails in this, that it does not distinguish between a *naturalized* stranger, *i. e.*, one made and treated as if by nature a Jew, and an unnaturalized one. The former was under every obligation which rested upon a Jew, but not the latter. The former, *e. g.*, kept the passover (Ex. 12:48, 49), but not the latter (verse 43); the one might not eat that which died of itself (Lev. 17:15), while the other might (Deut. 14:21) whether he was "within" or without the gates of Israel. This last reference will also show that I was right in my construction of "within" in Ex. 20:10, and Eld. W. slightly in the dark.

The stranger who was not so naturalized as to be "as one that is born in the land," was not distinguished from others by being an idolater; for many of them kept up the patriarchal worship, as Jethro, the Ninevites, Cornelius, and Justus. They were those "other sheep," of whom the Saviour spoke, who were "not of this [Jewish] fold." John 10:16.

ELD. J. H. WAGGONER'S THIRD NEGATIVE.

The reader will bear in mind that a discussion is different from an essay or an independent argument; it is not to be expected that every point involved in the subject should be noticed, but those contested. The *identity of days* and the bearing of the word *sanctify* are often matters of earnest dispute; but they are not with us. Eld. Vogel and myself agree on these. Also, where time is so limited, it is impossible to notice everything which might in strict justice demand attention.

1. Eld. Vogel says the section I quoted from Crosby was put "in small type to show that it figures but little in the case." It is explanatory, and necessary to an understanding of the subject. Its being put in small type does not indicate that it is not truth! Nor does he speak of "impassioned prose"—"even in prose" are his words; and they will stand.

I did not maintain silence concerning the Hebrew. I said the exceptions were numerous in *both Testaments*. Gesenius says of the article, its use is "nearly the same as in Greek and German." He also makes the same exception that Crosby does in regard to poetry, though Green does not; and *this shows that Green's not noticing the exceptions, is not evidence that no exceptions exist.* Let us notice a few of them.

a. Eld. V. says the Sabbath was so well known on that morning when the manna was first withheld, that the article was demanded. Yet when they had kept the Sabbath about five months longer, having witnessed the constantly recurring miracles which pointed it out, and made its observance a necessity; having heard the voice of Jehovah, in his terrible majesty, defining and enforcing it on Mt. Sinai; and Moses had received two copies written by the finger of God; after this lapse of time, with all this evidence of its being well known, the same form is used in Ex. 35:2, that was used in Ex. 16:23; the article is wanting. And this is "legal information" also; not poetry nor "impassioned prose."

b. Lev. 23:3, was spoken a number of months later, yet the article is omitted. Surely, it was not then lacking in "general notoriety," "emphatic distinction," or in anything that would insure the presence of the article, if there were no exceptions to the rules.

c. A striking instance is found in Ex. 20:10, "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is a Sabbath of the Lord thy God." It cannot be said that this is indefinite, for the article is inserted in verses 8 and 11, on either side of this. Did the translators turn commentators on this text? No; nor did they on Ex. 16:23. Facts of history and the usage of the language justify their course.

d. Gen. 1:1: "In a beginning."—Heb. Who can find fault with the translators for here inserting the article? It is a faithful translation, *i. e.*, gives the true idea of the text.

e. Ps. 21:1: "A king shall joy in thy strength," &c. Read the connection, and see if the translators have not done justice to the text by inserting the article. I am at a loss to comprehend Eld. Vogel's remark, "The Hebrew . . . has no such exceptions as he would force on the Greek text." If he means that the Grammar

which he uses does not notice exceptions, it does not meet the case; for others do; and his expression is unfortunate, liable to mislead. But if he means that the Hebrew of the Old Testament has no such exceptions, then his "mine" is easily exploded. I did not use the phrase, "no scholar," in an invidious sense, as his italicising the last word infers; but I *now* think *perhaps* he was right in his emphasis.

f. I repeat, that his reference to the expression, "*a holy convocation*," is "an element of weakness in his argument" It is *invariably* without the article. It is as if he should attempt to show that a certain man might be distinguished from certain others because his name is John, when John is the name of every one of them! Compare on the passover, Ex. 12:16, with Lev. 23:7, though a year intervened between their mentions.

But Bro. Vogel is confessedly ingenious and fruitful of expedients. When the fallacy of his argument on this point is shown, he answers: "Nearly every mention by Moses was either a first mention, or a re-mention, for the purpose of additional legislation, which is nearly an equivalent." "A kind of equivalent," and "nearly an equivalent," are "a kind of" cushion which he prepares on which to fall easily when compelled to fall from his assumed position; and in case of necessity, as on Neh. 9, he can hide behind their ambiguity. The prefix "re" signifies *again*. A "re-mention" is simply a mentioning again. Does he mean that these "re-mentions" are additional instances of the first mention? And may there be a second, third, or fourth occurrence, at long intervals, of the *first mention*? If not, what does he mean? I would like to know how many months or years must intervene to distinguish between a first and second mention, or between the second mention and merely a "re-mention"? Or if it is only "nearly equivalent," what proportion belongs to the first mention; and how much of it shall we pass over to the second? If this is not bending language to help a failing theory I never knew an instance.

Yet again, he says the yearly sabbaths might be mentioned indefinitely because the weekly Sabbath had taken the article by "emphatic distinction." If so, why is it that the weekly Sabbath wants the article so long after its mention in Ex. 16? And how can it take the article by "emphatic distinction," if there is not a "vestige of difference" between it and the others, and if it belongs to "the same category," as he has said?

Gesenius, as quoted by Eld. Vogel, was evidently referring to the term *Sabbath*, without regard to its being definite or indefinite, for, in the next article, he renders the text cited, "a Sabbath of sabbatism." But inasmuch as Eld. V. offers it in proof, he indorses the giving of the article to *Sabbath*, Lev. 23:32, and thus he furnishes another exception to the rule which he says has no exceptions!

2. At first, he said the rulers were "surprised," yet now he says they knew of the order for gathering a double rate of manna. But they came and told Moses before he spoke to them of the Sabbath, as in verse 23. Yet again he says it is "absurd" to suppose they went to let Moses know the order was obeyed. Well, why did they go? Can he give another reason? Is their "surprise" a matter of "conjecture," or of revelation? One thing is beyond conjecture—Eld. V. is befogged over Ex. 16.

3. He says the passover commemorated only "one thing," namely, the passing over of the death-angel, in Egypt. *Why* did he make this assertion so contrary to the express reading of Ex. 12:15-17? I leave it to the reader if some of his assumed "facts" are not "imaginary." All that I said in regard to the passover and the Sabbath is fully confirmed by the Scriptures.

4. He does not notice the proof I gave that Deut. 5 has not the original copy of the Decalogue. "*These words*," in Deut. 5:22, is the equivalent of *these commandments*. Compare Ex. 34:28, where Moses says the Lord wrote "the ten words" (Heb.) on the tables of stone. Eld. V. might with equal propriety assert that there were *only ten words* on the tables of stone. "*Words*," in these texts, has a technical or special signification. His remark concerning the rest of Deut. 12:9, &c., is without point. I did not disregard the distinction between the command and the promise. I distinguished, also, between the rest of Deut. 12, and the Sabbath of Deut. 5. His

words convey an erroneous impression. I said, and I repeat, that the *rest* which was promised to them in contrast with their bondage in Egypt, was not the Sabbath, but the inheritance of Canaan. The Lord's words to Paul will far more aptly refer to himself.

5. His remarks on "make known" do not better his case; his quotations are irrelevant. To quote Ps. 9:16, to show that "make known" is used in its "primary sense," is truly strange, for the words are not there! "Make known," and "is known," are not synonymous. Nor does Eze. 39:7, speak of making known his "*new name*" as Ex. 6:3-7, quoted by Eld. Vogel. I shall not try to account for his passing off such random statements for arguments on the case; I have given him credit for sufficient discrimination to perceive their irrelevancy.

6. On John 7 (1) He says the authors I quoted "all held the Sabbath to be a moral institution," and translated according to their prepossessions. I do not wish to arouse his "righteous indignation" a second time over this passage, but I am compelled in justice to say his statement is not correct. (2) Who are those "best N. T. lexicographers" who devote a page or more to the discussion of the Greek word, *hina*? It is true, they give a variety of combinations in which it is used; but what lexicographer gives a different rendering of *hina mee* from that I gave from Parkhurst, Robinson, Liddell and Scott, Greenfield, Groves, and Donnegan? That is confirmed by the renderings I quoted from the *Diaglott*, and from Olshausen; and I notice also by the grammars of McClintock and Crooks, and Crosby. (3) I must repeat, and every reader can see, that "Tholuck's paraphrase" of John 7:23, does not agree with the marginal reading, notwithstanding the effort of Bro. V. to harmonize them. If "Ye transgress the law," and "Without breaking the law," are synonymous in his vocabulary, I have but to say they are not in mine. There is plausibility in Bro. Vogel's softening of the terms, to wit, it was "no transgression at all," but *Tholuck does not say that!* but the very opposite. Why, then, did he quote Tholuck, seeing there is a contradiction between them? After accusing me at the very outset of the discussion, and without any reason, of "begging the question," and afterward, of "perverting facts," he is now very indignant because I can assign no other reason for his use of Tholuck than "for effect." He asks if I saw his heart, and refers to Matt. 7:1, 2. I answer, No; but I saw what proceeded from it, and refer him to verse 20 of the same chapter. Had he acted up to Matt. 6:12, from the first, his complainings would come with better grace. But the evidences are before the readers, and they can judge between us. (4) His quotation from Dr. Campbell's preface does not favor his view. It simply says the reader has a "choice of different translations," but not on which side that choice should fall. I never saw a man catch at smaller straws than does Eld. V. The marginal reading in this case is inadmissible, and his argument on it a *non sequitur*.

7. My view of the record of the spoiling of Jericho he thinks would enable him to show that I cannot prove what day of true time the Jews observed as a Sabbath. Let him try it and see. He cannot show by Ex. 16 that it was the seventh day after six days' falling of the manna; nor can he prove that it was the day of their deliverance from Egypt. But I can abundantly show that it was the day on which God rested when he made heaven and earth; and the seventh day from "the beginning," and of course the true seventh day of the week. This truth cannot be hid by any means.

8. "Ex. 31:17, when fairly construed," says Eld. V., "simply refers to the facts of creation *for the frequency* of the Sabbath." This is certainly assuming much, considering that the idea is so foreign to every statement concerning the blessing and sanctification of the day. Let the reader turn to my last article, and see my paraphrase of the fourth commandment. The definitions of terms there given cannot be disputed, and they sustain all that I claim, or have claimed, for the seventh day as *the creation Sabbath*. Creation is referred to, not merely to point out relation or frequency, which could be done without it, but, to show that it is the Lord's rest day; a day of holiness; a sign that Jehovah is the true God—the Creator of all things.

9. All that he says about a "naturalized stranger" has no force. According to his

view, he cannot prove that the Gentile, *as such*, had any law at all. So evidently is this the outgrowth of his theory, that I have known prominent men of his denomination to openly take the position that they had none. The blessings of the gospel are also only for "naturalized strangers," for Gentiles *as such* are not partakers of the promises to Israel in the new covenant. Compare Rom. 2:28, 29; 9:1-5; Heb. 8:6-10; Eph. 2:11-19. His theory of abstract law, and "moral law on a positive basis," is fanciful and dangerous, as will be fully shown in due time. According to his explanations, there is no difference between the "concrete or tangible form, *i. e.*, as a positive command," and revealed law. Outside of this positive moral law, or tangible, there could be no express or "tangible" rules of obligation! Of course, man's only rule of action was his own "intuitions," as spiritualists now have it. And when the "concrete," the "tangible," or the "direct enforcement," was abolished, the whole world was turned back to the blessedness of heathenism; restored to those "general principles" which had so completely failed as a guide in the past, leaving each one to supply the "tangible," or the "direct," according to his prepossessions, feelings, intuitions, or what not; but no more to be guided by the direct, the specific, the tangible, or in other words, the revealed! If this does not set aside the word of God as a rule of life, and open the door for "liberty" large enough to suit the "carnal mind" (see Rom. 8:7), I cannot imagine how that might be done. May the Lord save us from the legitimate results of such a theory.

I will briefly notice a few points, passed hitherto for want of space. I am willing to leave it with the reader if a duty cannot be "directly enforced" at different times. To deny it is preposterous. A contrast may exist between the direct and indirect, but it was not implied in my language, and he knew I did not have any such contrast in view. To my reference to Cornelius, he replies: "The enforcement at the house of Cornelius has no direct reference to baptism, but to Cornelius." What was enforced there? Baptism, and nothing else. Therefore the enforcement of baptism has no direct reference to baptism! The angel told Cornelius to send for Peter, that he might tell him what he ought to do. To this, his mission had "direct reference," and he "commanded them to be baptized." Was this a direct or indirect, "tangible" or intangible enforcement of baptism? He drew a contrast between the direct and indirect enforcement of the Sabbath. Well, if to Cornelius there was but an indirect enforcement of baptism, we are satisfied with just such an indirect enforcement of the Sabbath! But what, then, does he gain by his hypercriticism?

I deny that I perverted facts in my remarks on Genesis. Not a text that he quoted in the Old Testament presents an instance of anachronism. His position, as I now understand it, is as absurd as the one I examined, to wit, that Adam did not name his wife until long after he received her—until after her children were born. Very many names in the Old Testament were given by prophetic foresight, as every reader knows, and the naming of Eve is one of the most evident instances of this kind. The *tense*, emphasized by him, argues nothing in the case. The Lord said to Abraham, "A father of many nations have I made thee," while the son of promise was not yet born.

Eld. Vogel said the reader would inquire whether the word "constitute" as used by him, was not borrowed as a quotation from me, either directly or indirectly, for the purpose of showing up the fallacy of my reasoning. I can answer the inquiry; it was not in a quotation, either directly or indirectly, but in his own *direct argument* that he used it. These are his words, "It is at least possible for God to rest without making it thereby a sacred rest; and while his resting on any day would constitute that day a rest day (Sabbath) *i. e.*, day in which he had rested, it would not constitute it a sacred rest day." If, as he claimed, "constitute" can be *only* properly used in the sense of "appoint," what is the force of his argument? His pretended explanation is not fair; it does not present the matter in its true light. And his assertion, that I confess that there is force in his strictures by my saying that he has made the same distinction, is only frivolous.

His remarks and quotations, to show that

God is still working in upholding, &c., are irrelevant, and being so, would require no notice were they not calculated to mislead. The Sabbath institution has no reference whatever to the work of upholding or preserving, but *only* to the work of *creating*. This has been so often placed before the reader, that it might seem unnecessary to repeat it. But it is truth, that in a discussion the prejudices of many are easily excited, and it is justifiable to meet whatever tends to divert the readers from the truth in issue. Were their minds always directed to those truths of revelation at issue, and never diverted from them, discussions might be more pleasant and profitable than is generally the case.

Having now passed through the first two propositions, I submit the subject to the reader, confident that it has been established that,

1. The Sabbath is a memorial of creation; it was blessed and set apart by Jehovah at the conclusion of his work; the Lord himself gave the facts of creation as its basis, and the only reason of its being blessed and sanctified; and when its sanctification is spoken of, it is never connected with any other events.

2. A great and manifest difference is shown between the seventh day, or weekly Sabbath, and the yearly sabbaths, in that it was based on the facts of creation; it was the rest day of the Almighty; God spoke it with his own voice; he wrote it in the tables of stone; it was deposited in the ark with *only moral precepts*, over which atonement was made before God. Not one of these facts can be applied to the yearly sabbaths, which were parts of a system growing, not out of the acts of the Creator, but out of the necessities of man arising from his own rebellion.

3. There is neither express statement, nor necessary inference, to invalidate any of these truths.

And, again, I pray that God may, by his Spirit, guide us into all truth; that through faith in his Son, who died "to put away sin," we may so "keep his commandments, which is the whole duty of man," that we may be able to stand in that day when "God shall bring every work into Judgment."

Pride.

BY A FRIEND TO ZION.

"ONLY by pride cometh contention," is the expression of Solomon. This is a subject that is seldom treated upon, and the reason is obvious; mortals are so subject to its spirit, they are unwilling to have the truth told them. He feels like one who said, "I hate that prophet, for he prophesies evil concerning me and not good." It is to be feared that too many of the professed servants of Christ shrink from reproving, lest they should offend. The temptation of the enemy is, "These are my good, rich friends; if I reprove them for their luxury and pride, I shall lose their friendship." The rich are the very characters that the servants of God ought to reprove, rebuke, and exhort to set an example of self-denial. Those that have the materials to gratify the pride of life should set the example for the poor; this would be learning of Christ; he was rich, but for our sake became poor. He set an example of deprivation. Suffer me, though unworthy, to entreat my fathers, mothers, brothers, and sisters, in Christ, whom God has given wealth, to lay aside superfluities, and pride, that baneful root that is so troublesome in the garden of Christ. The nature of this root is such, that if it is broken off in one place, it will sprout in another. It requires a diligent, watchful care, lest this root hinders the plant of grace growing.

Much is said of temperance. I am pleased with it; but I want to have it extended as far as the apostle recommended it: Be thou temperate in all things. I find a deficiency in myself; I see it in others in every denomination. It is pride that produces contention among different orders. If pride was slain, contention would cease. The question may be asked, How shall this great oak be cut down? Let every one that wishes to see more primitive religion flourish strike a blow at it, both by precept and example. Use the gospel ax. Lay it at the root, and it must fall. Let us bring the question home to ourselves, Do we not cultivate this root of bitterness more than the seed of grace? Do we not make more exertion, daily, to gratify the pride of life and superfluities thereof, than we do in

striving to inform ourselves of truths of the gospel? If we spend a little more time in searching the Scriptures, that will inform us of this evil root. Pride is that evil that God hates. Jeremiah says, Give ear; be not proud; for the Lord has spoken. He said if they would not hear, his soul should weep in secret places for their pride.

Now, since pride is that which God hates and led the prophet to weep, does it not become us, the professed followers of Christ, to suppress this growing evil? Let us commence anew to clip the thrifty branches. We are not to be discouraged if we do not succeed in slaying this enemy in one week, or one month. Let us be laying aside every weight, and perhaps we are already convinced that pride is the heaviest weight that we carry, and impedes our Christian race the most of any weight, the greatest part of trouble that people complain of. If we trace the stream to the fountain, we shall find it originates from pride. It was this evil that first produced contention between David and Saul. It was said, Saul has slain his thousands and David his tens of thousands. Saul thought there was not so much honor conferred on him as was on David.

Now to all the professed disciples of Christ, whom I love in the truth: If you desire peace of mind, and a good hope that dispels doubts and fears, crucify pride. If you desire to feel that sweet communion with Jesus that you enjoyed when you first espoused the cause of Christ, crucify pride; for what communion has light with darkness? Christ is light; pride is a trait of darkness. While that spirit is nourished, there is no sweet union with Jesus; a cold heart, weak faith, disregard for the Scriptures, is the fruit; family and closet prayer becomes a burden. By neglecting duty, the mind becomes unfruitful. Pride comes in, and says, You can't pray as well as you did once, you better not pray at all. The young convert has got more grace than you have. Here pride prevents mortals doing their duty. Pride displays itself in various ways; sometimes good gifts prove a snare. The enemy tells the child of God, You have spoken well, and prayed and preached the best. Now pride in this channel is more dangerous than the former, for it is a wound that is not so easily discovered, therefore, it is more dangerous. It is very evident that if the child of God grows proud of the gift that Heaven has bestowed, God will send leanness into the soul. The prayer of my heart is, that those that have a small gift may not be ashamed of it, and those that have a great one may not be proud of it. A great gift without great grace proves a stumbling-block to the world. They say such ones talk well, but they don't live well; they are as proud and love the world as well as I do.

If these lines should be read by those that love the world better than the cross, it will be an unpleasant message. I have written the feelings of my mind so plain, perhaps it may not be so well pleasing to some; however, I think all difficulty on this subject will vanish when the soul is filled with the good, humble spirit. My prayer to God is that some one with a deeper mind and better heart may be constrained by the Spirit of God to continue this subject. We need line upon line, and precept upon precept, on this subject. It cannot fail of hitting every one that reads or writes it. I consider that a subject that will reprove every class of people, high and low, rich and poor, ought to be often dwelt upon in order to show its heinous nature. Should one soul resolve to overcome the pride of life, I shall be amply compensated for my time. One thing I have learned in my short pilgrimage, that every one that feeds pride starves the soul, produces disappointments, discontent, anxiety, and tribulations of various kinds; and those that crucify pride, enjoy peace of mind, and a bright prospect of that rest that remains for the people of God. They can submit to the changing scenes of a checkered life with a cheerful resignation. This is the advantage we may derive in crucifying pride.—*Christian Palladium*.

God's commandments are not an arbitrary display of power. He prohibits nothing because he has the power to prohibit, but because the thing forbidden is destructive to our real happiness and best good.

WHEN the arrow of a saint's prayer is put into the bow of Christ's intercession, it pierceth the very heavens.

BROTHER, go fight for Jesus—haste;
No precious time hast' thou to waste,
For life is fleeting fast;
The battle must be fought and won,
Ere the day of life be done,
For night will come at last.

Self-Will.

It is not safe for us to always have our own way. If we do, we become obstinate and self-willed, and incapable of bearing contradiction. When we get into such a state, we are all well-nigh incurable. For what is really a very great vice, we then esteem a great virtue. Our self-will wears, in our own eyes, the guise of zeal for God. Submission to the judgment of others, as spiritual as ourselves, even where no principle is involved, and where the peace and welfare of a whole society may be at stake, looks to us like compromising; and so we dare not yield. To pause, because of the consequences that are almost certain to result from our rash actions, has, in our eyes, the appearance of distrusting God. No one is always right. The judgment of the very best is liable to be swayed by ignorance or prejudice. Here we know only in part. Our understanding is imperfect, and our knowledge limited. We should not, then, in matters where others are as much interested as ourselves, always insist upon having our way. We should learn to yield fully and gracefully. The divine rule is, submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God. This does not mean that everybody must submit to us. The submission is to be mutual. We, ourselves, must sometimes yield. The earth attracts the moon, but the moon at the same time attracts the earth just as much in proportion to its size. This is the cause of tides. So we must make toward others as well as require them to make toward us. The back-bone supports the body. It is not rigid and inflexible, but is full of joints. If it would not bend, it could not keep straight. A loss of flexibility produces deformity. A symmetrical Christian can keep straight alone and do his duty even when others do not concur in his opinion. Peter did not leave the church because the advice of James was followed.—*Earnest Christian*.

The First Sabbath.

THE dark wilds of chaos had given place to light and life, uncouth, and inorganic matter had assumed forms of beauty and glory, and man, the crowning glory of the new-risen world, had received the complacent benediction of his Heavenly Father, and with a companion, whose graces drew forth from his bosom the perfection of virtuous love, was placed in happy Eden; when a proclamation from God announced the Sabbath's dawn, and blessed the seventh day as one of holy rest. God himself then rested, for the energies of that power which had evolved the matter of the universe from nonentity and fashioned it to the forms which Infinite Wisdom had devised were now relieved. Omnipotence had rest, for the new creation was ended, and its beaming beauty showed with what perfection the work was finished.

Well might the Almighty bless and sanctify the day which witnessed so glorious a consummation, and well might the sacred Law-giver refer us to this Sabbath of the Lord to enforce the divine requirement expressed in the decalogue. For, to contemplate the scenes of that day, is sufficient to endear the Sabbath to every pious heart. It was a day when Infinite Power and holy created intelligences stood still to witness the harmonious operation of a new-created universe, when the sight of a world that had not been marred by sin drew forth effusions of adoration and praise from the heart of man and angels to its great Creator.

Yes, the calmness of that blissful morning was rendered heavenly by sweet-toned, celestial music, ushering in its dawn. Celestial voices to its burnished air whispered of peace and shouted songs of praise.

"The morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." Our first parents, in Eden's Elysian bowers, spent the day in sacred rest. Prayer had not yet been known, for want had not been begotten by transgression, yet a spirit of adoration filled their bosoms, and when the day was passed, it was their privilege to record one Sabbath which man had kept holy unto the Lord.—*The Garland*.

To be filled with the Spirit is to have all the resources of Heaven at our command.

The Review and Herald.

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

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, OCT. 29, 1872.

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

Departing and Being with Christ.

WHEN will all men come to agree respecting the state of the dead? When will the question whether the dead are alive, conscious, active and intelligent, or whether they rest in the grave in unconsciousness and inactivity, cease to be a vexed question? When shall it be decided whether the shout of triumph which the ransomed are to raise, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" is the celebration of a real victory, or only an unnecessary and useless transaction, as it must be if the grave holds not the real man, but only the shell, the mortal body, which is generally considered an incumbrance and a clog? Never will this question be decided till man shall be willing to follow the Scriptures, instead of trying to compel the Scriptures to follow them. Never, while they put the figurative for the literal, and the literal for the figurative, mistake sound for sense, and rest on the possible construction of an isolated text, instead of, and in opposition to, the general tenor of the teaching of the inspired writers.

Paul has told us often enough, and it would seem explicitly enough, when the Christian goes to be with his Lord. It is at the redemption of the body. Rom. 8:23. It is in the day of the Lord Jesus. 1 Cor. 5:5. It is at the last trump. 1 Cor. 15:51-55. It is when we are clothed upon with our house from Heaven. 2 Cor. 5:4. It is when Christ our life shall appear. Col. 3:4. It is when the Lord descends from Heaven with a shout, and the dead are raised. 1 Thess. 4:16, 17. It is at the coming of the Lord. 2 Thess. 2:1. It is to be at "that day," an expression by which Paul frequently designates the day of Christ's appearing. 2 Tim. 4:7, 8.

Yet Paul in one instance, without stopping to explain, uses the expression, "to depart and to be with Christ;" whereupon his words are seized by religious teachers as unanswerable evidence that at death the spirit enters at once into the presence of its Redeemer. The passage is found in Phil. 1:21-24, and reads as follows:—

"For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor: yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ; which is far better. Nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you."

Willing to go with our friends as far as we can in their interpretation of any passage, we raise no issue here on the word depart. Paul probably means by it the same as in 2 Tim. 4:6, where he says, "The time of my departure is at hand," referring to his approaching death. Then Paul, immediately on dying, was to be with Christ. Not so fast. The very point intended to be proved, has, in such a conclusion, to be assumed. Paul had in view two conditions: this present state, and the future state. Between these two he was in a strait. The cause of God on earth, the interests of the church, stirring to its very depths his large and sympathetic heart, drew him here; his own desires drew him to the future state of victory and rest. And so evenly balanced were the influences drawing him in either direction, that he hardly knew upon which course he would decide, were it left to him as a matter of choice. Nevertheless, he said that it was more needful for the church that he remain here, to give them still the benefit of his counsel and his labors.

The state or condition to which he looked forward was one which he greatly desired. About four years before he wrote these words to the Philippians, he had written to the Corinthians, telling them what he did desire, and what he did not desire, in reference to the future. Said he, "Not that we would be unclothed." 2 Cor. 5:4. By being unclothed, he meant the state of death, from the cessation of mortal life to the resurrection. This he did not desire; but he immediately adds what he did desire, namely, to be "clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life;" and when this is done, all

that is mortal of us is made immortal, the dead are raised, and the body is redeemed. Rom. 8:23; 1 Cor. 15:52, 53.

In writing to the Corinthians he thus stated that the object of his desire was to be clothed upon, and have mortality swallowed up of life; to the Philippians he stated that the object of his desire was to be with Christ. These expressions, then, mean the same thing. Therefore, in Phil. 1:23, Paul passes over the state of death, the unclothed state, just as he had done to the Corinthians; for he would not tell the Corinthians that he did not desire a certain state, and four years after write to the Philippians that he did desire it. Paul did not thus contradict himself.

But this intermediate state is the disputed territory in this controversy; the condition of the dead therein is the very point in question; and on this the text before us is entirely silent.

This is the vulnerable point in the popular argument on this text. It is assumed that the being with Christ takes place immediately on the departure. But, while the text asserts nothing of this kind, multitudes of other texts affirm that the point when we gain immortality and the presence of Christ, is a point in the future beyond the resurrection. And, unless some necessary connection can be shown between the departing and the being with Christ, and the hosts of texts which make our entrance into Christ's presence a future event can be harmonized therewith, any attempt to prove consciousness in death from this text is an utter failure.

Landis seems to feel the weakness of his side in this respect, and spends the strength of his argument, pp. 224-229, in trying to make the inference appear necessary that the being with Christ must be immediate on the departure. He would have us think it utterly absurd and nonsensical to suppose a moment to elapse between the two events.

Let us then see if there is anything in Paul's language which contradicts the idea that a period of utter unconsciousness, of greater or less length, intervenes between death and our entrance into the future life. In the first place, if the unconsciousness is absolute, as we suppose, the space passed over in the individual's experience is an utter blank. There is not the least perception, with such person, of the lapse of a moment of time. When consciousness returns, the line of thought is taken up at the very point where it ceased, without the consciousness of a moment's interruption. This fact is often proved by actual experience. Persons have been known to become utterly unconscious by a fracture of the skull, and a portion of it being depressed upon the brain, suspending its action. Perhaps when the accident happened they were in the act of issuing an order, or giving directions to those about them. They have lain unconscious for months, and then been relieved by a surgical operation; and when the brain began again to act, and consciousness returned, they have immediately spoken and completed the sentence they were in the act of uttering when they were struck down, months before. This shows that to these persons there was no consciousness of any time intervening, more than what passes between the words of a sentence which we are speaking. It was all the same to them as if they had at once completed the sentence they commenced to utter, instead of having weeks and months of unconsciousness thrown in between the words of which that sentence was composed.

So with the dead. They are not aware of the lapse of a moment of time between their death and the resurrection. A wink of the eye shuts out for an instant the sight of all objects, but it is so instantaneous that we do not perceive any interruption of the rays of vision. Six thousand years in the grave to a dead man is no more than a wink of the eye to the living. To them, consciousness, our only means of measuring time, is gone; and it will seem to them when they awake that absolutely none has elapsed. When Abel awakes from the dead, it will seem to him, until his attention is attracted by the new scenes of immortality to which he will be raised, that he is rising up from the murderous blows of Cain, under which he had seemingly just fallen. And to Stephen, who died beholding the exaltation of Christ in Heaven, it will be the same as if he had without a moment's interruption entered into his glorious presence. And when Paul himself shall be raised, it will seem to him that

the stroke of the executioner was his translation to glory.

Such being the indisputable evidence of facts upon this point, we ask how a person, understanding this matter, would speak of the future life, if he expected to obtain it in the kingdom of God? Would he speak of passing long ages in the grave before he reached it? He might if he designed to state, for any one's instruction, the actual facts in the case; but if he was speaking simply of his own experience, it would not be proper for him to mention the intervening time, because he would not be conscious of any such time, and it would not seem to him on awaking to life again that any such period had elapsed.

Accordingly Bishop Law lays down this general principle on this question:—

"The Scriptures, in speaking of the connection between our present and future being, do not take into the account our *intermediate state in death*; no more than we in describing the course of any man's actions, take into account the time *he sleeps*. Therefore, the Scriptures (to be consistent with themselves) *must affirm* an immediate connection between death and the Judgment. Heb. 9:27; 2 Cor. 5:6, 8."

John Crellius says:—

"Because the time between death and the resurrection is not to be reckoned, therefore the apostle might speak thus, though the soul has no sense of anything after death."

Dr. Priestly says:—

"The apostle, considering his own situation, would naturally connect the end of this life with the commencement of another and a better, as he would have no perception of any interval between them. That the apostle had no view short of the coming of Christ to Judgment, is evident from the phrase he makes use of, namely, *being with Christ*, which can only take place at his second coming. For Christ himself has said that he would come again, and that he would take his disciples to himself, which clearly implies that they were not to be with him before that time."

So in harmony with this reference to our Lord's teaching is the language used by Paul in 1 Thess. 4:16, 17, that we here refer to it again: "For the Lord himself shall descend from Heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

As Christ taught that the time when his people were to be with him again was at his second coming, so Paul here teaches. We call attention to the word, *so*, in the last sentence of the quotation. *So*, means in this way, in this manner, by this means. "*So*," in this manner, by this means, "shall we ever be with the Lord." When Paul, as he does here, describes without any limitations, the way and means by which we go to be with the Lord, he precludes every other means. He the same as says there is no other means by which we can be with the Lord, and if there is any other means of gaining this end, this language is not true. If we go to be with the Lord, by means of our immortal spirit when we die, we do not go to be with him by means of the visible coming of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, and the change of the living, and Paul's language is a stupendous falsehood. There is no possible way of avoiding this conclusion except by claiming that the descent of the Lord from Heaven, the great shout, the voice of the archangel, the sounding of the great trump of God, the resurrection of the dead, and the change of the living, all take place when a person dies—a position too absurd to be seriously refuted, and almost too ridiculous to be even stated.

Shall we then take the position that Paul taught the Philippians that a person went by his immortal spirit immediately at death to be with the Lord, when he had plainly told the Thessalonians that this was to be brought about in altogether a different manner, and by altogether different means? No one who would have venerated that holy apostle when alive, or who has any decent regard for his memory now that he is dead, will accuse him of so acting.

Why, then, does he say that he has a desire to depart, that is, to die? Because he well understood that his life of suffering, of toil, and trial here, was to terminate by death; and if the church could spare him, he would gladly have it come, not only to release him from his almost unbearable burdens, but because he knew further that all the intervening space between his death and the return of his Lord would

seem to him to be instantly annihilated, and the glories of the eternal world, through his resurrection from the dead, would instantly open upon his view.

It is objected again that Paul was very foolish to express such a desire if he was not to be with his Lord till the resurrection; for, in that case, he would be with him no sooner if he died than he would if he did not die. Those who make this objection, either cannot have fully considered this subject, or they utterly fail to comprehend it. They have no difficulty in seeing how Paul would be with Christ sooner by dying, provided his spirit, when he died, immediately entered into his presence; but they cannot see how it would be so when the time between his death and the coming of Christ is to him an utter blank, and then without the consciousness, on his part, that a single instance has elapsed, he is ushered into the presence of his Redeemer. Remember that Paul's consciousness was his only means of measuring time; and if he had died just as he wrote these words to the Philippians, it would have been to him an entrance into Christ's presence just as much sooner as what time elapsed between the penning of that sentence and the day of his death. None can fail to see this point, if they will consider it in the light of the fact we have here tried so fully to set forth, that the dead have no perceptions of passing time.

In the light of the foregoing reasoning, let us read and paraphrase this famous passage to the Philippians:—

"For to me to live is for the furtherance of the cause of Christ, and for me to die is still gain to that cause (because 'Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life or death,' verse 20). But if I live in the flesh, this, the furtherance of Christ's cause, is the fruit of my labor; but what course I should take were it left for me to decide, I know not; for I am in a strait betwixt two: I know that the church still needs my labors, but I have a desire to end my mortal pilgrimage, and be the next instant, so far as my experience goes (for the dead perceive no passing of time), in the presence of my Lord. Consulting my own feelings, this I should esteem far better; but I know that it is more needful for you that I abide still in a condition to labor on for your good in this mortal state."

Who can say, bearing in mind the language Paul frequently uses in his other epistles, that this is not a just paraphrase of his language here. The only objection against it is, that, so rendered, it does not support the conscious-state dogma. But it makes a harmony in all that Paul has taught on the subject; and is it not far more desirable to maintain the harmony of the sacred writings, than to try to make them defend a dogma which involves them in a fatal contradiction?

How to Visit.

VISITING from house to house, and talking with people privately, is an important part of every minister's duty. This cannot be neglected without neglecting the most effective part of his ministry, without losing his strongest hold upon the people. In the family, by the fireside, and in social conversation, is where the minister can get the nearest to the hearts of the people. Here he sees them as they are, and learns their peculiarities and their especial needs. He sees just where they are weak, and where they need help. On their part, the people learn to love their minister more, and have a stronger attachment for him through these social visits. Paul visited from house to house and taught the people.

Yet, like all other privileges, this may be terribly misused. I am inclined to think that our duty in this important item is more poorly done than in any other. How easy for us to go into a family and spend hours in idle chit-chat about the weather, the neighbors, and other idle conversation, which really amounts to nothing at all. Such time is worse than lost. It is not only not improved; but a bad example is set to the family. If the minister can spend his time so, if he can indulge in such conversation, so can they; and thus liberty is taken to sin.

The minister should direct and control the conversation. This he can do easily and without injuring anybody's feelings. Let him follow the example of Christ. How frequently we have it recorded of him, where some one asks him a simple question, relating to worldly affairs, where by his answer he turns the conversation directly upon sacred and religious things. He seized it as an opportunity to teach them some important lesson. That is the reason why people were ever listening to him. His conversation was always instructive. So it should be with us. We ought to be able to teach the peo-

ple, not only in the pulpit, but in all our private conversation. How much time is lost by neglecting this sacred duty. We should preach, not only while in the desk, but at all times, and everywhere we go. To do this, we must watch every opportunity to turn the conversation in the proper channel. Generally, the people are anxious to have us do this; indeed, they expect it, and are disappointed if we do not do it.

Of course this could be carried to extremes, so that the minister's call would be simply a nuisance. But we need not do that. Let us study the character and circumstances of the family or persons with whom we are visiting; and then always give such a turn to the conversation as will benefit them. God will hold us responsible if we do not; and we shall lose our best opportunity to do good. How unlike Christ for a minister to spend several hours, perhaps a day or two, with a family, without saying anything about religion till the last parting word. He waits till the team is hitched up, his overcoat on, his satchel in his hand, and then perhaps as he reaches out his hand to bid them good-bye, he offers them a few words of spiritual advice. Is that the way Christ did? May the Lord help us to think of these things and improve every opportunity, both in season and out of season, to help the people in saving their souls. D. M. CANRIGHT.

"A Very Little."

OF unhygienic food and condiments, I hear some say that they use a very little of these. Why not use more? Why not use them freely? Because convinced that they are hurtful. Then why not abandon them entirely? Because it is admitted it is not best to make the change in our manner of living too suddenly. How long have you been in making the change? From five to ten years. Is the quantity of these things which you use constantly growing less? No; it was reduced quite considerably for a time, with the view of leaving them entirely; but the caution came not to be in too great haste, and concluding it was not necessary, we slacked our speed, and perhaps we now use more of them than we did years ago. Very well. You have avoided the evil of leaving off too suddenly; but how long will it take to discontinue them, at this rate? Progressing a little, as you do, in the wrong direction, when will you reach the desired end? Will it ever be reached?

To leave off gradually, if I understand it rightly, still means to leave off. It is too much like nonsense to talk of leaving off gradually, while not intending to leave off at all. If a thing is good and wholesome, why talk of discontinuing the use. Keep on; and say nothing about using a very little. But if it is not good, and you therefore intend to leave it, make progress in that direction until the object is attained; and do not act as though you intended to use up a whole millennium, and more, in making the change. R. F. COTTRELL.

Sympathy.

NO QUALITY of mind is more to be admired than sympathy, if rightly applied; and none more to be detested than this, when misapplied.

If you see a person in a suffering condition, you may sympathize with him and relieve him, if consistent, but if inconsistent, you cannot honorably sympathize with his case, or relieve him. Thus the idler, or spendthrift, or drunkard, who, finally, ends his career in disgrace, may have your pity; but your sympathy you withhold. The murderer or thief, who lies awaiting his trial, you would be ashamed to assist with your sympathy, for you would thus be a partaker of his sins, and you would so be regarded. This being the case, in the common affairs of life, you must see that one must be chary of sympathy toward offenders, not only against civil law, but you must be careful lest you sympathize with offenders against moral law.

The man who leaves the preacher's stand to dally with harlots, or immodest women, is already beyond your sympathy; and if he would attempt to obtain it, you would disdain to comfort him.

When an offender against the laws of decency finds fault with the court which awards him his penalty, and at the same time admits his guilt, and then shifts his ground and protests his innocence, and attempts to get your sympathy on these grounds, he only increases his guilt. Or he who denies his guilt, then admits and voluntarily confesses his guilt, and afterward protests his innocence, so stultifies himself as to forfeit even your respect.

The principle of mercy must not be overstrained. We cannot sympathize with Satan in rebellion, nor can we go beyond reason in sympathy with offenders. To great sinners confessing their guilt, you may offer your sympathy; but when they shift their ground and plead innocence, you abandon their society.

Had the prodigal son so proceeded, he would never have won the heart of his father, nor would he have worn the best robe, nor have partaken of the feast prepared.

Let offenders beware of obtaining sympathizers, for in so doing, they not only greatly injure others, but they are in danger of rendering their own cases hopeless.

You have no doubt noticed that in the church

there are two classes of offenders, who, when dealt with, go away, one finding fault and endeavoring to get sympathy; the other leaving in sorrow and silence. The first of these classes seldom return to the fold, the last seldom fail to return. People, when they do wrong, often feel as if they were thought more guilty than they deserve. They do not consider that their offenses generally give cause for such conclusions; and if our cotemporaries infer more than is proved, we cannot be surprised.

Straight forward confessions are the only confessions the Bible indorses; and a mixing up of confession with protestations of innocence, so does violence to common sense that the common mind revolts at the thought. A denial of the crime we have repeatedly confessed, and which is proved against us, is an act so near idiocy or insanity that we only wish to think of something else as a relief to the pain we have within at so great an inconsistency.

A good conscience, preserved inviolate, is a priceless treasure not to be parted with. It is beyond price inestimable; and a mind capable of right decision on all the points which present themselves, in ecclesiastical affairs must have a good conscience as a basis of action, a conscience enlightened by the word of God and quickened by the influences of the Holy Spirit.

Never do we need divine discernment more than when we hear of offenses against the church, the manner of their execution and the discipline of the same, especially if the accused sets up a defense. But the course of parties accused and condemned on such occasions is of the greatest importance to themselves, as I have shown, and those who listen to the representations of the offending party are usually to blame for even giving an ear for one moment to the disaffected. Beware of false sympathy. This caused Satan's fall and brought death into the world, and all our woe. JOS. CLARKE.

Progress.

THIS is said to be an age of progress; but, which way?

"Dr. Manning, in an eloquent lecture on progress, declared that the church was progressing in extent, in external unity, in internal unity, of faith and in self-evidence; that the nations were departing from the principles which created their civilization in faith, unity, and morals; that civilization was becoming more and more material, though less moral; that modern civilization was, therefore, not progressing; that nations were not growing happier; that society was not more solid and safe, but the reverse; and that individuals were becoming more anarchical and stubborn."

How could we expect a great progress in morals when the mind feeds on fiction and neglects its real food. The general agent of the American Tract Society, who visited this coast some two years since, gave as the result of careful statistics, that, in the State of California, not over two persons out of every hundred ever attended church, while in the older States it was about seventeen to every hundred that attended church.

The last monthly report of the reading matter drawn from the Mercantile Library in San Francisco speaks for itself:—

"WHAT THEY READ.—If the books of the Mercantile Library for the past month may be taken as a criterion, our people read romances, scientific and religious books, etc., in about the following proportion: Total number of books taken out during the month of June, 6,957, of which 4,806 were romances; Juvenile books, 620; Travels, 256; Biography, 190; Belles Letters, 213; Science, 251; History, 158; Poetry, 106; Miscellaneous, 41; Religious, 45. Of books in foreign languages, 172 were in French, 69 in German, and 7 in Spanish."

But few religious books are kept for sale in the city. Having occasion to inquire for religious works for our church library in Santa Rosa a few weeks since, I visited two of the largest book stores in San Francisco, and was told in the onset that there was but very little demand for religious works, that they would order for me anything I found in their catalogues that I wished; that they found greater demand for romance and such like. In one store, Mr. Bancroft's, I was conducted to shelves in one corner where were about four bushels of books he called religious, which constituted his supply in his massive store. He said he would be glad to sell me anything I found there at one-third rates.

On examination, I found his religious works were religious! Spiritualism and Mormonism all classed religious. I thought, If the saying be true, that "supply and demand wait on each other;" there cannot be much demand for truly religious books in San Francisco, surely. The catalogue above of the Mercantile Library, a good criterion, too, shows that one hundred and six works on romance are read in San Francisco while one is read of a religious nature.

No wonder that divorcees in San Francisco average about twenty per month, and family broils abound, when minds are deceived into fictitious ideas of life by romance. How can there be true progression until the mind is stored with the real and substantial?

J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

Men and Things.

HEATHENS AT HOME.

THE following from the highest ecclesiastical authority, the Archbishop of Canterbury, England, reveals the terrible state of things in that so-called Christian land. He says that heathenism is rapidly encroaching upon Christianity, in the very place where it is supposed to be the strongest. While the church is making nominal Christians of a few of these simple heathens, heathenism is getting possession of many influential and leading minds in Christian lands. What will be the end of this? The *Christian Union* says:—

"Perhaps a more sudden, unexpected, and widespread sensation has never arisen than that caused by a short incidental speech recently made before a missionary society, by the Archbishop of Canterbury. It was not a labored effort, but an appeal for greater liberality and earnestness in the work of converting the heathen. Among other things, he said that it was not necessary now to go to foreign lands to find them and to know what they are, for they are in England in great numbers, of all classes, from the best to the worst. He pointed out those parts of London where they congregate for trade, and the schools of the Temple and Lincoln's Inn where they study law, and the ambassadors and visitors of high rank often seen in England. He expressed, also, fear of the influence of their philosophy upon English students, and suggested his apprehension that if they did not convert the heathen, the heathen would convert them. He adverted also to the fact that the philosophical and religious errors of the heathen are regarded with less repulsion and increasing tolerance, which he considered as a dangerous symptom."

MODERN CAMP-MEETINGS.

"The *Springfield Republican* says of camp-meetings, that they 'have become less occasions of religious revival and instruction, and more of social reunion and summer recreation in pleasant camps in the country. There is less of ostensible religion, less of accompanying vice, and more of comfort and pleasure.'"

What a manifest fulfillment this is of Paul's description of a fallen church in the last days. 2 Tim. 3:1-5: "Lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." Formerly, these camp-meetings were a mighty power, where the Holy Ghost was poured out, and sinners fell before its influence; but now they are simply occasions of social intercourse and pleasure-seeking. It shows where the religious world is drifting. May God save his true people from following this terrible example.

HOW TO SPEND MONEY.

The following article from the *Christian Union*, I here give for the benefit of stingy people, for those who are saving, keeping, and hoarding up all they have, and giving little or nothing for the cause of Christ. You, my brother, who are worth from two to four thousand dollars, and are in good circumstances generally, and yet are giving not more than twenty-five or thirty dollars a year for benevolent purposes, you are the man who ought to read this two or three times over, and then lay it to heart. If you do not change your course, you will soon be as poor as the poorest, you will have nothing in this world, nor the world to come. Wake up, reform, and bestir yourself while there is still opportunity:—

"An old friend of ours was bewailing, the other day, some pecuniary losses, when his wiser half interposed to remind him of certain expenditures he had made which might have been avoided. 'Nonsense,' he replied; 'what I spend is the only money I am sure of!' Though liable to abuse in its practical application, there is a profound philosophy in this thought. He that hoards his wealth, when losses come, is poor indeed; while he that expends it judiciously can never lose the fruits thereof that he has received into his own soul. But of consecrated expenditure this is doubly true. The man who spends his life in amassing wealth, is said, in common parlance, to 'die rich.' Nay, rather, he must die miserably poor. The liberal soul, as it passes away from all earthly possessions, may well exclaim, 'What I have given away is now all that I am sure of!' This, we apprehend, is the divine philosophy that resides in that golden saying of the wise man: 'There is that scattereth and yet increaseth, and that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty.'"

TO OUR PREACHERS.

Dear brethren, as I read the following words in the *Christian Union*, they struck me as being worthy of a very careful perusal by every one of us. I hope they may do me good; and I ask your prayerful attention to them. What is the fruit of our labors? What kind of Christians are we making? What kind of men and women does our preaching develop? What kind of characters are formed under our influence? Are they mere theorists, self-sufficient, cold debaters? or are they warm-hearted, self-denying, peaceable, God-fearing men—men who will glorify God, and be saved in his kingdom? Read the following words, and may the Spirit of God set them home to every heart:—

"The main question for every church to ask is: What are the results of our teachings and our labors in the characters of the men and women of our congregation and our neighborhood? How many are we reaching with our influence, and what are we doing for them? Are the people to whom our gospel goes, enriched by it in their affections, enlightened by it in their understandings, restrained by it from wrong, urged by it to righteousness? Is it proving itself the savor of life unto life unto many? Is the truth as we have learned it, as we preach it, as we talk it, as we live it, the power of God unto the salvation of men from selfishness, from lust, from low cunning, from wrath and uncharitableness? Are the men who sit in our pews, and pray in our prayer-meetings, and teach in our Sunday-schools, known everywhere as true, brave, honest men? Do they carry their religion into Broad street? Does it keep them from cheating in trade? Does it hold them back, in these hot days of political strife, from misjudging and slandering their opponents, and from retailing the lies of the campaign on the stump or in the newspapers? Do they leave the Golden Rule in a gilt frame upon the parlor wall at home, or do they take it with them into the world as the measure of all their conduct? Are they surrounded with an atmosphere of cheerfulness, and does the Spirit of Him who came bringing peace to earth, and good-will to men, shine from their faces and breathe like a sweet fragrance from their garments as they walk? What sort of a society is it which these Christians of ours, men and women, are building up? Is it a society in which simple tastes, generous aims, helpfulness and beneficence abound? Do the mean deceits and the shallow frivolities of the time flourish or decline among them?"

"Men and brethren! this is the main question. There are many ways of putting it, but it means only this: What is the effect of this religion of ours upon the men and women to whom it is preached? By their lives, the world judges our religion. If we are helping them to a better manhood and womanhood, we shall need no other arguments to prove its truth. If we are not, all the evidences of Christianity that have been written will make no impression upon the minds of doubters. Would it not be well for the brethren who have risen to various points of order to withdraw them for a little while, and let us all discuss the main question?"

D. M. CANRIGHT.

Reporting.

It is cheering to have frequent reports of an encouraging character from those engaged in publishing abroad the message; and if we do not get frequent reports from our ministers, we begin to wonder where they are and what they are doing. But it is very difficult to make a good report, where there is nothing of progress to report; and this naturally causes delay in reporting. But perhaps it is better to report the situation, though there be nothing encouraging to report.

I sympathized with Bro. Canright when he reported so discouragingly in regard to the interest, or rather want of interest, in his field of labor. And I am extremely glad to learn from more recent reports that there has been a change, and the prospect brightens. Perhaps the reports of his discouragements has had an influence in opening the way for his labors. If so, it was of use to report, though there was nothing cheering to report.

In my own case, I am anxious to engage in some new place to publish the truth. But there are no calls, except those that are at two great a distance to warrant me in getting out. Still I will try to find the place where God would have me; and am determined to do what is in my power to open the way. There are those to whom the truth will be acceptable, and, by the help of God, I am determined to find them. The cause that I know not, I will go in search of. I must have a part in this work.

R. F. COTTRELL.

The Greatest Joy of Life.

DR. CHALMERS said: "Unless I make religion my great and engrossing concern, I shall be a stranger to all peace and enjoyment. I have at times caught a glimpse of the comfort which it yields to the spirit, when I merge my will into God's will—when I resolve to have no will of my own separate from God. I feel quite assured that this renunciation of self, and entire devotion to God's service, would give a simplicity and grandeur to my existence—would throw an unclouded sunshine over all my ways—would raise me above the cares and provocations of life—would enhance even my sensible gratifications of a higher order, which constitute the main and essential blessings of Heaven. O my God, may it be thus with me! Call me out of nature's darkness into thine own marvelous light. Give me to aspire after the graces, and hold forth to my acquaintances, and, above all, to my children, the example of righteousness! Conform me to the gospel economy under which I sit, that as Christ died for my sin, I may die to it; that as he rose again, I may rise to a newness of life, and feel it is my meat and drink to do thy will."

"Strive to enter in at the straight gate."

WEARY OF EARTH.

I AM weary of this life of ceaseless toiling, By want and care oppressed; With aching brow, and tired, faltering footsteps I sigh for Heaven's sweet rest.

Progress of the Cause.

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

Report.

At present, I am preaching in Shelby Co., Iowa, about forty miles from Omaha. Here is a large Danish settlement in the town of Fairview. The majority of the people are Baptists. Two of their preachers live right here, and one of them has shown himself as a zealous opposer of the Advent faith since I first embraced it.

About nine years ago, he told his church in Wisconsin, when I came there preaching, that they must not go to my meetings. If they did, they would be excluded. But most of them went, nevertheless. They said they would not be under a pope, a church-meeting was called. He requested obedience, or he would leave. They voted, Leave. I listened to his farewell sermon. He left for Omaha. Afterwards, he became pastor of this church. He has shown no open opposition yet. But there is a deep prejudice in the minds of the people, and of course the leading men try hard to keep the people away. I tried one week in one school-house, but only a few would come; next week, in another school-house, with like result. Then I was invited to a third house. These school-houses are only two miles apart, and free for meetings. Here, the people turn out generally, and manifest good interest so far. This is the third week I am here. Sundays, we have had a congregation of about one hundred. I have hope that some souls may be gained by patient labor. The truth of God is very precious, under evil as well as good report. May it become a living reality to us. And may we, through daily union with Christ and patient continuance in well-doing, at last obtain immortality.

JOHN MATTESON.

Altamont, Shelby Co., Iowa, Oct. 14, 1872.

East Charleston, Vt.

We are still laboring to save souls here, and are glad to report some progress. Yesterday (Sabbath), was a good day to the cause in this place. Bro. Hutchins was with us in the absence of my brother to attend to important matters connected with the interests of the cause; and his testimony was appreciated. In the afternoon we had a good social meeting, at the close of which we called for an expression, to know how many desired to be Christians in the fullest sense of the term, and several arose, some of whom had never made a profession of religion. One was an old man aged eighty-four years. The scene was affecting. Several were in tears. But we realize that the work is only commenced, and that there is much to be done for those who have taken a stand on present truth.

Sunday, Sept. 29, Eld. Spencer, a Methodist preacher, opposed us on the Sabbath question. He was replied to after a short intermission. His positions were: 1. The seventh-day Sabbath is abolished. 2. There is no holy time. Yet with the next breath he quoted, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy." Question. How can we keep a day holy that is not already sanctified? 3. "I shall take a broad view of the subject. Every day is kept. If all agree to keep one day holy, they will be acceptable unto God." 4. The Sabbath has been changed by divine authority, and we should keep the first day. That is, God has changed the Sabbath and wants us to keep the first day; yet we are acceptable to him if we all agree to keep any day, whether the seventh day or the first. In other words, we can obey God or not, just as we please; or God is changeable, and we cannot obey him in one particular without disobeying him in another! He regretted very much that Eld. Smalley, a Free-will Baptist, who heard us on the Sabbath, said that we had the Bible argument favoring the seventh day. In the reply, we stated that we were glad for the frank admission of

Eld. Smalley, and that would to God every preacher was with us on this question, with the exception of the unpleasantness of meeting- opposition.

To-day (Sunday), we had an appointment out for Eld. Hutchins at 1 o'clock p. m., which interfered with no other appointment. Eld. Spencer spoke in the forenoon, and at the close of his discourse gave out a notice for another man to speak at the same hour. He soon saw he had gone too far; for most of the congregation were against his course, and many were leaving. He withdrew his appointment, stating that the man who had the greatest share in the meeting-house, and others, were dissatisfied, and that henceforth he would speak no more in the church. Eld. Hutchins spoke to a large audience on repentance and faith.

Last Sunday, Eld. Smalley pursued a wiser and more honorable course. He recommended our work, said he had cheerfully given way to us, because he knew his people were well entertained, and that the crowded house showed we were doing good. He spoke on the rest that remains for the people of God, and we followed on seeking the Lord. And in the evening he passed over his social meeting into our hands, stating that as we had been laboring here, we knew best where the people stood; and he was cheered to hear testimonies from some who had never served the Lord. May God bless this man and guide him and others into all truth.

We have labored very hard, having visited nearly every day for six weeks. But Providence is favoring us. We see the hand of God in the work. Praise the Lord. D. T. BOURDEAU.

Iowa.

ACCORDING to previous appointment, we met in quarterly meeting with the brethren and sisters of District No. 5, at Knoxville, August 31 and September 1. There was a representation from all the churches in the District, except State Center. We had a good degree of freedom in talking the truth; still there did not seem to be as much of the deep, melting influence of the Spirit of God in the meeting as we would have been glad to see. We were here forcibly impressed with the thought that, with many of our old churches where much light has been given, there is not that life and animation in the meetings that there is with those who have newly embraced the truth. The only reason we can assign for this, is, that many of the members of these churches are failing to come up to the advancing light on present truth; especially the truths embraced in the great health question; and in this condition, they have merely a name to live, while they are backslidden from God at heart. Thus they prove a clog instead of a help to those who would go forward. The Lord help all such to realize their condition before it is forever too late.

There was one very interesting feature, however, in the meeting, which we take pleasure in mentioning: It was the presence and very encouraging testimony of Bro. Luke, who has been in rather a backslidden state for a number of years. Since our last camp-meeting, the work of reform seems to have commenced with him in good earnest. He was offered a license to publicly present the truth, at our last Conference. This he refused at that time, stating that he had a work to do at home first, which he meant to enter upon immediately. In this he states that he has met with good success. He has now received a license to improve his gift in publicly presenting the truth as the way may open. May he have the prayers of the friends of truth.

September 7 and 8, at Adel. Here we were much disappointed by not meeting any of our friends from Winterset and Peru. Perhaps these brethren and sisters did not fully understand the relation they sustain to the Adel church, by being associated with them in quarterly meeting, and consequently did not make that effort they should have done. They will doubtless do better another time.

The little band at Adel are united, and we had truly a precious season with them. We were forcibly impressed with the fact that where there is union there is strength. At a communion season near the close of the Sabbath, where only about a dozen assembled at the house of Bro. Toney's, the blessing of God was manifested to such a degree that convinced us that he was willing to let his blessing come upon even a few, when they are walking in the humble path of obedience.

Sept. 14 and 15, with the church at Oceola. Here we met brethren and sisters from Peru, Afton, Decatur City, Woodburn, and Knoxville. To meet with many of these old friends, together with the young and interesting church of Oceola, was truly gratifying and very encouraging. Our meetings here were all characterized with freedom and a good degree of the deep moving of the Spirit of God; and as we contrasted the state of things in Oceola, with that of a year ago,

we were led to praise the name of the Lord. Truly the Lord has greatly blessed the labors of Brn. Canright and Butler at Oceola. One soul followed her Lord in the ordinance of baptism. We left these new friends feeling that our meeting with them was one long to be remembered. They would much appreciate a visit from Bro. Canright.

Sept. 21 and 22, at Sigourney. Here we met a good delegation of brethren and sisters from Brighton, Washington, and Pilot Grove. The Sigourney church was much encouraged to have these old tried friends meet with them. Here, too, we felt very much at home with many of our old friends, that we had met with so many times. Our testimony, though very plain and pointed, was well received, and there was a general taking hold on the part of nearly all present. We had truly one of the very best meetings we ever enjoyed.

The church at Sigourney, though not large, are building a meeting-house 28x42, at a cost not far from \$2000. They will probably have it completed in five or six weeks. Then they are expecting a visit from Bro. Canright to dedicate it.

Sept. 28 and 29, at Brighton. Here we were happy to meet Bro. McCoy and a few others from Sigourney, and a few from Washington; but there was no delegation from Mt. Pleasant, nor Richland, which we very much hoped to see. There seemed to be a general impression with those present, that these friends were intending to come Sabbath morning as they had done so frequently before, but Sabbath morning proved to be so rainy that it was impracticable to turn out to go that distance. Friday was a pleasant day, and would it not be far better for brethren that have from ten to twenty miles to go to meeting, to take part, or even all day Friday, if it is necessary, and be on hand to commence with the beginning of the meeting? These meetings only come once in three months, and it will not be your turn to go every time; for the meeting will be at your place some of these times. If you should take Friday to go to the place of meeting, it would not be a very great sacrifice of time. Then you would be there to begin with the meeting, and you will enjoy the meetings enough better to pay you well for your time. Please try it next time. Is it not also rather doubtful whether it can be harmonized with good Sabbath-keeping, while using so much of the day in traveling, even if it is going to meeting; especially if it is making a journey that could and should be done on another day.

Our meeting at Brighton, though not so good as our other meetings, we hope and feel was not an entire failure. We believe there will great good result from it, the fruit of which may be seen hereafter. We organized a Tract and Missionary Society at each of these meetings. The hurrying part of the season will now soon be over; then we hope the members of the Society will find more time to labor as missionaries, and thus carry out the design and object of the Society. We hope the officers especially will be prompt to duty. Let this be our motto, that whatever is worth doing at all is worth doing promptly and well. If each one will take hold, and faithfully discharge the duties allotted to him in the name of the Lord, success is bound to attend this branch of the work. HENRY NICOLA, J. T. MITCHEL.

Minnesota.

I LEFT Michigan the 4th of last June to spend the summer with the tent in this State. Reached High Forest, Olmstead Co., where Bro. Canright was laboring, the 9th. Found Bro. C. in poor health, on account of excessive labor and having taken cold. He expected me to assist in preaching, which I felt unprepared to do; and informed him that I came intending to act merely as tent-master. This had a tendency to somewhat depress his spirits, yet he labored on with an energy and zeal, such as those only that truly love God and his cause will manifest.

The results of his labor he has reported through the REVIEW. I will however notice one thing. A brother from Iowa expresses himself as not being sorry that some of Bro. C.'s labors have not been very successful the past summer. I supposed that the cause was one, and all felt an equal interest for its advancement, in all parts of the field. If presenting the truth in a clear and convincing manner, and sincere devotion to the cause, is not acceptable to the Lord, and calculated to build up the work, I know not what is. This I have seen exhibited by Bro. C., greatly, I trust, to my profit.

At Albert Lea, where we pitched the tent after leaving High Forest, the population was more than one half of them foreigners; being Norwegians, Danes, Germans, &c. The American element, with the exception of a small church of Presbyterians, was Universalists, infidels, and spiritualists.

At Glencoe, the state of things was even worse. But the gospel was to be preached

for a witness unto all nations, not to convert them all.

At Hutchinson, the scale was turned. Like the noble Bereans, they commenced searching the Scriptures, and a large company are now rejoicing in the truth. This greatly revived and cheered us.

By the advice of Bro. Canright, I decided to give a course of lectures after leaving the tent, before I returned to Michigan. Commenced meetings in company with Bro. George Dimmick, four miles west of Lake Crystal, Blue Earth Co., Friday evening, Oct. 4, in a commodious brick school-house. The interest has increased from the first, so that nearly every evening, and on Sunday, the house has been crowded.

The Methodist minister has been doing what he could to keep the people away, by slurs and insinuations. Having shown the perpetuity of the law and Sabbath, we announced that we would show by what authority the Sabbath was changed. Their minister was present. I had good freedom in presenting the subject. After meeting, he found considerable fault because I quoted from history and Catholic catechisms. I asked him how we could tell whether the prophecies that reached this side of the time the Bible was written, were fulfilled or not, without referring to history. I then asked him to take my Bible and show the people one text that supported first-day keeping; but he would not touch it.

Bro. Dimmick in the evening showed clearly the restoration of the Sabbath under the third angel's message. Night before last, we called for an expression, when ten voted to keep the Sabbath and walk in the truth. Several more are convinced who we hope will soon take hold. I expect to start for Michigan next week, but Bro. Dimmick will stay here and follow up the work. I trust the blessing of the Lord will attend him. It is with reluctance that I leave. We are sure that the Lord has blessed our efforts here. I have enjoyed freedom and peace of mind, and am glad that I came to this State to spend the summer. My coming was first suggested by our beloved brother, Eld. James White, who has for several years manifested a deep interest in my welfare. I hope I shall prove worthy of his confidence. I think there are many others who have equal reason for gratitude for the interest he has shown in their behalf. I intend as soon as circumstances will admit, to go out and do what I can in spreading the glorious truth, to which end, I ask the prayers of God's people.

CHAS. A. RUSSELL.

Lake Crystal, Blue Earth Co., Minn., Oct. 17, 1872.

Michigan.

SEPT. 23, left home for Holly, to join Bro. Weeks in the town of Rose. Found him laboring under favorable circumstances, with a good interest to hear. The Sabbath question was being thoroughly canvassed when I left there, and the result could not then be told.

Oct. 4, I left Rose for my appointment at Alaiedon. Here I found quite a discouraging state of things. I gave nine discourses, and had three social meetings. Bro. Jones failed to meet me there as appointed, on account of special business at home. This church was thrown into a distracted state and very much soured by some who had come there with a burden upon the subject of health reform who themselves were poor representatives of health reform. This matter, appearing as it did, fermented, and set them one against another, and the Spirit of God had almost left them. Some seem to think that common sense cannot mingle with the Spirit of God. But it seems to me like a great mistake. I sincerely hope that untried spirits will not think more highly of themselves than they ought to think, but to think soberly.

When it began to be seen that I had not come among them with clubs, the coldness began to yield, and the Spirit of the Lord began to return.

The last Sabbath and first-day was a good time. Quite a number came from Genoa, Locke, and Leslie, which added much to the interest of the meeting. The Spirit of the Lord met confessions, and sympathizing tears and love and union prevailed. If that church carry out their resolutions, they will see better days. May they continue in the love of God and in union with all the work of God in gathering up all the rays of light which will shine more and more until the perfect day shall come.

I am now at home for a few days preparing for winter, then I shall be free to go and do as Providence may direct.

H. S. GURNEY.

HE who sedulously attends, pointedly asks, calmly speaks, coolly answers, and ceases when he has no more to say, is in possession of some of the best requisites of man.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT:

Or the Sunday, The Sabbath, The Change,
and The Restitution.

No. 2.

TURNING from the secular phase of this subject, let us regard it for a moment from the religious standpoint.

Is there anything in the purpose itself which is worthy of the cost at which alone it can be realized? In other words, since the object aimed at is ostensibly that of bringing the nation up to the point of a general regard for the first day of the week as a Sabbath, would such a result be one which should be profoundly desired?

We reply, that this will depend altogether upon circumstances. In this case, as in the first, mere cessation from labor on that day, which is not prompted by a regard for the will and approval of Jehovah, could afford no relief to a nation which is seeking to avert divine displeasure, since there is no element in the act itself calculated to recommend it to the favor of Heaven. To illustrate: The individual sentenced to solitary confinement in the State's Prison is precluded from the possibility of laboring on the Sunday; will any one therefore argue that there is any merit in his inaction on that day? Again: the heathen nations, in common with the majority of the Christian world, have many of them regarded the Sunday as a sacred day; should we presume, therefore, that they are looked upon by the Almighty more complacently on this account? You answer, No; and urge, as a reason for this reply, that they have been engaged in a false worship, and have not been actuated by any regard for the true God. Where, then, is the line? Manifestly right here; the men who honor God by the keeping of any day, must be prompted by the conviction that they are doing it in strict and cheerful obedience to a divine command.

Here, then, is the crucible in which we will try the metal of this modern movement. If, when their grand design shall be accomplished—as the result of many labors and toils—and even though before their purpose is attained, it shall be found necessary for them to reach their object through a conflict intensely bitter and impassioned on the part of the opposition—we shall witness the spectacle of a nation bowing submissively to the law and will of God in the humble and fervent observance of a weekly rest of *divine appointment*, it will be the grandest triumph which history has recorded. No treasure of gold—we were about to say no sacrifice of life—would be too great a price to pay for so glorious a victory. Let it be understood, however, that this must be a voluntary and intelligent worship on the part, at least, of the great mass of the people.

But will this be true, should our friends compass the great object of their ambition? Let us inquire once more after their intentions. What is it they advocate? The answer is, A universal regard for the first day of the week, as the Sabbath of the Lord.

But what is the authority upon which the majority of them rest their argument for the proposed observance? Is it merely pecuniary advantage? No, say they, it is out of a sincere regard for the God of Heaven, and a conscientious desire to fulfill his law. But this implies religious duty. So far, so good. It also clearly sets forth the fact that God has a law, and a Sabbath which it enforces. The appeal, therefore, must inevitably be to that law, as the proper instrument from which to instruct the people.

To that they must be brought again and again. Its import must be patiently taught, its sacredness must be thoroughly inculcated. Let them but be satisfied by *sound logic* that the divine statute is explicit in its demands for a strict observance of the first day of the week, let them be thoroughly educated into the idea that they are under its jurisdiction, and let them be instructed that this whole movement proceeds upon this religious conviction, and you have laid a foundation which will uphold a structure of imposing dimensions and enduring character, the corner-stone whereof is the fear of God, and an acknowledgment of his presence in the affairs of men. But how is it in the case in question? Is the commandment of a nature such as to support, in every particular, the tenets presented by the reform under consideration? This is really the vital point. Let it speak for itself. It is the fourth of the decalogue

which is urged. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." If this is not a Sabbath law, then there is none in existence. For, *mark* it, this is the only instance in all the Scriptures in which it will be claimed by any one that we have a positive command for the observance of the Sabbath. So far, therefore, as the first day of the week is concerned, its friends have this advantage, that, if they but succeed in resting it upon this commandment, their labor is ended; for it—*i. e.*, the commandment—has no rival. All that is needed, consequently, is a clear, pointed exegesis, showing that the day in question is the one the observance of which the divine Law-giver has required. But unfortunately such an exegesis would be beset with difficulties. To begin with, who shall be able to harmonize the declaration which the commandment contains in these words, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work," with the utterance of those who, on the contrary, say that the *first day* is the Sabbath of the Lord, and must be observed as such. The divine Law-giver—as if determined that there shall be no room for debate in regard to the day which he had in his mind—has identified it in a manner such as to leave no room for dispute. In the first place, he announces his willingness that six days of the week should be devoted to secular employment, "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work:" then follows the disjunctive, "but—the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." Here it is made plain that it is the "Sabbath of the Lord" upon which we are to rest. Again; passing over the intermediate space, we come to the close of the commandment, in which he sets forth three important transactions by which that was constituted the Sabbath, and by which it may ever be recognized. He says, "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." That is, the day which we are to keep as the Sabbath of the Lord is the one upon which he rested, which he blessed, and which he hallowed. Therefore, before the first day of the week can, with any show of reason, be kept in fulfillment of this commandment, *i. e.*, before it came to be regarded as the "Sabbath of the Lord," it must be shown that, at some time God has rested upon it, blessed, and hallowed it. But this would be a difficult task; for not only are the Scriptures silent, so far as the affirmation of this fact is concerned with reference to the first day of the week, but, on the contrary, they positively declare that it was the very day upon which Jehovah entered upon the stupendous undertaking of making a world. Should additional evidence be required on this point, *i. e.*, that the last day of the week, and not the first, is the one which Jehovah intended to sanctify—we have but to cite the intelligent reader to the fact that Moses, the prophets, the Lord himself, the holy women after his death, and the whole Jewish nation—in whose language the decalogue was given—are, and have been, unanimous in placing this construction upon the Sabbatic law.

Should any, however, perceiving the dilemma into which they are thrown by the effort to enforce their view in the use of the law, as it was originally given—seek relief in the position that it was so far amended in the days of Christ as to admit of the substitution of the day of his resurrection for that of God's rest at the end of Creation week, we reply: If such a fact can be clearly made out, it would certainly furnish the very help which is needed just at this juncture, and without which confusion must inevitably characterize the movements of those who feel the necessity of a Sabbatic law for the keeping of Sunday.

Let us therefore carefully investigate this most important point. Is it true that the Son of God did so change the phraseology of the commandment of the Father, that from his time forward its utterances have not only justified the secularizing of the last, but have also enforced, by the penalty

of eternal death, a strictly religious regard for the first day of the week, on the part of both the Jewish and the Gentile world? Now this, if accomplished, was no trifling affair, and could not have been done in a corner; since it involved the guilt or innocence, the life or death, of countless millions of men and women, whose condemnation in the day of Judgment for the violation of Sunday sanctity would turn, of necessity, upon the words of one who both had the power to change, and had brought the knowledge of that change clearly before them. Certain it is, therefore,—since God does not first judge, and legislate afterward—all the light which is necessary for the proper elucidation of this subject is now to be found in his written word. To this, then, we turn; and with a profound conviction that the language of Christ was true in its largest sense, "If any man will do his will he shall know of the doctrine,"—we inquire, Where is it stated, *in so many words*, that God made the amendment in question?

Should the response be returned—as it certainly must be—that such a statement is not to be found within the lids of the Bible, we answer that this is a concession which, most assuredly, will greatly embarrass our friends in the proposed reform. Sagacious men will not be slow in discovering its bearing upon the subject, and it will be very difficult to explain such an omission to the satisfaction of cautious and reflecting minds. Should it be suggested, however, that—notwithstanding the fact the change has not been set forth in so many words—it has nevertheless occurred, and is therefore binding, we answer: Although the transaction upon the face of it, to say the least, would be a singular one, if an alteration has really been made, the next thing to be ascertained is its precise nature. We have already seen that the first law was very explicit in its statements, and all are conversant with the fact that to it was given the greatest publicity, and that it was uttered by the voice, and written by the finger of God, under the most imposing circumstances. Now if Christ—whose power to do so we shall not question here—has really undertaken the task of adding to, or taking from, this most sacred precept, will some one furnish us with an *authentic copy* of the statute, as amended? Now this is a reasonable and just request. To declare simply that a change has occurred, without making known precisely what that change is, is but to bewilder and confuse. Conscious of this fact, the State is always extremely careful to give to its citizens—in the most public manner—every variation which is made in its enactments, lest the loyal man should be incapable of proving his fidelity by obedience, or the disloyal justify his violation upon the plea of necessary ignorance. Shall man be more just than his Maker? Shall Christ—who in every other respect, has in matters of duty furnished us with line upon line, and precept upon precept—be found at last, upon this most important point to have been unmindful of the highest interests of his followers? Most assuredly not. He that never slumbereth nor sleepeth, He that knoweth the end from the beginning, He who hath said, "Where there is no law there is no transgression," has certainly never required his people to occupy a position in the face of their enemies so extremely embarrassing as that in which they would be compelled to ignore the plainest dictates of reason and Scripture, by seeking to condemn in the world a practice which is not necessarily immoral in itself, and against which there is no explicit denunciation of the Bible. Who then, we inquire again, will furnish us from the sacred page the precept so remodelled as to meet the exigences of this case? Is it *larger* or more *condensed* than before? Does the first clause read, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy?" If so, it is well. Is the second in order expressed in these words, "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work?" This, again, is good. But how is it with the third, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work?" Here, unquestionably, the change must begin. Who among us therefore can produce the divine warrant for a reading of this passage which shall make it harmonize with the keeping of Sunday? Who dare declare, upon his veracity, that he has ever discovered in the sacred word an instance in which it has been so re-written as to read, "But the *first day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work."

Furthermore, passing over the instructions in regard to sons, daughters, servants, the stranger, etc., what has the pen of the divine remodeller done with the *reason* of the commandment as found in the words, "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?" Has that been stricken out altogether? Or, is there a glaring inconsistency in the remodelled statute, by which it is made to state that the *first day* of the week, instead of the *seventh*, is now the Sabbath of the Lord our God, because of the fact that in the creation of the world, God rested upon, blessed and hallowed, the latter? These are weighty questions. Upon them virtually turns the issue of an amended law. For, to amend, is so to change or alter as to vary the duty of a subject; and if no one is capable of informing definitely and particularly in regard to the precise variations of the phraseology, then of course no one is able to decide just how far our course of action should deviate from what it has been hitherto, in order to meet the demands of the divine will as now expressed, in a rule which has never been seen, and which no hand would venture to trace with any claim to exactitude. Who, then, we inquire again, is sufficient for this task? Not one among the millions of Protestants who are so earnestly clamoring for the sanctity of the day in question, will seriously lay claim to the ability to perform that which would at once elevate him to a position—in view of the relief which it would bring to thousands of troubled minds—more exalted than that of any saint or martyr who has ever lived.

Nor is this all; behind all this pretentious claim for an amended law, are very many indications of a widespread conviction—though undefined and hardly recognized by the individuals themselves—that the fact upon which they place so much stress is, after all, one in regard to which there are serious doubts in their own minds. As an illustration of this, we have but to call attention to two things. First, on each Lord's day, so called, thousands of congregations—after devoutly listening to the reading of the fourth commandment of the decalogue—word for word, syllable for syllable, letter for letter, precisely as it was written upon the table of stone by the finger of God—are in the habit of responding with solemn cadence to the utterances of the preacher, "O Lord, incline our hearts to keep this law." Now this prayer means something, or nothing. It is either an expression of desire, on the part of those employing it, for grace to enable them rightly to observe the commandment as it reads—seventh day and all—or else it is a solemn mockery, which must inevitably provoke the wrath of Heaven. These people, therefore, judging from the most charitable standpoint, are witnesses—unconscious though they may be of the fact—of a generally pervading opinion that the verbiage of the fourth commandment has not been changed, and that it is as a whole as binding as ever. Second, nor is it simply true that those only who have a liturgy, have committed themselves to this idea. It is astonishing to what extent it has crept into creeds, confessions of faith, church disciplines, and documents of a like nature. But among the most striking of all evidences of its universality, when properly understood, is the practice of nearly all religious denominations of printing, for general distribution among the Sunday-school scholars, verbatim copies of the decalogue, as given in the 20th chapter of Exodus. Yet this practice would be a pernicious one, and worthy of the most severe censure, as calculated to lead astray and deceive the minds of the young, if it were really true that this code, in at least one very important particular, failed to meet the facts in the case, as it regards present duty.

In view of these considerations, a change of the base of operations becomes indispensable. A commandment, altered in its expressions so as to vary its import, and yet no one acquainted with the exact terms in which it is at present couched—and all, in reality, being so skeptical upon the point that even its most ardent advocates reason as if it had never occurred—would certainly furnish a foundation altogether insufficient for the mighty superstructure of a great reform, which proposes, ere the accomplishment of its mission, to revolutionize the State.—W. H. L., in *Christian Statesman*.

(To be Continued.)

The Review and Herald.

Battle Creek, Mich., Third-day, Oct. 29, 1872.

Advance Pay System.

THE Trustees of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association determined to bring about the strict pay-in-advance system on the REVIEW AND HERALD, the Health Reformer, and the Youth's Instructor, at the commencement of new volumes at the first of January, 1873. Timely notice is hereby given to all delinquents to pay up.

The only proper and just course to take in this matter is to pay up, and save the Tract and Missionary Societies in the several States, the trouble of collecting these dues. The sum of two dollars, or less, in United States currency, properly enveloped, in any one letter, and addressed, REVIEW AND HERALD, Battle Creek, Mich., may be forwarded at the risk of the Association. If larger sums in currency be sent in any one letter, it must be at the risk of the sender.

Those who cannot conveniently obtain Drafts or Money Orders, can forward currency, not exceeding two dollars, in a letter, and when they see that receipted, if they are still in arrears they can forward another, and still another, until they have paid one year in advance on the REVIEW, Reformer, and Instructor. Should any of these small sums be lost, the amount will be credited to the sender, the same as if received. We give definite explanations, and make the terms easy, and shall expect all to pay up immediately.

Tract and Missionary Societies are hereby notified that it is expected of them to see that all these accounts are settled as soon as possible. Special directions how to proceed in the case of delinquents, can be obtained by letter from the REVIEW AND HERALD Office. Send immediately.

JAMES WHITE, Pres. S. D. A. P. A.

To the Churches

OF THE N. Y. AND PA. CONFERENCE.

DEAR BRETHREN:—You doubtless remember that at our last Conference it was resolved that we have a more thorough system established in our financial affairs, and especially in regard to Systematic Benevolence. Now, in order to bring this about, it will be necessary for each person to pay his pledge for this quarter, on or before the first of November next, to the treasurer of the church of which he is a member, then it will be the duty of the treasurer to forward the whole amount (in a draft) to E. S. Lane, Locke, Cayuga Co., N. Y., and send a report of the same to Eld. S. B. Whitney, Keene, Essex Co., N. Y. The necessity of prompt action in this will be apparent when you understand that we do not design to give ministers orders on church treasurers as in some instances heretofore, but directly on the conference treasurer. If this plan is carried out (and we hope it will be) it will place the means of the conference where it will be available at any time, save trouble in making out reports, and what is not least, avoid very much labor and care at the time of the Conference.

Brethren, let us be faithful in these things as dealing with God. CONF. COMMITTEE. Kirksville, Oct. 24, 1872.

A Short Appeal

TO THE BRETHREN IN MINNESOTA.

DEAR BRETHREN:—God has smiled upon us, and given a bountiful harvest to Minnesota of which few other States can boast.

And now, brethren, what are we going to do with this blessing? Are we selfishly going to heap the avails into our own bosoms? Have we houses and barns to build? Do we need things more convenient? Are there so many necessities that we hardly know which way to turn first? Must many debts be paid? All this is true more or less with all, no doubt. But I wish to say in regard to buildings, There is a building above, "a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens," and it is so arranged that man can have a building there, and we do not want to build too much here. As to things convenient, what is more convenient than to know that one has a title to the eternal inheritance. And please tell me what is, or will be, more necessary than a covering in the day of God's wrath? And what debt is to be compared with the debt we owe for the price that was paid for us, even the price of the blood of God's dear Son? and not only this, but the vows we vow to God.

Now, dear brethren, look about you, and in your decisions of this subject do not be selfish. I would not use this term were it not a fact that the human heart is deceitful above all things, and very selfish. It is not that the cause of God is languishing for means that we urge upon you the necessity of doing something, for the Lord will not forget the needs of those who labor for him; but we "desire fruit that may abound to your account." We cannot expect to share in the eternal riches unless we are faithful in what is here committed to our trust, and the more we can transfer to the bank of Heaven the better.

Now there is considerable labor bestowed in Minnesota this season. Bro. Cartright is laboring with all his might. Bro. Grant is doing no less. There are Bro. Russell and Eld. Long, who have helped us. Bro. John Matteson has done a good work among his

people. And now have we not a thank-offering to present? At least, have we not made up our minds to pay up our Systematic Benevolence? There is about one thousand dollars due the Conference from the different churches in this Conference. Now it is the small sums that make up this larger one. And we do most earnestly hope, and we would urge and beseech you, dear brethren, to pay your vows unto the Lord.

Now, we do not expect that God's cause will suffer if you do not pay one cent of this sum. But you will certainly suffer a very great loss, both here and in the world to come. For as the word of the Lord is sure, so sure his curse will follow those who profess to follow in this Heaven-ordained plan, and yet fail of coming up to the work. Now, shall next Conference find us with a clean record? It is possible. Or shall this terrible blot stand, with all its discouraging influence, upon your Conference records? One quarter of the year is passed and the debt is increasing. Three-quarters are yet in the future, during which time we may clear the account. Shall it be done?

It is but justice to our brethren of the Danish church to say that they never fail of keeping a clear account. Let us imitate their example in this respect, and try, by working, to get nearer to the Lord.

H. F. PHELPS.

Iine Island, Minn.

News and Miscellany.

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

Facts for the Times.

THE following from the Advocate of Christian Holiness on wearing earrings is certainly appropriate at this time, when there seems to be so many disregarding the instructions of Paul: "In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with broided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array." 1 Tim. 2:9.

C. H. BLISS.

EARRINGS.

"It has been a custom in all ages for stock-growers to put the mark of their ownership on the ears of their animals; and the Beast, Satan, very early in the history of the world, soon after Eve was driven out of Eden, managed to put his mark on the ears of woman.

"We read that when Jacob went up with his household to Bethel, to build an altar unto God, that, at his command, 'they gave unto Jacob all the strange gods which were in their hands, and all the earrings which were in their ears, and Jacob hid them under the oak which was by Shechem.'

"The controversy thus successfully inaugurated by Jacob, 616 years after the flood, against this Satanic and barbarous custom, has been kept up till the present day. But Satan still holds women by the ears; and the more degraded and besotted a nation or a tribe, the heavier the badges of his power in the ears of their women.

"This relic of barbarism has come down to us, and many of our women bear the marks of the beast, and display the badges of his ownership; and their ears, the perfect and beautiful creation of the divine hand, are pierced, and mangled, and dragged out of shape, and despoiled of their beauty.

"But, say some, 'I have weak eyes, and my physician advised me to have my ears pierced.' Looking around us, we might suppose that we had a nation of weak-eyed women; for most of the ladies we have spoken to on the subject claim to have weak eyes. Better get a box of eye-salve; for this remedy is a humbug, unless the ears are kept sore and discharging; and we observe that most ladies heal them as soon as possible; and, indeed, it would be a pitiable sight to see one-half or two-thirds of our women going about with sore ears.

"But the fact is, young girls want to look womanly, and old women want to look girlish; and women with round faces want them to look long; and peaked-faced women want them to look broad; and many women want to look beautiful; and, like the women of heathen lands, who color their teeth, and paint their eyelids, and tattoo their faces, and imagine they look beautiful, our women think that they are adding to their personal beauty, when, in truth, they are only making themselves ridiculous in the eyes of men and angels. Away with this relic of barbarism."

A Wonder.

"I WILL show wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke." Joel 2:30.

The above scripture was brought forcibly to my mind while recently reading in a secular paper the following account of a strange phenomenon, and while, perhaps, none will be able to account for the wonder on any known law of nature, a few will attach to it significance, as a sign of the "day of the Lord."

I copy the article in question from the Owego (N. Y.) Times: A. SMITH.

"A PHENOMENON.

"The Albany Times has the following account of what it justly calls a phenomenon: 'It was seen on Wednesday [Aug. 28], about six miles from Albany, beyond the old McKown woods. During the storm which prevailed, a cloud, funnel-shaped, descended from the heavens, extending apparently from the clouds to the ground. The tail was near the ground, and within this peculiar shaped mass, smoke and fire were seen to prevail to a degree which caused general alarm among the residents in that locality, being impressed with the idea that Plantamour's comet had been delayed and come at last. The funnel-shaped mass would separate, occasionally, when the flame was plainly visible. This continued ten minutes, and was witnessed by a number of persons, all of whom agree as to the circumstances referred to. After the funnel-shaped cloud had disappeared, it was discovered that the corn and other produce on the farms in the locality where the tail of the funnel apparently rested, were all burned off even with the surface of the earth. By this, a great deal of prop-

erty was destroyed, and no little alarm occasioned. What produced the phenomenon is more than any one in that locality could determine, and it would be well if some scientific gentleman could make an investigation and report the result.'

The Pope's Infallibility.

THE pope was declared infallible on the 21st of July, 1870, by a vote of 538 against 2 of the Ecumenical Council at Rome.

A PROMINENT Massachusetts pastor suggests, that at the close of the Boston Jubilee, the great Coliseum building be used for a series of religious meetings. He says: "Let us have a World's Prayer Meeting for three days. Invie the multitudes gathered there to remain, and telegraph to all accessible points of Christendom to send, as far as possible, large delegations to a great meeting to pray for the conversion of the world."

TROUBLE IN MADRID, OCT. 8.—After the shopkeepers' manifestations yesterday, which temporarily subsided on the promise of the Alcade that the tax on show bills shall be reconsidered, crowds again collected on the streets, hissed the members of the city government who were trying to allay the excitement, and assailed the police with clubs and stones. The civil force being unable to suppress the disorder, and the rioters becoming more violent, a battalion of National Guards was called out and cleared the streets. Several persons were injured, but none killed. Order was restored, and the city to-day has been quiet.

Look to Your Cellars.

THOSE who have in charge the care of the household should frequently think of their cellars. No vegetables, except potatoes, should be stored in the cellar. Especially should cabbages, beets, celery, and turnips be excluded. A cellar should be thoroughly whitewashed at least once a year, and swept and put in order twice a month. The air in a properly kept cellar will not become impure when the weather becomes sufficiently cold to render necessary the closing up of the open windows, while on the other hand, the air of a cellar so closed up, which is untidily kept and filled with vegetables, some of them in a decayed state, may be well imagined. All cellars, however, should have the outside doors thrown open for an hour or two in mid-day, upon clear days, when the temperature is above the freezing point.

An excess of water, or too much dampness, in some instances arises from surface water, and in others from spring veins that crop out in the cellar. Sometimes the bottom of the cellar will often be covered with water.

The correct way to avoid a wet cellar is to lay a tile drain entirely around the outside of the excavation, nearly a foot lower than the bottom of the cellar, before the foundation walls are laid. But after an edifice has already been erected, and water appears on the cellar bottom, the most satisfactory way to render the bottom dry is to sink the channel nearly a foot deep entirely around the cellar close to the wall, and a course of drain-tiles in the bottom, which will cut off all water-veins, and thus render the cellar quite satisfactorily dry, by conducting the water into the tiles before it can work along toward the middle of the cellar.—Scientific American.

Appointments.

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

THE next quarterly meeting of the Tract and Missionary Society in District No. 2, of New England, will be held in Boston, Sabbath and first-day, Nov. 2 and 3.

The next annual meeting of the New England Tract and Missionary Society will be held at New Ipswich, N. H., Nov. 9 and 10. This will be an important meeting of the Tract and Missionary Society as has ever been held in this Conference. There is Conference business also to come up at this meeting; therefore a general attendance is expected. The quarterly meeting of District No. 3 will be held at this time and place. S. N. HASKELL.

WHILE stopping at home in Iowa for a few weeks, I shall esteem it a privilege to have a general meeting of the friends of the cause in Osceola, Iowa, Nov. 9 and 10, meetings to commence with the Sabbath, and close Sunday night. I shall esteem it a great privilege to have a general attendance of my old friends from all that section of country. GEO. I. BUTLER.

A GENERAL meeting of the S. D. Adventists of Tuscola County, Mich., will be held at Vassar, beginning Friday evening, Nov. 8, 1872, and continuing over Sabbath and Sunday. On Sunday, the 10th, at 10:30 A. M., the dedication services of their new meeting-house will take place. Brethren and sisters from other places are cordially invited. I. D. VAN HORN.

IN connection with Eld. Downer, I will commence a protracted meeting in the new meeting house at Mt. Hope, Grant Co., Wis., commencing Sabbath morning, Dec. 7, at half past ten A. M. Dedication sermon Sunday morning following, at half past ten A. M. I. SANBORN.

MONTHLY meeting for Oakland, Little Prairie, Raymond, and Johnstown, will be held at Johnstown, Wis., Nov. 2 and 3, 1872. Can Bro. Sanborn or some other minister meet with us? D. B. STAPLES, Clerk.

QUARTERLY meeting of the Greenbush church at the Colony school-house in Duplain, Mich., Nov. 9 and 10. Preaching is expected. O. B. SEVY, Clerk.

QUARTERLY meeting of the Waukon and West Union churches, at West Union, Iowa, Nov. 16 and 17. Bro. H. Nicola is invited to attend; and if the time appointed does not suit his convenience, he is at liberty to change it. NASON HOTT.

THE quarterly meeting of the Tract and Missionary Society for district No. 9 will be held at East Otto, Cattaraugus Co., N. Y., Nov. 9, 10, 1872. The monthly meeting for that county will be held in connection with it. Those going by the E. R. R. should stop at the Cattaraugus Station, where teams will await them at 12 o'clock Friday. District No. 10, at Wiles Hill, Allegany Co., Nov. 2 and 3.

District No. 2, at West Monroe. Failing to hear from the other Directors, I am unable to make appointments for the eastern and northern districts; but, as I now expect to attend them myself, due notice will be given. P. Z. KINNE, Pres. N. Y. and Pa. T. and M. Society.

THE next monthly meeting of S. D. Adventists of Erie Co., N. Y., will be held at Lancaster, Nov. 9 and 10. All come that can. Z. BROOKS.

PROVIDENCE permitting, I will meet with the following Districts in Tract and quarterly meeting: District No. 9, at Ithaca, Nov. 2, 3. " " " " Alma, " 4. " " " " Jay, " 5. " " " " Watrousville, " 7. " " " " Tuscola, " 8. " " " " Vassar, " 9, 10. " " " " St. Charles, " 12. " " " " Chesaning, " 13. " " " " Holly, " 14. " " " " Lapeer, " 16, 17. " " " " Memphis, " 18. " " " " Oakland, " 20. " " " " Genoa, " 22. " " " " Alameda, " 23, 24.

Meeting to commence at 7 o'clock P. M., except Sabbath. We hope that our brethren will come prepared to seek God and help advance his cause at all these meetings. E. H. ROOR.

MONTHLY meeting of the Jackson church, at Jackson, on the first Sabbath in November. Cannot a minister meet with us, as we would like to have the ordinances? By request of the church, E. P. GILES, Elder.

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.

\$2.00 EACH. Albert Greene 42-8, J T Orton 41-21, E A Woodruff 42-19, Cynthia McCoy 43-1, Thompson Lowry 42-17, Richard Martz 42-16, A Powers 42-1, B Lucas 42-18, John Stone 43-2, E Parks 43-1, Rufus Baker 43-1, R S Tyler 42-10, John E Davis 42-7, J F Sindleger 42-4, John Rogers 42-6, A Stranahan 42-6, Thomas Lindsay 42-14, S Hastings 42-18, Samantha Lyon 41-1, James Hanson 42-17, Mrs Phebe Pery 42-20, Mahala Jackson 42-19, N C Walsworth 42-11, H C Watkins 42-9, Mrs L J Belnap 32-14, Simon T Beck 42-20, Kate V Temple 42-11, Geo Field 42-20, B W Caswell 42-16, L Reynolds 42-14, James Brezee 45-1, J Meseraull 42-20, David Robins 42-4, A Foss 43-1, L H Densmore 42-11.

\$1.50 EACH. Miles Curry 42-19, Capt T C Alvord 42-19, I N Van Gorder 40-16, Silas Fosdick 42-19, George Dade 42-20, David Fulton 42-20, Eld D P Curtis 42-20, S W Whitlock 42-20, Walter Pepper 42-20, A D Perdee 42-20, Seth Woods 42-20, James Viers 42-20, R F A for S C Brinkerhoof 42-18, R F A for Jane Manson 42-18, Charles Magnuson 42-20, John H Totman 42-20.

\$1.00 EACH. Dr T Stringer 41-14, J H Whitmore 41-19, Wacey Holland 41-19, E A Nutting 41-3, B M Smith 40-17, Mrs N Calowel 41-20, D W Crandall 41-1, L Lunger 41-19, P Lightner 41-20, M E Moulton 41-4, G B Sarchut, George Poulson 41-18, Z Z Brooks 41-17.

MISCELLANEOUS. Polly Conklin 50c 41-1, A Conklin 50c 41-9, N Sargent \$2.50 42-14, E A Beale 3.60 40-20, A P Williams 75c 41-20, M Gould 2.50 42-1, A Gregory 75c 41-20, E Carpenter 3.00 42-1, G G Green 2.50 41-15, H C Crumb 5.00 41-12, Ann Needy 50c 40-22, H Bingham 1.12 45-1, A C Woodbury 3.00 43-1, Mariah Harper 5.00 40-23.

Books Sent by Mail.

James Hanson \$2.00, Peter Vogel 50c, D T Bourdeau 3.39, Emma Beebe 1.20, S D Wagar 1.00, H A St. John 2.00, J P Smith 30c, A P Taggart 20c, Emma E Stone 1.00, Geo W Washburn 75c, J A Killingsworth 2.00, Theodosia Terry 50c, Miss Cornelia Walker 1.10, D M Canright 25c, A Rasmusen 25c, C W Armstrong 1.50, Sarah Clark 50c, Jesse Dorcas 2.25, B M Caswell 25c, D H Maxham 25c, D Ticknor 20c, D Malin 3.00, M Hicks 40c, James Brezee 50c, M C Knight 20c, L Richer 50c, J C Eller 60c, S R Wells 3.40, J W Snyder 1.00, J M Wilkenson 50c, Clara Bryant 1.50, J M Butcher 50c, Mrs Wm Earl 45c, S F Potts 25c, S Kennedy 20c, Dr A Wetmore 1.00, D Bowe 1.00, H S Smith 20c.

Books Sent by Express.

J O Corliss, Clare, Clare Co., Mich., \$5.63, R F Cottrell, Cattaraugus, N. Y., 4.13, R M Kilgore, Washington, Iowa, 15.00.

Books Sent by Freight.

D M Canright, Dassel, Muker Co., Minn., \$36.00, P Strong, Pine Grove Station, Van Buren Co, Mich., 75.83.

Cash Received on Account.

J N Loughborough \$150.00, R F Andrews 2.00, P S Thurston 3.00, E Goodrich 65c.

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

James Hanson \$10.00, Hannah Soule 10.00, Addie Bartholf 10.00.

Michigan Conference Fund.

From the Danish brethren in Montcalm Co., \$18.40.

Review to the Poor.

A friend \$500.

General Conference Fund.

Erastus Elmer \$2.00.

Book Fund.—\$10,000 Wanted.

Amount previously acknowledged—\$5,560.93. Five dollars each—Ellen E Armstrong, Nancy Collins. Miscellaneous.—James Hanson \$3.00.

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 AND HERALD, BATTLE CREEK, MICH.