

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 29, 1873.

NUMBER 20.

The Review and Herald

IS ISSUED WEEKLY BY

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

ELDER JAMES WHITE, PRESIDENT.

TERMS: See Last Page.
Address REVIEW & HERALD, BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

"WHILE THE DAYS ARE GOING BY."

There are lonely hearts to cherish,
While the days are going by;
There are weary souls that perish,
While the days are going by.
If a smile we can renew
As our journey we pursue,
Oh! the good we all may do,
While the days are going by.

There's no time for idle scorning,
While the days are going by;
Let your face be like the morning,
While the days are going by;
Oh! the world is full of sighs—
Full of sad and weeping eyes—
Help your fallen brother rise,
While the days are going by.

All the loving links that bind us,
While the days are going by,
One by one we leave behind us,
While the days are going by:
But the seeds of good we sow,
Both in shade and shine shall grow,
And shall keep our hearts aglow,
While the days are passing by.

—Sol.

LIFE OF WILLIAM MILLER.

CHAPTER SEVEN.

INCIDENT AT SHAFTSBURY—RESULTS OF HIS LABORS
—TESTIMONY OF A CONVERT FROM INFIDELITY—
LETTER OF REV. C. FITCH—URGENT APPEALS TO
VISIT VARIOUS TOWNS, &c.

Mr. Miller again lectured in Dresden, N. Y., on the 7th of August; in Orwell, Vt., on the 11th of September; and in Keeseville, N. Y., on the 18th. He then gave courses of lectures, beginning at Lawrence, N. Y., on the 22d; Stockholm, on the 29th; Parishville, on the 7th of October; Massena, N. Y., on the 14th. He gave ten lectures at Fort Covington, N. Y., beginning on the 20th, and was at Chataugay, N. Y., on the 27th. This terminated his labors for the year 1836. In allusion to these last visits, he wrote on the 23d of December:—

"I have not visited a place where the Lord has not given me one or two souls for my hire. I have spent eight weeks in St. Lawrence County, and delivered eighty-two lectures this fall. Next week I am going to Shaftsbury and vicinity."

He visited Shaftsbury, Vt., the 23d of January, 1837, and gave his full course of sixteen lectures. At the close of one lecture, a Baptist clergyman arose, and stated that he had come there for the purpose of exposing the folly of Mr. M., but had to confess that he was confounded, convicted, and converted. He acknowledged that he had applied various unhandsome appellations to Mr. Miller, calling him "the end of the world man," "the old visionary," "dreamer," "fanatic," and for which he felt covered with shame and confusion. That confession, evidently so honest, was like a thunderbolt on the audience.

Very few particulars of interest have been gathered respecting his labors during the year 1837. According to his memorandum-book, he lectured in Wells, Vt., on the 3d of February; in Shrewsbury, Vt., on the 3d of March; in Andover, Vt., from the 5th to the 12th of March; in Weston, Vt., four days, beginning with the 13th; in Mt. Holly, Vt., on the 17th; in Orwell, Vt., on the 23d of April and 7th of May; in Danby, Vt., the 14th of May; in Poultney, Vt., eight days, beginning with the 21st of May; in Orwell, again, on the 4th of June; in North Springfield, Vt., from the 11th to the 17th; in Ludlow, Vt., from the 19th to the 21st; in Mt. Holly, Vt., from the 25th

of June to the 2d. of July; * in Orwell, Vt., on the 9th of July; at Fairhaven, Vt., from the 11th to the 20th; in Whiting, Vt., on the 23d; in Fairhaven, Vt., on the 13th of Aug.; in Moriah, Vt., from the 14th to the 22d of October; in Ludlow, Vt., from the 29th to the 6th of November, and at Stillwater, N. Y., on the 31st of December.

With the 1st of January, 1838, he commenced a second course of lectures at Lansingburg, N. Y., in compliance with the urgent request of the Baptist church in that place, and of E. B. Crandall, their pastor. The lectures continued nine days, and were listened to by crowded and attentive audiences. The result also was most heart-cheering. Infidelity had several strongholds in that neighborhood, and many of that class attended his lectures, and were greatly affected by them. In a letter dated on the 25th of that month, two weeks after the close of the lectures, a gentleman of that place writes to Mr. Miller:—

"I have never witnessed so powerful an effect in any place, as in this, on all who heard. I am of the opinion that not less than one hundred persons, who held infidel sentiments, are brought to believe the Bible. Infidelity is dumb in this place, as if frightened, and converts are many."

The following testimony of one who was converted from infidelity during these lectures, is copied from the *Boston Investigator* (an infidel paper) of January, 1845:—

"MR. EDITOR:—I was a warm supporter of the views of Abner Kneeland, attended his lectures and *protracted dances*, disbelieved in divine revelation and a future existence, and fully accorded with Mr. Kneeland's views of religion. Having read every work of note that I could obtain, and having heard many lectures opposed to God and the Bible, I considered myself prepared to overthrow the Christian faith, and feared no argument that could be brought from the Bible. With these feelings, I attended a full course of Mr. Miller's lectures. He gave his rules of interpretation, and pledged himself to prove his position. I approved of his rules—to which I refer you—and the result was, he established the fact that the Bible is what it purports to be—the word of God—to my mind, beyond a doubt; and I have taken it as the man of my counsel. I notice your doubts of the truth of the statement in relation to hundreds of infidels being converted under the preaching of Mr. Miller. This may possibly be owing to your never having given Mr. Miller a candid and thorough hearing. He is a man mighty in the Scriptures, and has done terrible execution in the ranks of the 'King's enemies,' with the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God. I am personally acquainted with nearly one hundred, who held to similar views with Abner Kneeland, who were converted under the preaching of Mr. Miller; and we did not yield the point without a struggle, nor without due consideration. Each and every prop and refuge of infidelity and unbelief were taken away from us, and our sandy foundation was swept by the truth of the Almighty as chaff is driven by the wind. Yet we parted with them much as a man parts with a *diseased tooth*. We tried to cure and keep it there, and when made to know that the *root* and foundation was rotten, it was painful to part with; but we rejoiced and felt better after the separation; for there is balm in Gilead—there is a Physician there.

Lansingburgh, N. Y., Jan., 1845."

On the 14th of January, Mr. Miller lectured at Westhaven, N. Y., and two weeks from that day, at Low Hampton, N. Y. On the 4th of February, he commenced a course of lectures at Pantton, Vt., which he continued eight days. He then returned to West Ha-

* At this place they raised, and placed in his hands, quite a sum of money for his services. He took \$1.50 to pay his stage fare to the next place, and directed them to give the balance to some benevolent object.

ven, N. Y., and lectured seven days, beginning February 18th.

On returning to Low Hampton, he found the following letter from Rev. Charles Fitch, pastor at the Marlboro' Chapel, Boston. It was the beginning of an acquaintance between those dear brethren in Christ, and as such, will be read with interest by all:—

"Boston, March 5, 1838.

"MY DEAR BROTHER:—I am a stranger to you, but I trust that, through the free sovereign grace of God, I am not altogether a stranger to Jesus Christ, whom you serve. I am the pastor of an Orthodox Congregational church in this city. A few weeks since, your lectures on the Second Coming of Christ were put into my hands. I sat down to read the work, knowing nothing of the views which it contained. I have studied it with an overwhelming interest, such as I never felt in any other book except the Bible. I have compared it with Scripture and history, and I find nothing on which to rest a single doubt respecting the correctness of your views. Though a miserable, guilty sinner, I trust that, through the Lord's abounding grace, I shall be among those that 'love his appearing.' I preached to my people two discourses yesterday on the coming of our Lord, and I believe a deep and permanent interest will be awakened thereby in God's testimonies. My object in writing you, my dear sir, is twofold.

"1st. Will you have the kindness to inform me, by letter, in what history you find the fact stated that the last of the ten kings was baptized A. D. 508, and also that the decree of Justinian, giving the Bishop of Rome power to suppress the reading of the Scriptures, was issued in 538? All the other data which you have given, I have found correct, and I know of no reason to doubt your correctness in these. But, as I have not yet been able to find a statement of those facts, you will do me a great favor by just informing me where I may find them; and I shall then feel prepared to defend the truth, and to point others to the right source of information.

"There is a meeting of our Ministerial Association, to-morrow, and, as I am appointed to read an essay, I design to bring up this whole subject for discussion, and trust that I may thereby do something to spread the truth.

"2d. My second object in writing was to ask if you would put me in the way to obtain a dozen copies of your lectures. I know of none to be obtained here. I know of several individuals who are very desirous to obtain the work, and if you can tell me of any place where it can be obtained in this city, or in New York, you will greatly oblige me. If you can give me any information of importance on the subject, not contained in your book, I should greatly rejoice, because, as I stand a watchman on the walls, I wish to 'give the trumpet a certain sound,' and to make that sound as full, and explicit, and convincing, as possible.

"Yours in the faith of Jesus Christ,
"CHARLES FITCH."

On the 12th of March, Mr. M. commenced a course of lectures, and continued eight days, at Benson, Vt. Previous to this, he had received urgent requests from the Rev. Mr. Hill, of the First Church in Troy, N. Y., and Rev. Mr. Parke, of the church in West Troy, uniting with their respective churches, for a course of lectures in each place; and they were expected, in West Troy, to have been commenced previous to those in Benson, Vt. Their disappointment, and the great anxiety of ministers and people, at that period, to secure his services, may be judged of by the following letter from the pastor of the church in that place:

"West Troy, March 12, 1838.

"WILLIAM S. MILLER, ESQ.:* Dear Sir,—I received a line from you, dated March 1st, and was glad to hear that Father

* A son of Mr. M., who was at that time Postmaster in Low Hampton.

Miller had concluded to visit West Troy on Saturday last. With much anxiety, all looked forward to that day, expecting the privilege of hearing something upon the subject of Christ's Second Coming. But, alas! we are *disappointed*. Dear sir, I write these few lines, letting you know something of the state of feeling in this place upon the subject of Mr. Miller's lectures. In the street, in the house, in short, wherever (almost) you meet an individual, the first thing is, Has Mr. Miller come yet? When is Mr. Miller going to be here? What is the reason he does not come? &c. If the old gentleman can possibly come down to West Troy, I wish him to come as soon as possible. I hope he will not delay. I think we have a little claim upon him, if our wishes may be brought into account. Dear sir, upon the reception of this, please write me the reason of the *disappointment*; also, when he will come, if at all, that I may give an answer to them that ask.

"Yours in haste,

"FREDERIC S. PARKE."

At the same date, Mr. Miller's son received a letter from Troy, N. Y., stating that "Rev. Mr. Hill is at present very anxious, and most of his church, for your father to come to East Troy first, and he has undertaken a negotiation with Eld. Parke, for your father to visit them half of the time."

In compliance with these urgent requests, he commenced a course of lectures at West Troy, N. Y., on the 8th of March, and continued till the 15th, when he began in East Troy, where he continued till the 25th. These were attended with happy results. In March of the next year, the Rev. Mr. Parke wrote Mr. Miller as follows:—

"It is my privilege to say that God in mercy is doing a great work in West Troy. Old and young and middle-aged are alike made the happy recipients of grace. The Dutch Reformed church are enjoying an interesting state of things. The Methodists are full of the Spirit, and the Baptists are pressing on in the good cause. Praise the Lord! A number date their awakening to your lectures on the Second Coming of Christ. . . . You have great reason to rejoice that God is pleased to make you the honored instrument of awakening poor sinners."

Previous to these lectures, he had received the following urgent request from Rev. Emerson Andrews, of the Baptist church in Rome, N. Y.:—

"Rome, N. Y., March 20, 1838.

"DEAR BROTHER MILLER:— We have heard something of you and yours, and want to see you here in person, and hear your whole course of lectures. I feel as if the time had arrived for you 'to preach the gospel at Rome also.' There is more attention to religion now than formerly, and some anxiety. The desire to hear from you is very great. We want you to come immediately, the first Sunday, if possible. Don't, I beg of you, make *any delay*, or *excuse*, but come right off. . . . I want you to be here before the time if possible."

Engagements at Troy made it necessary to defer compliance with the above till they were attended to. After a few days' rest, he visited Rome, N. Y., began his lectures there on the 6th of May, and continued till the 16th. In the absence of any journal, or of any reference to these lectures in any of the letters preserved by him, their results cannot be here recorded.

In June following, he again visited his friends in Canada East, and lectured at Outlet on the 10th and 11th, and at Bolton from the 12th to the 14th,—returning home before the end of the month. After this, he gave courses of lectures, commencing on the 26th of August, at Braintree, Vt.; on the 16th of September, at White Creek, Vt.; on the 3d of October, at Pittsfield, Vt.; on the 7th, at Randolph, Vt.; and on the 16th, at Brookfield, Vt.

This last course was given at the urgent request of Rev. Jehiel Claffin and the Bap-

tist church in that place. As early as the 26th of June, Mr. C. wrote him: "There are a great many people in this and the adjoining towns, who are very anxious to hear you lecture on the subject of the Millennium." And, on the 16th of July, he wrote: "I received your favor of the 30th ult., and read the same with much delight, to find that you could gratify the wish of so many friends in this, and the adjacent towns. I read your letter in meeting, yesterday, to my congregation; and, some being present from abroad, I consulted them according to your request, and found an increasing anxiety in their minds that you should come and lecture in this vicinity, or near by."

On the 7th of November, he commenced a course of lectures at Montpelier, Vt., which he continued there and in the neighborhood till the 23d. On the 17th, he writes from that place to his son:

"There is a great excitement on the subject in this place. Last night, we had a solemn and interesting meeting. There was a great breaking down, and much weeping. Some souls have been born again. I can hardly get away from this people. They want me to stay another week; but I shall go to the next village on Monday. Mr. Kellogg, the Congregational minister here, is a good man, and his church are living Christians. Montpelier is quite a considerable village, and contains some very intelligent people, who appear to listen with much interest. This afternoon, I meet the citizens, and am to give them an opportunity to ask questions and state objections. . . . May God help me to give his truth! I know my own weakness, and I know that I have neither power of body nor of mind to do what the Lord is doing by me. It is the Lord's doings and marvelous in our eyes. The world do not know how weak I am. They think much more of the old man than I think of him."

A gentleman in this place, on the 20th of February following, wrote to Mr. M. as follows: "I am happy to inform you that your labors with us have been blessed, and twenty have united with our church [the Baptist] since you left Montpelier, and twenty or thirty more will soon join, all of whom date their awakening at the time you lectured here. Bro. Kellogg (the Congregationalist minister) is strong in the faith, and his views are with Bro. Miller on the second coming of Christ."

On the 24th of November, he commenced a series of lectures in Jericho, Vt., which continued till the 2d of December. On the 28th of this month, he went to Stockbridge, Vt., and on the 30th, to Rochester, where he continued till the 6th of January, 1839.

On the 7th of January, 1839, he wrote to his son from Bethel, Vt., that he had lectured in those places to large audiences, and was on his way to Woodstock. He arrived at that place on the 7th, and commenced a second course of lectures, which continued to the 14th. From that date to the 20th, he lectured at Pomfret, Vt.; from the 21st to the 27th, at Bethel, Vt.; and from the 28th to the 31st, at Gaysville, Vt.;—from which place, he returned home. On the 28th, he wrote from Gaysville to his son:

"There has been a reformation in every place that I have lectured in since I left home, and the work is progressing in every place rapidly. The meeting-houses are crowded to overflowing. Much excitement prevails among the people. Many say they believe; some scoff; others are sober and thinking. Give my love to all—mother and the children. I remain yours, etc.

"Wm. MILLER."

On the 10th of March, he commenced in Essex, Vt., and lectured till the 17th. From the 18th to the 24th, he was at Williston, Vt.; and on the 26th, he commenced another course of lectures at Waterbury, Vt., which closed on the 1st of April. Having projected a tour into Massachusetts about this time, he was obliged to disappoint a large number who had solicited visits from him. As evidence of the great desire to hear him, he then had on file, urgent requests from Frederic Daley, "preacher in charge," Northfield, Vt.,—with fifteen signatures from Strafford, Vt.,—expressing "a great anxiety on the part of the public to hear a course of lectures;" from Joseph Chase, Middlesex, announcing that the meeting-house had been opened for him without a dissenting vote, and urging him to come by all means; Wm. D. Leavett, Grantham, N. H.—urging his presence there "at as early a day as possible;" Z. Delano, Hartford, Vt., wishing him to come

as early "as practicable;" Jonathan Woods, Dover, Vt.—"many people being desirous to hear;" Hiram Freeman, pastor of the Congregationalist church in Middlesex, Vt.—stating that "the church would gladly see him, and were generally anxious for him to come," etc., etc.;—none of which appear to have been complied with.

Oratory in Prayer.

THE subject of "speech-making in prayer," is thus deprecated by the *Christian Advocate*, New York:

Should prayer offered in public be an oration? A few months ago, we went to church on a Sunday evening, in a large country town, and heard something which so impressed us that we have since thought about it very often. It was not the sermon; there was nothing memorable in that. It was a prayer, or, at least, when the minister began, he said, "Let us pray," and the people bowed their heads as if in supplication. Then we heard a brief eulogy on human nature, setting forth its dignity and independence. Then there was a description of the horrible, enslaving effects of superstition, and of false views of the character of God, which have always been entertained in the Christian church. After this the result of modern theological criticism was summed up, the prayer concluded with a sketch in outline of the "good time coming, when a man will be emancipated from the bondage of traditions, and rites, and superstitious usages, and will reverence and worship only the divine in his own nature." This is no caricature; it is an accurate report of what we heard on the occasion referred to, and in important respects it is much like what we have often heard in our own denomination and in others. There is a great deal of praying in public that closely resembles speech-making. Of course we intend no criticism of the obvious ideas and opinions of the minister whom we heard; we only ask whether such an oration can properly be termed a prayer?

A Good Fight.

It is a sad thing to see a *man* contending for a livelihood under disadvantages; but to see a delicate *woman*, with helpless little ones at her back, fighting the giants of poverty and sorrow, is more affecting. It was a humble home; and passers-by knew not that within those four walls were displays of courage more admirable than that of Hannibal crossing the Alps, or in the pass of Thermopylae, or at Balaklava, where, "into the jaws of death rode the six hundred." These heroes had the whole world to cheer them on; but there were none to applaud the struggle in that humble home. She fought for bread, for clothing, for fire, for shelter, with aching head, and weak side, and exhausted strength, through the long night, by the brook Jabbok. Could it be that none would give her help? Had God forgotten to be gracious? No! contending soul, the midnight air is full of wings coming to the rescue. She hears it now, in the sigh of the night wind, in the ripple of the brook Jabbok—the promise made so long ago, ringing down the sky: "Thy fatherless children; I will preserve them alive; and let thy widows trust in me." Some one said to a very poor woman, "How is it that in such distress you keep cheerful?" She said: "I do it by what I call 'cross-prayers.' When I had my rent to pay, and nothing to pay it with, and bread to buy, and nothing to buy it with, I used to sit down and cry. But now I do not get discouraged. If I go along the street, when I come to a corner of a street, I say: 'The Lord help me.' I then go on until I come to another crossing of the street, and again I say: 'The Lord help me.' And so I utter a prayer at every crossing; and since I have got into the habit of saying these 'cross-prayers,' I have been able to keep up my courage."—*Talmage*.

Childhood.

LET man enjoy what he will in after-life, if his childhood has been blessed with the care and kindness of a judicious mother, there will come moments when the cup of pleasure will be dashed from his lips as tasteless, in comparison with those hours of sweet and social intercourse, when he first learned to look for a pervading spirit in the realms of nature—to welcome all the animated and joyous creatures of earth as members of his own wide brotherhood, and to hail the beams of morning as pledges of the inexhaustible beneficence which created both life and sight, and ordained them as blessings to mankind.

THE STATESMAN ARTICLES.

ARTICLE SIX.

TESTIMONY OF PAUL AND JOHN TO THE FIRST-DAY SABBATH.

Two important portions of the inspired records remain to be considered. The first of these reads as follows: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." (1 Cor. 16: 1, 2.)

From this passage it is clear that the churches of Galatia, as well as the church at Corinth, or that Christians generally, were required to set apart a proportion of their worldly goods, as God prospered them, for benevolent purposes. It is also clear that the act of setting apart the required proportion of means was to be performed statedly, every week, on the first day of the week.

Whatever may be the correct interpretation of the words, "lay by him in store," enough is beyond all doubt and agreed upon by all, to show that the first day of the week was regarded by the apostle and the Christian churches as a special day, and one more fitting than others for the benevolent and religious duty enjoined.

The phrase rendered in our version, "by him," is unquestionably an idiomatic Greek expression for "at home." (Compare Luke 24: 12, and John 20: 10.) And even if we understand this phrase to be connected with the word rendered "in store," which is a participle signifying "treasuring up," the proof of first-day sacred observance is still clear and strong. But the true connection of the words, "at home," is with what precedes. "Let every one place or devote at home." Place what? The answer is not hard to find—a proportion of the weekly earnings; a suitable part of what God in his bounty had given. When this proportion was separated by each Christian at home, from the rest of his weekly earnings, it was to be treasured up. But where? This is the important question. Where was the money each Christian set apart at home on the first day of the week, from his weekly receipts, to be kept in store? It appears that this treasuring up was not at each Christian's home:

1. Because the phrase, "at home," grammatically connects, not with the word, "treasuring," but with the preceding verb. This verb does not mean "lay by," but "lay," or "place." The preposition rendered "by" is part of the phrase, "at home." If it is insisted that the idea of treasuring in store is in the word rendered "lay," then we have this tautology: "Let every one place in store, or lay by at home, placing in store." Paul did not write in this way.

2. The first day of the week must have offered a special facility for doing what was required. True, if nothing more is meant than laying by at home, even that marks the first day with distinguishing honor. But the placing or putting of God's portion by itself, separated from the balance of the receipts of the past week, on each first day, in each Christian's home, was in order to something else, for which the first day alone gave opportunity. On that day, as we have learned from Acts 20: 7, and other portions of Scripture, Christians were accustomed to meet for public religious services, and at these public gatherings, each Christian put into the treasury of the church what he had set apart at home from the rest of the gains of the week.

3. The most conclusive argument, however, is drawn from the end that Paul desired to accomplish. He states expressly that his aim in giving his directions was to avoid the necessity of gatherings or collections when he should come. The force of this consideration is evaded by explaining the apostle's words as meaning "small collections." But if every Christian had his money laid by at home, whether it were much or little, the "collections" would still have to be made. Each Christian, it is true, would have his sum already made up, and would need to make no personal gathering. But the apostle's word is much more naturally and fittingly applied to collections on a larger and wider scale. And to effect the apostle's end, and avoid such collections at his coming, the Corinthians, like the Galatians, were to make a collection every Lord's day, of what each one at home had set apart or placed aside from the proceeds of his business

during the preceding week. In no other way would the moneys needed be in perfect readiness for the apostle. If left in the hands of individuals scattered around, there would be uncertainty about the apostle's receipt of them, and there would still be trouble in connection with collections on his arrival. But with the moneys already gathered at the regular weekly meetings into the common treasury of the church, and there waiting his coming, his aim is satisfactorily accomplished.

The only remaining passage is Rev. 1: 10: "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." It has been admitted by opponents of the first-day Sabbath, that if by the Lord's day in this passage, the first day of the week is meant, their cause is lost. And lost it is; for no other day can be meant. Three interpretations have been given of John's words:

1. By the Lord's day is meant the day of Judgment. Wetstein, in his elaborate edition of the Greek New Testament, in the year 1752, first advanced this view. His comment is: "Hunc diem judicii vident in spiritu; i. e., prævidit representatum." "John saw in Spirit the day of Judgment: that is, he foresaw it represented." The phrase, "the day of the Lord," does mean in the Scriptures the day of Judgment. But that phrase is different from the one here employed. The literal rendering of the former is, "the day of the Lord." The literal rendering of the other is, "the dominical day." This was not a day foreseen, but a day on which John was in the Spirit—a day of weekly recurrence, which the Lord claims as his own, as he claims the dominical supper.

2. By the Lord's day, it is maintained again, is meant the seventh-day Sabbath. In support of this view, it is said that the phrase employed by John corresponds with such Old-Testament expressions as "a Sabbath to the Lord," and with the Saviour's language: "The Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath." But the very fact that the seventh day had a well known and distinctive name by which it was always designated, is strong presumptive proof that this new and unusual phrase used by John cannot apply to it. It would be most natural to suppose that some other day is meant, and this is clearly proved to be the fact.

3. The phrase, the Lord's day, was the common expression for designating the first-day Sabbath from John's time onward. As the meal which the Lord hallowed as his own was called the Lord's Supper, so the day hallowed by the Lord's resurrection; by his repeated meeting with his disciples after rising from the dead; by the descent of his Spirit; by the weekly religious assemblies of his people with their communions, preaching and hearing the word, prayers and almsgiving, was properly termed the Lord's day. It has been argued on the other side of the question that the Lord had a day, and but one in the week, called specially his own. But, as has been shown, Jesus himself, after his resurrection, paid no regard to the seventh day. His disciples did not observe it. It could not, therefore, have been the Lord's day. On the other hand, Jesus did honor the first day, and the Christian churches everywhere did the same; and thus this honored day is the only one of which John could speak when he said he was "in the Spirit on the Lord's day." By this name, as will be seen in our next article, the first day of the week was known in the early church.—*Christian Statesman*, Jan. 11, 1873.

"TESTIMONY OF PAUL AND JOHN TO THE FIRST-DAY SABBATH."

A REJOINDER.

WITH no small degree of interest we have perused the article entitled "Testimony of Paul and John to the First-day Sabbath." The two texts which it brings forward in defense of the theory of a changed Sabbath, are regarded by the friends of that theory, generally, as among the strongest of its supports. The first of them (1 Cor. 16: 1, 2), we had assailed, and adduced a criticism, from the pen of Mr. J. W. Morton, which was of great importance. In it, the very stronghold of the Sunday argument had been fearlessly attacked, and, to our mind, carried beyond all question. The writer whom we quoted presented twelve versions and translations, all of which clearly sustained the position that the expression, "by him," was equivalent to the term, "at home." If this were true,

then beyond all dispute the Sunday argument had been denuded of all its strength, provided it ever had any; for the support of its logic was the assumption that the transaction brought to view in this text was to take place in the respective assemblies of the saints.

It is, therefore, with the most profound satisfaction that—if we rightly apprehend the remarks of our reviewer—he concedes the point that the words, “by him,” do indeed answer to a Greek idiom, of which the original terms are equivalent to the expression, “at home.” This being true, we are agreed that at least a *portion* of the duty which Paul commanded was to be performed, not at the house of assembly, but at the *dwelling of the individual Christian*. In other words, he admits that the money which they were to “place or devote” to charitable purposes, was first to be estimated and separated while yet they were in their own houses. Having conceded thus much, he reasons that the money was to be carried to the place of worship, and laid up in store, or deposited among the collections regularly made on the first day of the week. In order to sustain this view, he offers a grammatical criticism to which it cannot be objected that it is not drawn finely enough to meet the taste of the most fastidious. But the writer does not seem to plant himself so squarely upon it as we would naturally expect one would who feels that he is standing upon solid ground.

The *force of his logic* seems to be drawn from the *object* which Paul had in view, in ordering beforehand this weekly laying aside of money for the poor saints at Jerusalem. The writer thinks that the evident reference of Paul, in the words, “that there be no gatherings when I come,” is to contributions to be taken up in the congregation when he should have reached the place. If he is wrong in this, he is wrong in all; for no one will dispute that money *could* be “laid by in store” at home, as well as in the church, since to lay by in store, is to put in some safe and accessible place.

Right here, then, we inquire, What were the “gatherings” which Paul sought to avoid on his arrival? They could refer to but one of two things; either, first, the collection of moneys in the church; or, secondly, the collecting of them by individuals from those who were indebted to them. That the first was not the sense in which Paul employed the word, we submit is apparent, from the fact that the end to be gained by writing months beforehand, in order to prevent the taking up of a collection in the church, was not commensurate with the dignity which is given to it by so prominent a place in the sacred epistle. So far as the collection itself was concerned, it could have been brought about, unquestionably, within the space of fifteen minutes. The amount of time, therefore, which it would consume, is too insignificant to be worthy of mention.

Again, as it regards the moral complexion of the act, it will not be objected by our reviewer that it was to be avoided from any scruples in that direction, since he believes that such collections were taken up on every first day of the week. On the other hand, taking the second view as being the one which properly expresses the facts, we find that it is in perfect harmony with the circumstances of the case, and consistent with the notion that Paul had a sufficient motive for writing beforehand, as he did, concerning the collections. He was about to make a brief visit to Corinth. How long he should remain, he could not tell. While there, he wanted the undivided attention of the people to be given to religious purposes, and also that the money which he expected should be in readiness, so that no delay might be necessary.

This, however, could not be, since, not knowing the exact time of his arrival, they would not be likely to have it on hand when he should come, unless they laid it by, week-

ly, at their homes. Should he, therefore, drop in upon them suddenly, they would be thrown into a confusion of mind illy compatible with the purposes of daily worship during his visit, since they would be annoyed and distracted by the necessity of gathering from this direction and that, the amounts of the weekly contribution which they had agreed to make for the benefit of the suffering saints at Jerusalem.

But once more: Having settled the point that the explanation claimed does not satisfactorily account for the mention of the subject in an epistle, while the one which we present meets the requirements of the case in every particular—since it both supplies the money, and furnishes the apostle with a body of Christians ready to listen to the preaching of the word—let us look at the matter from another standpoint.

The plan proposed by Paul could have been arrived at in but one of two ways. Every Christian was expected, either, first, to give a fixed sum, every week, of an amount equal to that which the general valuation of his property would require; or, secondly, he was, as the writer supposes, to pay in a fluctuating amount weekly, that amount to be determined by the gains or losses of the week.

We will suppose, for a moment, that the first theory is correct, and will test the plan in question thereby. While doing so, for convenience' sake, we will employ the currency of our own time. Here is a Corinthian Christian who is worth, say \$10,000. He decides that he will give for the purposes mentioned, ten dollars per week. He has money in his purse, and nothing to prevent his doing it at any time. Being anxious to obey the injunction of Paul, he proceeds as the writer suggests. On Sunday morning he is at home, knowing just what he must contribute on that day, when he goes to church, having previously decided this point. The amount, as we have seen, is precisely ten dollars. But Paul says he must do something with it “at home,” before going to church. What was he to do with it? The writer says, “to place or devote it.” Well, he takes out his purse; from it he extracts just ten dollars. He holds it in his fingers. Now, what shall he do with it? The writer says he must “place or devote it.” Yes, but we inquire, What does *place or devote* mean, in such a connection as this? In other words, What shall he do with the money at home? Shall he take it out, and turn it over, and look at it, and put it back in his purse again, and then go to church and place it in the contribution box? We answer, that this would be a solemn farce. To say, also, that having taken it out of his purse he must not put it back again, but must place it in some other pocket, and then carry it to church, is simply ridiculous. So far, therefore, as the men were concerned whose property was fixed, and whose contributions were the same, weekly, all that was said by Paul about “devoting or placing” at home was pure nonsense, in the light of the exposition offered.²

Now for the other class, or the men of fluctuating resources. How shall they proceed? Were they to estimate the amount of their weekly gains, and to collect in the sum, on the last day, which they were to give on the first day of the week? If so, then in their cases, as well as in those of the first order, the whole process was a mere sham, an empty and meaningless form. For they also, at their homes, would simply have to take out their money and look at it, and then put it back and go to the church for the purpose of donating it.

But again; as we have seen, that unless the work of deciding how much they ought to give, and separating the amount for that purpose while at home on the first day of the week, was a part of the plan of the apostle, the whole suggestion had in it neither rhyme nor reason, we now turn to the only alternative left our opponent; which is the conclusion that the work indicated by the term, “place or devote at home,” was that of *deciding upon and separating* the sum which they could spare to the weekly contribution.

What are the consequences of such a position? We reply, It overturns and ut-

² Instead of selecting a wealthy person able to contribute ten dollars per week, as has been done above, let an individual be chosen from the poorer classes of Corinthians—say from among those who would be able to donate only twenty-five cents per week—and the reader will be more forcibly impressed with the unreasonableness of that construction which makes it necessary that so small a pittance should first be placed or devoted at home, and then carried to the church, and there deposited in the general collection.

terly uproots the whole theory of Sunday sanctity; for the lesson taught by 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2, instead of being favorable to the conception that Paul held to such a theory, shows that he regarded the first day of the week as secular time. Do you ask, How do you reach such a conclusion? I answer, It is inevitable, since the men who were acting under the instruction of Paul could not carry out the work prescribed by him without devoting at least the morning of the first day of the week to worldly business, such as that of figuring up and deciding upon the losses and profits of the preceding week, and, perhaps, collecting from outstanding matters the pro-rata amount necessary for the stated collection at the church.

Should it be objected that our suggestion is open to the criticism that the well-to-do class of Christians could have furnished their means at any time, we answer, Very true; but that, should week after week elapse without the separation, on the part of the wealthy, of the stipulated sum, it might, before the arrival of the apostle, reach figures which it would be difficult even for them to meet without perplexity. And besides, the better, easier, more natural, and we think, spiritually, the more profitable method, even for them, would be found in doing it weekly. We might offer many reasons for this conviction, had we space. Paul was giving a general rule to meet the condition of all classes. The poor comprised the larger portion of these classes, and a principle was laid down, therefore, which, while it was better for the rich than any other, was indispensable, for the purposes in question, to the men of moderate circumstances.

Our interpretation, stated in brief, is simply this: The apostle instructed them on the first day of the week to lay by in store, at home, what they proposed to give to the saints at Jerusalem, hoarding it up until he should visit them, so that at his arrival they might put it into the common treasury; thus avoiding the possibility of being unable, on the one hand, to meet their pledges, and on the other, of being necessitated to have their minds occupied with temporal affairs, during his stay. This conception is free from embarrassments. Even were the gentleman's interpretation of the passage correct, it cannot be shown to be unsound. He would read the scripture substantially as follows: “Let every one of you devote at home, treasuring up, that there be no gatherings when I come.” To our mind, there is no tautology, even in the declaration of the apostle thus expressed, which is worthy of mention; for should the term “treasuring up” be interpreted to mean the same as placing or devoting at home, it is explanatory, not of the command, but of the purpose of the command. A paraphrase, which is often employed with profit in the writings of Paul, will make it all clear: “Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay aside, or devote to the Lord, an amount commensurate with the prosperity which he has bestowed upon you, treasuring it up, so that there need be no gatherings when I come.”

The only difference between the gentleman and myself, therefore, would be as to the *place where* it was to be treasured up; he insisting that it was at the church, and we, at the house of the individual Christian. We have shown that his opinion is not only unnecessary, but that it is also absurd, since it divides a transaction which Paul does not divide; and, after admitting that a part of it transpired at the home of the individual, it represents the other part as having taken place at the church; whereas, neither the church, the contribution box, nor the assembly, are so much as mentioned. And besides, it presents Paul in an attitude which certainly does not compliment his sagacity. Mark you, it is “every one of you” that he instructs to “lay by at home.” It must therefore be, not the church collectively, but its individual members who are called upon to treasure up, or lay by in store. Just here we submit that the language employed is literal, and not figurative, and that, this being true, the moment that the saints at Corinth placed their funds in the common treasury, they violated the injunction of the apostle, which was that they should treasure it up, or lay it by in store, individually. By way of enforcing our logic, we inquire of the reader, who has doubtless contributed many times to church collections, Can you look upon money thus bestowed as in any proper sense of the term belonging to you individually? or as still treasured up or laid by in store? We

think that your answer will not be equivocal. To lay by in store, as before stated, is to put in some safe and accessible place; but money once donated is not accessible to the individual contributor, since he has no longer any individual property in it.

Here we must terminate our remarks on 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2. As we do so, we have disposed of the last Bible text which will be cited in the support of a supposed practice of Sunday-keeping on the part of the early church. Error begets error. Having rejected the obvious teaching of Acts 20: 7, that Paul, after holding a meeting on the first day of the week, traveled nineteen and a half miles on foot, and having endeavored to explain away this journey by inferring that it took place on the second day of the week, which is not mentioned in the connection, our opponent comes to the consideration of 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2, lugging along in his arms a precedent which God had clearly taught him was not designed to teach the lesson which he sought to extract from it. With this precedent thus illegitimately obtained, he seeks to explain the language of Paul which we have been considering. By this means, he has been led to indorse error. But we need not recapitulate.

In conclusion on this point, we remark: How admirable is the providence of God! He has instructed us in his word, in regard to duty, by clear precepts, and has never told us to study its requirements simply in the light of human example. How remarkable, therefore, that he should have condescended to so order, by his Spirit, the record which has been made in the case of every precedent brought forward, that the text and context would utterly overthrow every effort of him who should attempt to employ them in the interest of a false doctrine. On the day of the resurrection, as if to show that it was not holy time, two disciples are brought to view as traveling fifteen miles; a portion of the distance in company with their approving Lord, and the balance of it after he had appeared to, walked and conversed with, them. In Acts 20: 7, apparently perceiving the use which might be made of it, he places, in the foreground of the sacred record, the apostle, threading a weary journey on foot from Troas to Assos; and lastly, in 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2, he framed the language so that it should inculcate, not the idea that the first day of the week was holy time, but, on the contrary, that it might be devoted to the secular work of casting up accounts and collecting funds.

With the exposition offered of the words, “I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day,” Rev. 1: 10, we shall make short work. What we have previously said on that passage is not sufficiently disturbed to warrant extended remark. Be it remembered, then, that, as said above, the passage proves that God has a day in this dispensation. At this point commences our divergence. We say that the term “Lord's day” refers to the seventh-day Sabbath. The writer says that it refers to the first day of the week. The declaration that Christ paid no attention to the seventh-day Sabbath after his resurrection, needs no reply here, except that he was under no obligation to do so, and there was no good reason why he should, since he regarded it strictly in his lifetime, and enjoined it upon his followers. Perhaps, however, it would be well to add that he at least never did anything after his resurrection which might be construed into a desecration of it; whereas, in the case of the only first-day on which it can be *proved* that he ever met with his disciples, after his death, he devoted a portion of its hours to travel on the highway.

To the objection of the writer that, if the term “Lord's day,” in the case before us, does apply to the seventh-day Sabbath, it is strange that it should have been called in every case but this “the Sabbath,” we reply, that, were this true, this would simply prove a choice in titles, and implies no disrespect to the day itself, since the term “Sabbath,” equally with that of “Lord's day,” was a sacred denomination. Not so, however, if he be right in the supposition that the term “Lord's day” applies to the Sunday; for if he be correct in this, then indeed we have something which is *passing strange*. For, in all the New Testament, that which he is pleased to style the “Christian Sabbath,” and to which, according to his theory, belonged the honorable name of “Lord's day,” is not only so called but once; but, being spoken of nine times by inspired men, it is mentioned eight times out of the nine by them in an utter disregard of its hallowed nature, in the terms

(Continued on page 158.)

¹ This point is an important one; and as we are anxious to satisfy the reader that it is well taken, we append the following remarks of Albert Barnes, who—though agreeing with the writer in the *Statement* that this passage furnishes proof for Sunday observance—nevertheless frankly concedes, as will be seen, that the construction of the original phrase for “treasuring up,” is such as to admit of the idea that the work was to be done at home. He says: “The phrase in Greek, ‘treasuring up,’ may mean that each one was to put the part which he had designated into the common treasury. This interpretation seems to be demanded by the latter part of the verse. They were to lay it by, and to put it into the common treasury, that there might be no trouble of collecting when he should come. Or, it may, perhaps, mean that they were individually to *treasure it up*, having designated in their own minds the sum which they could give, and have it in readiness, when he should come.”

The Review and Herald.

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

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, APRIL 29, 1873.

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

Does Rom. 5:18, 19, Teach Universalism?

THE verses referred to read: "Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." The one through whom condemnation came upon all, it need not be said, was Adam. His disobedience was his transgression by which death came into the world. The "many" who were made sinners by his disobedience, were all his posterity, the entire human race. The one whose obedience is brought to view was the second Adam, Christ. His obedience was the acts by which he provided a sinless, and therefore an efficacious, offering for all the world. The "many" who are made righteous by his obedience, are—how many? This is the question. Is this second many as comprehensive as the first? Does it like the first include the whole race? If so, are not all men to be made righteous, and so all to be saved, through Christ? And is not then universal salvation the result? Or, on the other hand, since it appears from other texts that only a few, comparatively, will reach that degree of righteousness through Christ that will entitle them to salvation, can the second "many," that are to be made righteous, be limited to that number while the first is unlimited?

The statement of verse 18 seems to cut off positively the idea of limiting one of the terms and not the other. It says that judgment came upon all men to condemnation, and also that the free gift came upon all men to the justification of life. Here the same expression "all men," is used in both terms of the proposition. So the many that are made sinners, and the many that are made righteous, must include the same number. All the race are made righteous by the obedience of one, Jesus Christ.

Then is not Universalism the result? It would be altogether too hasty to so conclude, before we inquire in what respect, and to what extent, all men are made sinners, and in what respect, and to what extent, all are made righteous by Christ; for here is a point upon which, after all, everything may turn.

When God commanded Adam not to partake of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, the penalty he attached to disobedience was suspended upon no conditions. Adam transgressed and the penalty was inflicted. He became possessed of a mortal dying nature. He could bequeath to his posterity no higher nature than he possessed; hence the unborn millions of the race were involved with him in the effects of that penalty, and all became subject to death.

Who are subject to death? Those who are in some sense sinners; for death is the direct result of sin. But from whose sin does the death we experience in this life result? From our own personal sins, or from those of some other person? Not from our own; for no person now suffers the first or temporal death as the penalty for his own personal sins. He may, to be sure, so violate the laws of his physical nature, as to hasten the stroke of death, or he may so offend against high Heaven that God is compelled to cut short in wrath his guilty career. But this only brings on his death a little sooner than it would otherwise occur. This does not affect the fact that death stands forth as the lot to which we all are doomed, and that, too, irrespective of character. The righteous die as well as the wicked; those who try to live in strict obedience to moral and physical law, as well as those who wildly and recklessly transgress them.

From whose sin, then, does death come upon us? Answer: From the sin of Adam. We die because Adam sinned. Just in this respect, and just to this degree, therefore, are we made sinners by Adam, that we are involved in the result of his transgression. Just to this degree "judgment has come upon all men to condemnation," for this one man's sin. But it goes no farther; for we are not held on our own personal account, as transgressors on account of the sin of Adam.

But now the curtain rises, and a new scene is disclosed to our view. Christ steps upon the stage and offers his intervention in behalf of the human race. Had he not come to our assistance, death would have been the extinction of Adam and all his posterity. Our lot would have been one of hopeless despair, and as death closed the scene, that would have been our final end. Then the consequences of Adam's sin to us, instead of being temporary would have been eternal. But the love of God has arranged in our behalf that our eternal destiny shall not be determined by the action of another but by our own personal course of life. Hence it has been provided through Christ that the race should be placed upon a new probation, and every man determine by his own obedience or disobedience, what his final doom should be; and it is further provided, to make salvation possible, that when we sin, since we labor under the disadvantage of having inherited from Adam a fallen nature, the sentence shall not stand absolute and inexorable against us, but may be averted, if we will seek pardon for our offense through Jesus Christ.

With this provision, and on these conditions, the history of our race has progressed for six thousand years from the expulsion of our first parents from the garden of Eden. And every individual is answerable for his course of life, and the use he makes of the privileges within his reach. And so the apostle has written: "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. 5:10. And again, in Rom. 14:12, he says, "So then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God."

The good and bad, according to these Scriptures, are alike to give account of themselves, and receive their just deserts for the things done in the body. But this account we do not render up in this life. Before the judgment seat of Christ we do not stand in this state of existence. How, then, is this to be brought about? It can be done only by a restoration of all from the grave. A resurrection from the dead of the whole human family, irrespective of character, is the absolutely unavoidable sequence of the work which Christ has undertaken for fallen man. As in Adam all die so in Christ shall all be made alive. And when we are made alive by the resurrection, we are released from all the effect of Adam's sin upon us. Every one can then say, I was made subject to death by Adam's sin; and I died. But all that is past; the power of that death is broken, and I am placed back again upon the plane of life. I now stand just as I should have stood, if Adam never had sinned, my future now depending wholly upon my individual character. And those who are then found righteous either because they have never violated the law, or because they have secured through Christ forgiveness for all their transgressions, will live forever, while those who have failed, will for their sins come under the same penalty that was pronounced upon Adam for his sin, namely, death; and no release being provided from this death, it will be eternal.

With these facts before us, the application of Rom. 5:18, 19, can be made in few words. We have seen that all are made sinners by Adam only so far as to be involved in death in consequence of his sin. And we have also seen that all are to be released by Christ from those consequences. So far then all are made righteous by Christ. We are made righteous just as far as we are made sinners, and no farther. All the world are included in both declarations. But none are made sinners in Adam so far as to insure their eternal ruin; and none are made righteous in Christ, irrespective of character, so far as to secure their eternal salvation.

"They Never Speak Roughly."

I WAS walking lately with a young, unconverted friend, in whom I felt a great interest, and in the course of conversation, I said:—"How many of your companions do you think are Christians?" In reply she gave me the names of four: J. F., A. L., M. M., and S. L. I said: "Why do you think they are Christians?" "Because," she replied, "they never speak roughly." Is not this a lesson to the children of God, of the deep importance of words?—*Exchange.*

Stumbling Stones.

A BROTHER writes: "With shame and sorrow I have to report no progress in divine life. Still stumbling over 'visions' and 'health reform.'"

The very thing which should prove a help is a stumbling stone. Christ came as the prophets had foretold. Everything connected with his advent should have caused them to believe. These things were the evidences of the truth of the predictions of the prophets, and of the claims of Jesus as being the promised Christ. Prophets had spoken, their words were fulfilled; and the only logical conclusion was faith in Jesus. But they stumbled and fell, because of unbelief. God laid this stumbling stone in Zion; but not for the purpose of causing men to stumble, but for the very purpose of producing faith. Hence it was said, "He that believeth on him shall not be confounded."

It is just so at the present time. God has promised the spirit of prophecy as a characteristic of the remnant of the true church, the people that, under the proclamation of the last message, keep the commandments of God. Rev. 12:17, and 19:10. The exercise of the gift of prophecy, in connection with the proclamation of the warning of the third angel (Rev. 14:9-12), is one of the strongest evidences of the divinity of the work, or, in other words, that the hand of God is truly set to fulfill this all-important warning to mankind. But that which was designed to produce faith, and is the best calculated to have this effect, to unbelief becomes a cause of stumbling. By the preaching of the Heaven-sent message, men are convinced of the perpetuity and immutability of the law of God. Then they fancy that they would engage in keeping the commandments entire, were not the message encumbered with the faith that God is verily in the work. In other words, if the message was wanting in some things that were promised, they could believe and embrace it heartily. This is the logic of unbelief. Faith believes what has been promised when it comes.

And is there not need enough of health reform? and is it too small a matter for God to care for? Those who believe that the body is an essential, as well as material, part of man, should not be slow to believe that a proper care for it has a great moral and spiritual value. We believe, as a Methodist minister of my acquaintance expressed it, that if we save our souls, we shall save our bodies also. And the Scriptures also are full of this doctrine. "Your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost." "Therefore glorify God in your body." If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." "Let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of the Lord."

God gave the Israelites in the desert lessons in health reform, and has set them forth as our examples, or as warnings to us, 1 Cor. 10, and is it not evident that in these degenerate days he should teach us to care for our bodies, enfeebled by disobedience of physical laws, and to do what we can for them, before he gives them the finishing touch of immortality by a translation without death? It is true, he might do everything for us, which he saw fit; but did he not intend that we shall do what we can for ourselves? He might give us the products of the earth without our labor, but he has seen best that we should labor for them; and this is for our health.

Those who believe present truth in full are the ones that we should expect would make progress in the divine life. And such we see to be the fact. Those who receive the truth and act upon it without reserve, are those who are ever found at the post of duty.

R. F. COTTRELL.

Objections to the Sabbath Answered.

SEVENTEENTH OBJECTION.

The Sabbath has been nailed to the cross. Col. 2:14-17.

Answer. We will quote the entire passage: "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ."

I believe it can be clearly shown that there is not one reference in all this to the decalogue, or the seventh-day Sabbath. On this, Dr. Adam Clarke says, "By the handwriting of ordinances, the apostle most evidently means the ceremonial law." Com. on verse 14. Look at the figures used. "Blotting out." That which was written on parchment in books, as was the ceremonial law, could be blotted out with a wet sponge. See Num. 5:23. But it would be improper and absurd to talk of blotting out what was engraved in stones, as was the decalogue. "Handwriting." The ceremonial law was the handwriting of Moses, but the decalogue was written by the finger of God. Ex. 31:18. "Of ordinances." Here is further proof that it is the law of cere-

monial ordinances which is meant. Compare Heb. 9:10: "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." Then there was a law which stood only in these carnal ordinances of meats, drinks, &c., the very things of which the apostle speaks in Colossians. Mark that these were imposed on them as a burden. So in Eph. 2:15: "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances."

Here, too, we have the law of ordinances, the enmity, abolished. "That was against us, which was contrary to us." The ceremonial law, with all its innumerable rites and ordinances, which must be carefully regarded in the smallest affairs of every-day life, was indeed a burden, a yoke, and against them, imposed upon them to keep them a separate people till Christ came. But which of the ten commandments is against us? Look them over. Is it against us, 1. To have no other gods? 2. Not to make or worship an image? 3. Not to swear? 5. To honor our parents? 6. Not to kill? 7. Nor commit adultery? 8. Nor steal? 9. Nor lie? 10. Nor covet? Are not these commandments good, and for our best interest? But perhaps the fourth precept, the Sabbath, is against us? No, indeed; for Christ himself said, "The Sabbath was made for man." Mark 2:27. That which is for man cannot be against him.

"Nailing it to his cross." It would be proper to speak of nailing to the cross a parchment, or laws written on paper, but entirely improper if the reference is to the tables of stone. They could not be nailed up. Notice now the items which the apostle mentions, not one of which is in the decalogue, but all of which are in the ceremonial law. "Let no man therefore judge you in meat." Any thing in the ten commandments about meat? Not a word. "Or in drink." Any thing there about drink? Nothing. "Or in respect of an holy day." The original word here rendered holy day, is *heortees*, which means a feast day. Thus Greenfield defines it: "A solemn feast, public festival, holy day." It occurs twenty-seven times in the New Testament, and is, except in this place, every time rendered "feast," or "feast day." The Diaglott renders it thus: "Let no one, therefore, rule you in food, or in drink, or in respect of a festival." There were many festival (*heortees*) days in the ceremonial law, but not one in the decalogue. See the yearly festivals enumerated in Lev. 23:2, 4, 6, 34, 37, 39, 41, &c., where the original word rendered festival is *heortees* every time. And this is the word which Paul uses in Col. 2:16, thus carefully pointing out those old yearly festivals of the ceremonial law. No such festival is mentioned in the ten commandments; hence he has no reference to them.

"Or of the new moon." Any thing about new moons in the ten commandments? Not a thing. Hence this can be no reference to that law. Was there a law touching the celebration of new moons? Yes; the ceremonial law. See Num. 10:10; 28:11; Ps. 81:3, 4. Thus far we have not found the slightest reference to the ten commandments, but every item mentioned is found in the ceremonial law outside of the decalogue.

"Or of the sabbath days." Here our opponents are in high glee thinking that the seventh-day Sabbath is surely meant by this; but we are as confident that it is not, and will give our reasons for it. Many of the ablest commentators agree with us in this. Dr. Clarke on this says, "The apostle speaks here in reference to some particulars of the handwriting of ordinances, which had been taken away, viz., the distinction of meats and drinks, what was clean, and what unclean, according to the law; and the necessity of observing certain holidays or festivals, such as the new moons, and particular sabbaths. . . . There is no intimation here that the Sabbath was done away, or that its moral use was superseded by the introduction of Christianity. I have shown elsewhere, that remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, is a command of perpetual obligation."

The American Tract Society comments thus on this passage: "A holy day—sabbath days; in the original, a festival—sabbaths. The days referred to are those required to be observed in the ceremonial law; days associated by God with meats, drinks, and new moons. The passage does not refer to the Sabbath of the moral law associated with the commands forbidding murder, theft, and adultery."

The following are some of the reasons why this does not apply to the weekly Sabbath:—

1. If it does, then it leaves us no weekly Sabbath day at all; for no exception is made. It sets aside the first-day Sabbath, as well as the seventh day—"Let no man judge you in respect to the sabbath days." If one man is not to be judged for disregarding one day, then another is not to be judged for disregarding another day, and so we need keep no day.
2. This interpretation contradicts the many plain and direct texts which assert that the law, which includes the Sabbath, is still in force and must be kept, even to the smallest point. Rom. 3:31; Matt. 5:17-19; Jas. 2:8-12, &c.
3. If this proves the Sabbath nailed to the cross, then the other commandments went with it, and so the law against murder, adultery, theft, &c., has been abolished.
4. Not a single expression in the whole passage, unless it be this one touching the Sabbath

days, is applicable to the law of God engraven in stones, as we have seen.

5. Every item in the context, enumerated by the apostle, viz., meats, drinks, festivals, and new moons, is found, not in the decalogue, but in the ceremonial law. This is a strong indication that he is simply talking of the institutions of that ceremonial law, and has no reference to the moral law.

6. But were there any sabbath days in the ceremonial law? Yes; several yearly sabbaths besides the Lord's Sabbath, and the two had no connection. They are described at length in Lev. 23. We will notice a few of them:—

Verse 24: "In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, shall ye have a sabbath, a memorial of blowing of trumpets, an holy convocation. Ye shall do no servile work therein." This sabbath was on the first day of the seventh month, which could only come once a year, as all can see.

Verses 27-32: "Also on the tenth day of this seventh month there shall be a day of atonement. It shall be unto you a sabbath of rest, and ye shall afflict your souls; in the ninth day of the month at even, from even unto even, shall ye celebrate your sabbath." The Greek word here rendered sabbath is *sabbaton*, the same that is used by Paul in Col. 2:16. This sabbath was on the tenth day of the seventh month and so could come only once a year. The first and tenth days of the month were sabbaths, which shows that they are not weekly Sabbaths; for they are ten days apart—rather a long week!

Verse 39: "Also in the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when ye have gathered in the fruit of the land, ye shall keep a feast unto the Lord seven days; on the first day [of the feast, hence the fifteenth of the month] shall be a sabbath, and on the eighth day shall be a sabbath." Here we have two more yearly sabbaths. That these are not weekly Sabbaths is further proved by the fact that the tenth and the fifteenth days of the month were sabbaths—a week only five days long! Further, the Lord says these are to be kept beside his Sabbath.

Verses 37, 38: "These are the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, to offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord, a burnt offering, and a meat offering, a sacrifice, and drink offerings, everything upon his day; beside the Sabbaths of the Lord." &c.

Thus we have the fact plainly before us that there were several yearly sabbaths connected with meats, drinks, new moons, feasts, &c., besides God's Sabbath. And this is the very list which Paul names in Col. 2 as nailed to the cross and blotted out. 7. The sabbath days mentioned by Paul he says were a shadow of Christ. Verse 17. This was true of the ceremonial sabbaths, but not of the seventh-day Sabbath. It pointed back to creation, not forward to the cross; hence it is not what the apostle meant.

But, says one, *days* is a supplied word in Col. 2:16. So the original would read, "Or of the Sabbath," singular number, hence the Sabbath, the seventh day, and not the sabbath days, the yearly sabbaths, plural. I answer, It is true that "*days*" is not in the original; but *sabbaton* is in the plural; hence if we do not render it *sabbath days*, we must render it *sabbaths*, plural, which is the same in substance. So our opponents have not even a single hook upon which to hang their theory in this passage.

D. M. CANRIGHT.

Practical Thoughts.

INVESTING MONEY WHERE IT WILL PAY.

THIS is what shrewd managers in temporal things do; and true believers in the last message of mercy will not be behind the men of this world in putting out their means where it will bring them rich returns. They have found a way to have their money bring more than one thousand fold at the end of a very few years, and that is by investing all they can in the different branches of the glorious cause of present truth. It would seem as though they received more than their pay here, in the approving blessings of God's Spirit, in seeing souls embrace the truth, and in seeing the cause prosper; but their full returns and rich reward will be realized in the settling-day, when those whom they have been the means of saving, by a right use of their talents, shall shine in the crowns of their rejoicing. Oh! what a satisfaction to meet such in the kingdom of glory! Who can express the blessedness that will result from such a meeting? What a thrill of humble joy and gratitude will then fill the souls of those who shall have improved every opportunity of helping push forward the work of God, with their means, as they behold on every hand immortal and glorified saints saved, forever saved, as the results of their sacrifices in connection with the grace of God. Such will not then feel tempted to think that God's servants, who invited them to lay up for themselves treasures in Heaven, were dunning them for selfish purposes. Oh! no; it will then seem that the sight of one of the saved, who will be worth more than ten thousand worlds, will more than pay them for all they have done. But this will be but a small part of their reward.

TAKING ADVANTAGE OF THE TIMES, AND INVESTING LARGELY IN THOSE ARTICLES THAT ARE LOW IN THE MARKET.

This is what sharp speculators do. They keep posted on market prices, and keep their eye on those articles that people must have, and when such articles get very low, they invest largely in them. By-and-by, the property they have purchased comes up, and they make a fortune. Much of this principle should be followed in religion. In the spiritual market, there are also articles which are valued very low, even by the mass of professors. One of these is the suffering, self-denying part of religion for the sake of unpopular truth. This article is looked upon by the masses as being almost, or quite, valueless. But it is sure to come up in the spiritual market, when troubles come upon earth, and when the reward is bestowed. It will work out for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. This part of religion is so despised, that but few dare to purchase it. This is true of those who are governed by worldly principles, and walk by sight, and not by faith. But thank God that some are taking, as it were, advantage of the times, and they are willing to invest all in the sacrificing part of religion.

VENTURING IN BUSINESS.

While it is sometimes true that he who ventures nothing loses nothing, it is also true that men often come to turns in their worldly affairs, that, unless they venture, they shall gain nothing, and perhaps lose much. Hence men will run great risks, at times, to better themselves pecuniarily; and they will sometimes lose much; but their hope revives, and they will try again.

Why not also run risks for the Lord, and not be so fearful that his cause will prove a failure? Every great undertaking set on foot, thus far, for the furtherance of God's cause, has proved a success. Some enterprises may have received slight jogs; but even these have been like the wind blowing on a tree firmly rooted in rich soil, which only serves to increase its growth, strength, and firmness. We should not be discouraged till we have lost as much in the Lord's cause as we have in our temporal matters. Lost, do I say? There can be no entire loss in venturing for God, for God will reward us according to our good motives in giving. Can we be justified before God unless we venture as much for him, in point of means, as we do for ourselves? But how easy it is for us to excuse ourselves for not giving, and to think that when a call is made for means, it is made to others, and not to us.

TIMID AND DESPONDING CHRISTIANS

Are in danger of thinking that their cases are hopeless, while there is often a greater prospect of their being saved, than there would be if they had no deep sense of the sinfulness of sin, and of the narrowness of the way that leads to the kingdom of God. When men and women have principle and moral courage to take hold of unpopular truth, and sacrifice for it; when they open their hearts and their doors to receive God's children, and delight to see them enjoy the service of God, and to see the cause prosper, we think that their case is very hopeful. Yet they are not without their dangers. They must make an effort to look on the bright side, to believe that God does forgive them their sins, and to shut out the temptations of Satan by taking up their cross, and doing every known duty. The best way for timid souls to get confidence and strength, is to exercise. Thousands have learned this from experience, and others can do the same. True, the cross of such may be heavy, at first, and we should bear with them; but they, too, may triumph in God, and help others by a rich experience.

D. T. BOURDEAU.

The Amendment.

I CLIP the following from *The Independent* of Feb. 27, 1873, in reference to the Constitutional Amendment. It speaks for itself:—

AN UNCHRISTIAN AMENDMENT.

Those persons who believe that it is lawful to use force in propagating Christianity are holding a public meeting in the Cooper Institute in this city as this paper is passing through the press. The call for the meeting is signed by a Justice of the Supreme Court, by several governors, ex-governors, bishops, doctors of divinity, and other notabilities, civil and ecclesiastical; many of whom are men of undoubted worth and respectability, and whose connection with this enterprise is the only impeachment of their good sense.

We say that these people propose to use force in propagating the Christian religion. That is a point which must not be lost sight of. Law is force. It rests upon force; it is maintained by force; whenever it is violated, force must be appealed to for its vindication. We always speak of enforcing law; and it is not a figure of speech, by any means. An amendment to the Constitution recognizing and proclaiming Christianity as the supreme law of the land would be maintained only by the suggestion or the use of carnal weapons. This is directly contrary to the letter and the spirit of Christianity. "My kingdom is not of this world" said the Master; and those who undertake by political methods to ad-

vance his kingdom are disobeying his express command.

No worse dishonor has ever been put upon the religion of Christ by its professed adherents than this proclamation, signed by a chief justice of our Supreme Court and a vast number of other dignitaries, that "every Christian feature" will surely be obliterated from existing institutions unless we "make the Constitution explicitly Christian." The power of the pulpit and the Christian press; the influence of Sunday-schools and home missions; the moral and spiritual forces at our command: the promised aid of Him who said, "Lo! I am with you alway"—all these will be of no avail to preserve our land from heathenism, if we cannot get a few words of religious dogma into the text of our Constitution! We desire the public to understand that these men do not represent the Christian sentiment of this land. They are but an insignificant faction in the churches, and their numbers will not increase. Many of them are wholly sincere in their advocacy of this measure; but there is not a ghost of a chance that it will be adopted, and the agitation of it can result only in harm. It is not only an unchristian but an Antichristian project, and ought to be repudiated with indignation by every man who believes that "where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty."

The Editor of the *Christian Union*, in a late issue, also speaks as follows:—

1. The method here proposed is antagonistic to the Christian method, which, in its purest forms and pre-eminently in the hands of Christ himself, has ever been to deal first with the inside, and work thence outward; to attach great value to the spirit, and very little to mechanical devices, to secure the good profession by securing first the good heart. But the process advocated by the National Association is exactly the reverse of this. Its plan is to secure an operation which is begun on the outside and not within: to get the mechanical device of a formal acknowledgment, in our national charter, of God, of Jesus Christ, and of the Bible, without any account being taken of the attitude of the national spirit; to obtain a profession by the lips, whatever may be the testimony of the heart and the life. Let it not be said that this question of method is unimportant. Nay, it goes to the very essence of the strife between Christianity and all corruptions of it. The first note of a fatal lapse from the spirit of Christ is to be discovered in the shifting to the field of religious operation from the interior to the surface. The worst opponents whom Christ encountered on earth were those Hebrew religionists whose external service was perfect; and who continually wore upon their foreheads slips of parchment on which was inscribed the devout "recognition of Almighty God." The plan we are discussing is a proposal to wear a phylactery upon the forehead of the Constitution.

2. The method of the National Association is antagonistic to the spirit of American civil liberty. Every argument which has been or can be used in favor of the theological amendment of the Constitution, has been used a thousand times, just as logically, for the union of Church and State. Moreover, every one of these arguments would justify prosecution in the courts of the land for opinion's sake. Suppose that you have carried your amendment. Instantly you have revolutionized the civil spirit of this Republic. From the moment of your victory, you make the holding of certain theological opinions, different from your own, an offense indictable in our courts and punishable in our prisons. When you have gained so much, what have you left of American liberty?

Both as Christians and as patriots, therefore, we solemnly protest against the measure now in agitation. It is a measure in every way evil. Its success would be fatal at once to religion and to freedom in America.

Thus speak two of the leading papers in America, and although they cherish the belief, the project will not succeed, as in the language of one of them they think the scheme as "impossible as it is objectionable," what would be their consternation were their eyes open to the future of this government as delineated in the sure word of prophecy.

How thankful ought we to be as a people for the light which has shone upon us in advance. Who shall be ready for the contest?

CHAS. A. RUSSELL.

Plainwell, Mich.

Confidence in God.

"Trust in the Lord and do good." Ps. 37:3.

FAITH is the foundation of Christianity. A sincere, rational, and unshaken confidence in the Creator of all things, as the author of all that is good, must underlie the whole system of practical godliness: for doubt on this subject causes just such a catastrophe here as happens to a building when the foundation is defective or decayed, or is wholly removed.

A man who doubts the Bible, or its author, has already, not only renounced Christianity, but, ranked himself with Paine and Voltaire, and the infidelity of the age.

The persons to whom the text is addressed, are supposed not only to have a faith in theory, but they are supposed to have a practical faith, that can trust God in emergencies, when difficulties arise, when want or misfortune lay a heavy hand upon the trusting saint.

When all the artillery of Satan is let loose upon the child of God, he may be in want, or sorrow, persecuted by enemies, and forsaken of friends; he may be friendless and alone, or he may be the victim of a Herod or a Nero, or a victim of the more refined cruelty of councils and edicts, yet faith and confidence in God never fail him; but, like the strong arm of Omnipotence, it lifts him above the earth. He seems to breathe the atmosphere of Paradise; and the greater his suffering, the stronger his faith, and love, and joy.

J. CLARKE.

Take Heed to the Sure Word of Prophecy.

"I BEHELD then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame." Dan. 7:11. "And then shall that wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." 2 Thess. 2:8.

The following statements from *Connellan* in the *Pilot*—a strictly Catholic organ, printed in Boston, we think are wonderful concessions to the verification of the above prophecies. Indeed, it seems not a little singular that such statements should come from such a source. We give the italics:—

The year that has just been gathered to the past, while it has not been distinguished by those greater events which strike men with wonder and horror, has yet been filled with many grievous incidents, and has been marked by the development of principles which have produced, and will continue to produce, sad results to Europe. More than all other years, 1872 will stand out in modern history as the year when a general European persecution against the Catholic church was inaugurated. *From west to east, from north to south, from France (where, indeed, the opposition to Catholicity is less, perhaps, than anywhere else) to Turkey, from Italy to Russia, the rulers of Europe are in arms against the Catholic church. In some fashion or other the Catholics of every country are suffering.* Here, education is the channel through which persecution is inflicted; there, sequestration of church property is the grievance, and, in other parts, banishment of the clergy inflicts the gravest wrong on Catholics. A rapid glance at the various countries of Europe, and a review of the salient points in their history during the past year, will show *what spirit is at work*, and will enable us to connect the events of the twelve months that are gone with the events that may occur during the year that is beginning.

ROME.

To Catholics, Rome must be the beginning and the end of every question touching religion or foreign politics. The conditions made around the Pope, *his continued imprisonment*, his words and his acts, possess at the present time a more powerful interest than any other series of questions occupying the nations of the world.

The latter days of 1871 beheld Pius IX. *forsaken by the governments of the world*, with the solitary exception of the Republic of Ecuador, and the year 1872 opened and concluded, leaving the Pope in a similar, probably in a worse, condition with governments. * * * The nations of Europe are thus, for the most part, in *open warfare with the Sovereign Pontiff. In person, surrounded by enemies, slandered in the press, insulted by caricatures, his guards slain, his mandates disregarded, his words perverted to basest uses—behold the condition of His Holiness Pope Pius IX. in the 81st year of his age, in his holy city of Rome!*

Controversy.

I PRESENT the following extract as worthy of notice in discussions, especially upon religious subjects.

A. P. V. H.

"I like controversy when it is thoroughly honest. I do admire to see two large and generous minds approach a subject from opposite quarters, and then to watch the new lights that flash over it, and show it in a thousand relations that were not obvious before. It lifts us out of the ruts of our sect and party, in whose treadmill we have been grinding all our lives, and mistaking it for the universe. But controversy with small minds is the smallest business that is done in this world. It slides inevitably into word-catching, and ends in personalities. The moment I saw a man consciously trying to put my language to a different use from what I had put it myself, I would stop short with him and say: 'I am glad to compare ideas with you, but I have no time for word-catching.' To say, as Dr. Johnson did, 'I can't furnish meaning and brains too,' is not courteous. The only controversy that ever convinces the convertists is a friendly comparison of beliefs, each turning the other's round, and viewing it under all the angles of reflection. It is not this sort of controversy, but fighting with word mongers, that Dr. Holmes must have in mind, 'You know that if you had a bent tube, one arm of which was the size of a pipe stem, and the other big enough to hold the ocean, water would stand in the same height in one as in the other. Controversy equalizes fools and wise men in the same way, and the fools know it.'—*Rev. E. H. Sears.*

SABBATH EVE.

FATHER! The sun, with dying glow
Of gold and crimson, sinketh low,
The shadows creep across the plain,
The Sabbath eve is here again.

Father, earth cares—a myriad train,
Have bound me with their six-days' chain,
But this calm hour brings blest release,
A presage of eternal peace.

Father, each word and law of thine,
But most this Sabbath hour divine,
Binds to thy throne our finite powers,
We feel creation's God is ours.

Then hail, thrice-hallowed Sabbath eve,
That brings from toil a sweet reprieve,
That lures the earth-bound spirits hence,
And links it with Omnipotence.

JULIA H. WOODRUFF.

Progress of the Cause.

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

California.

THE interest of the work here in Woodland is greater than ever before. Since the dedication of the church, I have been laboring constantly in public and from house to house, and while I have besought the Lord with many prayers and tears, for myself and this people, the work has revived, and increased each day until the present time. Eleven more were baptized yesterday, making, in all, twenty since the house was dedicated.

The editor of the *Yolo Democrat*, Mr. William Saunders, formerly editor of a paper at Charlotte, Mich., with his wife and daughter, were among the happy number baptized yesterday. Also the foreman in his office, with his wife. Bro. Saunders had investigated very thoroughly, and after weighing the matter for several months took a firm and decided stand. Being a man of sterling integrity and of good report, and highly prizing the truth he has embraced, we shall confidently hope that he will be a pillar in the cause here. The baptismal scene was one of unusual interest and solemnity. The Spirit of God rested down upon us, and many were affected to tears. Hard hearts were softened, and some noted skeptics were constrained to acknowledge that it was surely the work of God.

Several more decided last evening, and many more are under deep conviction. I had planned to go to another field before this, but can get no liberty to leave here while this harvest is ungathered. So long as my burden of prayer and freedom in speaking continues, and souls are pressing to the light by scores, I cannot leave. My courage was never better than now, and I want to say to all the workers in the cause that you may reckon on all there is left of me in this harvest work until it is done. I believe God accepts me anew as a laborer, though I feel very unworthy to be trusted with so responsible a work. My gratitude to God knows no bounds, and I praise him day and night for such goodness and mercy. The work is the Lord's, and to him be all the glory.

M. E. CORNELL.

Woodland, April 14, 1873.

Tract and Missionary Department.

Quarterly Meeting of Ohio T. and M. Society.

THE second quarterly meeting of the Ohio T. and M. Society was held at Clyde, March 23, 1873. Meeting convened at 9 o'clock. Bro. St. John being present, addressed the congregation briefly on the subject of missionary labor from Eccl. 11:6.

Business meeting at 10½ o'clock. Opened with prayer by Bro. St. John. O. F. Guilford in the Chair. Report of the previous meeting was called for, read, and accepted. Reports of the several districts of missionary labor for quarter ending March 23 showed the following results:—

Pamphlets and tracts distributed, 70,417 pages; No. of families visited, 167; No. of letters written, 117.

Received for Memberships,	\$10.00
“ “ Donations,	29.57
“ “ Book Sales,	11.89
Total,	\$51.46
Subscribers obtained for REVIEW, 81; Instructor, 49; Reformer, 49.	
Distribution of reading matter, REVIEWS, 97; Instructors, 52; Reformers, 81.	
Money raised for delinquents,	\$218.60
Paid out “ “	195.21
Balance,	\$ 23.39
Cash on hand at the Office,	\$ 54.34
“ in “ of Treasurer,	74.73
Total,	\$129.07

Moved, That the Chair appoint a committee of three to draw up resolutions. Carried. Committee on Resolutions: H. A. St. John, John Mears, and Emory Hutchins.

Resolved, That each church furnish the

worthy poor of its number with our periodicals.

Resolved, That the T. and M. Society furnish the worthy poor outside of the churches, who desire our periodicals, with the same, and charge to the Missionary Fund.

Resolved, That the director of each several district decide who are worthy to receive our periodicals free, or below subscription price, in their districts, and draw from the Missionary Fund to meet the want. Resolutions adopted.

Moved to adjourn to first Sabbath and Sunday in July. Carried.

O. F. GUILFORD, President.

M. E. REYNOLDS, Secretary.

The Statesman Articles.

(Continued from page 155.)

employed, since it is referred to by its secular name, first day of the week, in all these instances. The reader will recollect that, in our positive argument, we showed that the term “Lord’s day” was a fitting one for the last day of the week, provided the term translated “Lord” was applicable to God, the Father, as well as to Christ, the Son. 1. Because it was the day which he blessed and sanctified in Eden, thus claiming it as his own (Gen. 2:3). 2. Because, in the commandment, he calls it “the Sabbath of the Lord.” 3. Because, in Isa. 58:13, 14, he makes mention of it in the use of the terms, “Sabbath,” “my holy day,” “the holy of the Lord,” &c.

In addition, we might cite other honorable and distinguishing terms, by which it is pointed out in the Bible as a day which belongs peculiarly to the Lord our God, but these are sufficient.

If it be replied that the word translated “Lord” in Rev. 1:10, is necessarily limited to Christ, we answer: 1. As we have argued formerly, that he said he was Lord of the Sabbath. Mark 2:27, 28. 2. That the following texts show conclusively that the divine Son of God was engaged, equally with the Father, in the creation of this world; and, therefore, that he undoubtedly shared in the rest which furnished the foundation for the Edenic Sabbath, as well as in the act of blessing and sanctifying it, or setting it apart for religious purposes. “All things were made by him [Christ]: and without him was not anything made that was made.” John 1:3. “He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not.” John 1:10. “. . . Who [God] created all things by Jesus Christ.” Eph. 3:9. “For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth; . . . all things were created by him, and for him.” Col. 1:16. “God . . . hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds.” Heb. 1:1, 2. Even though we should grant, therefore, which we do not, that the term translated “Lord,” as above, applies exclusively to the Son of God, we cannot see why the seventh day might not, with all propriety, be called after him the Lord’s day.

In the concluding remarks on this branch of the subject, it will not be considered out of place for us to remind the reader of the protest which we offered, in the rejoinder to the second article of the gentleman of the *Statesman*, against his effort to obtain all the benefit which could be derived from his interpretation of Rev. 1:10, before he had struck a single blow, either in the direction of overturning our construction, or establishing, by fair argument, his own. The reason why this protest was offered is now apparent. The gentleman there, by anticipation, assumed that John meant by the term, “Lord’s day,” the first day of the week. He promised that in due time he would make good his assertion. But how has it proved, now that he has reached the very point where he should have fulfilled this engagement? Every one must see that he has utterly failed. Proof was the very thing which was promised, and which was needed, right here. It is the very thing, also, which he has neglected to adduce. All that is said in reference to the theory of Wetstein, may have served to give respectability, in point of length, to the treatment of that which he has regarded a most important scripture in his line of evidence; but it was utterly irrelevant to anything which we had said; for the reader will remember that we emphatically planted ourselves on the position that it was the weekly Sabbath to which allusion is made.

To the restatement of the scriptures employed in vindication of this last opinion, there can be no objection, but we inquire

again, Where are the passages, where the deductions from Scripture teachings, by which the gentleman has proved that the Lord’s day is the first day of the week? He has not so much as cited one. He has not made even a respectable effort at argument; but, with a haste which is irreverent, if not indecent, he rushes away from the book of God, as if impelled by the conviction that his view will find no support there, and plunges headlong into the regions of patristic myth and moonshine. At this we are not surprised. It is just what we expected. Sabbatarians are as well acquainted with this device as they are with the emptiness of the so-called Bible argument for the Sunday. It simply serves to strengthen their conviction, so often expressed in these articles, that the stronghold of first-day observance will ever be found in writings which have been manipulated, retrenched, and interpolated, by the church of Rome. For, be it remembered, it is from the authorities to which the gentleman now appeals, that the papacy brings its stoutest testimonials for apostolic succession, papistic supremacy, and the other heresies which blacken the record of its apostasy. All it is necessary to say to the reader here is, therefore, that he should bear in mind that Sabbatarians are willing to leave the arbitrament of this whole question where it can be determined from the standpoint of Bible evidence. It is the opposition, and not we, who make it necessary, in the investigation of this subject, to go upon forbidden ground. “All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” 2 Tim. 3:16, 17. If, therefore, first-day sanctity has no warrant in the Bible, which we have seen to be the case, then it is not among those things which are profitable, or which, as Christian doctrines, are necessary to furnish the man of God unto all good works.

W. H. LITTLEJOHN.

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 EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE.

Eld. VOGEL said, “That no passage of Scripture is so fortified but that an ingenious opponent can say something contrary to its most obvious sense, and even make his position seem plausible.” Had he been only intent on illustrating this in all his course he could have hardly succeeded better than he has, except that he has not by any means always made “his positions seem plausible.” I have aimed more to get the truth before the readers than to notice all his efforts to cover it up, exposing the more prominent as occasion seemed to require. I will briefly notice the objections remaining.

He says “under grace” means “under the gospel,” and answers that “the children of wrath” are “under the gospel,” and so “under grace.” But every reader knows that Paul, in Rom. 6 and 7, addressed only those who had died to sin, and were baptized into the death of Christ. Have the children of wrath been “delivered from the law” by “having become dead to the law by the body of Christ”? Have they “obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine” delivered unto them? Are they under grace because they are dead to sin, as sin has no dominion over them? A more manifest perversion of Scripture I never saw than Eld. V.’s comments on Rom. 6 and 7. He applied chap. 7 to the Jews, who, he said, were “joined to Christ” by his crucifixion! and yet says “under grace” does not prove “union with Christ.” He also said chap. 7 does not describe a “constant Christian experience.” But I ask, Does it describe the experience of one convicted of sin, who is looking to Christ for salvation? Not a single verse in these chapters will apply to “the children of wrath,” or to the Jews who are not in “union with Christ.” There is no hint of the death (or abolition) of the law, but of individuals who, dying to sin, are “redeemed from the curse of the law” that they may be united to Christ.

He made a just distinction between “carnal” as applied to sinful man, in Romans, and as applied to a positive law, in Hebrews, and then illogically proceeded to apply the sense of the “carnal commandment” of Hebrews to Romans! “Carnal,” in Rom. 7 and 8, is a state of sin, of enmity against God and opposition to his law. There can be no higher or stronger sense of carnal than that of enmity to God,—sold under sin; but this is placed in opposition to the spiritual law of Rom. 7. And spiritual can be used in no higher sense than as the opposite of sin, or of enmity against God. Eld. Vogel persistently confounds things essentially distinct. I will speak of this subject again.

He again affirms that Rom. 3:10-19, refers only to the Jews, and cites to the O. T. quotations as proof. We will look at one of them: “God looked down from Heaven upon the children of men to see if there were any that did understand, that did seek God. Every one of them is gone back: they are altogether become filthy; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.” If Eld. V. cannot see that this applies to “all the world,” he might yet submit to Paul, who so makes the application. In chap. 2, Paul has been speaking directly of Jews and Gentiles, and then asks, “What advantage then hath the Jew?”

over the Gentiles, of course.” He has still both classes before his mind. “What then? are we [Jews] better than they [Gentiles]? No, in no wise, for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin, as it is written, ‘There is none righteous, no, not one,’ &c. I rest this with the reader. It is most remarkable with what ease Eld. V. can find proof, in his favor, in the merest inference, but none at all in a plain declaration against him.

He cites the case of a will, to prove that an abolished law may be in force as regards that will,—which is not, however, the correct way of stating it—and then says that that proves that pardon and abolition of law go together! Can he be so obtuse as to think that is so? Let him show a case of prosecution and conviction under an abolished law, and he will then have approached the point. If his eyes shall ever be opened to see the difference between moral and circumstantial duties he will understand the difference between crime, and the distribution of property!

There is not the least evidence that either Jacob or Jonah thought of getting “beyond the jurisdiction of God.” But look at his position in that light. Jacob was one of the very few on earth who had preserved the knowledge of the true God; and the world did not improve in piety from his time to that of Moses. Eld. V. said the law was given in “a tangible form” “that they might see sin where before they did not.” And this was essential to be done, in the condition of the race. But the gospel swept away all that means of instruction in moral obligation, and restored men to their former liberty, without a “direct enforcement” of even the law against murder! leaving men under “principles” by which they had never yet known God or their duty to him. What a gospel!

The letter of the Jews to Voltaire says their “government” was both civil and religious, and Eld. V. says this proves that they considered the “ten commandments” a political instrument. It proves no such thing. He complains that I make him say the law was only political, whereas he said it was mainly political. He said “it was political,” “a secular compact,” and argued on these statements without qualification. If he is not always consistent with himself, it is not my fault. I took the basis of his argument as the ground of my assertion, and he has no right to complain.

He says, “Eld. W. is constrained to admit that the old covenant is abolished.” Well, that is cool! Will not Eld. Vogel next say that the power of his logic has driven me to acknowledge that we are in the Christian dispensation and claim it as a victory? I charge directly that such things can only be said “for effect.”

He denies the relation of covenants as presented by me, that is, that the first covenant (agreement) of Ex. 19 was based on the covenant (law) given in Ex. 20. I gave 2 Kings 23:3, as an illustration. This he denies, and says the people alone could not make a covenant with God—they only made a “vow” to keep the covenant. I gave the verse in full—the king “made a covenant before the Lord,” “to perform the words of the covenant that were written in this book.” It is easy to see his object in thus directly contradicting this text, but how he dares to do it is not so easy to understand. It proves his saying that “an ingenious [?] opponent can say something contrary to its obvious sense!”

He says Deut. 5:5, cannot refer to Ex. 19. It reads, “I stood between the Lord and you at that time to show you the word of the Lord; for ye were afraid by reason of the fire, and went not up into the mount.” But it is true that in Ex. 19, Moses took the word of the Lord down to the people, and returned the word of the people to the Lord; verses 5-8. And it is true that by reason of the manifestation of God’s glory on the mount, “all the people that was in the camp trembled.” Ex. 19:16, &c. These are the very things to which Deut. 5:5, does refer.

Eld. V. would do well to inform his readers how much of the word of inspiration may be safely thrown aside as a “poetic outburst.” That which David said was commanded to a thousand generations (and to Abraham) was confirmed to Jacob and to Israel for a law, and an everlasting covenant. Christ and the apostles recognized the inspiration of David’s “poetic outbursts.” Is Eld. V. greater than they? There is no parallel between “a thousand generations” and “your generations.” Everlasting, and forever, may be so limited as to be less than one generation. See Ex. 21:6.

Matt. 19:21, does not prove that the first covenant failed of its object “when fully kept,” for it never was fully kept. It was designed to develop a holy people (Ex. 19:5-8), but it failed, for they did not keep it. The Saviour quoted a part of the decalogue to the young man, that which hangs on the duty of love to our neighbor, Matt. 22:34-40, and thus proved that the young man was selfish and covetous. His testimony in his own favor is not decisive; for it is not unusual to see “a young man” vain-glorious and self-conceited.

James’ “law of liberty” says “thou shalt not kill;” but Eld. Vogel says this law is not “directly” or “tangibly” enforced in the N. T.! Therefore James’ law is not that of Eld. V. James tells us some of the things that his “law of liberty” says; but Eld. V. cannot tell what his law says because it is “intangible.” Nay, such a law cannot say anything.

His remark on Rom. 3:31, was not misunderstood. He did refer it to the whole Mosaic code with especial reference, &c.

To make plausible his absurd statement that the constitution of the new dispensation is the Messiahship of Jesus, he quotes the figurative expression, “On this rock will I build my church.” This may be good proof to one who teaches things “intangible.”

I did not ridicule his crude notions of law and character, only as they appear ridiculous in a fair presentation. My illustrations hold good, and his emphasis does not change the nature of his expression. It amounts to this: A certain thing tested by a stick is straight as to that stick though the stick itself be crooked! What kind of straightness has it? Or, a certain angle, because it agrees with an obtuse angle, is a right angle as to that obtuse angle! But what is the form of such a right angle? Perhaps he cannot see anything crude in such a position as his—it is not for me to measure his capacity.

His comment on my view of Rev. 11:19, is certainly unworthy of any man professing the least degree of candor. I said, and proved by Heb. 3:1-5, &c., that the temple of tabernacle of testimony in Heaven is the antitype of the Jewish sanctuary; and he says my argument would transfer the Jewish temple to Heaven! He might as well assert that my saying that Christ is a priest in Heaven would transfer the Levitical priesthood to Heaven. I made a clear distinction between the type and antitype;

why does he try to cover it up? There is just as clear a distinction between the church and the sanctuary, as there was between the children of Israel and the sanctuary. His reference to "the veil" within which Christ "is entered" does not show that there is but one of "the holies" in Heaven, for Heb. 9:3, speaks of "the second veil." The second proves a first; therefore there are two. In Rev. 16:17-21, the "great voice out of the temple of Heaven, from the throne" is followed by thunders, lightnings, earthquake, and hail-storm on the earth; and so in chap. 11:19. He has better shown ability to caricature the Revelation than to expound it. He also says I err in applying the "heavenly things" of Heb. 8:5, to a place rather than to a condition. But verse 5 is the complement of verses 1 and 2, which, corrected to suit his theory, would read, "We have such an High Priest who is set on the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the condition! It is not in that condition, but in that place, that he is "a minister of the sanctuary, and the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man," and of which (sanctuary) that pitched by man was a type.

Ex. 24:12, is an important proof text, and I know not how to characterize his course on this except to call it an evasion. When I quoted it literally according to the original—"the law"—he said:—

"I said that I knew of no text which calls the ten commandments the law simply. (Please note this little word when you quote me again, Bro. W.)"

Did he require that the word, simply, should be in the text which calls the ten commandments "the law?" That would be a miserable cavil. Or, did he use the word in the sense of solely, as calling them and them only, the law? If so, Ex. 24:12, does exactly that thing, and he cannot deny it. Or, was this word, simply, thrown in to help to evade the conclusion when the text was produced? In either case it was a very simple thing. Beside his learned (!) reference to the Hebrew on this text, he tries to evade its force by reference to the English grammar. Behold his parallel—"The man who is upright." I trust our readers are not so easily deceived as to take this as an illustration in point. Eld. Vogel knows there is no illustration in Ex. 24:12. Were the ten commandments one of a class of laws written on tables of stone? No. A qualifying sentence which can refer to only one individual, as is the case in this text, does not weaken the specifying power of the article. The ten commandments are the only law that ever had the honor of being spoken and written by Jehovah, and he who detracts from the holiness, the justice, and the authority, of that sacred law cannot fail to bring confusion upon his own head.

All readers of the Bible know that Moses was required to make a copy in a book of all the laws given through him. All the ceremonial laws and types of Christ were therein written. But the argument of Eld. V. was this: The ten commandments were the only law that God ever wrote; therefore they alone are the "handwriting," and to them Paul refers when he says the handwriting was "blotted out." That being so the ten commandments only were nailed to the cross! The laws written by Moses in a book were typical, and being so, must be nailed to the cross of Christ—the antitype. (Not, however, nailed to the day of Pentecost, as Eld. V. would have it!)

And I will leave it to the reader if "blotting out" is not a figure more suitably applied to that which Moses wrote in a book, than to that which God wrote on tables of stone. And whether "nailing to his cross," and "taking out of the way," are not more fitly referred to types of the cross and to positive institutions, than to such precepts as these. "Thou shalt not kill—Thou shalt not commit adultery—Thou shalt not steal." For whose benefit, or in what interest, were they taken out of the way. In whose "way" did these precepts stand? or what class of men would rejoice to be assured that these were "blotted out," and left on no "tangible" footing of "direct enforcement?" Eld. V. re-iterates this position in his last article, saying that not the Sabbath alone "was against us and contrary to us. This we have seen to be true of the entire decalogue." Is it possible that the "entire decalogue" if "directly enforced" even in the most "positive manner" would be "against" Eld. Vogel, and "contrary to" him? Is he willing to admit that the precepts, "Thou shalt not kill—Thou shalt not commit adultery," would be in his way if they were yet of "direct enforcement?" Are they "contrary to" him, and to the "liberty" which he desires? Or if he would not admit the conclusion of his argument as applied to himself, I ask again, Out of whose way were they taken? In what interest were they abolished? This antinomian heresy is nothing new. It has been deprecated by the thoughtfully pious of all ages. And happy will it be for the world if the advocates of such a theory never fall altogether to the level of their own teachings.

He plays upon the words, "as given to Israel," and "positive enactment," as if they changed the nature of the precepts of Jehovah. He knows that he cannot justly apply these words to the ten commandments in the sense of merely positive laws, but only in the sense of expressly revealed laws. They do not affect the question of their morality at all. It is no credit either to himself or to his position that he persistently harps on the conclusion when he has been once compelled to renounce the premise.

After a long delay the closing part of Eld. Vogel's article reached me as I had written this. I care to notice only a few points on the Hebrew, barely sufficient to submit the question.

(1.) I have not denied that the predicate may take the article, and sometimes does, as exceptions exist to the best accredited rules; but that it necessarily or usually does I deny, and point to the uniformity of use in the instances given, to sustain me. As to whether Winer is comparable to Gosenius as authority, I say nothing, as it is not a question of argument. But of the facts presented, I know.

(2.) I yield nothing on Ex. 16:23. I laid no claim on the use of the preposition, only because I knew it was no sufficient ground; and he has now conceded that point. He admits that the preposition is used in its possessive sense when the first noun is indefinite. Then, of course, that use does not prove the first noun to be definite, as he claimed; that must be determined by other means. My wonder was that he so confidently made such a claim in the face of this fact. Yet he seems determined to show his inconsistency by again quoting that it "may be substituted for the construct relation," not seeming to understand that it is only in its possessive sense, not affecting the question of its definiteness. He cannot possibly avoid the dilemma in which I placed him by comparing Ex. 16:25, and 20:10. But he says "the contextual connection" alters the case! And so after all it is the context and not the use of the preposition that makes it definite, is it? This is the first of my knowing that a noun may be proved to be "definite by construction," by the context, when it cannot be done by the construction of the sentence!

He has given no just reason why Ex. 20:10, is definite—the true reason he denies.

(3.) My criticisms on Ex. 24:12, he sets aside by simply reasserting his position and appealing to the learned for its justness. This is perhaps next to the best thing he could do in the case; the best would be to frankly confess his errors. If he really think his position is just, then I "reassert my position," that it is because he knows nothing of Hebrew accents. And yet I query thus: It seems that he must know enough of Hebrew to be aware of the error of his statements when the facts are pointed out, even if he knew nothing of those facts before. I feared from the first that he was not so ignorant as his position would indicate; but I was willing to put the mildest possible construction on his case. There are those who will have an interest to put it into the hands of "the learned" for decision, and if Eld. Vogel is willing to risk a reassertion of his position before them, I am satisfied. I cheerfully submit it. I might point out other errors in his last, but I take leave of the Hebrew unless he opens it himself.

When I consented to hold this discussion I stipulated for the privilege of ten articles on this proposition, promising, however, to confine it to eight if possible. I have matter prepared for others, but I could not present all my proofs even with many more, and I let other considerations prevail, and thus abruptly close. The unusual length of Eld. Vogel's last suggested this method of closing by lengthening this, reserving a summary till the final close. I think I may safely say that proofs beyond controversy have been presented that the moral law is yet of force—yet the means of condemning sin. I pray that all of our readers may weigh the evidences with that candor and reverence that is due to such an important subject.

The Lord's Servants.

"And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men." 2 Tim. 2:24.

My mind has been called, of late, to the above text, by the deportment of a public speaker, a professed minister of the Lord Jesus. I requested him to show the people wherein I had taught error—when, lo! he turned upon me, using such language, and making such gestures, that, to say the least, the people declared his demeanor wrong.

We should never try to build up self, nor the cause we love, on the mistakes of others; this is wrong. To imagine yourselves to be right, simply because we can see faults in others, is truly a superficial conclusion. "But they, measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are not wise." 2 Cor. 10:12.

That all our hearts may be more fully inclined to the soul-purifying service of Him who said, "Learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart," do I offer the following thoughts:—

Our calling is to be servants, not of self, but of the Lord. How high, how holy, the vocation! As high as perfection's mark, Phil. 3:14, and as holy as Heaven. Heb. 3:1. "And who is sufficient for these things?" No one, innately; but he who is willing to "deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow" the Lord, may say, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." Oh! for that consecration that will be accepted in Heaven.

But further: Having heard the call, and become his servants, how it becomes us to yield a full and willing service, in truth; nothing short of this will be acceptable in the sight of our Maker. And until we realize this truth, we are not standing where we should. God has spoken; shall we not all give ear? "The servant of the Lord must not strive"—must not contend for the superiority—"but" he must "be gentle unto all men." Toward those who oppose our faith, should we manifest this lovable spirit of gentleness, just as fully as toward those in unison with us.

This just requisition has reasons appended: 1. "A wrathful man stirreth up strife," but it is appeased by him who "is slow to anger." Prov. 15:18. 2. To allow the spirit of unsanctified contention to rule in our hearts, proves us carnal. 1 Cor. 3:3. 3. Strife is seed sown for a fruitful harvest of "every evil work." James 3:16.

Its presence is to be deprecated in all; but especially so in the labors of the Lord's ministers. "Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife; and some of good will." Phil. 1:15. Two classes are here brought to view: One preach "Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction;" "the other of love, knowing that" he is "set for the defense of the gospel." Verses 16, 17. Popular ministers often "strive for masteries" because they fear the loss of their people's favor—apprehend that the God-fearing members of their flock will see and cherish the light of truth, and, as a result, they will be compelled to sustain a decrement of their fame; a decrease in the membership, and a diminution of their hire. For a better description, see Isa. 56:9-12; Eze. 34:2, 3; Matt. 15:14; 23:1-8.

Dear brethren, while we would strive to "declare all the counsel of God," may we

have wisdom "to feed the church of God;" to reclaim those who "err from the truth;" and to save souls from the second death. This is our calling—but how little we realize it! Lord, help us to comply with the requirements of thy word more and more perfectly, that at last it may be said to us, "Well done." G. W. COLCORD.

Government of the Tongue.

How beautiful is that admonition of St. James, from the propriety of the imagery under which the moral is conveyed! He exhorts to govern the tongue, which, though so small a member of the body, is yet of such great effect, that to govern the tongue is to govern the whole man. "If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man, and able also to bridle the whole body. Behold, we put bits in the horses' mouths, that they may obey us, and we turn about the whole body. Behold, also, the ships, which, though they be so great, and are driven of fierce winds, yet are they turned about with a very small helm, whithersoever the governor listeth." Nothing upon the subject can possibly exceed the eloquence of this passage; and the apostle carries on his discourse all the way in the same beautiful style of allusion.

Writing for the Paper.

If a man could sit down and write his thoughts, just as they come to him, with the glow of feeling that comes with them, and without the restraint that is put upon him by the consciousness that he is writing for others to read, who will question his facts, controvert his views, and criticise his syntax, it would be far easier to express one's thoughts, or tell his story. Not that there is no advantage in this public censorship, for there is, both to the writer and the reader. The discipline is an advantage to him in this, it makes him more careful in his style and statements. It is an advantage to the reader, because he knows that he may have confidence in what he reads. To write for a daily newspaper, if it be news, it should be stated concisely, yet in full. If it be editorial, it should be comprehensive, plain and direct. A leader should be, in one sense, a summary of important news, or a short, clear statement of a public question or of matters vital to the interests of the people.

An editor, while he is neither a preacher, lawyer, doctor, manufacturer nor merchant, is all in one. He must know and have something to say on all that pertains to these callings. He is not to write pleas, essays, nor treatises, but to embrace something of each, as the occasion may require. A daily paper is a journal, a teacher and a guide. The man whose time is mostly taken up in his business, so that he has but little time for reading or literary entertainment, expects, when he looks over his paper at night, to find true information in good form ready for him. Those who write for the papers should observe three things—condense, write short articles, and to the point. The first excellence in a newspaper article is its point; the second, its clearness; the third, its brevity.—Providence Journal.

The First Prayer in Congress.

In Thatcher's Military Journal, under date of December, 1777, is found a note containing the identical "first prayer in Congress," made by the Rev. Jacob Duche, a gentleman of great eloquence. Here it is—a historical curiosity:—

O Lord, our Heavenly Father, high and mighty King of kings, and Lord of lords, who dost from thy throne behold all the dwellers of the earth, and reignest with power supreme and uncontrolled over all the kingdoms, empires, and governments, look down in mercy, we beseech thee, on the American States, who have fled to thee from the rod of the oppressor, and thrown themselves on thy gracious protection, desiring to be henceforth dependent only on thee. To thee they have appealed for the righteousness of their cause; to thee do they now look up for that countenance and support which thou alone canst give. Take them, therefore, Heavenly Father, unto thy nurturing care. Give them wisdom in council and valor in the field. Defeat the malicious designs of our adversaries; convince them of the unrighteousness of their course and if they still persist in sanguinary purposes, oh! let the voice of thine own unerring justice, sounding in their hearts, constrain them to drop the weapons of war from their unnerved hands in the day of battle. Be thou present, O God of wisdom,

and direct the councils of this honorable assembly. Enable them to settle things on the best and surest foundations, that the scenes of blood may be speedily closed, and order, harmony and peace may be effectually restored, and truth and justice, religion and piety, prevail and flourish among thy people. Preserve the health of their bodies and the vigor of their minds; shower down upon them and the millions they here represent such temporal blessings as thou seest expedient for them in this world, and crown them with everlasting glory in the world to come. All this we ask in the name and through the merits of Jesus Christ, thy Son, our Saviour. Amen.

Obituary Notices.

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

DIED, at Patricksburg, Owen Co., Ind., March 19, 1873, our much esteemed sister, Rebecca McCully, in the 34th year of her age. Sister McCully had loved and observed the Sabbath with all of God's commandments since she first saw the light, nearly three years since. She seemed to love every cross, and bear all with willingness. Her disease was consumption, and although she was a great sufferer, still she seemed to have much of the grace of God to help her to endure, till death took her. She gave good evidence of departing in the triumphs of faith, and we trust she sleeps in Jesus, and will have part in the first resurrection. Funeral discourse by Eld. D. H. Oberholtzer, S. D. A. E. B. L.

DIED, near Woodburn, Clark Co., Iowa, March 3, 1873, of consumption, sister Mary A., wife of Mahlon W. Neal, aged thirty-one years, six months, and fourteen days. She leaves five children and her companion to mourn their loss. She died in hope of a part in the first resurrection. The funeral was attended the 5th. Remarks by Bro. H. Nicola, from Job 14:14. B. AUTEN.

DIED, in Ringville, Franklin Co., N. Y., March 17, 1873, of fits caused by whooping cough, Willie E., infant son of R. and H. Town, aged seven months and eight days. Funeral sermon by H. W. Lawrence, of West Bangor. RICHARD TOWN.

DIED, in Ceresco, Feb., 1873, of spinal meningitis, Thomas Crouch, near twenty years of age. Being an only child, it renders the affliction severe to his dear parents. May his mother, who is feeble in health, be sustained in this trying hour. Funeral discourse by the minister of the Baptist church in the village. J. BYINGTON.

DIED, in Hillsdale, Mich., of putrid erysipelas, Almon T. Pond, in the seventy-second year of his age.

After many years of toil and adversity, our dear father is at rest. He suffered much, as the disease went to his lungs, yet not a murmur or complaint escaped his lips. He was sick just one week. In his prolonged agony, he would look up and say, "How long, O Lord, how long!" and, "Lord, speed the time." As if in answer to our earnest prayers, his death was like one falling into a quiet slumber.

Although we mourn our loss; yet the hope of meeting again in the glorious resurrection morning gives sweet consolation to our aching hearts. He leaves a wife and four children, one an adopted daughter, whose untiring efforts for his comfort were remarked by all.

As no minister of like faith could be had, Prof. Dunn, F. W. Baptist, spoke words of comfort on the foundation of the Christian's hope, from 2 Cor. 4:14. E. J. PAINE.

DIED, at Waterloo, March 31, 1873, of consumption, after a lingering illness of months, our beloved Bro. Wm. Elwell, aged 43 years and 11 months.

Our brother called his friends and weeping wife and children to his bedside, exhorting them to live out present truth. He has been a faithful soldier of the cross. He leaves a wife and five small children, who hope soon to meet him beyond this vale of tears. Funeral discourse by the writer. Text, Job 14:10. DAVID DOWNER.

DIED, at Lapeer, Mich., March 26, 1873, sister Margaret Castle. Sister Castle has been identified with God's commandment-keeping people about fourteen years, having, I believe, embraced the truth under the labors of Bro. Lawrence. Funeral services by the writer from 2 Sam. 14:14. A. M. WEEKS.

DIED, at Waterloo, Feb. 21, 1873, Lucinda Deulard, infant child of Alrezo and Mary Deulard, aged six weeks and four days. Discourse by writer, from 2 Sam. 12:23. D. DOWNER.

The Review and Herald.

Battle Creek, Mich., Third-day, April 29, 1873.

We have just now, quite a large amount of manuscript on hand. Correspondents will therefore please have patience for the appearance of their articles.

A correspondent says: As Bro. Canright is answering objections to the Sabbath, I hope he will take up the no-Sabbath theory, and expose its falsity.

We have received from the General Western Passenger Agent of the C. B. and Q. R. R., Chicago, Ill., a pamphlet entitled, How to go West; a guide to Southern Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, California, and the whole Great West. This is an instructive and interesting pamphlet of 78 pages containing numerous maps and illustrations. Sent free of charge to those desiring the information it contains. Those who are traveling extensively in the West, would do well to obtain it. Address as above.

Games of Amusement.

To those correspondents who have inquired respecting the lawfulness of games of amusement, and how far they should be allowed, we would say that the question was recently discussed by the Literary Society, and Bro. Geo. I. Butler was appointed to write an article on the subject for the Review.

To Correspondents.

W. L. BRISBEN: We regard the drying up of the Euphrates, Rev. 16:12, as the complete overthrow of the Turkish power; and the fact that the prospect now seems to be that that power must soon be overthrown is evidence that we must be near the time of the pouring out of the plagues.

Baptism we regard so far a saving ordinance that it cannot with impunity, be intentionally disregarded, any more than any other requirement of the gospel. But we think that when a person is hindered by unavoidable circumstances from receiving baptism, he may still be saved.

J. HOFFER: We see nothing out of the way in raising and selling chickens, unless you live in a city and have neighbors who don't keep them.

R. R. MOON: We understand that the gospel was preached to the dead, as stated in 1 Pet. 4:6, while they were yet alive, not after they died. For an exposition of the spirits in prison, 1 Pet. 3:19, see the forthcoming volume on the State of the Dead, and the Destiny of the Wicked.

A. RASMUSSEN: We do not think a Christian can scripturally marry an unbeliever, nor that a person can be called a health reformer, while indulging in pork and tobacco.

A. F. STONER: For an exposition of Matt. 24:30, see the Exposition of that chapter, for sale at this Office.

N. B.: A Sabbath-keeper cannot consistently accept any office which will require him to violate the Sabbath.

N. S. RAYMOND: We understand that the kiss with which Paul commands the brethren to greet one another, is a token of Christian fellowship. It seems, at least, appropriate to make use of it at the celebration of the ordinances, as well as on other occasions. The question whether the reports of the auditing committees should be made public, is one for the different Conferences to decide at their annual sessions.

A. FARLEY: The Jews are entitled to credit respecting the compilation of the books which constitute their Scriptures. They assign to Ezra the work of collecting and arranging them down to his day, and afterward to "the great synagogue." We know of no authority for the statements of the man you refer to, that they were twice destroyed and re-written. "The complete canon of the New Testament, as commonly received at present, was ratified at the third Council of Carthage, A. D. 391, and from that time was accepted throughout the Latin church." Smith's Bible Dictionary, art., Canon of Scripture.

To Scattered Sabbath-Keepers in Minnesota.

DEAR BRETHREN AND SISTERS: As I cannot see you, either at your homes or in our meetings, I take this way to address you. As nearly as I can learn, from one quarter to one-third the Seventh-day Adventists in Minnesota are scattered, one here, two or three there, &c., in almost every section of the State where they can have no meetings nor attend those we hold with the different churches. Being thus situated, many lose the spirit of the message, do not keep up with the progress of the work, leave off sacrificing for the cause, drink in the spirit of the world, and finally either backslide entirely, or live in a half dead and alive condition.

Knowing that there is greater danger of your doing this, than there would be if you were where you could have the society and encouragement of a church, I want to remind you of this danger and help you all I can. Watch yourselves, examine yourselves often, try yourselves honestly whether you are not letting the truth leak out of your hearts, little at a time. I once

tried living alone for five years, and came near losing my soul. Hence, I know how to sympathize with you.

If you live as you ought and work as you should, you may be preparing the way for the truth to be preached sooner or later in your different places. If this does not come as soon as you wish, hold on, stick to it, and keep calling till you do get help. Some, after they have written once or twice for help, become tried with us because we do not immediately come, and will write no more, nor help the cause any. This is wrong and foolish. We try to plan our work in the fear of God and go where there is the best prospect.

I now have this special request to make of every Sabbath-keeper in Minnesota who either does not belong to any one of our churches or who is not now paying s. b. which he or she has pledged to some church:—

Write to me immediately at Hutchinson, McLeod Co., Minn., and state very distinctly, 1. Where you live, town and county, nearest village, railroad depot, and your post-office. 2. What is the opening to present the truth there or near there. 3. Whether you take the Review, Reformer, and Instructor. 4. Tell me what you are willing to give per week for the next year, beginning April 1, 1873, for the support of the cause in Minnesota. This need not be paid now, but at any time during the year.

Come my brother, my sister, don't excuse yourself now and so do nothing while all the rest are sacrificing to help on the good work. We want you to do this more for your own sake than because we need the means, though it is needed much. We know that if you do not give something you will lose your interest in the work and the reward in the kingdom. Are you poor? So are others. Give a little. Then God will bless what you do have. You are not poorer than the poor widow. The Lord is coming soon. The harvest is being gathered. Are you helping? Don't wait till you are rich. This is a deception of the devil. Wait till you are out of debt? Yes, but you always manage to keep in debt. Don't be deceived.

Our report for Conference must be prepared soon. We want to know how the State stands, what we can depend upon for another year. What shall we report for you? Do you wish to give \$1.00? That will be 2 cts per week. \$5.00 will be 10 cts per week. \$10.00 will be 20 cts per week, &c. Let me hear from you.

We are determined to get all our forces in Minnesota into good order and working condition this season so far as possible. Will you help us? or do you feel no interest in the cause?

D. M. CANRIGHT.

To the Wisconsin Conference.

I wish to say that I expected that before this my wife's health would be so much improved that I could be relieved from taking care of her and be engaged in laboring in my Master's vineyard. But, in this, I have been disappointed. Ever since Christmas, she has been confined to her bed almost constantly, and most of the time, she could not stand alone nor turn herself in bed. She has suffered almost constantly with neuralgic pains through her body, and an almost constant sickness at the stomach, with spells of vomiting every few hours. I finally decided to have her go to the Health Institute. She has been here most three weeks. I soon found that she must have some one with her all the time, and that no one could wait on her so well as myself. I therefore decide to remain here while she stays. And although she suffers considerable, yet I think there is some improvement in her condition.

I also wish to say to all the churches that expected me to visit them before camp-meeting. Please wait patiently; for I believe the Lord will yet open the way before me so that I may be free to labor in his cause as in the past; but perhaps not before camp-meeting. May I therefore have the fervent prayers of all the faithful, that this affliction may have a sanctifying influence upon us? I. SANBORN.

Health Institute, Battle Creek.

Notice.

As I have decided to go back to Wisconsin, my address will be Monroe, Green Co., Wis., till further notice is given. I. SANBORN.

ERRATUM. Read last line of 4th column, on page 148 of last week's Review, as last line of second column.

News and Miscellany.

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

Greatness of London.

THE population of London, according to the last census, is 3,883,000. This vast multitude is more than the combined population of New York, Philadelphia, Brooklyn, St. Louis, Chicago, Baltimore, Cincinnati, Boston, New Orleans, San Francisco, Buffalo, and Alleghany City, Penn. To lodge these people, 777,000 dwellings are required, and the people consume annually about 4,480,000 barrels of flour, 420,000 bullocks, 2,975,000 sheep, 49,000 calves, 61,250 hogs, and one market alone supplies annually 7,043,750 head of game. This, together with 5,200,000 salmon, irrespective of other fish and flesh, is washed down by 75,600,000 gallons of ale and porter, 3,500,000 gallons of spirits, and 113,750 pipes of wine. To fill its milk and cream jugs, 22,750 cows are kept. To light its streets at night, 680,000

gaslights are required, consuming every 24 hours 22,270,000 cubic feet of gas. Its water system supplies the enormous quantity of 77,670,824 gallons per day, while its sewer system carries off 16,629,770 cubic feet of refuse.

Trial of a Prophet.

JOSEPH S. CURRY, the so-called prophet of the new dispensation, was tried at Opling, Columbus County, Georgia, last week, on a charge of adultery and fornication, before County Judge Wilson. Curry came from Massachusetts with a colony of about 200 men and women, over a year ago, and bought lands, and settled in Columbus County. They lived in tents and held the property in common. Curry called himself "Elijah" and the "Prophet of Jehovah," supreme in all things spiritual and temporal. The colony went on swimmingly for a brief period, but the "prophet" took to himself too many wives. Jealousy and insubordination ensued in the colony and many of the colonists returned to Massachusetts, being provided with free passage to the nearest seaports, with free tickets to Charleston or Savannah. Finally, the colony became so demoralized and Curry so licentious, that the grand jury indicted him and his queen-paramour. Curry, robed in white linen, with head and feet bare, in imitation of the Saviour, appeared before the court. His queen appeared in the same attire, with white stockings on her feet and a white bow on her head. Speaking in his own defense, he maintained that men and women could live together as man and wife without cohabiting, and that by mortification and prayer they could become perfect. He repelled the charge of insanity, and displayed much erudition and familiarity with the Scriptures. He said he had revelation after revelation that a new era had dawned, when men and women should come out of the natural order of things to a higher state of purity. After speeches from the prosecutors and defendant, the jury retired, and after half an hour's absence returned and gave a verdict of guilty, with a recommendation to mercy. Sentence has been deferred for a few weeks. It is thought that the "prophet" and his followers will be given an opportunity to find another Canaan far away to pitch their tents.—Detroit Post, Apr. 1, 1873.

Railways in Russia.

THE new railway and telegraph chart of the Russian empire, just published, seems to have taken the German general staff by surprise. Russia is shown by this chart to possess railways and telegraph lines actually in operation of which the world outside had not the slightest notice, or even suspicion. There is a complete system of strategic railways, radiating from the three principal lines uniting at St. Petersburg, Moscow, and Kieff, and extending even to the Asiatic frontier in no less than ten lines. All the military centers, even Nova Teherbas, the headquarters of the Don Cossacks, are accessible by rail; and in a short time, if not at this moment, Russia can move large bodies of troops and concentrate them within a few days at any desired spot. In view of these facts, the German journals urge their government to hasten forward the construction of railways on their own eastern frontier, which they will need for their own safety in case of war.

THE Spanish republic appears to be in a very bad way, and "getting no better very fast." The Spanish army is insubordinate, as might be expected where the soldiers are some of them Carlists, some Communists, some Republicans, some Federalists, and all ignorant, badly paid, and not well disciplined. Under these circumstances, the Carlists have won important advantages, which they appear to have cruelly abused. Spain is a bigoted Roman Catholic country, and the priests are nearly all Carlists; hence, discontent, superstition, insubordination, and other evils in the army are natural, and the wonder is that the army is not entirely disorganized. A republic cannot long succeed upon any other basis than free popular education, free religion, and popular equality. Spain must get rid of her grandees, abolish the rule of priestcraft, educate her masses, and become thrifty and intelligent, before she can expect quiet and good order. It will require a long and arduous struggle to bring this about against the opposition of the nobles, the priests, and the superstition and ignorance of the peasantry. If DON CARLOS succeeds, his success will only be the beginning of a long and bloody struggle, probably. If he fails, he will not be the last enemy the republic will have to conquer.

Appointments.

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

TRACT and Missionary Meeting at Aledo, Ill., May 10, 11. At Serena, 17, 18. There should be an extra effort made to attend these meetings; especially should the directors of all the districts in the Conference and also the Vice-president and Secretary attend one or both of them. Bro. S. N. Haskell is expected.

Now, brethren, is our opportunity to get instructed as to the best manner of prosecuting this work. Let us not permit the pressure of the business affairs of this life to keep us away, and we thus lose the good that we might have gained by attending. R. F. ANDREWS.

PROVIDENCE permitting, I will be at Soldier Valley, Iowa, May 3 and 4; Onawa, Tuesday and Wednesday evenings, 6 and 7; at the Barcus school-house Decatur, Neb. 10 and 11. I hope to see the friends from Hooper and Mt. Pleasant at this meeting. Cherokee, Iowa, at the Bugh school-house, Tuesday and Thursday evenings, May 13 and 15. Bach Grove, at the Gensman school-house, May 17 and 18. Hook's Point, 24 and 25. Washington, May 31 and June 1. At these meetings, opportunities will be afforded for baptism. Will Bro. Webb meet me at Duncombe Station, Friday, May 16? R. M. KILGORE.

At Parma, in Quarterly meeting, the first Sabbath in May. Hope to see a general attendance. A. S. HUTCHINS.

QUARTERLY meeting for S. D. Adventists of Gratiot Co., will be held at Alma, Sabbath and Sunday, May 3 and 4. Brethren and sisters from other churches are invited. G. W. STATES, Clerk.

QUARTERLY meetings of the N. Y. and Pa. T. and M. Society will be held as follows:— Dist. No. 9, at Wheeler, May 3 and 4, 1873. " " 10, " Ulysses, Pa., May 10 and 11, 1873. " " 11, " Where Bro. Welch may appoint, May 17 and 18. Further appointments may appear next week. P. Z. KINNE, Pres.

MONTHLY meeting at the Sands school-house, for the Onawa and Decatur churches, May 10. Will Bro. Bartlett meet with us? M. D. CLARK.

Business Department.

Not clothful in Business. Rom. 12:11.

Business Notes.

J. B. FOLLETT: Please give former address.

J. C. WITTER: Please give address in full.

COMBE CAPMAN, New London, Wis., wants work in a mill, or on a farm, through the summer. Address him as above.

Special Notice to Subscribers.

A blue cross on the margin of your paper signifies that your subscription will expire with two more numbers. 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 Papers. If money to the paper is not in due time acknowledged, immediate notice of the omission should then be given.

\$2.00 EACH. J S Hight 43-18, D Howard 43-20, Michael Follan 43-21, F Nelson 46-1, A M Rathbun 43-9, Sarah Jones 43-14, J W Bond 43-20, E S Griggs 45-3, J H Chandler 43-20, Nancy Sisco 43-20, J W Rickett 43-20, E Stone 44-2, D Malin 43-20, C J Boonville 43-20, J H Morrison 43-20, Jesse Vansyoc 43-20, M B Phillips 43-19, "People's Library" 44-10, H C S Carus 43-14, J F Carlton 43-20, F H Thurlow 43-20, John B Webster 43-19, F Harmon 43 18, Wm Harmon 43-17, John Taylor 43-18, Kathrina Hale 43-20, P Robinson 43-20, E G Doud 43-21, D A Albin 43-20, Jacob Thompson 41-1, A H Vankirk 43-4, Thomas Armitage 43-14, H Hodgson 43-14, John Pugh 43-17, W J Wilkins 43-20, Sarah Bowers 43-20, Charles Lea 43-20, John A Pease 43-1, M Wood 44-1, Alfred Mason 43-20, F Squire 43 18, Amos Holt 43-15, B Haskins 43-14, M Lehman 45-1, Sol Berridge 43-20.

\$1.00 EACH. J H Murray 42-20, Elnor Rathbun 43-14, John A Towns 42-14, Martha Coombs 43-1, W E Armstrong 42-20, C S Straw 43-1, Theodore Brackett 43-14, E H Winchester 42-20, M Adsit 42-20, E G Blackman 41-25, J W Raymond 42-20, Mrs R Slater 44-14, J P Chapman 43-20, M A Lyons 44-16, J T Smith 42-20.

MISCELLANEOUS. Mrs J V Keene 75c 42-14, S Burnham 50c 42-6, E Robinson 10c 42-10, P Lightner 50c 42-6, C F Hall 60c 42-1, H W Barrows \$3.00 44-16, Elisha Calkins 75c 42-14, E F Reynolds 2.20 44-1, T Worthington 60c 41-12, H D Corey 50c 42-1, S Maxon 2.10 43-22, Mrs P J Striplin 1.50 44-1, M A Ayrhart 75c 42-14, W J Patterson 2.50 43-20, H Robinson 1.50 45-4.

75 Cents Each. Paying to Vol. 40, 18. Geo M Atkinson, Caroline Little, E A Dodge, J M Corner, Lewis Deinst.

50 Cents Each, Paying to Vol. 42, 18. John Coley, Eli Wisbey, David Estes, Minnie Baker, Annie Coil, Walter Glendining, Betsey K Smith, Mrs E J Ray, Elmira Davis, Eli Reese, John McGiffin, L C Rogers, Margaret Tallman, Nancy Srode, Eddie Fulton, L Crum, Albert Pearsall, P Rave, J D Gay, Emeline Ellis, Demas Hall, Henry Duncan, Sarah Nott, Edson House, S D Ross, D L Bartlett, Helen Filkins, Julia A Wright.

Books Sent by Mail.

R Huston \$3.50, Mrs E H Bramball 6.64, M B Philipps 60c, Miss H Carr 50c, Ezra Strong 25c, E H Tefft 25c, C A Burt 1.00, M A Eaton 35c, U Hertzler 20c, Mrs S H Terry 20c, Peter Campbell 50c, H G Duncanson 25c, Mrs S E Healey 1.10, S Flanders 50c, Mrs Jaycox 10c, D M Canright 4.87, N Hutchison 3.00, Clarence D Palmer 85c, L C Brickey 50c, Isaac Markle 50c, Mrs Amos Wright 45c, Mrs George D Jaquith 20c, E H Gates 20c, Philo Boise 2.00, Adolph Marshall 50c, W L Himes 1.00, J Taber 20c, N Muller 1.30, C M Batchelder 20c, J Engberg 4.35, A O Burrill 1.25, A M Hunt 10c, D Malin 25c, O R North 20c, Mrs I Bell 1.00, David Allison 50c, G W Tibbitts 10c, M Akins 40c, W J Branim 1.15, Susan Guild 25c, R M Dickson 75c, Sarah E Elder 25c, J L Rice 1.00, S B London 3 25, Mary Capen 1.00, W C Wiggins 5 00, H A Higley 1.10, J B Ingalls 50c, O W Austin 1.25, D A Albin 2.10.

Books Sent by Express.

Theodore Pickard \$14.00.

Cash Received on Account.

H F Phelps \$10.00, A C Bourdeau 5.00, W H Hankins for J W Adams 16 00, M J Sawyer 2.10, N Carahoo for W W Sharp 8.60, R Stringer 2.00, O W Austin 25c, J H Morrison 16.00, G W Colcord 5.82, E G Rust 65c.

Shares in Publishing Association.

E S Griggs \$10 00, J Puls 30.00.

Shares in Health Institute.

E S Griggs \$25.00, J Puls 25.00.

Donations for the Danish Monthly.

L A Sargent \$2 50, H A Weston 2.00, Emma F Sargent 50c, D T Bourdeau 5.00, A friend in Worth 5.00, B M Osgood 1.00, Mary A Davis 50c.

HYGIENIC BOOK FUND.

J Puls \$15.00, A Persing 5.00.

Book Fund.

J Puls \$20.00.

Michigan Conference Fund.

Rec'd of H C Booter of Ransom Center \$2.00, Hillsdale 20.00, Tuscola 20.00, Burlington 10.00.

Review to the Poor.

A friend in Worth \$5.00, A lone one in the faith 5.00, B M Osgood 75c, Richard Moon 50c, Juliana Hoffer 2.00.

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.