

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 41.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, APRIL 15, 1873.

NUMBER 18.

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.

SANCTIFIED AFFLICTIONS.

Oh! how oft in life's sad changes friends most cherished we must leave,
And though we may be submissive, nature claims the right to grieve,
'Tis the only balm earth gives us for the heart's deep pain and wound,
But the blessings we may gather, are alone in Jesus found.

Every sanctified affliction only renders Heaven more dear;
Welcome, then, life's disappointments, welcome pain and suffering here;
If we learn the secret, wholly to the Lord to yield our will,
Feeling that our final glory is his aim and purpose still.

No good thing is e'er withholden from the good and true in heart;
And if thus we stand before him, God knows best what to impart.
Are we forced to leave the places where we've loved to oft retire,
'Tis a voice from Heaven, saying, look to places purer, higher.

Think not rest will be our portion, while the foe is in the field,
But gird on the armor bravely, and no foothold ever yield,
For the Lord will be our leader, and our battles he will fight,
While we move in his own order, and go forward in his light.

Then whatever our sacrifices let them all be promptly made,
Christ to save lost men from ruin, has a precious ransom paid.
To advance his cause, if need be, home and kindred let us leave,
To beseech the wandering sinner God's rich mercy to receive.

Naught our own should we consider, all we have is only lent,
In this blessed gospel labor, all our substance should be spent.
Thus we gain the real riches, by investing all in this,
An inheritance in Heaven, endless life in realms of bliss.

West Wilton, N. H.

REBEKAH SMITH.

LIFE OF WILLIAM MILLER.

CHAPTER FIVE.

BECOMES A LICENSED PREACHER—VISITS DIFFERENT PLACES—LETTER ON UNIVERSALISM—RECORD OF HIS LABORS.

In the autumn of this year, Mr. Miller received a license to preach, from the church of which he was a member, as follows:

"Let brotherly love continue: the Baptist church of Christ, in Hampton and Whitehall, do certify that Brother William Miller is a member in regular standing in this church. Brother Miller has been improving his gifts with us in expounding the words of divine truth in public, for some time past, to the approbation and edification of the church. We are satisfied that Bro. Miller has a gift to improve in public; and are willing he should improve the same, wherever his lot may be cast among the Zion of God—that the name of the Lord may be glorified, and his followers edified. Done in church meeting, Saturday, Sept. 14, 1833. By order of the church.

(Signed) BYRON S. HARLOW,
"Clerk, Pro tem."

In a letter to his sister, before referred to, written two days subsequent to the date of the above, and dated "Low Hampton, Sept. 16, 1833," he speaks of the above license, and of his labors, as follows:

"I have just returned from Dresden, where I have been to spend a Sabbath, and to preach to them the word of life. My texts, yesterday, were Hosea 13:1; Isa. 61:7; and Ps. 102:16. . . . I do feel anxious to come and see you; and, if the Lord will, and your people should not object, to try to speak to them of the things

of the kingdom. My brethren have given me a license—unworthy, and old, and disobedient as I am. Oh, to grace how great a debtor!"

He then proceeds with matters of mere family interests, and closes with the following exhortation to his brother-in-law, respecting the doctrine of Universalism:

"Just as sure as the word of God is true, depend upon it, universal salvation is not true. Was this what David saw when he saw the end of the wicked? Enter into the sanctuary of your own conscience, my brother, and you will find, 'No,' responded with appalling force. Enter into the sanctuary of God's word, and, in every page, you will have to meet this little word, 'NO,' or declarations as plain. 'Strive to enter in at the strait gate; for many shall seek to enter in, and shall not be able.' Look at Dan. 12:9, 10;—here we have the end described. What does conscience say? Be careful, my brother; remember that eternal consequences hang on your decision; and what is the answer? 'Many [not all] shall be purified, and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly; and none of the wicked shall understand.' See Mal. 4:1-3. Where are the wicked, the proud, and all that do wickedly? Do they enjoy the healing beams of the Sun of Righteousness? 'No.' Again, in Matt. 13:49, 50. Are the wicked permitted to dwell with the just? Is Heaven and happiness their abode? Enter into the sanctuary, and what do you hear? No! No! Again, in Matt. 25:12, 30, and 46. Do the foolish virgins enter in to the marriage supper? or are they ever married to the Lamb? No! Is the unprofitable servant 'in light and glory?' No! No! And are the goats enjoying the same communion with the sheep? or are they going 'into life eternal?' No! No! NO! Read, again, Rom. 1:18, to the fifth verse of the second chapter. Would it be unjust for God to condemn the characters there described? Your judgment tells you, No! Your conscience responds the same answer, No! Your tongue must one day answer, NO! For every tongue must and will confess to the glory of God. O my brother, enter into the sanctuary and knock while the door may be opened; seek while you may find; look while you may live; and you will most assuredly learn 'their end.' All the plausible reasoning of all the Universalists under the whole canopy of heaven cannot save one soul. 'Except a man is born of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God.'

During the fall of 1833, and the ensuing winter, Mr. Miller seems to have been constantly occupied in lecturing in Dresden and other towns in New York and Vermont. The very modest estimate which he had of his own abilities and qualifications as a preacher, is apparent in all his correspondence, where any reference is made to his public labors. In writing to Eld. Hendryx, under date of Low Hampton, Feb. 25, 1834, he says:

" . . . You have undoubtedly heard that I have been trying to preach (as some call it) about in this vicinity. I have been laboring, it is true, in my weak manner, in Dresden, two or three months; and the Lord has seen fit to bless us with a little reformation. I have likewise preached in Putnam, Wrentham, Poultney, and in this place. You laugh, Bro. Hendryx, to think old Bro. Miller is preaching! But laugh on: you are not the only one that laughs; and it is all right—I deserve it. If I could preach the truth, it is all I could ask."

Being now recognized as a regularly licensed preacher, his Bro. Hendryx naturally addressed him as the "Rev. William Miller." To a letter thus directed, Mr. Miller, under date of "Hampton, March 22, 1834," thus replied:

"DEAR BRO. HENDRYX:—I wish you would look into your Bible and see if you can find the word Rev. applied to a sinful mortal like myself; and govern yourself accordingly. . . . Let us be determined

to live and die on the Bible. God is about to rise and punish the inhabitants of the world. The proud, the high, the lofty, must be brought low; and the humble, the meek, and the contrite, will be exalted. Then, what care I for what the world calls great or honorable? Give me Jesus, and a knowledge of his word, faith in his name, hope in his grace, interest in his love, and let me be clothed in his righteousness, and the world may enjoy all the high-sounding titles, the riches it can boast, the vanities it is heir to, and all the pleasures of sin; and they will be no more than a drop in the ocean. Yes, let me have Jesus Christ, and then vanish all earthly toys. What glory has God revealed in the face of Jesus Christ! In him all power centers. In him all power dwells. He is the evidence of all truth, the fountain of all mercy, the giver of all grace, the object of all adoration, and the source of all light; and I hope to enjoy him to all eternity. What! such a sinful wretch as I enjoy Christ? How can this be? Yes, yes; through the electing love of God, the sprinkling of the blood of the covenant, and the work of regeneration, such a sinner as I may be cleansed from sin, purified, and made white, and glorified in the New Jerusalem, together with him, and with all who love our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and who love his appearing. Bro. H., shall you and I appear together in that general assembly and church of the first-born? If God will, I hope we shall there meet, to part no more. How can I realize the glory that will there be manifested? And how could I bear the thought to be banished from the face of Jesus, and from the glory of his power? Forbid it, O my Redeemer! Forbid! and let grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord."

The same devotional feelings are manifested in all his epistles, and also evince that he experienced nearness of access to God, and great religious enjoyment.

Mr. Miller kept no journal, nor any record of the places he visited, till October, 1834. Beginning at a place called "The Forks," supposed to be "Moore's Forks" in Clinton County, N. Y., the names of places where, the dates when, and the texts from which, he preached, are given in two small memorandum books as follows:

PLACE.	TIME.	TEXT.	TEXT.
Forks, N. Y.,	Oct. 1.	Luke 15:18.	Rev. 8:13.
Keesville, N. Y.,	" 5.	Rev. 1:20.	Job 23:24.
Beekmantown,	" 6.	Dan. 8:13, 14.	" 10:14.
Plattsburgh,	" 8.	Dan. 8:13, 14.	Rev. 20: 6.
"	" 11.	1 Cor. 3:11.	"
"	" 12.	Rom. 8:6, 7.	Luke 15:18.
Keesville,	" 14.	Dan. 8:13, 14.	" 10:14.
Westport,	" 15.	Rev. 20: 6.	"

After visiting the above places, he returned home to Low Hampton, and soon after wrote to Eld. Hendryx, as follows:

"North Hampton, Oct 23, 1834.

"MY DEAR BROTHER HENDRYX:—Your favor of Sept. 17 came to hand while I was absent on a tour into Clinton County, of about six weeks. I gave thirty-six lectures on the second coming of Christ, was at two covenant meetings, attended two protracted meetings in said time, saw a number of new-born babes in Christ; and now, being at home, I shall write to Bro. H. and rest myself a little. . . .

"I am every day more convinced that the whole word of God is given for our instruction, reproof, and correction; and that the prophecies contain the strongest evidences of the divinity and truth of the Bible; and present to saint and sinner the strongest motives for a holy life, and repentance and faith toward God, that can be produced. When John preached repentance, he prophesied that the kingdom of Heaven was at hand, as a principal motive. The apostles prophesied that God had appointed a day, in which he would judge the world in righteousness, by that man, Jesus Christ; and your unworthy brother in Christ proclaims that the day is at hand, when 'he that is filthy will be filthy still, and he that is holy will be holy still;' and that Christ is now standing at the door and knocking for the last time. And, my dear brother, I

can truly say that 'the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.' And yet how many professed ministers of Christ, at the present day, treat that part of the word with total neglect, and even laugh and jeer at those who would warn the people of their approaching danger. But God has supported me beyond my most sanguine expectation. And although they say much before they hear, yet when they do hear they seem confounded.

"The evidence is so clear, the testimony is so strong, that we live on the eve of the present dispensation, toward the dawn of the *Glorious Day*, that I wonder why ministers and people do not wake up and trim their lamps. Yes, my brother, almost two years since you heard the news, 'Behold the bridegroom cometh!'—and yet you cry, A little more sleep, a little more slumber. Blame not your people if they go to sleep under your preaching. You have done the same. Bear with me, my brother. In every letter you have written me, you have promised to study this all-important subject, and in every letter you confess your negligence. The day draws near. More than one-sixth of the time is gone since my Bro. Hendryx promised, and yet asleep! O God, forgive him! Are you waiting for all the world to wake up before you dare get up? 'Where has your courage fled?' Awake! awake! O sluggard! Defend your own castle, or take sides with the word of God; *destroy or build*. You must not, you cannot, you shall not be neutral. Awake! awake! Tell Deacon Smith to help wake you. Tell him, for me, to shake you, and not give out shaking, until Bro. H. will put on the whole armor of light.

"In every church where I have lectured on this important subject, many, very many, seem to awake, rub open their eyes, and then fall back to sleep again. But the enemy is waking up. In one town (North Beekmantown) I received a letter, the day after my first lecture, from some bullies and blackguards, 'that if I did not clear out of the State, they would put me where the dogs could never find me.' The letter was signed by ten of them. I staid, and, blessed be God! he poured out his Spirit, and began a work which gainsayers could not resist.

"Some ministers try to persuade their people not to hear me; but the people will go, and every additional lecture will bring an additional multitude, until their meeting-houses cannot hold them. Depend upon it, my brother, God is in this thing; and he will be glorified; and blessed be his holy name! Do pray for me, my brother, that I may have grace equal to my need, and that I may always see my need, feel my weakness, and be kept humble, and that I may always declare the truth. *Do pray!*

"I think, if the Lord will, I shall be in your section of country next spring or summer. Do give me a list of some brethren between here and your place, if you can.

"I remain yours in Christ,
"WILLIAM MILLER."

Two days subsequent to the date of the above, Mr. M. was again in the field; and, according to his memorandum-book, gave lectures as follows: Oct. 25 and 26, at Paulet, Vt.; Nov. 6, 8, and 9, at Orwell, Vt.; 10 and 12, Cornwall, Vt.; and Nov. 16, in Hampton, N. Y. His success in the above places is indicated in the following extract from a letter which he wrote Elder Hendryx from Low Hampton, on the 28th of Nov., 1834:

"I have had good success since I wrote you before. The Lord has been with me. I have been into a number of towns in Vermont. Some old, hardened rebels have been brought to plead for mercy, even before my course of lectures was finished. Blessed be the holy name of God! He has given me more than I should have dared to ask. How good, my brother, it is to preach, having God for paymaster! He pays down. He pays in souls. He paid the Shepherd thus, and he was satisfied: will he not pay

his servants too? Yes, yes. Bless his name, O my soul, for all his benefits!

"I find that studious Christians are the best hearers: and the reason is obvious. The more we know of mankind, the less room there is for bigotry, superstition, and prejudice. Those are evils always attending ignorance.

THE STATESMAN ARTICLES.

ARTICLE FOUR.

ARGUMENT FOR THE FIRST-DAY SABBATH FROM THE GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT ON THE DAY OF PENTECOST.

THE testimony brought forward in our last number from the gospels for the first-day Sabbath, finds abundant confirmation in other portions of the New-Testament Scriptures. We shall confine ourselves in this article to the argument drawn from the beginning of the second chapter of the Acts: "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place." There has been so much discussion of this passage that a somewhat careful consideration of it may be of interest in itself, as well as from its important connection with the subject now specially in hand. In regard to it we note:—

1. The day of the outpouring of the Spirit was the day of Pentecost—not some day preceding or following. The correct rendering of the original words is not, as Lightfoot gives it, "when the day of Pentecost had passed," nor as Hitzig would have it, "as the day of Pentecost was approaching its fulfillment;" but, "while the day of Pentecost was being fulfilled;" that is, during the progress of that particular day, or, as our authorized English version has it, "when the day of Pentecost was fully come."

2. This day of Pentecost, on which the Holy Spirit was given, was the first day of the week. A number of eminent authorities, chief among whom is the chronologist Wieseler, compute it to have been the seventh. This question hinges upon that of the day of the Lord's death. It is almost universally admitted that Christ was crucified on Friday. But it is disputed whether that Friday was the fourteenth or the fifteenth of Nisan. From Leviticus 23:15, 16, we learn that Pentecost, signifying literally the fiftieth, was counted from the second day of unleavened bread. The paschal lamb was killed at the close of the fourteenth day of the month Abib or Nisan, and the next day, the fifteenth, was the first day of unleavened bread. This day was regarded as a holy Sabbath; and from the morrow following, that is, from the sixteenth of Nisan, fifty days were to be reckoned to determine the day of Pentecost.

Wieseler contends that the Lord was crucified on the fifteenth of Nisan—the first day of unleavened bread. The sixteenth of the month would therefore fall on the seventh day of the week, and fifty days reckoned from and including this, according to the manner of the Jews, would fix the day of Pentecost on the Jewish Sabbath. It is interesting to observe that many who agree with Wieseler in regarding the Friday of Christ's crucifixion as the fifteenth of Nisan, still reckon the fifty days so as to make Pentecost fall on the first day of the week. Prominent among these chronologists is Canon Wordsworth. In all frankness we would admit that Wordsworth's reckoning will not hold. If the Friday on which the Lord was crucified was the fifteenth of Nisan, and if that day was observed as the first day of unleavened bread so that the specified fifty days would be reckoned from the following day, then Pentecost must have occurred on the seventh day of the week.

Others of our ablest scholars, such as Greswell, Elliot, and Schaff, maintain that the day on which our Lord was crucified was the fourteenth of Nisan. An exhaustive discussion of this whole question would be out of place in these columns. We give a brief, and we think conclusive, argument in favor of the view that the Friday of our Lord's death was the fourteenth of Nisan, and that therefore the fifteenth of Nisan, or first day of unleavened bread, coincided with the Jewish Sabbath. The reasons in favor of this view are the following:—

(1) The language of John, chapter 18:28, intimates clearly that the Jews had not, on the morning of Friday, yet partaken of the Passover. Friday could not, therefore, have been the fifteenth of Nisan.

(2) The same day, Friday, John states that "it was the preparation of the Passover." (Chapter 19:14.) It seems next to impossible to understand this expression in any other way than as referring to that day, Friday, as the day of preparation for Passover observance, or, in other words, as the day preceding the fifteenth of Nisan.

(3) John's statement, in chapter 19:31, that the Sabbath following the day of crucifixion was "a high day," admits of no easy or natural explanation except that of the coincidence of the first day of unleavened bread, or the fifteenth Nisan, with the seventh-day Sabbath.

(4) The antitypical character of Christ, as the Paschal Lamb of God and the true Passover Sacrifice (John 1:29, 36; 1 Cor. 5:7), would lead us to expect that the very day and hour of his death would correspond with the time of the killing of the typical Passover lamb. If it be urged that Christ himself with his disciples, in obeying the requirements of the law, killed the Passover on the evening of the fourteenth, and that the Synoptical Gospels intimate this, it may be replied that such an interpretation of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, is not required, and that the exceeding difficulty, not to say impossibility, of harmonizing it with the statements already quoted from John, is quite decisive against it. It is much easier to interpret the Synoptists in the light of John's Gospel. In this chapter, 13:1, we are informed of a supper before the Passover. That this was the same supper spoken of by the Synoptists, though one day before the usual time, in order that the true Passover Lamb might be put to death at the time appointed, appears from the peculiar nature of the message sent by chosen apostles to the "good man of the house"—a message of special direction, pointing out something of an unusual character. (See Matthew 26:18, Mark 14:14, and Luke 22:11.) There are, also, in the Synoptical Gospels a number of statements showing that the Friday on which our Lord was crucified was not marked by the Sabbath sacredness belonging to the first day of unleavened bread. (See Matthew 27:59; Mark 15:42, 46; Luke 23:56.) This seems to be the easiest and most natural way of harmonizing the apparent discrepancies between the Synoptists and John.

(5) Wieseler's own chronological tables may be used against him to show that the Friday of our Lord's crucifixion was the fourteenth of Nisan. We would speak with becoming diffidence, in any attempt to make out a system of chronology for the events recorded in Scripture. There are, however, in Wieseler's elaborate book, tables independently proved to be accurate. By them, admitting the year of our Lord's crucifixion to have been A. D. 30, which is regarded by most chronologists as highly probable, and admitting also that the day was Friday, which will not be disputed, it is shown beyond all doubt that Christ died on the fourteenth of Nisan, and must have eaten the Passover with his disciples on the first hours of that day, the preceding evening. The tables referred to show, by the most minute and accurate calculations, that in the year A. D. 30, the new moon for the month Nisan, appeared on Wednesday, the next to the last day of the preceding month, corresponding to March 22, at eight minutes past eight o'clock in the evening. Hence it would follow that the first day of Nisan commenced on Friday evening, March 24, corresponding, as to daylight, with Saturday, March 25; of course, the Friday of the next week, would be the seventh of Nisan, and the same day the following week, the fourteenth. Thus, according to Wieseler's own tables, Friday of the week of our Lord's passion, is made out to be the fourteenth of Nisan. The fifteenth of Nisan, then, or the first day of unleavened bread, coincided at that time with the seventh day of the week, or the Jewish Sabbath; and reckoning fifty days from the morrow, that day included, we find Pentecost falling on the first day of the eighth week following our Lord's crucifixion.

So clear and emphatic is the testimony of the primitive church to this fact, that many who hold that the Friday of Christ's death was the fifteenth Nisan, still do so in cordial indorsement of that fact. They reconcile the apparent difference between John and the Synoptists by supposing that the Jewish authorities, probably because of the crucifixion, or for some other reason, did not observe the Passover at the usual time, but passing by the fifteenth Nisan, in

reality kept the sixteenth in its place; and thus counting the fifty days from the seventeenth of the month, instead of the sixteenth, Pentecost would fall on the first day of the week.

It is worth mentioning, before we pass on, that the Karaite Jews like the Sadducees before them, understand the word, "Sabbath," in Leviticus 23:11, 15, 16, to mean, not the first day of unleavened bread, which was kept as a Sabbath, on whatever day of the week it might fall, but the seventh day of the week, the regular weekly Sabbath of the Jews. According to this understanding, the fifty days would always be reckoned from the morrow after the seventh day, and Pentecost would always fall on the first day of the week.

Having thus been at some pains to establish the fundamental position in this argument, a position to which scholars generally are coming with constantly increasing unanimity, we need not dwell long upon the manifest application of what has been proven. The facts here, after Christ's ascension, are full of significance, as we have seen the facts to be concerning the days just succeeding his resurrection. After the Lord's ascension, his disciples abode in Jerusalem, awaiting the promised gift of the Spirit. Many days passed by, including two seventh days, and still no fulfillment of the promise. On the first day of the second week after the ascension, the disciples were all with one accord in one place. Once more, the day which the Lord had singled out and honored is specially honored by the plentiful effusion of the Spirit of God. And thus the day which Christ taught his disciples to regard with special sacredness by repeatedly appearing to them in their collective gatherings, and blessing them, is even more clearly and significantly marked out from the other days of the week by this most marvelous outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

If it be objected that it was the Jewish festival, and not the first day of the week, that was honored, it is readily replied that there is no trace of the services of the Jewish festival on that blessed day. The Holy Ghost was given, not to persons observing Jewish ordinances, and keeping the Pentecost of the old dispensation, with a new meat offering and first fruits. He was given to Christian disciples met on the Christian's honored day; and the disciples, who on that day had received important spiritual instructions from the Lord just after his resurrection, and who now on the same day received the promised Spirit, begin the true work of the Christian Sabbath by preaching the gospel of salvation, and three thousand souls are added to the church of Christ.

The objection on the score that Pentecost only happened to fall on the first day that year, is unworthy of any one who believes that "not a sparrow falls to the ground, without our Heavenly Father's notice." It has been admitted that if the view of the Karaite Jews were true, and Pentecost occurred every year on the first day of the week, then would there be a strong argument for the first-day Sabbath in the pre-arrangements of God's providence. But to our mind, the argument from the pre-arrangement of Providence is stronger on the other and better interpretation of Leviticus 23:11, 15, 16. He who in infinite wisdom arranged everything from the beginning, so ordered all events connected with Christ's death, as to make the day of Pentecost coincide with the Christian Sabbath, and then gathered to himself, not the first-fruits of the fields of grain, but three thousand immortal souls, the first-fruits of the ingathering of the spiritual fields white to the harvest—the harvest of all the Gentile nations yet to be brought into the church of Christ, with the restoration of the covenant people of old. This is a Pentecost worthy of the church of Him who died for sinners of every race, and of the honored day which commemorates his rising from the dead.—*Christian Statesman*, Dec. 28, 1872.

"ARGUMENT FOR THE FIRST-DAY SABBATH FROM THE GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT ON THE DAY OF PENTECOST."

A REJOINDER.

It is always a source of satisfaction to one in examining opinions from which he is compelled to differ, to feel that the presentation of them which he is considering is the best which could be made under the circumstances. With pleasure, therefore, we recognize the manifest tokens of research and erudition on the part of the author of the

views presented in the columns of the *Statesman*, in the communication entitled, "Argument for the first-day Sabbath from the gift of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost." We do not flatter ourselves, however, that all which has been said in that article was for our benefit. It is not a little remarkable that three-fourths of its contents are devoted to the settlement of a point, which—while indeed it affects the question at issue—is not one upon which we bestowed many words, having preferred to consider, for the sake of argument, that the Pentecost did, on the year of our Lord's crucifixion, fall upon the first day of the week; and then, having done this, to prove that this co-incidence in no way affected, necessarily, the nature of that day.

Nevertheless, we must beg leave here to express our gratitude that, notwithstanding the concession in question, the readers of the *Statesman* are at last instructed by an abler pen than our own in reference to the diversity of opinion which exists among the learned, as to whether indeed it is safe to conclude that the Sunday, to the exclusion of the Sabbath, was the day upon which the Holy Ghost descended upon the apostles. Be it remembered also, that the learned men who stand as the advocates of the seventh day as the one which God thus honored, were not observers of that day as the Sabbath. All the authorities quoted are men who, if they regarded any Sabbath at all, gave their preference to the first, and not the last day, of the week. This being the case, they certainly cannot be charged with any bias in favor of the creation Sabbath. Not only so, but all their predilections were doubtless against that day, and favorable to its rival. Hence we see that when, under these circumstances, it is admitted that such distinguished men as Lightfoot, Weiseler, and Hitzig, have agreed that the last day of the week was the one on which the Pentecost occurred at the time in question, they did so—not in the interest of preconceived notions, nor for the purpose of bolstering up a theory which was in desperate need of help—but because there was, to their minds at least, much which compelled a conclusion they would gladly have avoided. Right here, also, in order to widen the breach in the wall of evidence, we beg leave to act in harmony with the plan pursued by the writer, and to present a note from the pen of one no less distinguished than professor Hackett, which will make it manifest beyond dispute that the scholars who at the present time sympathize with those cited above, who regard the seventh day of the week and not the first as having been the day of the Pentecost, are both numerous and celebrated; "It is generally supposed that this Pentecost, signalized by the outpouring of the Spirit, fell on the Jewish Sabbath, our Saturday." Quoted in "Hist. of Sab." by J. N. A., page 150. Let the reader bear in mind that we are not assuming to decide between these long lines of doctors who differ so widely upon a very important point, as regarded by some; but that our purpose is simply to call attention to the fact of this discrepancy, and to show its bearing upon the subject under discussion.

The first query which should be propounded, therefore, is this: Has God ever declared that the day of the Pentecost, which we are trying to locate, was identical with the first day of the week? The answer is in the negative. There is not one word in the text (Acts 2:11) or in the Testament, in regard to the day of the week on which these events occurred. It is simply stated that they took place "when the day of Pentecost was fully come." How remarkable, if the object was not to honor a feast which occurred annually, but especially for the purpose of distinguishing the first day of the week! Before, however, that day could be illustrated by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon it, it must first be decided—and that too from Bible evidence—that such outpouring did occur on the day specified. Can this be done? We appeal for a response to the average Christian men and women of this time. Tell me, after having read the three-column argument of the gentleman, has not the effect of what he has said been to unsettle, rather than to establish, your convictions upon the point before our minds? If never before, is it not now true that you feel somewhat shaken in regard to the identity of the Sunday with the Pentecost, on the year of the crucifixion? In view of what has been written, would you undertake to establish your faith from any deduction which you yourself could make from plain Scripture declarations? Is it not true that your opinion in the premises depends

entirely upon the faith of the one or the other class of scholars who have ranged themselves on both sides of this subject? Has the religion of Jesus Christ then changed? Is it no longer true that its great and important practical truths are withheld "from the wise and prudent, and revealed unto babes"? Has God left the important question of first-day sanctity, not upon the solid basis of explicit command, but upon the doubtful inference which is to be derived from certain transactions which occurred on a certain day, and then left the day of their occurrence to occupy a position in the week so doubtful that the most learned of those who had a desire to keep it should be honestly divided in opinion as to which day it was? We believe not. To our mind, it is simple presumption to intimate that God—who is not willing that any should perish, and who has said that he will do nothing but he will reveal it to his servants the prophets—should deal with his creatures in a manner at once so indirect and so obscure.

Having seen that there is a wide divergence of views among the very men who are the observers of the modern Sunday, in regard to its claims to distinction on the score of its having been first honored by the outpouring of the Spirit on the fiftieth day after the resurrection, let us look for a moment at the situation with reference to the possible effect upon the seventh day of the logic employed. Taking it for granted that our friends would not fly from their favorite deduction provided it should prove to be true that they are mistaken in regard to the time of the Pentecost, let us concede, for the time being, that the long line of celebrities, headed by such men as Lightfoot, Weiseler, and Hitzig, were right in arguing that Saturday, and not Sunday, was the day on which the great Jewish festival occurred; then, beyond all dispute, it must be conceded by our opponents that this was but another effort on the part of Jehovah, to illustrate, for the benefit of succeeding generations, the day which he had previously made memorable by his resting, his blessing, and his sanctification. In other words, with this view of the design of the outpouring of the Spirit, the effect upon the ancient Sabbath would be the same as it is now claimed to have been upon the first day of the week. The point, therefore, of the identity of the days is to *them* a vital one. If they are wrong in this, they are wrong in all. We appeal to them, therefore, in view of the infinite consequences which hang upon the proper celebration of the right Sabbath, to at least make their logic so plain that it will be accepted by men of their own faith, before they speak of its strength with great assumption of confidence. Before any person has a right to employ the events which transpired at the time of the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit in the interest of Sunday sanctity, he must be able to solve, at least to the satisfaction of his own mind, all the difficulties which complicate this question. As God has never seen fit to say that the Jewish feast, at the time under consideration, transpired on the first day of the week, he must be able to establish that proposition independently of an explicit *thus saith the Lord*.

There are two ways in which this may be attempted. 1st. By proving that the Pentecost always took place on the first day of the week; or, 2d. by demonstrating that Christ was crucified on Friday, the fourteenth day of Nisan, and that consequently the Pentecost must have fallen upon a Sunday following, and separated from that day by about fifty days. But, so far as the first proposition is concerned, which would be by far the easier of demonstration, if it were true—should the reader be inclined to favor it—he must convince himself that he could establish it against the conviction and the learning of the writer in question; for he rejects it as being untenable. Should he therefore turn to the second, then, as remarked above, he must be able to prove, not merely that Christ died on the fourteenth day of the Jewish month Nisan, but that likewise that fourteenth day of the month was also the sixth day of the week. When we say that this will be a task which few minds are capable of performing, and from which those who are best informed will the most readily turn away, we but assert what the writer in question has very distinctly shadowed forth in the facile manner in which he disposes of the obscurity of the statements in the three Synoptical Gospels by arbitrarily deciding that they must be interpreted by that of John.

What the real object of the writer was in making the statement that the Karaites and

the Sadducees held to the first theory stated above, we are at a loss to decide, since he himself concludes that they were wrong in their hypothesis. But let us suppose for a moment that they were right, and that the Pentecost always followed the weekly Sabbath. Would that prove that it occurred on Sunday? We answer, Yes. But would it prove that Sunday was therefore holy time? We answer, No; it would not so much as touch this independent question. Or rather, it should be said, if it affected it at all, it would increase the strength of the seventh-day Sabbath argument. Do you ask how? We answer that, according to their theory, you must first have a weekly Sabbath before you could decide when you had reached the Pentecost Sunday. The direction in Leviticus was that they should count to themselves seven Sabbaths from the day that they brought the sheaf of the wave offering, which would bring them to the feast in question.

Now let it be supposed that the crucifixion answered to the ancient Passover, and that the apostles proceeded to the determination of the time when the Pentecost would be reached, according to the theory of the Karaites. The first thing which would have been necessary was, the weekly Sabbath, which immediately followed the crucifixion of Christ. Having found it, they would have numbered seven Sabbaths, and have decided that the day immediately following the last of these answered to the feast. But unfortunately for them, they would have discovered—had they believed in the modern doctrine that the law of the Sabbath was nailed to the cross, Col. 2:6 (?)—that they were deprived of a starting point. For the Sabbath institution is a thing of commandment. Take away the commandment, and the institution is gone. Therefore, as the cross had accomplished its work, and had been taken down on Friday, God had removed the landmark from which they were commanded to measure the time which should bring them to the Pentecost, at the very period when they needed it most. In reality, there was left them no Sabbath which answered to the one in Leviticus.

Should it be replied, however, that the Sabbath, though gone in fact, existed nevertheless in name, it might be responded that this would indeed be an anomalous condition of things. Mark it: it is not the incidental mention, by its proper name, of an institution which had ceased to be, which we are considering; but it is the deliberate action of that God who knows the end from the beginning, in compelling the disciples to treat the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, in order to the decision of an important fact, for eight weeks after, as is claimed, it had lost its Sabbatic character.

Again; should it be urged, as a means of escape from the embarrassments of the situation, that God did not actually require them to count the seventh day as the Sabbath, since there was really no day of Pentecost which they were obliged to keep on the year of our Lord's crucifixion, we answer, very good; then of course we shall hear nothing hereafter from the argument for Sunday sanctity which is based upon the hypothesis that the day of Pentecost fell on the first day of the week in the year in question, since it will have been admitted that there was no Pentecost that year, and consequently that it could not properly be said to have fallen upon any day.

Once more, should it be insisted that though the Pentecostal feast was not binding in the year of our Lord thirty, or thereabout, but that the antitype of the feast was the thing of importance, then, in reply it may be said, that God rendered it necessary for them, in order to locate that antitype, according to the Karaite view, to count the Sabbath which followed the crucifixion as the Sabbath of creation, a thing which certainly will be very difficult of explanation by those who can speak as becomingly of the providence of God as did the gentleman in the article which is passing under review.

Finally, we repeat, therefore, that, if indeed there were a legal Pentecost this side of the death of our Lord, and if the Karaite system for locating it were the right one, then the seventh day which followed the death of Christ was distinguished by three very significant facts. 1. It was honored by the women (and therefore by the disciples) by their resting upon it. 2. Luke, in speaking of it thirty years subsequent to its occurrence, mentions it as the Sabbath "according to the commandment." 3. God made it necessary that the whole Jewish nation should keep the Pentecostal feast fifty days after the crucifixion of the Lord; and, in doing so, that they should count the sev-

enth day of the week as still continuing to be the Sabbath.

In passing to the last branch of the subject which will be treated in this article, we invite the reader to note the following facts, as we shall have occasion to employ them hereafter: 1. That the writer proceeds with his reasoning upon the hypothesis that the months at the time of the crucifixion were Jewish months, commencing with the new moon. 2. That the days were Jewish days, commencing and ending with the setting of the sun. These points we have previously urged, and are happy to see that they are conceded as being correct.

In conclusion, we turn our attention to the remaining feature of the communication in the *Statesman*, i. e., that portion of the article which relates to the real matter in dispute, namely—granting, for the sake of argument, that the first day of the week was the one on which the Pentecost fell in the year under consideration—whether that fact necessarily affected the character of that day so as to mark it out as one which God had chosen as peculiarly his own. For be it remembered, that—though the whole argument which has been made respecting the identity of those two days should be conceded—we should then simply be prepared to decide whether the facts agreed upon would prove what is claimed, or not.

We ask, therefore, the candid attention of all to the use which has been made of the elaborate argument which we have been carefully considering point by point. We would naturally have expected—if the gentleman felt that he had proved what he desired to, namely, that the Pentecost fell upon the first day of the week—that the real sinews of a masterly logic would have been discovered in an effort to show that it followed of necessity that it must therefore have been holy time. But has he done this? Or, in other words, if he has, in what manner has he brought it about? Has it been by fair logical deduction? We believe that there are very few who will insist that he has attempted such a deduction, with any measure of success, at the very point where it should have been expected most.

What he has said in the connection is very pretty. Yes, pretty is the word which precisely expresses it. How handsomely he alludes to the analogy between the natural harvest and the ingathering of souls. But who does not know that such analogies are cheap things, and that one gifted with a prolific fancy can multiply them indefinitely? What was expected, and what we had a right to demand, was something which partook of the nature of certainty. How great was our disappointment at learning that the writer did not even pretend to have any authority from the Lord so far as written statements are concerned. The whole thing he thought was fairly deducible from the coincidence of days, since nothing ever merely "happens" to occur in the providence of God.

What has been gained, then? Manifestly, simply the point that God had some object in view in having the Pentecost fall on the first day of the week in the year of our Lord thirty, or thereabout. The next question to be decided is, What was that object? Right here is where we need help. God could have given it to us, had he seen fit so to do. He has not done so, therefore it is safe to conclude that it was not important that we should know what his purpose was.

But if any gentleman can be found who is wise above what is written, and who is able to decide with unerring certainty as to the motives of God at all times, and under all circumstances, we should like to propound a few questions to him. First, what did God mean when, in his providence, he allowed the Pentecost to fall upon Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday or Saturday? It is said that God had a purpose in it; but can any one tell us what that purpose was? When he has answered this, then we have a list of similar interrogatories, to the solution of which his wisdom will be invited. In the mean time, we shall adopt the suggestions of men in regard to plans of Deity with great caution, for, if it should fall out in the day of Judgment that we had followed their fallacious inferences, to the disregard of a positive written law of God, we know not what defense could be made for our course of conduct, since we had been previously informed that his judgments are *unsearchable*, "and his ways *past finding out*."

Now let us look at the proposition concerning the outpouring of the Spirit. It is agreed on all hands that the manifestation occurred as written. It is inferred by the

writer in question that it was done with reference especially to the honoring as sacred of the day of the resurrection. Here again is the assumption of knowledge which has never been imparted by divine authority. God has never said that he meant any such thing. Not only so, but it can not even be fairly inferred that such was his purpose. 1st. Because he does not so much as mention, in the record, the first day of the week by name, an omission which can never be explained satisfactorily by those who insist that the events which occurred on the day of Pentecost transpired with especial reference to the honoring above all others, on the part of Jehovah, of the first day of the week. 2dly. Because, were we to judge at all in the matter, as he passed over six first-days waiting for the arrival of the Pentecost, we must conclude that there was something in connection with that feast which induced him to act when he did, and as he did. 3dly. Because the Pentecost furnished an opportunity for the display of the power of the ascended Christ before thousands of Jews and proselytes from all parts of the habitable globe, more advantageously than could be done at any other time; thus rendering it unnecessary that any other reason should be sought in explanation of its selection from among the other days of the year for the great outpouring of the Spirit. 4thly. Because, in apostolic times, it was not an uncommon thing for the Holy Ghost to fall upon men on all days of the week; thus proving that God is not restricted in the outpouring of his Spirit to holy times and places, and that it is not safe to conclude that any display of his power in this direction was made at any one time because of a special regard for the particular hours on which it took place.

In conclusion, as the fabric of Sunday sanctity, in so far as it is based upon the transactions of the day of Pentecost, is seen to rest, purely upon the opinions of men, and since those who observe the day are divided in sentiment as to whether the Pentecost did indeed really fall upon it at all, we close this article, as we did the last by stating that we have a *positive commandment* which is admitted to be binding, and which, as given in the Bible, says that the "seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work." Also, that our advice to those who are weary with threading the interminable labyrinth of conjecture and hypothesis is, Place your feet upon the rock of the Written Word; there and there only you are safe. Should any one seek to lure you from this position by the assertion that the law upon which you have planted yourself has been amended, it will be safe to follow them only when they are able to tell you when and where the commandment, as given in Exodus, was changed, and exactly how it reads since the change has occurred.

W. H. LITTLEJOHN.

Allegan, Mich.

Christian Attire.

How may a Christian girl dress? How many ruffles? Ear-rings? or not? How far may she follow the fashions?

That question is more difficult than the one about baptism. The love of personal ornamentation is by no means to be denied. There is a logic of love better than the logic of the head, and a Christian girl will settle these questions best by doing nothing that conflicts with a whole-hearted love of Christ. She will dress modestly, because a Christian heart shuns all vanity; she will not dress extravagantly, because a Christian girl will remember the poor. She will not expend her love of adornment on the exterior chiefly, for a Christian girl will not forget that a meek and quiet spirit is a brighter ornament than diamonds.—*Sel.*

ANYBODY can soil the reputation of an individual, however pure and chaste, by uttering a suspicion that his enemies will believe and his friends never hear of. A puff of the idle wind can take a million of the seeds of a thistle and do a work of mischief which the husbandman must labor long to undo, the floating particles being too fine to be seen and too light to be stopped. Such are the seeds of slander, so easily sown, so difficult to be gathered up, and yet so pernicious in their fruits. The slanderer knows that many a mind will catch up the plague and become poisoned by his insinuations, without ever seeking the antidote. No reputation can refute a sneer, nor any human skill prevent mischief.

The Review and Herald.

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

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, APRIL 15, 1873.

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

Stability a Characteristic of our Work.

We often hear it remarked in reference to the religious movement in which we are engaged, Oh! this will all blow over in a little while, or something similar to it, as though this work lacked stability. Now we are free to admit that permanence and strength are good evidences of vitality and of the truthfulness of any position. And no doubt we can tell very much about a cause, and whether it is worthy of our confidence, by first ascertaining whether it is based upon such principles as evidence, strength, and durability, or whether fluctuation and change characterize its growth and existence. Truth is eternal. Its pillars are firm as the everlasting hills. But error is ever changeable in form, even though hoary with age. We have no objection to being tested by this standard. If this cause has merely exhibited a mushroom growth, with nothing substantial about it, then nobody should link his eternal destiny to it. If our positions upon points of faith have ever been changing like the shifting sand, this would be a suspicious circumstance. If our efforts have been mainly to get up something sensational in character, that would catch the passing popular breeze, and then to drop it for something else of a similar nature; then we are unworthy of confidence. This is an age of the world when there are plenty of such efforts as I have mentioned. One can hardly turn his eye without seeing them. But those are not characteristic of truth, or of God's work, but rather of man-made theories, pushed forward by mere human agencies. God's work starts out perhaps in the greatest unpopularity, when it seems like certain ruin of reputation or life to be identified with the movement. Battling with hydra-headed wrong and error, fighting its way, inch by inch, against stubborn opposition, it stands at last justified before the world as founded upon God's eternal truth. It lays its plans, not to catch the passing breath of popular favor, but because they are right and according to sound principle and policy, regardless of what men may say about them. This battle has been fought over and over in the world. And it is in this school where the world's real heroes are. They are not made as the children of fortune, sharing her favor, but ever trained in the school of adversity and discouragement. After success has crowned their efforts, enough can always be found to shout their praises; but very few to share their labors when the battle is hottest. Every great movement of reform from the darkness of heathenism and papacy has witnessed the repetition of this struggle. Truth starts out unpopular. We claim to be engaged in a work of real reform from the darkness of papal apostasy. The great work of reformation of the last few centuries has shed light in many directions. And yet there is error to meet, and its chains must be broken before Christ's church shall stand without spot or wrinkle, prepared for his coming, full and complete as the church he left when he ascended on high.

We claim further that there has never been a religious movement more free from the merely sensational and fluctuating, than the one in which we are engaged. For some twenty-five years this movement has been in progress, meeting the united opposition of the leading churches of our land, and many times the most bitter and prejudiced statements concerning it. Its leading positions are all unpopular. The advent of the Saviour near has been a very unpopular position ever since the great disappointment of 1844. Our views on the life and death question have the popular sentiment of the religious world to contend against. While the seventh-day Sabbath arouses more opposition perhaps on account of its inconvenience than either of the others. And other views of less prominence are equally unpopular. There is nothing captivating to the popular heart about them. They tend to cut every one right off from those things that are esteemed highly by the world-loving throng. And yet this movement has gained strength every year in spite of this, and of a thousand other difficulties unknown to the outside world. We claim that there is no other religious movement in our world better prepared to meet opposition than this.

We are a thoroughly organized people, and our organization is not based upon mere appearances, but upon a solid foundation. Having struggled against all kinds of influences, within and without, and being now a unit, speaking the same thing from ocean to ocean, it is not a very easy thing to shake us to pieces. It has been tried many times and failed. Not a single theological position have our people, as a whole, ever accepted that they have been obliged to give up. How different from the course of every other people who have sailed under the advent name. These positions are becoming brighter and clearer every day. This is a very gratifying feature of our work to those who have been

toiling against opposition and opprobrium for years in the face of the whole religious world, to look back over a struggle of a quarter of a century's duration and see how God has kept us on the path of truth. It looks as though God's hand was leading out. No man can say that these positions which were taken in discouragement and apparent weakness, and great unpopularity, are not mightily stirring the public mind now in contrast with what seemed possible then. Openings are seen even this year as never before. Other nations and tongues are pleading for light on these points, and never had we greater encouragement to hope for good results.

The means and institutions supporting this movement are also of the most stable character. We have a Publishing Association, commenced in weakness, now owning a capital of nearly \$70,000, free from debt, and capable of flooding the land with our books, pamphlets, tracts, and periodicals. The founding and management of this has cost toil and energy, but it is a fixed fact, and one which argues strongly for future success.

Our Tract and Missionary Societies in process of organization will be able to scatter our publications in every nook and corner of our land, and make all our members unite in one system.

This is no ephemeral growth, gotten up for show, but something promising real work and real success. It will show, when fully completed, that we are in earnest to bring our views before all the people of our land. And what could otherwise be expected of a people who believe they have a message to test the world. We could not do otherwise and be consistent. There is labor in getting such a system into working order as any one can imagine who considers that the organization extends, more or less, over all the northern States where we have churches. To bring all these into harmony of working is a great undertaking. With a tract fund of from \$6000 to \$10,000, and with the willing contributions of thousands more, success may be most reasonably expected.

Our Systematic Benevolence for the support of our ministry is another institution peculiar to our people, and one greatly prized by us because it has been found to work so admirably. It consists of a system of giving in proportion to the amount of property, for the success of the cause, voluntarily adopted generally by our people. There is no compulsion about it. We find it abundant for the support of the object in view. Where can another people be found who have voluntarily adopted such a plan and practiced upon it for years? Cannot every one see that such a result as this is evidence of the strongest kind in favor of permanent prosperity. Surely such a result would not be expected of a work merely transient in its nature.

So of the Health Reform and Institute. These have come up against the greatest obstacles, involving denial of appetite, one of the hardest things poor nature has to practice, and yet one of the most important for men's temporal well-being. The Bible is full of instruction upon the subject of Christian temperance. And the last days are pointed out as being perilous in the extreme on account of gluttony, or surfeiting, and drunkenness. Here is an important reform to be carried out in the last days, whether people believe it or not; for the church of God who are translated will not be found destroying themselves and benumbing their noblest powers of mind when ready for the touch of immortality. We are glad to say that this reform is making progress among us. It is laid in the very principles of nature, in living, and in treating the sick, and therefore not fluctuating or changeable.

Our proposed school, in process of establishment, will also be founded in stability. Our main reason for its formation is that we may have a place where our young people may be taught with more thoroughness, and less of the artificial and showy, than in any place we can now find, and where those influences which poison the fountains of morality and religion may be counteracted. These reasons and the additional one of having a place where the important truths for this time may be taught are the great reasons we have for its establishment.

We appeal to an intelligent public if in all these mean which we are using there is anything of the merely sensational introduced. Are they not laid in common sense, in wisdom and stability? They are not designed for mere show and to captivate the passing popular favor. But they are just what an earnest people, with the fear of God before them, and the good-will of their fellow-men in their hearts, and a message of the greatest magnitude committed to them, would adopt to move the world. Fanatics do not pursue such a course, they do not create such institutions. And whatever people may think of the doctrines we teach, or of our ultimate motives in teaching them, it must be admitted that the means we are using for their promulgation and the principles we are acting upon, are stable, sensible, and consistent with truth. And the more our principles are examined and our theories investigated, with an unprejudiced mind, the more certainly will it be found that the doctrines and means are a part of one whole, well calculated to do the work we claim to be doing: the promulgation of a great system of truth calculated to test the world.

GEO. I. BUTLER.

Objections to the Sabbath Answered.

FOURTEENTH OBJECTION.

Old things are passed away, and all things have become new.

Answer. Those who raise this objection seldom know where to find the text on which it is founded; they know there is something of the kind somewhere in the New Testament, and that is sufficient. So they apply it to the Sabbath question and thus ease their consciences. But it has not the slightest reference to the Sabbath or the law as will be seen by reading it. 2 Cor. 5:17. "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away, behold, all things are become new." When do old things pass away and all things become new? At the death of Christ? At the change from the old dispensation to the new? Oh! no; but when a man comes into Christ and becomes a new creature. That is when this change occurs and what this text refers to.

Another text similar to this is found in Rev. 21:5. "Behold, I make all things new." What does this refer to? Read the connection. Verse 1. "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away," &c. The passing away of the old earth and the introduction of the new earth is what John is discoursing about. All can see that in either of these passages it is simply a perversion of Scripture to wrest them from their connection and apply them to the Sabbath or the law, to which they have not the slightest reference.

FIFTEENTH OBJECTION.

The law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, but after faith came we are no longer under a schoolmaster. Gal. 3:24, 25. *To the same effect the law is declared to be a yoke of bondage, from which Christ has made us free.* Gal. 5:1. *And other expressions in this book show that the law reached no farther than till the cross of Christ; hence the law has been abolished.*

Answer. The whole question, it seems to me, turns upon what law is under consideration in the book of Galatians. If what Paul here says of the law does apply to the decalogue, I should have to agree with our opponents that it has been abolished. But it seems evident to me that Paul is referring to the ceremonial law, and not to the law of ten commandments. For this I will give my reasons. Any particular expression in this book should be explained in accordance with the general subject of the letter. What object did Paul have in view in writing this letter to the Galatians? Does he find fault with them for keeping any one of the ten commandments? No such thing is mentioned in the whole letter. In the first chapter he appeals to them thus: "For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it; and profited in the Jews' religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers." Verses 13, 14. Here he mentions the traditions of the fathers, for which he had been very zealous. He then proceeds to say that the gospel which he preached, was directly revealed to him by Christ himself, and not taught him by any man, no, not even by the apostles themselves. See verses 15-24. He then refers to a certain visit which he and Barnabas made at Jerusalem, at which time a council was held concerning this very question which was troubling the Galatians. Hence he refers to that council, and the action that was taken there, to convince these Galatians that they were regarding a law which was no longer to be kept by the disciples. Thus he says: "Then fourteen years after, I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also." "But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised." Chap. 2:1, 2. Here he says that even Titus, a minister of the gospel, who went up to this council with him, was not compelled to be circumcised, though some, he says, tried to bring them into bondage, thus indicating that it is a law teaching circumcision which was troubling the Galatians.

If the reader will turn to Acts 15, there he will find a lengthy account of this very visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem. "And certain men which came down from Judea taught the brethren and said, except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved. When, therefore, Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question." Acts 15:1, 2. This language compared with Gal. 2:1-4, puts it beyond question that it is the same visit which is referred to in both places, and as will be seen, the same subject is up in both places, viz., that of circumcision and the law of Moses. The reader is requested to turn back and read my answer to the objection founded on Acts 15; but I will recapitulate a few points here.

Thus verse 5 says: "But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses." The question here is with regard to circumcision, as the reader cannot fail to see. This law, in

verse 10, Peter calls a yoke which neither their fathers nor themselves were able to bear. The council wrote to the Gentiles that they need not keep the law, with the exception of the four points which they name as follows: "That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well." Verse 29. The reader will see that all four of these things here mentioned are contained in the ceremonial law; hence it is also that law which is under consideration by Paul in his letter to the Galatians. Take another item in Paul's argument in chapter 2:11-14. "But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?"

How does this affect the question which Paul is arguing with the Galatians if the ten commandments is the law under consideration? It can have no bearing whatever upon it. But if it be the ceremonial law it is indeed very much to the point. Look at it. Peter, a Jew, and an apostle, comes down to Antioch, and freely eats with the Gentiles, which was a direct violation of the ceremonial law, forbidding such things. But when certain other zealous Jews came down from Jerusalem, Peter withdrew from the Gentiles, and would not eat with them any more, and thus showed by his conduct that he regarded that ceremonial law as still in force and binding on Christians. Paul justly reproveth him for this, thus: "If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" In other words, if Peter, a Jew, could disregard that law, how much more the Gentile. What law had he violated? Any one of the ten commandments? No; he had simply done what the Gentiles did, and thus broken the ceremonial law of the Jews. In this he did perfectly right.

This fact should have great weight in determining what law is under consideration here. Farther on, Paul asks them, "Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" Chap. 3:3. This has plain reference to the fleshly, or carnal, ordinances of the ceremonial law of which Paul, in another place, says, "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." Heb. 9:10.

It could not refer to the decalogue, because those precepts are directly opposed to the flesh. To this he refers the Galatians again in chapter 6:12. "As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised; only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ.

Here these works of the flesh are directly connected with circumcision, and those who kept that law did it to avoid the cross of Christ. Why? Because, by regarding all the ceremonies of the Jews, they would please them, and so escape persecution. That the law here spoken of is that which was written in the book of the law by Moses, and not on the tables of stone, is indicated by the following language: "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." Chap. 3:10. And verse 19, we think, is decisive as to what law is meant: "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgression, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator."

Paul asks, What is the object of the law? He answers, that it was added because of transgression. Transgression is the violation of the law. 1 John 3:4. "For where no law is, there is no transgression." Rom. 4:15. Then it certainly follows that some law existed and was transgressed before this law was given; and further, it follows that this law would not have been given if the other law had not previously been transgressed. Mark this point well. Paul says directly that this law was added because of transgression. Then if the cause (transgression) had never taken place, this law would not have been added. Transgression is a violation of law. So a law existed and was transgressed before this law in Galatians was given. And it never would have been given if the first had not been violated. It seems to me that this point is so plain that none can fail to see it.

Now look a moment at the facts. When God made man in Eden, he gave him everything for his life and comfort, with a free access to the tree of life. Gen. 2:8-17. Only one tree was man prohibited from eating. In the day he should eat of that he must die; but as long as he was obedient and did not transgress God's command, he should live; but he transgressed the law of God. Thus we read: "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food,

and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat." Gen. 3:6. By this act the woman transgressed three of the ten commandments. First, she desired, that is, coveted, the fruit which had been forbidden, and thus broke the tenth commandment, "Thou shalt not covet." Secondly, she then took that which did not belong to her, and broke the eighth commandment, "Thou shalt not steal." Thirdly, she obeyed Satan instead of God, and thus broke the first commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Comp. Rom. 6:16. Thus they transgressed the moral law of God and became condemned sinners. In order to save them, it became necessary for Christ to die; and to shadow forth this fact it became necessary to offer sacrifices of animals, &c. Then there must be priests to offer these, an altar upon which to sacrifice them, a temple, provisions for the support of the priests, &c. All these things required a law to regulate them; hence it became necessary now to add a second law, the ceremonial to the moral law. If the first had never been transgressed, then the second would never have been added. Hence Paul's language is true, "Wherefore then serveth the law," or what was the object of it? "It was added because of transgression." Yes, and we have seen the reason why. How long? Till the seed (Christ) should come. How long were these sacrifices, the temple, the altar, the priests, &c., to last? Only till Christ, to whom they pointed, should come. Hence that law ended there of necessity. Of this law Paul further says: "It was ordained by angels in the hands of a Mediator," precisely the way of the law of Moses was given. But the decalogue was given by God himself, written by his own finger—not in a book, but on tables of stone. In this light it seems to me Paul's language is very plain. "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ; but after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." Verses 24, 25. Chapter 5:1-3, furnishes further proof that it is not the ten commandment-law under consideration. "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law." It will be seen that there is no reference here to the moral law, but to the law regarding circumcision. "If ye be circumcised," says Paul, "Christ shall profit you nothing." This he keeps constantly before their minds. Then he says, "Whoever is circumcised is bound to keep the whole law, that is the whole of that law of which circumcision is a part; because if one part of that law is binding, of course it all is; hence they must proceed to offer sacrifices, &c. In the first place he calls it a yoke of bondage, the same term which Peter applies to the law of Moses. Acts 15:10. Can this apply to the ten commandments? Look them over. Is it a yoke of bondage to have no other gods, or to refrain from worshipping images, to speak God's name with reverence, to honor our parents, to keep ourselves from murder, adultery, theft, lying or coveting? Here are nine of the ten. Who would stand up and say that these are a yoke of bondage to him? The man who would, would declare himself to be an unrighteous, unconverted, carnal man.

There is only one commandment left which is the Sabbath commandment. Is it a yoke of bondage to rest on God's holy day, to go to the house of God, to pray and sing and worship the Creator? To the carnal heart, no doubt this would be bondage, but God says that we shall "call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable."

Every reference shows that Paul in Galatians is considering, not the moral, but the ceremonial law. We freely admit that some of his statements are as true of the moral law as of the ceremonial, and perhaps some of them may be a general reference to all law, as where he says, "for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." Chap. 2:16. And again, "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident; for the just shall live by faith." Gal. 3:11.

In my answer to previous objections, I have answered that founded upon these texts where I showed that it was impossible for a sinner to be justified by even the strictest obedience to law, the moral law, or any other; hence it is true that a man cannot be justified by the works of the law, either the ceremonial or the moral. The blood of Christ alone can wash away our sins. But that does not abolish the moral law, nor give liberty for a man to sin.

One or two more points in this book deserve a passing notice. Chap. 4:10, 11. Here, our opponents say, is a plain reference to the observance of the Sabbath—"Ye observe days, times," &c. But I wonder if Sunday-keepers do not observe days, and times, as well as Sabbath-keepers? Why would not this be equally true of them? If it has any reference to the observance of the Sabbath day, then it would be wrong to keep any day, for that would be observing days, and times, according to this interpretation. But go back to the Old Testament a moment, and we find Moses giving a similar prohibition. Lev. 19:26. "Ye shall not eat anything with the

blood, neither shall ye use enchantment, nor observe times." Again, Deut. 18:10, "There shall not be found among you . . . an observer of times, or an enchanter," &c. Did this refer to the Sabbath? All know that it did not, from the very fact that at the same time they were strictly required to keep the Sabbath, and other sacred days. We say that a fair interpretation of Paul's language in Galatians will apply in the same manner, viz., to the superstitious observing of days, months, and times, which the heathens regarded.

Another objection is founded on Paul's allegory of the two women, in chapter 4:22-31. "For it is written that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory; for these are the two covenants, the one from Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all." Because it is said that these two women represent the two covenants, and that one of these was from Mount Sinai, it is at once assumed that this is the ten commandments which were given at Mount Sinai. But there is no proof of this. It will be remembered that the ceremonial law was given from Mount Sinai as well as the ten commandments.

When we go to Hebrews 8, we shall see that the old covenant is not the ten commandments. But it is sufficient now to show that the ten commandments are not what is here represented by this bondwoman. What does Paul say that Agar represents? His language is direct and explicit, "For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to [or represents] Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children." A plainer statement cannot be made. The bondwoman, instead of representing the ten commandments, or the law, represents old Jerusalem with the unbelieving Jews, while the other represents not a new law, but the New Jerusalem, which is above, and is free. Paul concludes his argument on this point thus: "So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free." We are not children of this old, literal Jerusalem, which has been rejected by God, but of the new and heavenly Jerusalem above, which is free. How a person can make the mistake of applying these two women, one to the old law, and the other to the new, is more than I can see, when Paul so plainly says that they represent the one, old Jerusalem, which is in bondage with her children, and the other, Jerusalem above, which is free. All these points in this book might be made clearer by a more extended notice, but endeavoring to be brief, I have contented myself with simply stating facts enough to show that the position of our opponents is untenable.

Lessons from the Past:—Faith and Unbelief.

OUR first parents stood in the garden of Eden in the perfection of beauty and innocence, surrounded, by their Creator, with everything that could minister to their happiness, themselves the crowning glory of his creative work, when the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy, and he, looking over his fair creation, pronounced it very good. Every tree that was good for food, or pleasing to the eye, was theirs to enjoy; but in the midst of the garden stood one tree, only one, of which they might not partake; for God had said, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

Instead of believing and obeying him who had freely given them so many blessings, they chose to heed the insinuations of a stranger, a usurper, who, without a single claim to their confidence, boldly dared to question the truth of the Creator's word. They listened to his voice, and, yielding to the temptation, they plucked and ate the fruit of the forbidden tree, and found, alas! too late, only a knowledge of the good which might have been their own, but which they by transgression lost; and a sad, bitter experience of evil, that would darken all their earth-life with its baneful shadow. Then God, touched with pity for the misery which sin had wrought, provided for the fallen race a way of escape—a Saviour was promised, who would render perfect obedience to the law of God and, by giving his life a ransom, redeem lost man and open up, once more, the way to life's fair tree, forfeited by their sin.

Still faith and unbelief contended for mastery in the human heart. Abel humbly offered a lamb in sacrifice, obedient to God's command, and found the pardon which he sought; while Cain, in proud rebellion, brought only a thank-offering of the fruit of the earth and was turned away, rejected of him whose commands he dared to disregard.

When the children of Israel cried for deliverance from bondage in the land of Egypt, Jehovah, mindful of his promise to their fathers, revealed himself for their salvation. He brought them forth with such manifestations of his power in those terrible judgments on their oppressors as should have awakened the most unbounded confidence in his love and care for them; yet, when tested at the Red Sea, how soon did their faith

fail and unbelief and murmuring come in. Again the Lord delivered them; while their cruel foes were drowned in the mighty waters. Through all their journeyings in the wilderness, his tender watchcare was untiring. He fed them with the bread of Heaven, he guided them by a pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night; their clothing did not grow old, nor their shoes wear out, in all their travels; and, more than this, the mighty God promised to go before them, to drive out their enemies, and bring them to a good land, flowing with milk and honey, if they would serve and obey him. Surely, if any people ever exercised unwavering faith in God, we might expect to find it in the history before us. But, alas! when temptation came, they disbelieved him, murmured at the trials of the way, and limited the Holy One of Israel.

After the dread exhibitions of his power and majesty at Mount Sinai, when their leader was, for a little time, withdrawn from them, instead of patiently awaiting his return, they formed a calf of gold and raised the Heaven-daring cry, "These be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt!" No wonder that Moses, coming from the presence of the Infinite, with his light and glory still resting upon him, was filled with indignation at the sight, and cast the tables of stone upon the ground, breaking them in pieces.

Still, God in mercy bore with their unbelief, and led them on till they came to the very borders of the promised land. At his command, spies were sent up to view the country, and, returning laden with the rich fruits of the land, all but two repeated the disheartening story, "There are great giants in the land, in whose sight we were but as grasshoppers." Caleb and Joshua, with true courage and faith in God, replied, "If God delight in us, then he will bring us into this land and give it us; the Lord is with us—fear them not."

The people listened to the words of unbelief, and uttered the impious wish, "Would God we had died in the wilderness!" and the Lord granted them their rash desire. He bade them turn back into the wilderness, and there they wandered till, of all the men of war who left Egypt, only Caleb and Joshua remained, who followed the Lord with all their hearts.

These things were written as ensamples unto us on whom the ends of the world are come, that we should not fall after the same example of unbelief. This is the evil root from which springs disobedience, sin in every form; while faith in God, a confiding trust in him and belief of his word, lies at the foundation of all true obedience. It is simply taking God at his word, yielding ourselves to obey him, and trusting him for the result. In its very simplicity is strength; for it is by faith that human weakness becomes linked to Infinite Power, so the apostle could say, "When I am weak, then am I strong." Yes; when the sinner falls on Christ, broken, helpless, and penitent, believing his promises, and trusting to his atoning sacrifice, he has a power that can move the Eternal.

But how shall we discern this faith? How distinguish between the true and false? For we may be sure that Satan will have numberless counterfeits with which to deceive the unwary. Say the Scriptures, "By their fruits ye shall know them." If the tree is good, the fruit will be good also; but if the fruit is corrupt, we may be sure it springs from an evil heart of unbelief.

All the spirits which are gone out into the world come from one of these two sources. There are only two ways, the narrow and the broad. The Saviour says, "He that is not for me is against me, and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad."

As we draw near to the great consummation, this subject is of especial importance. God has given us sufficient evidence in his word, in the signs of the times, as seen in the political and religious world, in the sun, moon, and stars, in the elements, everywhere, so we may know our position in the world's history. The exact fulfillment of every prophecy in the past insures the realization of those which are still future. And it is the part of reason, of sound judgment, and good sense, to believe God and obey his word.

As it was in the days of Noah, so shall it be when the Son of man is revealed. He and his family alone, of all the world, believed God's word and obeyed it. All the rest had the light, but they rejected it and perished. It is safe to obey God. We find in every instance recorded in Holy Writ that those who accepted the warnings given, and moved in faith and obedience, received just the help they needed. God never fails. He has given us the greatest proof of love possible for even God to give, in sending his own Son, the majesty of Heaven, into the world. And he has promised, with him freely to give us all things that we need.

Have faith in God. With this, nothing indeed can separate us from his love, which is in Christ Jesus. Sin only, the bitter fruit of unbelief, can accomplish it.

If the Bible is the word of God, then it is true, all true, its precious promises are recorded for us, and we honor God by believing and claiming them for our own.

Like God's ancient people, we have come up to the very borders of the heavenly Canaan; let us not be discouraged by the trials of the way, but with unwavering faith in him cry out with those leaders of old, In the strength of

God, we are well able to go up and possess the goodly land. Those who are for us are more than all they who can be against us. All the heavenly hosts, God, Christ, and the innumerable company of pure, sinless angels, are interested in man's salvation. Very soon will faith be lost in sight, the disgrace of sin be forever wiped out, and once more from all His glorious creation arise the glad ascription—"Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever." MARY A. DAVIS.

Battle Creek.

No Cross, no Crown.

"WHOM the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the Father chasteneth not? But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons." Heb. 12:6-8.

How often we hear people complaining of the many trials and disappointments through which they are called to pass, when, in reality, they are but blessings in disguise. When an earthly father chastens his children, he is not confined to one kind of punishment, or two, but each receives a punishment suited to his or her disposition. Likewise our Heavenly Father has blessings especially adapted to the wants of each of his children. Some have a naturally proud heart with which to contend, and in mercy he visits such with some humiliating affliction; for he knows how little true happiness is enjoyed by the proud, either in this life, or in the world to come. And if the desired effect is not produced by the first visitation, another, still more humiliating, is sent, and still another, until they fully realize the truth of the words of Peter: "God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble."

But while some are proud, others are selfish, covetous, boasters, blasphemers, and the like, Paul says that these things shall be signs of the last days. Then, as we draw near the consummation of all things, we must expect to see these traits of character more fully developed in man. But do they tend to happiness? Look at the covetous man, who spends all his time and strength in scraping together a few of the transitory things of earth. Is he truly happy? Far from it. He is neither happy himself, nor has he any time to make others happy; no time to spend with his family; no time to speak a kind word to the sorrowing; no time for prayer. It is hurry, hurry, from morning till night, week after week, year in and year out. When he lays his head upon his pillow at night, it is not to be refreshed by sleep, but to pass the night in sleepless anxiety. He rises early, partakes of his breakfast in haste, and proceeds to his business without a parting word, or even a prayer that God will protect his family or direct his own steps. Does such a man expect to have the prospering hand of God in his business? Does he expect to have the honor and applause of this world, and in the next, to wear the victor's crown? I think not; for Christ has said that a "man cannot serve two masters; for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon."

Thus it is, that while our minds are filled with thoughts and plans of this life, we lose sight of the promises of God and of the eternal inheritance, which, as John Wesley says, "will be more beautiful than that ever beheld by Adam." Then who would not be willing to exchange all the pomp and royalty of an earthly king for a home in that beautiful paradise, and a crown far surpassing in worth and beauty that ever worn by mortals? Let us then bear cheerfully all the crosses and trials thrown in our pathway, knowing that they will work out for us "a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory."

MARY E. KELSEY.

Battle Creek.

The Christian's Anchor.

WHEN Cyrus Field, on board the "Great Eastern," was searching in mid-Atlantic for the lost "cable," the draggle was lowered, and though lost to view in the deep waters, he knew by the trembling of the chain that it was accomplishing its work on the bottom of the sea. So the Christian mariner, on the tempestuous sea of life, knows "by the trembling of the chain" that his hope as an anchor is securely fixed in the sanctuary above.

When the lost cable was recovered, its nerve was thrilled with electric fire and bade to go with a message of regard and inquiry to the home of his friends in distant America. In a few moments, from the deep sea, by way of Ireland, came the responsive congratulation, and the cheering, "All is well."

How like the Christian's experience on the tempest-tossed sea of human life. The promises of God bind him to the throne in the jasper-walled city above; prayer thrills the connection, and the Spirit responds in whispers of peace.

A. SMITH.

He that lendeth to another in time of prosperity shall never want help himself in the time of adversity.

KIND THOUGHTS.

Let us cherish a memory for pleasant things,
And let all the others go.
It is never by giving "tit for tat"
That we touch the heart of a foe.
It is not by dwelling on fancied wrongs
That we feel their sting grow less:
And malice once entering the heart is sure
To crush out all tenderness.

Forgive, forget, though the wrong be great,
And your heart be stricken sore;
For thinking of trouble makes it worse,
And its pain is all the more.
Do kindly things to your neighbors, e'en
Though they do not so to you.
Though they be wrong, unjust, unkind,
Keep your own heart ever true.

The heart is a garden, our thoughts the flowers
That spring into fruitful life;
Have care that in sowing there fall no seed
From the weed of cruel strife.
Oh! loving words are not hard to say
If the heart be loving too.
And the kinder thoughts you to others give
The kinder their thoughts of you.

—Hope Arbor.

Progress of the Cause.

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

Westmore, Vt.

ALTHOUGH it snowed and blowed nearly every day that we were in this place, making our congregation small, yet we were enabled to give twenty-four sermons in about three weeks of time, besides making a trip to East Charleston. Three intelligent persons have embraced the truth, and others are deeply interested and are investigating. Upon the whole, we are glad we went to Westmore. We became strongly attached to Bro. Litchfield's family, who had been alone for years, and for whom the Lord had commenced to work. They have an increasing confidence in all the branches and workings of this cause; and may their strength and courage increase in following up the interest started in their locality.

We remained in Westmore till yesterday, when we had reached the light of a hard thaw, and the roads were becoming impassable. It was with great difficulty that we reached this place. The good interest in Westmore has revived courage in our old brethren, and increased in them the missionary spirit. We hope that the friends in East Charleston and Westmore will make a special effort to keep up their meetings, and that when they cannot meet, they will improve their time in reading.

D. T. BOURDEAU.

March 31, 1873.

Boston.

At the commencement of last Sabbath, March 29, the S. D. A. church of Boston assembled at the house of Bro. H. B. Stratton for the purpose of communing with God, and to commemorate the death, burial, and resurrection, of their blessed Lord. It was a ceremony in its character solemn and affecting, reminding the saints of their relationship to their Heavenly Father, of what Christ had done and suffered in behalf of sinful man, and what he would do for all them that love him and keep his commandments. All present appeared to be lifted above the things of earth, and to hold sweet communion with Jesus while they sang forth praises to God in the highest. And in our communion with the Holy Spirit and with one another, there was that flow of spirit and brotherly love manifested between the brethren which is well-pleasing to God and a distinguishing feature of God's peculiar people. There was a general renewing of covenant vows, and heartfelt desires for a closer walk with God were expressed. The meeting was one of the most thrilling, solemn, softening, melting seasons of religious worship I ever attended.

Bro Prescott, who officiated, enjoyed much freedom in the Lord, and spoke words of good cheer to encourage us in our pilgrimage Zionward. Sister Temple rendered efficient aid to the younger sisters, while all hearts and voices united in singing praises to God, and honor to him that is to come and take the government upon his shoulders.

M. WOOD.

New Hampshire.

RETURNED home April 3, 1873, after an absence of about six months. I have been laboring most of the time in Lincoln, Woodstock, Thornton, and Campton, Grafton Co., N. H. I commenced in North Woodstock. Had a good hearing for a scattered community, and as a result, seven began to keep the Sabbath. One has since given up the struggle, two others left for other parts in a few weeks. I saw the remaining four about two weeks since. Found them advancing in the truth and grace of God.

My last effort was in Campton. The people there came in to hear quite as well as we could expect. Seven are keeping the Sabbath

now, and we still hope for others there if those now decided to obey take a straight forward, consistent course, and we expect they will.

A Bible-class was started in each of these places, and those who attend are becoming more and more interested.

The spiritualists have been considerably stirred in Thornton and Campton, and have shown some opposition, but truth has triumphed because of the blessing of God.

The weather and going have been more unfavorable than usual for meetings the past winter, but we have tried to do the best we could. We see much room for improvement, and, by the grace of God, we mean to go forward.

The people have been very kind to us, with but few exceptions; for which we are thankful, and we remember them all with kind feelings.

P. C. RODMAN.

April 4, 1873.

Wisconsin.

SINCE my report of March 18, I have been detained here by storms and bad roads. I have been holding meetings as often as consistent considering the condition of the roads, and am seeing some fruit of my labor.

Last Sabbath, six more united with the church. Sunday, March 30, five were baptized. Several more have commenced keeping the Sabbath. I now intend to go home for a few days to prepare for summer labor. We hear often from different parts of Wisconsin, people calling for help. One man offered me seventy dollars to go to an adjoining county and stay two weeks. I earnestly pray that God will send help to this State. But, brethren and sisters, we are toiling on. I believe we never have been in better working order than now. Our great lack is, a want of laborers. I am trying to do my work well. I still plead for your earnest prayers.

D. DOWNER.

Wallerloo, Wis., April 6, 1873.

Chesaning, Mich.

My last report was from Locke, Ingham Co., where we were having a good interest in the brick school-house. But the weather suddenly turned cold and stormy, so that the people could not attend meetings, and about that time I received an urgent request from my parents to come and care for them in their declining days. I considered the matter and felt it a duty to comply with their request, and expect soon to be there, the Lord permitting; and as I go, I will try to remember the interests of the cause everywhere, and especially in Chesaning. I plead for Chesaning, that it may have another course of lectures. Cannot the tent come here the first place in the season? There might not a great number embrace the truth, yet I think some would by proper instruction and the Lord's blessing. Many are disgusted with their present teachers, and some are inquiring after truth. The Lord direct.

At our last business meeting, Bro. Seth Sprague was chosen elder, and Bro. John Trotman, Treasurer, to act in my absence. My P. O. address will be, until further notice, West Seneca, Erie Co., N. Y.

D. W. MILK.

Nicolet Co., Minn.

THINKING the brethren of Minnesota would be glad to hear from me, I take this opportunity to report through the REVIEW.

March 13, commenced labor at the Keene school-house, nine miles west of Mankato. Found the people much prejudiced against us, still the Lord worked. Five took their stand with us, to obey God.

March 24, commenced meetings at the Belgrade school-house, three miles east. Found the people ready to receive the truth. Although the roads were muddy and the nights dark, we had a full house. God has blessed his word. Some twelve have taken hold with us, making, in all, seventeen. More are convinced, and I think will obey God. Pray for us, that the blessing of God may follow us, and many more here may give their hearts to Jesus.

GEORGE M. DIMMICK.

April 2, 1873.

SISTER S. E. GIBSON writes from Olmstead Co.: I desire ever to be enabled to say with the psalmist; "How love I thy law! it is my meditation all the day." How good it is to keep the commandments of God; and they are not grievous. I realize in some degree the beauty of those blessed words, spoken by our divine Lord, "My yoke is easy, and my burden light." Yes, it is even so. When by the eye of faith we can see Jesus, every burden is made light; every cross is sweet to lift.

I rejoice in the evidence that the good work is going on. May it continue to deepen and widen till all that are willing to be led by the Holy Spirit shall be gathered into the fold. And let us, who have seen the light, strive to walk in it; yea, strive,

remembering that Jesus said, "Many shall seek to enter in, but shall not be able." Does not that imply that they will not seek with sufficient earnestness? The blessing is promised to the doers of the Lord's will, and not to the hearers only.

I thank the Lord for the Testimonies; and, with his help, I mean they shall affect my life, and make me more like the great Pattern. The health and dress reforms are precious to me, and the benefit I have received from them has been beyond price. They have restored me from being a suffering invalid to the enjoyment of excellent health. Praise the Lord! Pray for me, that I may hold out faithful.

SISTER ELIZA EMMERSON writes from Stearns Co., Minn.: There are a few of us here that are trying to keep God's commandments, so that it may be well with us at his soon appearing. We never have had the pleasure of seeing or hearing one of God's servants who keep his commandments and have the faith of Jesus. Bro. Canright has labored at Hutchinson, not far from us. We would gladly send him the means to defray his expenses, if he would come and labor with us a few weeks; but we leave it with God, knowing that it will all be well. I feel to thank God that he has opened my eyes to see the truth, and also that he has enabled me to abandon the use of swine's flesh and tea; for I want to be cleansed from all filthiness of the flesh, so that it may be well with me at the soon coming of my blessed Lord and Master. I ask the prayers of God's chosen people, that I may prove faithful, and at last have the overcomer's reward.

Faith in God.

WHAT a fountain of happiness is contained in this short sentence, Faith in God. One can but be happy if he believes in the blessed promises; for we find in the Book of all books that consoling passage, All things work together for good to those that love the Lord. What would poor mortal creatures do when called upon to part with the dearest ties of earth, had they not access to the throne of grace; for all things earthly are then shrouded in darkness, and there is no comfort or consolation to be derived from any source, save in believing on the Lord Jesus Christ. I speak from experience. I have been called to pass through the furnace of affliction twice within sixteen months. The monster death entered my family and snatched away my two only daughters, aged, respectively, five and seventeen years, yet I can say with Job, "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him;" for I believe if we bear our afflictions patiently, they will eventually work out for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.

By the assisting grace of God, I feel determined to try to discharge every known and Christian duty, that at last I may be accounted worthy to have part and lot in the first resurrection, where the loved and lost will be restored to me, and I shall be permitted to behold him in whom I have trusted, and who has promised to receive all who come unto him. I believe that he is a rewarder of them who diligently seek him.

I am trying to keep all the commandments. Although it requires many sacrifices to keep the fourth, I feel I have ever been rewarded in so doing. Never in all my Christian experience have I enjoyed my mind as since I commenced keeping the seventh day. My faith is daily increasing in the Lord, as I become better acquainted with the Scriptures. I feel more resigned to his will, for there we learn, "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth," and if all things are to work together for good, then why should I murmur or complain, or think that my portion is hard, while it is my privilege to say, God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble?

M. J. RANDALL FULTON.

Kalamazoo, Mich.

Home Conversation.

CHILDREN hunger perpetually for new ideas. They will learn with pleasure from the lips of parents what they deem it drudgery to study in books; and even if they have the misfortune to be deprived of many educational advantages, they will grow up intelligent if they enjoy in childhood the privilege of listening daily to the conversation of intelligent people. We sometimes see parents who are the life of every company which they enter, dull, silent, and uninteresting at home among their children. If they have not mental stores sufficiently for both, let them first use what they have for their own household. A silent house is a dull place for young people, a place from which they will escape if they can. How much useful information, on the other hand, is often given in pleasant family conversation, and what unconscious but excellent mental training, in lively social argument. Cultivate to the utmost all the graces of home conversation.

DISCUSSION ON THE SABBATH QUESTION
BETWEEN ELD. J. H. WAGGONER, S. D. ADVENTIST,
AND ELD. PETER VOGEL, DISCIPLE.

THIRD PROPOSITION.

"Do the Scriptures teach that the seventh-day Sabbath is to be observed by Christians throughout the gospel dispensation?"

ELD. WAGGONER affirms; ELD. VOGEL denies.

ELD. WAGGONER'S SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE.

ANOTHER point or two I will now consider on the covenants:

(7). The minister or priest of the new covenant has also a sanctuary in which to officiate. The first covenant had a "worldly sanctuary" of two apartments—the holy and the most holy. In that the priests "served unto the example and shadow of heavenly things," as the sanctuary was made according to a pattern shown to Moses. Heb. 8:5; 9:1. But our priest serves in "the sanctuary and true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man,"—in the heavens. Heb. 8:1, 2. The earthly is called the pattern of the heavenly. "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures [resemblance, copy corresponding to an original—Greenfield] of the true [literally, true ones], but into Heaven itself." There are, therefore, holy places in the heavenly sanctuary. When Moses made the first sanctuary, the Lord promised to manifest his glory at "the door of the tabernacle of the congregation"—the holy; Ex. 29:42, 43; just inside of which door were the seven golden candlesticks (properly lampstands), and the table of show-bread. And when St. John had a view of the majesty of God in Heaven, where our High Priest was when the Revelation was given, he saw "seven lamps of fire burning before the throne." Rev. 4:1-6. But when "the seventh angel sounded," ushering in the third woe, coming down even to the "time of the dead that they should be judged," and to the giving of reward to the prophets, and to all that fear the Lord, small and great, then "there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament"—or covenant. Rev. 11:14-18. Comp. chap. 22:12; Luke 14:14.

As the time of giving reward here brought to view is at the coming of Christ, we look to Rev. 14:14, where the Saviour is seen coming to reap the harvest of the earth, and just preceding his coming, a call is made to "keep the commandments of God [the "one Law-giver"—"the Judge of all"] and the faith of Jesus," the "mediator between God and man" in the heavenly sanctuary. Thus it appears that under the seventh trumpet, our High Priest fulfills the type of "the day of atonement," or of "cleansing the sanctuary," Lev. 16:1-19; Dan. 8:14; by entering into the most holy of the heavenly places, wherein is seen the ark of God's testament, or covenant.

We readily admit that everything made by Moses was a figure or representation of the things in the heavens; but that which was in the ark—the law of God—was not made by Moses. It took hold on moral relations, and came directly from God himself. Paul says "the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets;" and we see this illustrated in the writings of inspired men. Though all were inspired by "one spirit," and "spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," they presented in their writings each the peculiarity of his own mind. What a difference is seen in the styles of Peter, John, Paul, Isaiah, Daniel, &c. Each book bears the visible impress of the mind of its writer, even under inspiration. But look at the ten commandments. "Whose image and superscription is this?" Here is an instrument which bears honors above all the revelation which God committed to the race. "And God spake all these words." Jehovah himself wrote them. They bear the impress of Deity alone. With what reverence and sacred awe should all men stand before the ten commandments of Jehovah!

When the gospel age closes—when probation ends, and "the seven last plagues" are to be poured out upon the earth, the angels receive these plagues from "the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony in Heaven"—the most holy place. Rev. 15. In those plagues "is filled up the wrath of God," because it is then and there that the work of our High Priest is finished; the atonement is made, and the sins of "all the Israel of God" are blotted out. This is an extensive theme, but my limits will not permit me to enlarge upon it.

(8). The new covenant was made with Judah and Israel. It was decidedly "Jewish," to use the language of our opponents; made with the Jews, and one born a Jew is its mediator! Paul says that to them pertain "the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises." These are privileges not to be despised; but the chief advantage of the Jews was that "unto them were committed the oracles of God." Rom. 3. Will the reader consider again the testimony of Stephen, Acts 7:38, that Moses "received the lively oracles [living oracles] to give unto us." Happy for "us" if we obey those "living oracles"—God's holy covenant, "the word which he commanded to a thousand generations."

But Eld. Vogel says "the commonwealth of Israel" was a "civil compact," and that nothing given to them remains. This assertion is disproved by the Scriptures; for the new covenant was made with them, and "the oracles of God," which Moses received, were "living oracles" in the time of Stephen. Such evidence cannot be evaded. And it strikes me there is unusual irreverence manifested in Eld. Vogel's statements on this subject. Of that "civil compact," he says:—

"(3). This is further evident from the fact that God stood to the Hebrews in the relation of political ruler, law-giver, and king. For when they said to Samuel, Make us a king to judge us like all the nations, Jehovah replied, They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them."

This has no point at all except this, that Jehovah was a ruler in every respect just like the one they chose in his stead! Will Eld. V. squarely avow that conclusion, or renounce his position? Saul was only a civil ruler, and could not administer government on moral grounds; "hence, it follows" that Jehovah was a political—not a moral governor! Question: Did the priests minister between Saul and the people after he began to reign? Or was there another important relation back of Saul's rule? Were the ten commandments the law of Saul; or was the glory of Saul manifested over the ark of the testament in the sanctuary? Does it not appear that Eld. Vogel is a very superficial reasoner on Bible relations? If we are to judge of the character and position of the one rejected, by that of the one chosen in his stead, to

what conclusion must we arrive from the Jews' rejecting Christ and choosing a murderer in his stead? Some say that such things are not so much the fault of the reasoner as of the theory which he is advocating; but I cannot accept such a distinction. Any person of ordinary ability is responsible for advocating a theory built on such premises and leading to such conclusions. When the truth and honor of God and the eternal welfare of our fellow-beings are at stake, our teachings involve a responsibility calling for especial carefulness and reverence.

Another point of importance, relating also to Eld. Vogel's errors in the term "Lord," I must waive to attend to that which I cannot longer postpone.

The reader may be assured that I regret the necessity of again referring to the Hebrew, but justice compels me to do so. I shall use "great plainness of speech," as the occasion requires. I have already pointed out errors of statement and deduction in Eld. Vogel which ought to have settled the question, but he persisted in his course. In this I shall convict him of such inaccuracies, or "blunders," to adopt his own courteous style, as will, I trust, put it to a final rest.

1. The reader will please notice the following cases where *Sabbath* is in predicate: Ex. 16: 23, 25, 26; chap. 20: 10; chap. 31: 15, first time; chap. 35: 2; Lev. 23: 3, twice; Deut. 5: 14; and the article is omitted in each case. It is not in predicate in the following instances: Ex. 16: 29; chap. 20: 8, 11; chap. 31: 14, 15, second time, 16, twice; chap. 35: 3; Lev. 23: 11, 15, 16; Deut. 5: 12; and in each case the article is used. This is not accidental; and I leave the reader to judge whether a first mention will account for its omission in Ex. 20, and 31, and 35, Lev. 23, and Deut. 5. Eld. Vogel's invention of a "re-mention nearly equivalent to a first mention" is positively puerile, got up only to meet the necessities of his case. If the statement of Gesenius is a "blunder," how is it that from first to last, in the same chapter and in the same verse, the article is omitted when the noun is in predicate, and inserted when it is not in predicate? This use fully justifies the words of Gesenius: "The precept is also correctly given by grammarians, that the predicate of a sentence does not take the article." Exceptions do not destroy this precept more than they do that quoted by Eld. Vogel, and exceptions to that are abundant, though he did positively deny it. He only misconstrues Green if he thinks he "condemns" Gesenius in this. The absence of the article is fully accounted for on other ground than that claimed by Eld. Vogel; hence, his inference is unwarranted and his argument a nullity.

2. He does me great injustice in accusing me of blundering in regard to the construction of Ex. 16: 23. He said I blundered once with Gesenius in claiming the above as a rule, and once again in claiming a definite construction for this text. But the reader will remember that I claimed it definite under this rule, and if the rule holds good I made no blunder at all, and this he knows. For, supposing that Gesenius did blunder in his statement, that does not show that I made any blunder in applying the rule to this text, nor did Eld. V. claim that. He "evaded the issue" by referring to a rule which has no bearing on the case.

3. I could show the inconclusiveness of his statement on the use of the preposition, and of the unfairness of his method of reference to Green; but as I instituted no claim on the preposition, I will pass it for brevity's sake, only referring to the following blunder of his: He claimed in his argument, Ex. 16: 25, as an instance of the indefinite use of *Sabbath*; but it is just like Ex. 20: 10, in construction, and he now claims the latter text as definite by construction! In a man who is "capable," never liable to "blunder," and never writes "for effect," this course is hard to explain.

4. His accusation that I blundered, accompanied with his reference to Green, 2246, 3, was unjust and presented the matter in a false light. For (1) He knew that I did not claim it definite by construction under that section. (2) He knew that that section did not cover the whole field of the omission of the article, and therefore it would not settle a question raised under other rules. (3) He knew that that section and number referred only to the construct state, and therefore would cut off his claim on Ex. 20: 10, if it would mine on Ex. 16: 23; for Ex. 20: 10, is not in the construct. His course in this was unfair, tending only to mislead, and was as unjust to the reader as to me. I have little reason to expect he will yield to proof, but I will insist that in simple matters of fact he shall have some regard for justice.

5. He treats with raillery my saying that *Sabbath* means rest, as if it were parallel to his own pedantry. But this is so generally known that I assumed nothing in the statement; the English reader has learned the same from Webster. His ridicule about my holding on to it would be in better place if I had said anything that admitted of denial.

6. Perhaps it is because I have not recently graduated at a theological school that I am not able to appreciate his very chaste and genteel remarks about "the turtle." But if I am any judge of their force, they aptly represent his course on Ex. 24: 12. Had he simply confessed his "blunder" without trying to cover his retreat in such a questionable manner, he also would have done a "clever thing," and a thing more creditable to himself. But that would not be in keeping with his general course. As usual, when his proof is shown to be deficient, it makes no practical difference. Take away all his evidence, or turn it against him, and it never weakens his argument at all! To excuse his first blunder, which was too glaring to admit of denial, he runs into others equally apparent. Take the following in reference to the accents named:

"They are just alike in character, and often nearly, and sometimes wholly, in position, so that they may be easily mistaken for each other, as I inadvertently did."

They are just alike in shape, which is all the truth that the above statement contains, unless he dodges behind the word *nearly*, which is a poor refuge. They may occupy the same location on a given word, but not in consecution, that is, in their relation to other accents, so they may be easily and readily distinguished in any position. But in this case, even that excuse is not admissible, for in this text *pasha* occupies a position in location as well as in consecution, which *kadhma* never occupies, and therefore it may not be easily mistaken for the latter, except by a person who is entirely ignorant of both these plain and unvarying points of difference! And this, if we may trust his own showing, was the case with Eld. Vogel.

7. His further remarks on that "blunder" betray a like ignorance of the laws of consecution. To destroy the force of the article, he first said, the accent on "the law" was conjunctive, connecting these words with, "which I have written." Being corrected in that, he now says, "the practical result remains unchanged," because there is a still stronger

disjunctive over "the commandments" than that over "the law"! This is surely a novelty in consecution—if he wishes to get a patent on it, nobody will dispute his claim to the invention! Invariably, the nearer you approach the end of a section, the stronger is the disjunctive; and that over "the commandments" is a "kingly accent," and disjoins these and the preceding words from the "train" following, leaving the words, "which I have written," immediately connected by consecution with, "that thou mayest teach them." All that I have said in this and the preceding paragraph may be known from a single glance at the original by any person who has a knowledge of Hebrew accents.

At first I thought Eld. Vogel had at least a fair knowledge of Hebrew, but I have been forced to change my mind in regard to his attainments. Though his egotism was prominent all along, I inclined to overlook that, as it is so often manifested by young men not long from school, who have not grace to restrain it. When I proved beyond denial the error of his statement in regard to the omission of the article, he coolly accused me of "blundering," and of being "incapable," with a haughtiness and air of scorn that might almost have made Goliath die of envy. As he says, he did "chide" me often, and in an unseemly and arrogant manner; but I shall care but little for all that until I have some evidence that his knowledge nearly equals his assurance.

I have let forbearance rule as long as justice and a proper regard for the cause of truth will permit. As I write mainly for the benefit of English readers, I have had no desire to carry this discussion into the Hebrew; so far as I am personally concerned, I do not care how far he carries it in that direction, being confident that he can gain nothing by the controversy, because the truth is not with him.

His criticism on the English of Ex. 24: 12, is as defective as that on the Hebrew, but of this hereafter.

ELD. VOGEL'S SEVENTH NEGATIVE.

There still remain some points to be noticed in Eld. W.'s sixth affirmative. In trying to prove that Ex. 19, rather than 20, contains "the first covenant," he says that "the first covenant was useless and void, because the people did not fulfill it; and this will apply to an agreement, but will not apply to a law." (1) The facts, however, are that the first covenant expired by limitation (Gal. 3: 19); and this puts a wholly different phase upon the matter. If non-fulfillment on the part of the people was to have been the cause of its termination, then there were frequent and much stronger reasons for its annulment long before Christ's crucifixion, than at that time. (2) We may call the first covenant an agreement, if we will, yet it was also a law-covenant, for it was "enacted," or "legislated." This is by accommodation asserted of the new covenant, and so by implication of the "old." Christ "is the mediator of the better covenant, which was established upon better promises." "Was established" (Greek *nomothetei*, rendered "received the law," in chap. 7: 11), is translated by Conybeare, "is enacted," and by Rotherham, "has been legislated." Heb. 8: 6. In this view of the first covenant, I have with me also the mature judgment of Conybeare, in his note on verse 9—"the covenant which I gave unto their fathers." "It must be understood," says he, "that the Greek word does not (like the English *covenant*) imply reciprocity. It properly means a legal disposition, and would perhaps be better translated *dispensation*, here. A covenant between two parties is expressed by a different term." And thus we are irresistibly led to the decalogue as the first covenant. (3) It was owing to the "faultiness" of the first covenant that it was abolished; that is, though it was well adapted to the Jewish age, it was "faulty" for the Christian age. We have already seen that it failed of perfection, when fully kept (Matt. 19: 21); and Paul says, "If the first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second." Heb. 8: 7. The "finding fault with them," of the next verse, is altogether too slender a basis for so sweeping a conclusion as Bro. W. makes. He is certainly aware that the Greek construction is just as naturally expressed thus: "But finding fault, he saith unto them;" and this is Macknight's version. Conybeare fully agrees with Macknight, and translates thus: "Whereas he findeth fault, and saith unto them." He adds, in a note, "findeth fault" refers to the preceding 'faultless.' The pronoun should be joined with 'saith.'" The expression, "Because [Macknight, when] they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not," is a brief allusion to the many defections of the Hebrews, and to the punishment from God which followed each estrangement, showing the necessity of having laws written upon the heart, and the "faultiness" of having them written on tables of stone and statute books.

What Eld. W. says concerning "the better promises" of the new covenant, has no practical bearing on the question before us.

What God, through Jeremiah, calls "my law," he calls "my laws," through Paul (Jer. 31: 33; Heb. 8: 10). To hold that this refers to the ten commandments—no more and no less—is a bare assumption. We will not thus allow Eld. W. to transfer the Sabbath from the tables of stone into the hearts of Christians. I have no wish to deface the least iota of morality taught by the ten commandments; but I wish also to recognize the fact that God has a "law" which went "forth from Zion" (Isa. 2: 3), which is "his" as well as that from Sinai. If the two were identical, standing because ordained of old, why was there a new "legislation"? Be it remembered, however, that the new law is one of "liberty." And this law of liberty, when viewed as of God, may be called "the law of God."

My remarks on Rom. 3: 31, concerning the establishment of the entire Mosaic law in its "moral or basic principles," have been ridiculed because they were misunderstood. I used "basic principles," not as equivalent to "constitution" but as referring to every moral principle of the Mosaic code, whether in the ten commandments, or in other portions of the law.

This attempt at ridicule reminds me of another which I passed by as unworthy of notice, but, for the sake of some, ought perhaps to consider. I can see nothing "crude" in asserting that a man may be perfect and holy, as measured by a given law, whether the law itself be perfect or not. If the law is absolutely perfect, so will be the one obeying it; but if the law be defective, he is nevertheless perfect, as to that law, though imperfect, as measured by another and perfect law. But, says Bro. W., "if we have any means of determining that a law is imperfect, the same means will determine that a character must be imperfect that is conformed to that law." True; but this is declaring a character imperfect by another law. And before God gave us the

perfect standard of the gospel, men had no means of declaring either the Jews or their law imperfect or "faulty."

Eld. W. must pardon me for reiterating the "crude" statement that the Messiahship of Jesus is the constitution of the Christian church. Against the conclusion of all his reasonings and analogies between the priesthood and kingship of Christ, and those of Aaron and David, I place the single declaration, "Upon this rock will I build my church." That upon which we build is fundamental, organic, constitutional.

To argue the present obligation of the ten commandments, as given on Sinai, and hence of the Sabbath, from such passages as Rev. 11: 19, and 15: 5-8, surprises me. "And the temple of God was opened in Heaven," would, by the same logic, prove the transfer of the Jewish temple from earth to Heaven, to say nothing of the fact that "the ark of his testament" contained the whole Mosaic code (Deut. 31: 26), and so would prove nothing abolished! Then think of "lightnings," "thunderings," "great hail," and of "earthquakes" in Heaven! Shall we next have a philosophy of the cause of these earthquakes?

Respecting the antitype of the tabernacle, I must regard Eld. W. as in error, by construing "heavenly," in Heb. 8: 5, as referring to a place rather than descriptive of condition; or, if it must refer to a place, of taking it in too narrow a sense. For

1. The most holy place of both the tabernacle and the temple was, in the narrower sense of the word, a type of Heaven (Heb. 6: 19, 20; 9: 8, 24), into which our High Priest has entered, not is to enter, at some future time.

2. The holy place was a type of the Christian church. Acts 15: 16, 17; 1 Cor. 3: 16; 1 Tim. 3: 15. As the high priest officiates "within the veil," so the priests officiate in the holy place (Heb. 9: 6, 7). Christians are priests (1 Pet. 2: 5, 9), hence the church is the holy place. This might be still further shown from the antitype of the furniture of the holy place, but I forbear, with the remark that if the "candlestick," or seven-armed lampstand, typifies the Holy Spirit rather than the word of God, he is found in the church. 1 Cor. 3: 16.

The stress Eld. W. lays on the plural of Heb. 9: 24—"holy places"—with the purpose of proving both holy places to be in Heaven, results from insufficient attention to the subject. The Greeks often used the plural where, in English, only the singular is admissible. Thus the same word, and in the plural, too, is rendered *sanctuary*, in Heb. 8: 2; 9: 3; 13: 11; and *holy place*, in chap. 9: 12, 25. And just as the word "tabernacle" denotes sometimes both holy places, and at others, either one or the other of them (chap. 9: 2, 3), so also does *ta hagia*—"the sanctuary," or the holies.

3. The cleansing of "the sanctuary" (Dan. 8: 4) has reference to affairs on earth, at the destruction of Mahometanism. For as the little horn of Dan. 7 is a symbol of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, so that of chap. 8 is of Mahometanism; this, their respective places of origin, and spheres of influence, prove.

Everything in the tabernacle was a type, not excepting the ark and its contents; for as such, or as given on Sinai, the ten commandments were positive. Therefore we conclude again, that to argue from the passages adduced by Eld. W. from Revelation, that by the ark and its contents these things are literally meant, is not only to proceed most arbitrarily, but is also wholly out of character without taking "the temple," "the smoke," "the hail," "the lightning," "the thunder," "the earthquake," &c., &c., as equally literal. This will suffice to show the absurdity of my brother's interpretation of those passages in Revelation, without taking time to give a true exposition. Besides, it is too near the close of this proposition to enter on such foreign matters.

"The covenants and the giving of the law," of Rom. 9: 4, refer to the two or three covenants made with Abraham, "pertaining" to Israel, and to the "giving" to them of the law-covenant.

The "us," to whom the lively oracles (Acts 7: 38) were given, were Jews, among whom the circumcised Stephen classifies himself. The oracles were "living," when given; and if they now (in this dispensation) live, it is in their moral aspect and as "all Scripture is profitable."

The words, commanded to a "thousand generations," are no stronger than "perpetual" or "everlasting," predicated of the Aaronic priesthood (Ex. 40: 12-15), the Passover and its feast (Ex. 12), circumcision (Gen 17), the shew-bread (Lev. 24: 5-9), and a number of other things; and it is just as credible that the former period has expired as that the latter have.

If by "the commandments of God," in Rev. 14: 12, one chooses to understand all the morality God has commanded, I shall not oppose him; but if he means to intimate that the ten commandments are the only commandments of God, or are referred to as given on Sinai, I shall accuse him of begging the essential point. Christ gave commandments of his own. John 14: 21; 15: 10-14; 1 John 2: 3, 4. Christ's commandments are often called the commandments of God; John 12: 49, 50; 14: 31; 1 Tim. 1: 1; hence, there are commandments of God which are not of the law; see also 1 John 3: 21-24; Rom. 16: 26; Titus 1: 3; and other places.

Nearly one half of Eld. W.'s last article is devoted to Hebrew criticisms. Much of what he has to say relates only to one argument of the second proposition, and could be yielded without detriment to the main point at issue between us. Were his "great plainness of speech" to be taken as argument, I should yield the point at once. For the sake of the common reader, I wish to point out such misstatements as he can be judge of, and by these he may know what value to place upon the rest.

1. I said nothing about "re-mention" in connection with the weekly Sabbath.

2. I did not "treat with raillery" his saying that Sabbath means rest, but used the word myself in that sense.

3. My statement about his "holding on" had not reference to his definition of Sabbath, but to his persistency in Hebrew criticisms, dragging the second proposition into the third, in the face of his profession of not thrusting his scholarship before the reader. And I might have added, in the face of his challenge to discuss the use of the Greek article before the word "law."

4. He pronounced it egotism in me to accuse him of not understanding the Hebrew, when the fact is that I only paid him back in his own coin, as any one can see by reading his second affirmative. I wonder whether his style would have anything to do with making "Goliath die of envy?"

With but a few remarks bearing more directly on his criticisms, I submit the case.

1. We need no array of instances where *Sabbath* is used without the article. I have before said that I was aware of such occurrences. His statement, that

the predicate does not take the article, I disproved by good authority; and I might have adduced such examples as Ex. 9: 27, "the righteous (party)," and 16: 16, "the thing." It matters not how often Sabbath occurs in the predicate without the article; the essential point is, Why is the article absent in Ex. 16: 23? Had the Sabbath been a forgotten institution and there again insisted on, the article would be necessary; and its absence agrees with the universal custom of introducing a new institution in an indefinite way. "In the language of living intercourse, it is utterly impossible that the article should be omitted where it is decidedly necessary."—Winer, Gram. p. 115.

I will further add, that if the Sabbath had been an existing institution during the Egyptian bondage, when the majority of the Hebrews served the Lord, the silence of the Scriptures would be wholly inexplicable, since with nothing else would their task-service have so much interfered, and complaint on this point would have been severe and specific.

2. Seeing the necessity, on his supposition, of having the Sabbath institution definitely named in Ex. 16: 23, Eld. W. says, "The reader will remember that I claimed it definite under this rule," i. e. that the predicate does not take the article. This is another instance of drawing the very opposite conclusion yielded by the facts in the case. "A substantive with an article may be the predicate as well as the subject of a proposition, since even the predicate may be conceived of as a definite individual."—Winer, p. 114. That is, if the predicate has not the article, it is not definite.

3. Having signally failed in showing Ex. 16: 23, parallel with Ex. 20: 10, in the use of *lamed*, Eld. W. tries to draw chap. 16: 25, into service. Unfortunately for him, however, that construction is often resorted to in place of the regular construct when "the first noun is indefinite and the second definite." Green, 2257, 2. Should he reply that this may be the case in Ex. 20: 10, I answer, yes; but taken in its contextual connection, the case is altered. This, no doubt, determined the king's translators to render the first passage indefinitely and the second definitely. But if Eld. W. should insist on treating both alike, making each indefinite, be it so; my point stands sure.

4. All that Eld. W. says in his paragraph marked 4 is made pointless by the fact that when *lamed* is used "in its possessive sense," it "may be substituted for the construct relation."—Green, 2257.

5. The criticisms on Ex. 24: 12, I dispose of briefly by simply re-asserting my position, and an appeal to the learned reader for its justness.

THE SABBATH ABOLISHED.

I. Turning again to negative arguments, I insist upon it that the Sabbath is a positive institution. (1) It is described by the same term, Sabbath, which describes other positive institutions. (2) It is more-over admitted that Sabbath often takes the article, when denoting the weekly institution, by way of pre-eminence over or emphatic distinction from the annual sabbaths. A moral and a positive institution are never distinguished in this way. And being positive, the Sabbath passed away with the other positive institutions of the old economy.

II. The Sabbath is specially named as abrogated in Col. 2: 16, 17.

III. The Sabbath is here also declared to be a type, finding its antitype in the Christian dispensation. And, as Paul says, when the substance comes, the shadow ceases.

IV. Gentile Christians were not required to keep the Sabbath. (1) It was nowhere enjoined upon them. (2) They were specially exempted from keeping the positive institutions of the law (Acts 15: 23-29; 21: 20-25). (3) They were particularly forbidden to observe Jewish days. "Ye observe days [weekly Sabbaths], and months [new moons], and times [the Jewish festivals, which included the annual sabbaths, Lev. 23.], and years [Sabbatic years]. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." Gal. 4: 10, 11.

V. The Sabbath was "against us" and "contrary to us." This we have seen to be true of the entire decalogue, in that positive aspect in which it was given to the Jews, but it is particularly true of the Sabbath.

1. The Sabbath had a relentless death-penalty attached to it (Ex. 31: 14, 15; 35: 2), and in this, it was "contrary to" the genius of a dispensation of grace.

2. No fire was to be kindled on the Sabbath. Ex. 25: 1, 2. This marks the Sabbath as not intended for universal observance, owing to the coldness of some of the countries in which Christians often live. It is "against us."

3. The Sabbath was a sign between God and the Jews (Eze. 20: 12; Ex. 31: 12-18), and so was part of the middle wall of partition which is broken down. Eph. 2: 14.

ONE of the most important rules of the science of good manners is an almost total silence in regard to yourself.

Obituary Notices.

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

DIED, in Rome, Me., March 10, 1873, of lung disease, Fannie A., daughter of William and Etta Mitchell, aged three years and four months. Remarks by the writer from Rev. 21: 4. W. H. BLAISDELL.

DIED, in Albion, Me., March 25, 1873, after a long and distressing illness, Mrs. Hannah Smiley, aged sixty-four years. I. WIGGIN.

DIED, at Greenville, Montcalm Co., Mich., sister Phidelia Ann, wife of Bro. A. W. Maynard, aged forty-three years. Sister Maynard embraced the Advent faith thirteen years ago, under the labors of Eld. Frisbie. She possessed a meek and quiet spirit, and continued, to the end, a faithful, consistent exponent of the faith which she professed. Her end was peace.

A few thoughts from Job 14: 14, were presented on the day of the funeral for the consolation of the bereaved friends, by the writer. DONALD WARREN.

The Review and Herald.

Battle Creek, Mich., Third-day, April 15, 1873.

Sunday in Japan.

THE Missionary Herald, of Boston, noticing the changes that have recently taken place in Japan, says that the numerous and ancient holidays are abolished, and Sunday substituted in their place.

"And now, to close the year, comes a list of changes, great and sudden enough to startle the sleep of a Rip Van Winkle. Japan has heretofore had a variable year, using the lunar months; but with January 1, 1873, she is to start even with the world, and keep with her hereafter.

To Correspondents.

W. F. THOMAS: In the expression, "Faith is the substance of things hoped for," in Heb. 11: 1, the word substance is from hypostasis, and is defined by Greenfield as follows: "Something placed under; a basis, foundation; by metonymy a certain persuasion, firm or implicit confidence, constancy.

J. CRANDALL: That part of the territory of Africa which constituted the kingdom of the Vandals, was not known or occupied as a part of the civilized world, till it became a portion of the Roman Empire.

A. SMITH: We do not understand that the wicked at the end of the thousand years will be distinguished into nationalities, but are spoken of under the general terms Gog and Magog. The time when the beast and false prophet are cast alive into the lake of fire, Rev. 19: 20, is therefore at the commencement of the thousand years, when as distinct power or nationalities they are destroyed.

B. F. TERRY: The tune is too near like one in common use, and not improved by the change. The poetry will publish.

D. T. BOURDEAU: The manuscripts on "Temperance" and "How the Sabbath was Changed," were received. They were acknowledged by letters which it seems you did not receive.

Tract and Missionary Work in the West.

FEELING an earnest interest in this branch of the work, I venture to speak once more concerning it. Bro. Haskell starts West this week to hold the meetings appointed for Iowa. The leading brethren there, all of them earnest workers in the cause, have felt the need of help in getting the Tract Society as a system into working order.

The work of collecting the delinquencies on our periodicals, and renewing subscriptions, is a most important item to be attended to. Owing to the influence of these societies in New England, this matter is just about finished up there, while in New York and Ohio, where they were put in motion last year, they are in good progress, while in the West, but lit-

tle has been done. Bro. H. goes to Iowa with proper blanks to help forward this work, and to give such instruction as is needed. While Iowa is waking up in this matter, we have wondered whether the officers of these societies in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Illinois, felt any need of assistance and instruction. Bro. H. is prepared to spend two weeks in Illinois, three weeks in Wisconsin, and two weeks in Minnesota, if desired. It may be said that spring is not the best season of the year to attend to this business. Suppose this be all granted. Is it not better to get a good start this spring by making a special effort, and have these in working order through the summer months, than it is to put it off till fall and lose all this time? It seems so to us.

Do not Cut down the Peach Trees.

THIS morning a friend told me that the peach trees were killed; not the fruit buds only, but the trees. Some may be, but that they are, to any great extent, I do not believe. My object in writing this note is to caution against trusting to present appearances, and cutting down valuable trees. The spring is not the time to judge of the condition of a peach tree under the circumstances. The wood under the bark may look dark and dead, and still the tree be alive. More than this; the tree may be so injured by cold that it has not strength to put out leaves in the spring, and still not be killed. Wait until August; if there is any vitality in the tree, it will show it in that month by putting out leaves. If it does not leaf out in August, you may safely cut it down as a lumberer of the ground.

This is no guess work, but the result of observation. I have seen peach trees cut down, supposed to be dead, that put out leaves in the brush pile; and I have seen trees, pronounced dead by all who saw them, leaf out in August, and bear fruit the next year. I have known such trees to bear several crops before a young orchard could be raised to good bearing size.

It requires some faith and patience to let them stand through the spring and early summer with no appearance of life. But none who wait till August to test the matter will regret it. If some are killed, others may be saved by waiting.

Notice to the Churches of the Minn. Conf.

THE third quarter of our Conference year closed the last of March. I hope to hear from every one. Send in your reports. There are two or three I have not yet heard from this year.

H. F. PHELPS, Secy.

News and Miscellany.

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

The Cloud in the East.

THE intelligence just flashed across the Atlantic of the new attitude assumed by the Servian government toward the Porte in refusing to pay the usual tribute of \$1,000,000, may seem in itself insignificant, but the possible results of that act are by no means to be regarded in such a light. Should Turkey determine to enforce its payment and send, as it is said she intends to do, an armed force for that purpose, she will with her own hand again unloose that terrible European bete noir, of the Eastern question.

A very general misapprehension prevails in regard to the strength of the Servian army. The gazetteers and encyclopedias generally state that the regular force does not exceed two thousand men, with a militia force of forty thousand, but recent European statistical reports state that, with the exception of Germany, Servia has the most perfect military organization on the continent. In 1865 the Prussian system was introduced into the country, and it is now possible to place, at short notice, 150,000 troops, armed with breech-loading rifles, in the field, and to re-enforce that force, within one month, by fifty thousand reserves. With the peculiar configuration of the country to aid them, this number might successfully oppose an army of half a million, a greater force than Turkey would be able to send against them. With the possibilities and probabilities that attach to the future action of both powers, further news from that part of the world will be awaited with anxiety.—Boston Globe.

Increase of Crime in New York.

THE certainty of Foster's execution does not seem to have any salutary influence in lessening crime in New York. On Sunday night, March 30, a young man waiting for a car in the upper part of Madison avenue, was assaulted by two men. He escaped, and jumping on the car, appealed to the conductor and passengers for protection from the ruffians who followed him. His appeal was in vain, the cowardly passengers being afraid to interfere, while the brutes drew their knives and attacked him, cutting off one of his ears and otherwise injuring him, until he succeeded in escaping from the car. His assailants again overtook him, knocked him down, and robbed him, doing their work with utter disregard to the existence of policeman or passengers. On the next day, three

drunken men attacked a German saloon-keeper, knocked him down, beat him terribly, fatally stabbed his wife and a neighbor who came to his assistance, then, leaving the saloon, stabbed a man who was passing, and finally made their escape, leaving no trace to their identity. The same night, a gang of roughs attacked the passengers in a horse-car on Third avenue, and a lively skirmish with revolvers took place, during which the conductor and a passenger were shot, and the roughs escaped. In addition to these acts of violence, there was an unusual amount of thieving, issuing of forged railroad bonds, and other crimes.

Resurrection of Napoleonism.

THE death of Napoleon III. should have been the death of Napoleonism. But no; with a faith worthy of a better object, it is now announced by a recent correspondent of the Rainbow that, as Napoleon I. was the only man who possessed all the qualifications and characteristics required of the "man of sin," "antichrist," etc., he is to rise from the dead and become the great scourge of the church and world. Well, this is certainly laughing at difficulties. It would seem that if men were born to do a work, they would not die without accomplishing it. If they failed in the first life, they might in the second. And, then, if Providence had assigned them a mission, it would seem as if they ought to have arrived on time, and not come too soon for its fulfillment.

A recognition of the work of the past would save all this speculation. Centuries of blood and waste to the church of God were not overlooked by the prophets, to point out a trouble of a few months' duration. The prophecies should not be so cramped in their application. They treat more of offices and nations than individuals. They have a comprehensive fulfillment which may be studied in the light of history, and deductions made therefrom. The great powers of prophecy are in the past. The "man of sin" will soon be destroyed by the "brightness of his [Christ's] coming." Let us, then, look for Christ instead of antichrist; the Man of righteousness instead of the "man of sin."—Herald of Life.

Central America.

TERRIBLE EARTHQUAKE.

ASPINWALL, via. HAVANNA, April 10.—The city of San Salvador, Central America, has been destroyed by an earthquake. Eight hundred persons perished, and \$12,000,000 worth of property was destroyed. The earthquake was followed by conflagrations, and many buildings were burned. For a few days, slight shocks of earthquake occurred, but no serious apprehensions were entertained. It was on the afternoon of the 4th of March, about 4:30 o'clock, almost without warning, that a great part of the city was reduced to little more than ruins. The ground heaved as a ship in a gale;

TERRIBLE THUNDERINGS

burst from under foot; walls tottered and were rent in many places with wide crevices; roofs, tiles, etc., were precipitated to the ground, and lamps, pincers, basins, glass, etc., were overturned and broken. Three violent shocks followed in succession, and the servants commenced to scream piteously and could not be pacified. Wild birds flew to houses, horses grew frantic in their stables, and dogs, howling, slunk for protection. Every few minutes shakings of less violence occurred.

THE SCENE BEGARS DESCRIPTION.

Ruined houses, panic-stricken people, men, women, and children fleeing to the fields, with valuables hastily collected; then the ringing of the alarm bells and beating of drums, calling all the soldiers under arms, for in San Salvador, murder and pillage accompany the confusion of great earthquakes; and as the frightened citizens leave the towns, the dusky Indians from the forests

PROWL FOR PREY

into it, only checked by the bayonets of the government troops. These were posted in squads at short distances all over San Salvador.

THE POPE SERIOUSLY ILL.

New York, April 11.—A special to the New York World, dated Rome, April 11, says the pope is suffering from rheumatic fever and ulceration of the leg. His illness is extremely serious.

The English Coal Famine.

A WRITER in the Pall Mall Gazette says: "The death-rate rises week by week. Meetings are held among the cotton manufacturers of the north to determine on short time. Some factories are actually stopped. Railways are raising their terms for traffic. The companies who work ocean steamers are preparing to reduce the speed and the frequency of their voyages, and to raise their freights. Indignation meetings, very blind and unpractical, are being held in various places to deplore the high price of coal, and to denounce all whom the speakers fancy are concerned in causing it. Furnaces in the busiest districts are being blown out daily; and even at the recently advanced rates, iron cannot be produced without loss at the actual prices of coal and materials." The decline in price in London and at other points in the vicinity of mines is attributed chiefly to the actual or threatened reduction of the demand in consequence of the check to commercial and manufacturing activity, a danger which if not averted will impair the wealth and prosperity of the nation by reducing the demand for labor and throwing thousands of workmen out of employment. It is estimated that the rise in coal has loaded down the productive industry of the country with the enormous additional burden of \$250,000,000 per annum.

Appointments.

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

Meetings in Minnesota.

AS WE see by our last REVIEW, that Bro. Canright intends to hold a general meeting at Greenwood Prairie, Minn., we would say that circumstances are such we wish to have the place for this meeting changed, if this notice reaches the Office in season. We wish to have the meeting held at Oronoco, Olmsted Co., Minnesota. MINN. CONF. COM. Medford, April 8, 1873.

I DESIGN to hold three or four meetings in Wisconsin, previous to the general camp-meetings. I desire that these may be general meetings as far as possible consistent with the hurrying season of the year. I hold them now because of an earnest desire to benefit the cause. I have not found time to have them before, and cannot see any other time for months in the future. We hope our brethren will make an earnest effort to attend them. I appoint as follows:—

Monroe, Sabbath and Sunday, April 19, 20. Little Prairie, Sabbath and Sunday, April 26, 27. Hundred Mile Grove, Sabbath and Sunday, May 3, 4.

These meetings are to commence Sabbath evening. Come, brethren and sisters, and take hold zealously in the work of God. GEO. I. BUTLER.

THE next quarterly meeting for Eaton Co., will be held at Pottsville, April 26 and 27. All neighboring churches are invited. We hope to see a large gathering. It is designed to celebrate the ordinances. I expect to be present. By request. E. B. LANE.

QUARTERLY meeting of the church at Patricksburg, Owen Co., Ind., Sabbath and first-day, May 3 and 4. We invite all to attend this meeting that possibly can. NOAH CARAHOOF.

THE quarterly meeting of Dist. No. 7, Wisconsin, will be held in Plainfield, May 3 and 4, in connection with the quarterly meeting of the Fish Lake church. A general attendance is expected at this meeting. Bring your reports of work done in the Missionary cause. P. S. THURSTON, Pres.

MONTHLY meeting with the church at the Reed meeting-house, Richmond, Me., commencing Friday evening, April 25, 1873, at 7 p. m., and holding over Sabbath and first-day. We wish to see a general gathering of the friends of the cause. Let all come having a mind to work. J. B. GOODRICH.

QUARTERLY meeting for the church at Victory, Wis., first Sabbath and Sunday in May. G. C. CLARK.

Business Department.

Not slothful in Business. Rom. 12: 11.

Business Notes.

THE P. O. address of R. M. Kilgore is for the present, Siam, Taylor Co., Iowa.

Special Notice to Subscribers.

A blue cross on the margin of your paper signifies that your subscription will expire with two more number. A renewal is earnestly solicited.

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. E V Clark 43-17, Eld J Matteson 43-1, Elizabeth Whaley 38-1, W E Landon 43-1, Mrs M E Short 43-18, Charlotte Quebeck 43-14, Thomas Wyatt 43-15, J L Miller 43-18, Laura A Green 43-14, I F Parker 43-18, C M Joslin 44-1, Mrs N J Chaffee 42-1, L H Beebe 42-6, Mrs D Sterling 43-18, M C Hornaday 43-14, George Felschaw 45-14, C L Davis 43-18, Lucy Royce 43 1, Titus Tyrel 43-18, J L Hobart 43-17, Mrs S D Howard 43-15, Mrs M Demill 44-1, J L Howe 43-18, Chas Higgins 43-17.

\$1.00 EACH. J D Hough 42-14, Theodore Brackett 42-14, H C Miller 42-14, Hollis Clark 43 1, M P West 42-1, Francis Cromett 42-16, John Clark 42-17, C J Harpham 42-18, Adolphus Smith 42-14, Theococia Terry 42-14, James A Partridge 43-1, P S Smalley 42-18.

MISCELLANEOUS. A Serns 44c 41-11, Mrs E Scott \$1.75 42-18, T B Ransom 50c 42-4, G S Harpham 1.75 43-1, R Voorhes 50c 42-14.

75 Cents Each, Paying to Vol. 42, 18. Joshua Bailey, Marshall Bacon.

50 Cents Each, Paying to Vol. 42, 18. James Mas-call, Joseph Drorbaugh, John Lamb, A G Rhodes, H Riley, Lydia Ulrich, Eld Isaac Post, Thomas Matteson, Mrs Rosetta Rice, Dr Joel Rogers, Eld J Rogers, Mrs M Hannah, M E Rich, A R Sterling, Dr D W Perkins, Mrs D Griffin.

Books Sent by Mail.

Ed P Fields \$1.50, W W Lockwood 25c, O Emerson 2.10, E G Bolter 65c, Mrs S D Barr 1.50, Mrs F J Guinall 70c, S R Hogue 1.00, Adelaide Jacoc 25c, J E Phelps 50c, Mrs Emma Gorton 1.00, Eld D T Bourdeau 5.90, Addie Taylor 20c, John Miller 25c, Mary Beach 20c, A Luchsinger 20c, I N Pike 1.30, M A Collins 41c, Mrs Grace Weeks 41c, Maria Morris 43c, T Terry 20c, J M Gillett 3.16, Elbridge Green 1.00, A Crownhart 60c, Mrs B Coffey 21c, Harriet States 25c, L A White 20c, Stephen T Fowler 5.00, Minor Ellis 50c, Eli Glascock 30c, Wm Covey 50c, Mrs S D Howard 30c, Emma S Smith 1.00, Julius C Smith 30c, Laura J Payne 25c, I Ryder 20c, F Depas 10c, J L Hobart 1.25, J Wilmot 50c, H A Helgerson 30c, W W Stebbins 70c, Henry Clinton 3 00, H A Deerdon 75c, O W Austin 1.25, P C Santee 40c, E O Fish 30c.

Books Sent by Express.

D V Winne, Mason, Ingham Co., Mich. \$4.94.

Cash Received on Account.

J B Goodrich \$10.00, Ohio Delinquent Fund 45.00, L Bean 10.00, H C Blanchard 10.00, D T Bourdeau 1.50.

Review to the Poor.

John F Klostermyer \$2.00.

General Conference Fund.

Joseph A Demill (s B) \$10.00, M V Demill 50c.

Michigan Conference Fund.

Church at Jackson \$70.85, Vassar 32.00, Ransom Center 52.50, Alma 21.00, Vergennes 30.00, Deerfield 4.25.

The Review and Herald.

TERMS:

One year in advance.....\$2.00
When ordered by others for the poor, per year.....\$1.50
One volume of 26 numbers on trial..... 75 cts.
One volume " " sent to friends on trial..... 50 cts.
Address, REVIEW & HERALD, BATTLE CREEK, MICH.