

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, MAY 27, 1873.

NUMBER 24.

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.

ISRAEL'S MARCH-WORD.

[From "Hymns to our King," by Rev. John M. Leavitt, published by T. Whittaker.]

FORWARD! God's majestic cloud
Flames grandly in the sea.
Forward! Egypt, fierce and proud,
Clanks chains behind the free.

Forward! waves, like mountain-walls,
Stand towering by the way
Forward! when Jehovah calls,
'Tis madness to delay.

Forward! where yon guiding glow
Moves though the parted deep,
Pharaoh shall lie buried low—
In death his minions sleep!

Forward! in that mystic fire
Jehovah makes his shrine;
Forward! neither stop nor tire,
And what is best is thine.

Forward! over rocks and foes
Where smiles thy promised rest!
Milk there with the honey flows,
And there the grape is press'd.

Forward! Heaven's own fire shall die,
And Heaven's own manna cease;
But Jehovah, thy supply,
Thy bread, and light, and peace!

OPEN AND CLOSE COMMUNION.

BY ELDER GEO. I. BUTLER.

THIS question has agitated the religious world greatly in the past, and possibly some of the readers of the REVIEW may have been exercised upon it. I wish to present a few thoughts concerning it, claiming only to speak my own individual sentiments.

If I understand their position, those who believe in open communion take the ground that, in the act of partaking of the emblems of the broken body and spilled blood of our Lord, they have nothing to do with others, but are simply to "examine themselves," quoting the verse, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup," virtually taking the position that we have nothing to do with examining any body else.

Therefore, if individuals may not have been baptized by immersion, or may not be keeping the Sabbath, or may be remiss in many religious duties, doing things contrary to the Bible, we do not say we fellowship them by the act of partaking of the emblems with them. In other words, those who believe in open communion do not regard it as an act by which we show fellowship for each other as members of Christ's body.

But, if we do regard it as an act by which we show fellowship, it becomes a question of some magnitude as to who have a right to partake of the ordinance.

The first question that naturally arises in regard to the Lord's supper, is the object of its institution. Paul says, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." 1 Cor. 11:25, 26. "This do in remembrance of me," says Christ. The design of it, then, is to bring vividly before the mind the death of our divine Lord. It is a memorial of his broken body and of his blood that was shed for us. It must, therefore, be designed for his true followers, for the true children of God. It is not for worldlings. It is not for those who have abused their high profession, and who are living in sin and disgracing his name before the world, but for true Christians. Who were present when it was instituted, and to whom did our Saviour present these sacred emblems? Only to his own chosen disciples. It was not a promiscuous meal, as that which was served when the five thousand were fed with five loaves and two fishes, but it was insti-

tuted on a special occasion, in a private room, apart from the crowd, and given alone to disciples.

But it is often asked, Was not Judas the apostate present to partake in common with the rest? And if he could partake, at the hand of the Saviour himself, could not lesser sinners do the same and not violate the sacred design? We answer that the evidence, when carefully considered, proves that Judas was not present, and did not partake of the Lord's supper. We know that a casual reading of the evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, would seem to show that he was present, and partook. But when compared with John's account, it seems plain that he was not.

In the first three, we have an account of the room being procured in which the pass-over supper was to be partaken. When the time arrived, and they were all seated and commenced to partake, the Saviour told them that one of them would betray him. They began to ask, "Lord, is it I?" in great sorrow and amazement. He answered, as Matthew has it, "He that dip-peth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me." Or as John has it, "He it is to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it. And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot the son of Simon." "And after the sop, Satan entered into him." "He then, having received the sop, went immediately out; and it was night."

John gives us no account of the institution of the Lord's supper, but the other three evangelists, in their account, speak of the passover supper, and of the time when the Saviour told the disciples that one of them would betray him, and of his dipping with him in the dish, as taking place previous to the institution of the Lord's supper. The three do not tell us when Judas did go out, but John plainly tells us he went out "immediately" upon receiving the sop from the hand of Jesus. This being true, then he certainly was not present when the Lord instituted the memorial of his death, for this occurred some time after he received the portion from the hand of Christ, so Judas had no part in this divine memorial. So much for that objection.

We understand that all the gospel memorials were designed for true Christians only. Should we not all insist that a person was not a proper candidate for baptism until he had truly repented of his sins, and believed on the Lord Jesus Christ? We should not think it right to go forward and administer this ordinance until we had satisfactory evidence of an individual being in a proper condition. Baptism is properly regarded as the door into the church. It is a memorial of the burial and resurrection of Christ. Is not an equal degree of evidence requisite before a person can properly partake of the supper? Neither can it be said that a person has a right to partake of it simply because he has been baptized, for many a person falls away and gives no evidence of his being a true disciple after that. We claim that a person should give as satisfactory evidence of his being a true Christian at the time he partakes of the communion, as he would have to give if he was a candidate for baptism at the same moment. Both memorials were designed for precisely the same class. If we would consider it proper to baptize a man who was not keeping the law of God, then we ought to commune with such an one. If not, then we should not commune together. In the one case, we show our faith in the vicarious death of our Saviour; in the other, in his burial and divine resurrection.

Let us now consider another important testimony: "I speak as to wise men; judge ye what I say. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread. Behold Israel after the flesh; are not they which eat of the sacrifices, par-

takers of the altar? What say I then? that the idol is any thing, or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing? But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils, and not to God; and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils; ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils." 1 Cor. 10:15-21. Here the apostle in giving instruction concerning idolatry brings in the Lord's supper, and gives us some very forcible remarks concerning it. He addresses this instruction to wise men, as being very important. He next calls the supper the communion of the body and blood of Christ. The meaning of that term in the English is union, fellowship. In the Greek, the original word is generally rendered *fellowship*. For instances of the occurrence of the original word, I give the following, where it is italicized: "And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and *fellowship*, and in breaking of bread, and prayers." Acts 2:42. "God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the *fellowship* of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord." 1 Cor. 1:9. "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness, and what communion hath light with darkness?" 2 Cor. 6:14. From these instances of the occurrence of the word, and others might be given, it will be readily seen that it has the meaning of fellowship, *i. e.*, that union which should exist between the members of Christ's body. Fellowship is defined by Webster to mean, "Mutual association of persons on equal and friendly terms." The terms of association would be manifestly *unequal* if part of those who partook of this supper were true Christians and part were not so regarded. It would then be no fellowship or communion, and could not be so named. The fact that inspiration has so called it, plainly signifies that those who partake have mutual union with each other and confidence in each other. This is still further shown by the fact that he calls it the "communion of the body and blood of Christ." "For we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread." What could be a higher evidence of union than for each person, in each other's presence, to put forth his hand and partake of the mystical flesh and blood of the Son of God? The apostle holds forth this very act of the communicants as the most striking evidence of oneness. Has the apostle assigned a false reason? He has, unless we admit that it is a sign of fellowship. If there is no real fellowship existing, the act tells a practical falsehood. We do that which signifies union when it does not really exist. And I submit that a falsehood perpetrated under such solemn circumstances, in the presence of such solemn mementoes, could not be of minor consequence.

The apostle next speaks of ancient Israel eating of the sacrifices of the altar, as being partakers of the same, that is, it was an act by which they were recognized as belonging to God, and sharing the blessings derived from his worship. He then says, "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils." Why not, if the views of our friends who hold to open communion be correct? why not, if they chose to sit at both tables and no one had a right to examine any, but his own case? why not, unless sitting at the Lord's table was a mark of Christian fellowship and union? I certainly conclude from the apostle's words, that those who went to idol feasts, and partook at their orgies, would not be allowed to come to the table of the Lord. There certainly was one case, then, where individuals, who walked contrary to sound doctrine, could not be permitted to commune. I think another is referred to in 1 Cor. 5:11: "But now I have written unto you

not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat." The eating spoken of seems most likely to me to refer to the communion. It would seem rather strange to suppose that the common civilities of life could not be shown to one who had committed one of these sins, when such an act had nothing to do with any thought of fellowship, as we know the eating of a common meal has not. But should any one say you have no evidence that the eating spoken of is the Lord's supper, and no business to draw the conclusion from it that such individuals should be excluded from partaking of it, then I would inquire if such suppose we should be less particular in our associates, when we eat the Lord's supper, than when we eat a common meal? Does the apostle forbid us eating a common meal with a brother who does these things, and yet permit us to freely come around the table of the Lord Jesus with extortioners, drunkards, fornicators, idolaters, and covetous persons, and partake of those sacred mementoes of his death and sufferings? The very thought would be monstrous. Then the apostle does plainly teach that we must draw some line of division when it comes to participating in the Lord's supper. If, at the present day, every church of Christians will keep all the "extortioners" and "covetous" persons out, and all the idolaters, a good many, who now partake freely, will have to be "examined" by others, as well as themselves; and I fear some communion seasons would not be as well attended as heretofore. So it seems that there is a line of division to be drawn somewhere between those who may partake, and those who may not. The question of course will be, Where?

We now notice one more very important testimony, 1 Cor. 11:17-34, "Now in this that I declare unto you, I praise you not, that ye come together not for the better, but for the worse. For first of all, when ye come together in the church, I hear that there be divisions among you; and I partly believe it." "When ye come together, therefore, into one place, . . . ye cannot eat [margin] the Lord's supper. For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken" (or satisfied, as the Diaglott has it). Here we learn that divisions and parties in the church make it improper or impossible to celebrate the communion under such circumstances, and the reason appears very manifest when we consider that it is a token of fellowship between members of Christ's body. As long as no such fellowship existed, one important idea to be expressed by it would be lacking. This should ever be remembered where churches are divided into parties and schisms. Undertaking to celebrate the Lord's supper under such circumstances is little better than mockery. The Spirit of the Lord will stay away.

The apostle next gives the account of the institution and the design of this memorial, telling us it is to "show forth the Lord's death till he come," and that we are to eat and drink in remembrance of Christ. "Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body. For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep."

It seems very evident from the whole tenor of this passage that great disorder had crept into the Corinthian church, so much so that the whole design of this institution was lost sight of. Not only were they unfit to partake of the supper because of parties and dissensions, but they had gone so far as to make this most solemn

memorial into an occasion of feasting and jollity, till God was displeased with them, and many died in consequence of his judgments. This is evidently what he means by their "eating and drinking unworthily;" for he adds, they did not discern the Lord's body. They had entirely perverted the institution. They should have "examined themselves" closely when they approached the Lord's table. They should have made it a solemn occasion. But because he says they should examine themselves, this certainly does not forbid what other scriptures make a plain duty. It does not provide for a promiscuous gathering of Christians, and "covetous men, and extortioners," around the Lord's table to partake of the "one bread" and calling that a *communion*, in which the very essential idea of fellowship is all lost sight of. If it did, it would certainly nullify the idea of its being a memorial designed for Christians alone. It does not forbid the protection of this memorial from being turned into a common thing expressive of no nearness to each other in the members of Christ's body. Let us always do what the apostle says, "examine ourselves," previous to partaking of these emblems. But do not let us draw inferences from this declaration not warranted by the language, especially when it will lead us contrary to other plain scriptures.

Some conscientious souls have been so troubled in reference to the expressions, "examine yourselves," and, "eating and drinking unworthily," and, "drinking damnation to themselves," that they dare not partake of the Lord's supper at all. They felt that they were unworthy when they did examine themselves, and feared they should bring the frown of God upon themselves. To such I would say, You misapprehend entirely the design of this scripture. The apostle is speaking of those who had perverted the design of the ordinance, turning it into a feasting occasion, gathering in a disorderly manner, when there were parties and divisions among them, which rendered it impossible to properly partake of the "one bread and one cup." And above all, they did not "discern the Lord's body." The real object of the memorial was lost sight of. That which was designed to keep Christ's death in memory "till he comes," was forgotten. Had they "examined themselves," they would not have been left to such disorder. They were thoughtless, and careless of sacred things. This does not refer at all to such as feel a sense of the great sacredness of this memorial and that they are unworthy to partake of it. On the contrary, I claim that such are the only ones who are fit to partake of the Lord's supper. A man who feels whole and self-complacent when partaking of the emblems given to commemorate our dying Lord, and feels that he is worthy, is surely an object of pity. What sense can such a person have of the nature of sin, which caused that Saviour to die for him a cruel death? Our sins caused the death of the Son of God. If there ever is a time in a man's life when he ought to feel unworthy, it is when taking part in the celebration of the Saviour's passion. Let no humble, conscientious soul then stand back in fear of such expressions as, "eating and drinking damnation to himself," &c.; for they apply to an entirely different class.

In conclusion, then, we claim to have proven that the institution under consideration was designed for true Christians alone. The Saviour, when he instituted it, communicated it to no others. Its being called the *communion*, plainly implies that it was a mark of Christian fellowship. The fact that those who partake of the "one bread" are denominated by the apostle "one body," is strong evidence of this. And further, when the apostle says that those who partook of the table of devils could not eat the Lord's supper, and that "covetous" persons and extortioners were not proper subjects with whom to eat, he plainly teaches there is a line of division to be drawn somewhere. Where, then, should this line be drawn, and with whom shall we commune? We answer: Those who have been truly baptized by gospel baptism, and who take God's holy law as their rule of morality, and take upon themselves the obligations of the church covenant when practicable, and live consistent Christian lives, are the proper ones to partake of the emblems of Christ's broken body. And we do not see how one of these conditions can be properly left out. What is there hard or unreasonable in either of them? What good reason could be assigned by any person for refusing to act upon either? Should not every true Chris-

tian do each one of these duties? Could he be a true follower of Christ and refuse to live up to either? We think not. It is no more exclusive to require these prerequisites to communion than for baptism, and we certainly do in the latter, with the exception of baptism itself. Let us be consistent and reasonable, and not call laxity charity.

To offer the emblems to a person whom we would not at the same moment receive as a member of the church in full fellowship, seems to me a most manifest inconsistency. It cannot be justified by any principle of reasoning with which I am acquainted. Neither would it be likely to gain the respect of any sensible person whose favor was worth obtaining. But, on the contrary, it would cause them to despise us as inconsistent with our own profession, and as practically saying that our views were of no importance; for it is generally understood that when parties commune together, they acknowledge each other as standing on the same platform, as brethren, and justly too.

It seems perfectly reasonable for us to say to all that we commune with such, and such alone, as take upon themselves the same obligations, so far as great essentials are concerned, as we do ourselves. It is no hardship for others, for us to refuse to go further than this. Why should they ask us to commune with them when they are unwilling to take such obligations upon them as we take? Why not be content to commune with those who stand on their own platform? When they ask us to come to their level, they ask us virtually to say we do not think those things that separate us in practice and theory of any real, practical account. And that is really the meaning of open communion. All who feel thus can consistently practice it, and no others. For one, I beg to be excused.

Whitewater, Wis., April 30, 1873.

THE STATESMAN ARTICLES.

ARTICLE NINE.

THEORIES OF THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

WITH the facts of history before us concerning sacred time for nearly three centuries after the resurrection of Christ—facts drawn from the inspired writers of the New Testament and their immediate successors, we are prepared to consider the different theories of the Christian Sabbath. These theories may be summed up in three. Of one or another of these, all the remaining theories are simply modifications.

The first of these three leading theories is as follows:—

"The Sabbath was a Jewish institution, and expired with the Jewish dispensation. The Lord's day is not in any proper sense a Sabbath. It has an origin, a reason, and an obligation, not drawn from the fourth commandment, but peculiarly its own, as an institution belonging specially to the New-Testament dispensation."

The second theory, in the order in which we notice these different views, maintains that the observance of the Sabbath, as required under the Old-Testament dispensation, knows no change in any particular. The observance of the seventh day of the week is essential to the proper observance of the Sabbath under the gospel dispensation. The observance of the first day of the week is without divine warrant—a departure from the law of God through the corruptions which crept into the church.

The third theory agrees with the second in maintaining that the Sabbath existed from the beginning, and that it has never been abolished or superseded. It disagrees with the second theory in maintaining that the essential idea of the law of the Sabbath is not the holiness of a portion of time, but the consecration of a specified proportion of time, one day in seven; that, in accordance with this, a change of day was admissible; that a change was actually made by divine warrant from the resurrection of Christ; and that the first day of the week, the Lord's day, is the true Christian Sabbath, having its moral sanction in the fourth commandment.

By many of those who hold the first of these theories, the Lord's day is made a purely ecclesiastical institution, without any other warrant for its observance than the action of the church, by whose authority and in whose wisdom the day is set apart for divine service. By others who accept the same general theory, apostolic authority in the early church is admitted to afford a divine warrant for the observance of the

day. In a complete treatise on the Lord's day, a careful discussion of this theory would be required. Its want of any sufficient foundation could be satisfactorily shown by a presentation of the following points: (1.) The declaration of the Lord of the Sabbath is explicit—"The Sabbath was made for man." It was not made for any portion of the human family, but for the race of mankind. (2.) Thus, from the design of its Lord, and the very nature of the institution, the Sabbath cannot be limited to any locality or dispensation. (3.) Accordingly, it was given to man at his creation. (Gen. 3: 3.) (4.) For the same reason, the law of the Sabbath has its proper place, not among ceremonial, local, or positive enactments, but among the immutable moral precepts of the decalogue. (5.) This law is, therefore, of universal and perpetual obligation upon our race. These points would give room for many articles. But inasmuch as on all of them there is entire agreement between our seventh-day Sabbatarian friends and ourselves, we pass to a consideration of the second theory, which they accept as correct.

To make good their case, the advocates of the second theory must show that the seventh day continued to be the Sabbath observed by the church after the resurrection of Christ, just as before; and that, in the observance of the first day, a great departure took place from the original practice of the Christian church. They must not make bare statements, but they must furnish proof. Instead of appealing to the letter of the law, and insisting that fact must conform to their interpretation of it, they must accept the facts of history, and put their interpretations to the test. It is more reasonable to conclude that an interpretation of law is wrong, than to reject the attested facts of history, when the interpretation and the facts do not harmonize.

Let us briefly sum up the facts already fully brought to view. Christ himself, after his resurrection, passed by the seventh day, and repeatedly put special honor on the first day of the week. This same day was honored by the Pentecostal gift of the Holy Spirit. Christian congregations met for regular weekly service, not on the seventh day, but on the first day of the week. The inspired apostle Paul pointedly condemned the Judaizing teachers who insisted on the observance by Christians of the seventh-day Sabbath. The early writers, companions of the apostles, and others of the succeeding generations, bear the clearest and most explicit testimony to the same facts—the non-observance of the seventh-day Sabbath, and the stated meetings of Christians for divine service on the first day of the week, the Lord's day. Now, if their theory is correct, how will the seventh day Sabbatarians explain the fact that Christ himself, the Holy Spirit, inspired apostles, and Christian congregations all through the early church, ignored the seventh day and honored the first? A general and vague statement to the effect that an unwarranted change was made from the original practice of the Christian church will not do here. Was not the practice of the apostles and first organized congregations of Christians the original practice of the Christian church? That practice was, as we have seen, to observe the first day of the week. We repeat what we have already proved at length, viz., that there is not an instance in the Scriptures of the observance of the seventh day by any Christian church, nor of any regard to that day, after Christ's resurrection, by apostles or their fellow-laborers, except as they availed themselves, in their missionary work, of the meetings of Jewish assemblies in Jewish places of worship. "An unwarranted change!" Let those who take such language upon their lips consider that their charge lies at the door of Christ and his Spirit, and the inspired apostles.

But now, for the sake of the argument, let us leave all the testimony of the inspired writers of the New Testament to the first-day Sabbath out of view. Again, we have the vague charge of unwarranted change. Perhaps the most definite form of this charge is that which makes the change the work of the little horn in Daniel's prophecy, chap. 7. But will the expounder of Daniel be a little more explicit, and tell us who the historical personage is, and give us the dates and names of history? Does the little horn represent Antiochus Epiphanes? If so, then, of course, his change of the law of the Sabbath must have been before the Christian era. Will our expositor

give us some facts just here? If the little horn means the papacy, then, according to the prophecy itself, it did not arise until the Roman Empire, represented by the fourth beast, was broken into ten fragments, represented by the ten horns. The little horn sprang up after these, and its change of the law of the Sabbath must date after the fall of the old empire of Rome. But for centuries before this event, we have the testimony of numerous writers that the Christian churches everywhere observed, not the seventh, but the first, day of the week, the Lord's day. Again, we ask for facts, not mere statements and theories.

Leaving this vague attempt to connect the assumed unwarranted change with Daniel's prophecy, we come to what is, if possible, still more vague and indefinite. A change, it is asserted, was made by some particular officer or council of the church, as it became corrupt and began to depart from the practice of the original church of Christ. Who was this officer, or where did this council meet? But we will not make unreasonable demands for historical testimony. Let us grant that such an officer or such a council there was at some time or other. The question then arises, When did the change take place? In the days of Cyprian, A. D. 250? The answer is clear. The change must have been made before his day. Origen and Tertullian, fifty years earlier, knew only the first day of the week, the Lord's day, as the Christian Sabbath. Was the change then made in their day? We might assume that it was, only for the clear testimony of Irenæus and Justin Martyr carrying us back another half century, and the equally explicit testimony of still earlier writers carrying us back to the apostles themselves.

Notwithstanding all this dearth of historical testimony as to the existence of the supposed ruler or council, let it be further granted that, by some such corrupting authority, at some time, a decree changing the day for Sabbath observance was issued. How did the supposed legislators establish their decree? How did they make it effectual over all the different parts of the church? Must we suppose that a change like this was effected in the church, and not a scrap of a record left concerning it? The attempt made by the church to establish a common day for the anniversary of Christ's resurrection gave rise to long and bitter controversy, and led to division. And yet, as Prof. F. D. Maurice has well said, "it is supposed that this far more important change, affecting all the daily relations and circumstances of life, took effect by the decree of some apostle or some ecclesiastical synod, of which no record, no legend, even, is preserved! Or, perhaps, a half heathen, more than half heathen, statute of Constantine,¹ about the *Dies Solis*, accomplished what the legislators of the church could not accomplish—succeeded not only in securing its adoption by Athanasians, Arians, Semi-Arians, whose controversies Constantine could never heal, but in securing the allegiance of all the barbarous tribes which accepted the gospel under such various conditions in later times. Can any suppositions make greater demands on our credulity than these?" A Procrustean bed, indeed, must be that interpretation of the law of the Sabbath, which, to conform them to itself, must thus deal with the facts of history and the probabilities of historical evidence.

Just here is the difficulty in the theory of seventh-day Sabbatarians. They have somehow got lodged in their mind the idea that the last one of the seven days of the week is the sacred day, the observance of which is absolutely essential to the proper keeping of the Sabbath. What has already been proved from history, inspired and uninspired, is sufficient to show that this theory is unworthy of men, who, like Christ and his apostles, would grasp the true significance of the law of the Sabbath. But as so much stress is laid upon the question of time, we shall devote our next article to this crucial and very practical point.—*The Christian Statesman*, Feb. 1, 1873.

¹The attempt to attribute the change of day to Constantine's decree, is hardly worth noticing. It is enough to remember that it was issued in the beginning of the fourth century. No one who knows anything of the writings of Tertullian and Origen, dating back more than a century before Constantine, to say nothing of still earlier writers, will venture to ascribe the change to the Roman Emperor's decree. Besides, the language of the very decree referred to recognizes the honorable character of the first day of the week. It recognizes that day as already "venerable."

"THEORIES OF THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH."

A REJOINDER.

THE thoughtful reader need not be told that the article which he has just read, entitled, "Theories of the Christian Sabbath," has advanced the discussion of the question before us, in no material respect. The space devoted so generously to the consideration of theories, in regard to the unsoundness of which there is no difference of opinion between the gentleman and myself, is thrown away, so far as the present argument is concerned. While this is true, however, if it serves no other purpose, it has at least made it clear that, if the gentleman fails to make out his case in the end, it will not be because he has not had ample room for the presentation and elaboration of facts and arguments, since one who was crippled in his effort by a lack of space would hardly be willing to devote so much time and attention to subjects foreign to the present issue.

That which is said with reference to these theories might also be repeated in reference to the statement and restatement of points which it is claimed have been proved. Of course, it is the prerogative of any writer to conduct his own argument in his own way. All that we would call attention to is the fact that the line of policy pursued, in these things, is of a nature to satisfy even the most casual observer, that one who felt that he had resources upon which to draw, without limit, would not compel us to pass again and again over the same ground. There is, however, an apology which might properly be offered in the case of the gentleman, for calling our attention to these trivial points so repeatedly, which is found in the fact that his articles were written before our rejoinders were in print. We believe that, were not this the case, and had he perused what has been said in reply to them, we should be spared the monotony of answering them again. However, lest we should seem to avoid them, it will only be necessary that we say enough, bearing upon each point, to revive, in the mind of one who has followed us thus far, the fuller consideration given to all of them heretofore.

To the statement that Sabbatarians, in order to make good their case, must make their views harmonize with the facts of history, it is enough to say that, if it is meant by this, the facts of sacred history, as contained in the Bible, this we have already done; for before it can be urged that the opposite is true, as we have elsewhere seen, it must be shown that there is some transaction found in the sacred record which is in conflict with our interpretation of the law. This has not been done; for not only has it been made to appear that the Sabbath law is explicit in its requirement of the observance of the seventh day of the week, but also that there is not a single case of its violation, by a good man, to be found in the inspired pages. Nor is this all; we have gone beyond this, and proved, by the record, that the opposite was true of the Sunday, since upon it Christ and two of his disciples, on the day of his resurrection, as well as Paul and Luke and others at a subsequent period, did perform upon it labor, which the gentleman himself has not attempted, and will not undertake, to harmonize with any just conception of intelligent Sabbath-keeping. So far as it regards the absence of any mention of meetings of Christians on the Sabbath, it is sufficient to say, as we have already done, that, as in the history given, the account relates largely to missionary trips, where there was no church as yet developed, and, consequently, no possibility of separate meetings, such a record would be out of the question; also, that the argument is only a negative one, and really can have no force, until it can be demonstrated that God's plan is first to command, and then show, in every instance, what the commandment means, by practical illustrations furnished from the history of his people; a doctrine which is not only unsound and untrue, but absurd in the extreme. If, on the other hand, the gentleman means to be understood as insisting that the history of the church since the close of the canon of inspiration must be made to teach the faith which we hold as one which has always been entertained by the church, and therefore sound, we repudiate, in the name of Protestantism, this most pernicious view, and in all matters of practical duty, such as Sabbath-keeping, we decide according to the written word. To the first source (church history), the gentleman has appealed, and if every candid man and woman who has witnessed his effort has not been disgusted with the source

to which he has applied, then we know of nothing which would be calculated to create in him this condition of mind.

With the summary, in which it is claimed that Christ, and the apostles, and the Holy Spirit, and the early church, did repeatedly honor the first day of the week, we will not weary the reader here. We have disproved every one of these points, and we trust to the intelligence of those whom we are addressing, in the confident belief that what has been said, in the absence of even an attempt at refutation, needs not to be reproduced here.

We had barely mentioned, in our original articles, that Seventh-day Adventists held to the opinion that the pope of Rome had been instrumental in bringing about the change of the Sabbath. No effort was made to develop the argument on that point, since we did not dare to presume that room would be granted for the perfecting of the work; in fact, what was said was uttered rather with a view to calling the attention of the curious to our published works upon that subject, than for any other purpose. Now, however, this point is made to assume a prominence which does not really belong to it, in an argument so largely doctrinal, rather than historic. With this, nevertheless, we have no fault to find. Nothing is more satisfactory than the awakening of a spirit of investigation on all branches of this great subject; at the same time, we submit that the attitude of the gentleman must be very unsatisfactory to himself, since he will readily perceive that to an opponent, chafing under a denial of the privilege of answering him in the columns of his own paper, this whole affair wears the aspect of an empty bravado. "Tell us," says the editor, and he repeats his invitation again and again, "Who did this little horn represent? Was it Antiochus? or the pope? If the latter, then how, and when, and where, did he bring about the transition?" But we reply, Whom do you mean, sir, by the term, "us"? Truly, you would not require us to come to Philadelphia to enlighten you personally upon that point. Certainly, you are not particularly anxious that we should write a series of articles for the benefit of the readers of the REVIEW, on a matter with which they are as familiar as they are with the history of their own country; but if, indeed, you had in your mind the readers of the *Statesman*, then it may be inquired again, How has it been possible for us to reach them, under the circumstances? since throwing your forces behind the wall of your editorial prerogative, and closing against us the gate of possibilities, you have shut us out from all access to them. Gladly would we have availed ourselves of the opportunity of doing that which we have been denied the privilege of attempting before the men, many of whom, we believe, would have been glad to have followed this matter to the end; but as this cannot be done, a brief reply will be made here.

The first inquiry, relating, as it does, to the point whether Antiochus Epiphanes or the pope, was meant by the "little horn," in the seventh of Daniel, need not consume time. It has been urged by some that the "little horn," of Dan. 8: 9, applied to the former character. We believe the papists still insist upon this; but the gentleman, upon reflection—if in what he has said he has confounded the two—will not seriously argue against the almost universal admission of Protestant writers, that the character brought to view in the seventh chapter of Daniel's prophecy, is that of the papacy. In fact, reasoning as he does himself, most satisfactorily, that it could not arise until after the appearance of the original ten which represented the final breaking up of the Roman Empire into ten parts, he more than intimates his personal conviction that it could not represent Antiochus Epiphanes, who reigned one hundred and seventy-five years before Christ, since the Roman Empire was not partitioned among the barbarians who invaded it, until A. D. 483, more than six hundred years after the death of the Syrian king. The following, from a standard authority, will serve to show an almost universal agreement on this subject; and with its presentation we pass to the investigation of questions more difficult, and more worthy of our reflection. "Among Protestant writers, this ('the little horn,' of Dan. 7: 8) is considered to be the pope-dominion."—*A. Clark, Com. in loco.*

"To none can this ('He shall speak great words against the Most High') apply so well, and so fully, as to the popes of Rome."—*Idem, veres 25.*

The real point of debate, as intimated above, is the question whether the Roman Catholic church has been instrumental in bringing about the change of the Sabbath. The gentleman errs in asserting that we have anywhere stated that such a change was brought about by any particular officer or council. This we have never urged, nor does it accord with the view held by us. The "little horn" represented, not one, merely, but a whole line of priest-kings, who were to extend from the time of their rise, to the Judgment, and the setting up of the kingdom of God. Of this line of rulers, it is stated—not that they should really succeed in bringing about an actual change in the requirements of the law of God—but that they should "think" to accomplish this end. It is also said that, for a time, times, and dividing of time (1260 years), the saints of God and the law of God should be delivered into their hands. Not, indeed, that God would forsake either his people or his law, utterly, but that, for the period in question, they should be permitted to pursue a course destructive to the one, and antagonistic to the other. In other words, that they should put to death the saints, and presume to alter the commandments of God.

These specifications are simply introduced by way of identification. It is not said that the power indicated should spring into life suddenly, and without a previous stage of development; nor is it declared that the principles which were to characterize it in its mature life should be wholly peculiar to itself. Other powers, such as pagan Rome, might have persecuted the people of God before the rise of the papacy, as they unquestionably did. Other men might have begun the work of tampering with the law of God, long before the days of the hierarchy, and might have prepared to its hands the materials necessary to the accomplishment of the final blasphemous work of the man of sin. In the days of Paul, "the mystery of iniquity began to work," and from that point, its history was one of gradual development. Some of the most destructive heresies afterward incorporated into the faith of papists, it is well understood, were fully fledged, and quite generally accepted, before the installation of the first pope. So, too, concerning the first-day Sabbath. There can be little doubt that before the bishop of Rome became the "Corrector of Heretics," in A. D. 538, or entered the chair of St. Peter, the Sunday had come to be regarded, by many, as the rival, if not the superior, of the ancient Sabbath. Just how extensively the sentiment prevailed, however, it is hard to determine from church history, because, as has been shown in a previous article, the sources of our information have been so corrupted by unprincipled Romanists, that it is difficult to arrive at the facts in the case. One thing is certain; there was a mighty struggle on this question, the gentleman to the contrary, notwithstanding, which has left the marks of its existence in the records of the past. Clear down to the rise of Roman Catholicism, there were men who were strenuous for the observance of the seventh day, and rejecters of its rival. Doubtless the Sunday, by slow degrees, had worked itself into almost universal acceptance as a festival resting upon human, and not divine, authority; but the Sabbath of the Lord still continued in the faith of many, especially in the East, as a day to be sacredly devoted to the worship of God. On this point, Neander, the learned church historian, has given distinct and unequivocal utterance:—

"The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was only a human ordinance, and it was far from the intention of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect; far from them and from the early apostolic church to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday. Perhaps at the end of the second century, a false application of this kind had begun to take place; for men appear, by that time, to have considered laboring on Sunday as a sin."—*Rose's Translation of Neander, p. 186.*

Giesler also remarks as follows: "While the Christians of Palestine, who kept the whole Jewish law, celebrated, of course, all the Jewish festivals, the heathen converts observed only the Sabbath, and in remembrance of the closing scenes of our Saviour's life, the passover, though without the Jewish superstitions. Besides these, the

Sunday, as the day of our Saviour's resurrection, was devoted to religious worship."—*Church Hist. Apostolic Age to A. D. 70.*

Lyman Coleman, in his "Ancient Christianity Exemplified," testifies as follows: "The observance of the Lord's day, as the first day of the week, was at first introduced as a separate institution. Both this and the Jewish Sabbath were kept for some time; finally, the latter passed wholly over into the former, which now took the place of the ancient Sabbath of the Israelites. But their Sabbath, the last day of the week, was strictly kept in connection with that of the first day, for a long time after the overthrow of the temple and its worship. Down even to the fifth century, the observance of the Jewish Sabbath was continued in the Christian church, but with a rigor and solemnity gradually diminishing, until it was wholly discontinued. * * * Both were observed in the Christian church down to the fifth century, with this difference, that in the eastern church, both days were regarded as joyful occasions; but in the western, the Jewish Sabbath was kept as a fast." Chap. 26, sect. 2.

Wm. Twisse, whose antique style compares with that of the period in which he wrote, most pointedly declares the same fact in a work entitled, "The Morality of the Fourth Commandment:" "Yet for some hundred years in the primitive church, not the Lord's day only, but the seventh day also, was religiously observed, not by Ebion and Cerinthus only, but by pious Christians also, as Baronius writeth and Gomaius confesseth, and Rivut also." Page 9, London, 1641.

Morer, in speaking of the early Christians, remarks of them as follows: "The primitive Christians had a great veneration for the Sabbath, and spent the day in devotion and sermons, and it is not to be doubted but they derived the practice from the apostles themselves."—*Morer's Lord's Day, p. 189.*

Edward Brerewood, professor in Gresham College, London, writes: "The ancient Sabbath did remain, and was observed by the Christians of the east church above three hundred years after our Saviour's death, and besides that, no other day, for more hundred years than I spoke of before, was known in the church by the name of the Sabbath." Page 77, ed. 1631.

Prof. Stuart, in speaking of the period between A. D. 321 and the council of Laodicea, A. D. 364, furnishes the following interesting statement, which discloses the historic fact concerning the ebb and flow of discussion on this subject in the early church: "The practice of it [the keeping of the Sabbath], was continued by Christians who were jealous for the honor of the Mosaic law, and finally became, as we have seen, predominant throughout Christendom. It was supposed at length that the fourth commandment did require the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath [not merely a seventh part of time], and reasoning as Christians of the present day are wont to do, viz., that all which belong to the ten commandments was immutable and perpetual, the churches in general came gradually to regard the seventh-day Sabbath as altogether sacred." (Appendix to Gurney's Hist. of Sab., pp. 115, 116.) Concerning the same council, Prynne has made a similar historic record: "The seventh-day Sabbath was solemnized by Christ, the apostles and primitive Christians, till the Laodicean Council, did, in a manner, quite abolish the observance of it. * * * The Council of Laodicea, A. D. 364, first settled the observance of the Lord's day, and prohibited the keeping of the Jewish Sabbath, under an anathema." ("Dissertation on the Lord's Sabbath, pp. 33, 44, ed. 1633.") In alluding to the differences in practice between the eastern and the western churches, Neander distinctly sets forth the resolute animosity of the latter to the ancient Sabbath of the Lord, and the manner in which they sought to bring it into disrepute, while elevating the Sunday into favor. He says: "In the western churches, particularly the Roman, where opposition to Judaism was the prevailing tendency, this very opposition produced the custom of celebrating the Saturday as a fast day. This difference of customs would, of course, be striking, where members of the Oriental church spent their Sabbath day in the western church."—*Hist. Chris. Rel. and Church, First Three Centuries. Rose's trans., p. 186.*

Peter Heylyn also marks the peculiar favor shown to the first day of the week in the western church; and while he declares

¹ For the extracts given in this connection, the reader is referred to "Sabbath and Sunday," by A. H. Lewis, and to "The History of the Sabbath," by J. N. Andrews.

The Review and Herald.

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

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, MAY 27, 1873.

ELD. JAMES WHITE, } EDITORS.
" J. N. ANDREWS, }

Testimony of the Fathers.

WITH respect to the Sabbath, the religious world may be divided into three classes:—

1. Those who retain the ancient seventh-day Sabbath.
2. Those who observe the first-day Sabbath.
3. Those who deny the existence of any Sabbath.*

It is inevitable that controversy should exist between these parties. Their first appeal is to the Bible, and this should decide the case; for it reveals man's whole duty. But there is an appeal by the second party, and sometimes by the third, to another authority, the early fathers of the church, for the decision of the question.

The controversy stands thus: The second and third parties agree with the first that God did anciently require the observance of the seventh day; but both deny the doctrine of the first, that he still requires men to hallow that day; the second asserting that he has changed the Sabbath to the first day of the week; and the third declaring that he has totally abolished the institution itself.

The first class plant themselves upon the plain letter of the law of God, and adduce those scriptures which teach the perpetuity and immutability of the moral law, and which show that the new covenant does not abrogate that law, but puts it into the heart of every Christian.

The second class attempt to prove the change of the Sabbath by quoting those texts which mention the first day of the week, and also those which are said to refer to it. The first day is, on such authority, called by this party the Christian Sabbath, and the fourth commandment is used by them to enforce this new Sabbath.

The third class adduce those texts which assert the dissolution of the old covenant; and those which teach the abolition of the ceremonial law with all its distinction of days, as new moons, feast days, and annual sabbaths; and also those texts which declare that men cannot be justified by that law which condemns sin; and from all these contend that the law and the Sabbath are both abolished.

But the first class answer to the second that the texts which they bring forward do not meet the case, inasmuch as they say nothing respecting the change of the Sabbath; and that it is not honest to use the fourth commandment to enforce the observance of a day not therein commanded. And the third class assent to this answer as truthful and just.

To the position of the third class, the first make this answer: That the old covenant was made between God and his people concerning his law;† that it ceased because the people failed in its conditions, the keeping of the commandments; that the new covenant does not abrogate the law of God, but secures obedience to it by putting it into the heart of every Christian; that there are two systems of law, one being made up of typical and ceremonial precepts, and the other consisting of moral principles only; that those texts which speak of the abrogation of the handwriting of ordinances, and of the distinction in meats, drinks, and days, pertain alone to this shadowy system, and never to the moral law which contains the Sabbath of the Lord; and that it is not the fault of the law, but of sinners, that they are condemned by it; and that justification being attained only by the sacrifice of Christ as a sin-offering, is in itself a most powerful attestation to the perpetuity, immutability, and perfection, of that law which reveals sin. And to this answer the second class heartily assent.

But the second class have something further to say. The Bible, indeed, fails to assert the change of the Sabbath, but these persons have something else to offer, in their estimation, equally as good as the Scriptures. The early

fathers of the church, who conversed with the apostles, or who conversed with some who had conversed with them, and those who followed for several generations, are by this class presented as authority, and their testimony is used to establish the so-called Christian Sabbath on a firm basis. And this is what they assert respecting the fathers: That they distinctly teach the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, and that the first day is, by divine authority, the Christian Sabbath.

But the third class squarely deny this statement, and affirm that the fathers held the Sabbath as an institution made for the Jews when they came out of Egypt, and that Christ abolished it at his death. They also assert that the fathers held the first day, not as a Sabbath in which men must not labor lest they break a divine precept, but as an ecclesiastical institution, which they called the Lord's day, and which was the proper day for religious assemblies because custom and tradition thus concurred. And so the third class answer the second by an explicit denial of its alleged facts. They also aim a blow at the first by the assertion that the early fathers taught the no-Sabbath doctrine, which must therefore be acknowledged as the real doctrine of the New Testament.

And now the first class respond to these conflicting statements of the second and the third. And here is its response:—

1. That our duty respecting the Sabbath, and respecting every other thing, can be learned only from the Scriptures.

2. That the first three hundred years after the apostles, nearly accomplished the complete development of the great apostasy, which had commenced even in Paul's time; and this age of apostatizing cannot be good authority for making changes in the law of God.

3. That only a small proportion of the ministers and teachers of this period have transmitted any writings to our time; and these are generally fragments of the original works, and they have come down to us mainly through the hands of the Romanists, who have never scrupled to destroy, or to corrupt, that which witnesses against themselves, whenever it has been in their power to do it.

4. But inasmuch as these two classes, viz., those who maintain the first-day Sabbath, and those who deny the existence of any Sabbath, both appeal to these fathers for testimony with which to sustain themselves, and to put down the first class, viz., those who hallow the ancient Sabbath, it becomes necessary that the exact truth respecting the writings of that age, which now exist, should be shown. There is but one method of doing this which will effectually end the controversy. This is to give every one of their testimonies concerning the Sabbath and first-day in their own words. In doing this the following facts will appear:—

1. That in some important particulars there is a marked disagreement on this subject among them. For while some teach that the Sabbath originated at creation and should be hallowed even now, others assert that it began with the fall of the manna, and ended with the death of Christ. And while one class represent Christ as a violator of the Sabbath, another class represent him as sacredly hallowing it, and a third class declare that he certainly did violate it, and that he certainly never did, but always observed it! Some of them also affirm that the Sabbath was abolished, and in other places positively affirm that it is perpetuated and made more sacred than it formerly was. Moreover some assert that the ten commandments are absolutely abolished, whilst others declare that they are perpetuated, and are the tests of Christian character in this dispensation. Some call the day of Christ's resurrection the first day of the week; others call it the day of the sun, and the eighth day; and a larger number call it the Lord's day, but there are no examples of this application till the close of the second century. Some enjoin the observance of both the Sabbath and the first day, while others treat the seventh day as despicable.

2. But in several things of great importance there is perfect unity of sentiment. They always distinguish between the Sabbath and the first day of the week. The change of the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first is never mentioned in a single instance. They never term the first day the Christian Sabbath, nor do they treat it as a Sabbath of any kind. Nor is there a single declaration in any of them that labor on the first day of the week is sinful; the utmost

that can be found being one or two vague expressions which do not necessarily have any such sense.

3. Many of the fathers call the first day of the week the Lord's day. But none of them claim for it any scriptural authority, and some expressly state that it has none whatever, but rests solely upon custom and tradition.

4. But the writings of the fathers furnish positive proof that the Sabbath was observed in the Christian church down to the time when they wrote, and by no inconsiderable part of that body. For some of them expressly enjoin its observance, and even some of those who held that it was abolished speak of Christians who observed it, whom they would consent to fellowship if they would not make it a test.

5. And now mark the work of apostasy: This work never begins by thrusting out God's institutions, but always by bringing in those of men and at first only asking that they may be tolerated, while yet the ones ordained of God are sacredly observed. This, in time, being effected, the next effort is to make them equal with the divine. When this has been accomplished, the third stage of the process is to honor them above those divinely commanded; and this is speedily succeeded by the fourth, in which the divine institution is thrust out with contempt, and the whole ground given to its human rival.

6. Before the first three centuries had expired, apostasy concerning the Sabbath had, with many of the fathers, advanced to the third stage, and with a considerable number had already entered upon the fourth. For those fathers who hallow the Sabbath do generally associate with it the festival called by them the Lord's day. And though they speak of the Sabbath as a divine institution, and never speak thus of the so-called Lord's day, they do, nevertheless, give the greater honor to this human festival. So far had the apostasy progressed before the end of the third century, that only one thing more was needed to accomplish the work as far as the Sabbath was concerned, and this was to discard it, and to honor the Sunday festival alone. Some of the fathers had already gone thus far; and the work became general within five centuries after Christ.

7. The modern church historians make very conflicting statements respecting the Sabbath during the first centuries. Some pass over it almost in silence, or indicate that it was, at most, observed only by Jewish Christians. Others, however, testify to its general observance by the Gentile Christians; yet some of these assert that the Sabbath was observed as a matter of expediency and not of moral obligation, because those who kept it did not believe the commandments were binding. (This is a great error, as will appear in due time.) What is said, however, by these modern historians is comparatively unimportant inasmuch as their sources of information were of necessity the very writings which are about to be quoted.

8. In the following articles will be found in their own words, every statement † which the fathers of the first three centuries make by way of defining their views of the Sabbath and first-day. And even when they merely allude to either day in giving their views of other subjects, the nature of the allusion is stated, and, where practicable, the sentence or phrase containing it is quoted. The different writings are cited in the order in which they purport to have been written. A considerable number were not written by the persons to whom they were ascribed, but at a later date. And even these writings possess a certain historical value. For though not written by the ones whose names they bear, they are known to have been in existence from the second or third century, and they give some idea of the views which then prevailed.

First of all let us hear the so-called Apostolical Constitutions. These were not the work of the apostles, but they were in existence as early as the third century, and were then very generally believed to express the doctrine of the apostles. They do therefore furnish important historical testimony to the practice of the church at that time. Mosheim in his Historical Commentaries, sect. 51, speaks thus of these Constitutions:—

"The matter of this work is unquestionably ancient; since the manners and discipline of which it exhibits a view are those which prevailed amongst the Christians of the second and third centuries, especially those resident in Greece and the oriental regions."

† The case of Origen is a partial exception. Not all his works have been accessible to the writer, but sufficient of them have been examined to lay before the reader a just representation of his doctrine.

Of the Apostolical Constitutions, Guericke's Church History speaks thus:—

"This is a collection of ecclesiastical statutes purporting to be the work of the apostolic age, but in reality formed gradually in the second, third, and fourth centuries, and is of much value in reference to the history of polity, and Christian archaeology generally."—*Ancient Church*, p. 212.

J. N. A.

Calvary's Cross.

WHAT law was nailed to it? Evidently no other than that which prefigured the great offering for sin there to be made—the law of typical service which expired by limitation when the great sin-offering to which it pointed super-vened. The moral law, the primary law, the law, the transgression of which made man a sinner, is not made void, but established by the scene of Calvary. Christ magnified this law in his life, in his teaching, and most of all by his death. The sacredness of this law is shown in the fact that the divine Son of God "poured out his soul unto death" for our transgressions of it. If you would see the perfect holiness and exceeding value of that law, look to Calvary. Or, if you would justly appreciate the exceeding sinfulness of sin, mark how it put the Lamb of God to death!

This is the way the pious of a hundred years ago viewed it. Says Wm. Carosso: "This morning I have been meditating on the dreadful evil of sin. It was sin that caused angels to become devils; and it was sin that caused Adam to be driven from Paradise; by sin he lost the favor and image of God, and brought death into the world with all our woe! I see it was a manifestation of God's just displeasure against sin, when he swept off a whole world at one stroke. But, O my blessed Saviour! when I turn my thoughts for a moment to reflect on what thou hast done and suffered to redeem the ruined race, I have a still clearer discovery of its dreadful evil. When I behold thee at Pilate's bar with thy sacred body 'all one wound,' and follow thee to Calvary, and see thee stretched on yonder tree, fainting and 'crushed beneath my load,' crying out, 'My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me,' I see the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and am constrained to say,—

"O Lamb of God, was ever pain,
Was ever love, like thine?"

R. F. COTTRELL.

Practical Thoughts.

UNDULY SENSITIVE.

THOSE who are thus are unhappy, and their course, to say the least, is a source of uneasiness and perplexity to others. What good can result from being in constant fear that somebody has hurt you, or is going to hurt you? that everything which is said to you or concerning you, is aimed at you, and is intended to injure you? that you are slighted? &c. The imagination has much to do in this matter. It is too vivid, and manufactures things which do not exist. But, as a general thing, this is not the worst feature. Selfishness is at the bottom of this sensitiveness. If self was dead, there would not be so much worrying over seeming, or even real, neglect, and we would not feel so sensitive when our wrongs are pointed out. We would even be calm when accused of sins of which we are not guilty. It will not pay to labor so hard to build up self, our worst enemy. Self is a poor god to worship. It gives bondage and unrest. May the desire of every heart be that self may be wholly crucified, and that God may rule in us fully. Let us learn of Jesus, who was meek and lowly in heart, and we shall find rest from the troubles of sensitiveness, and give others rest from anxiety on our account.

AN ILLUSTRATION.—SOMETHING TO BE CONSIDERED.

You receive a certain sum of money of a man. For the use of this money, and as a token of gratitude to the one from whom you receive it, you are to pay a certain interest, yearly. But if, instead of doing this, you wait a number of years, and then pay only the interest on the money for the last year, would you be regarded as doing justice to your creditor? You justly answer, No; there are previous claims upon me, which are as sacred as those of the last year. Well, in this respect, what is just with man is just with God, who has for years claimed something for the use of means he has lent us. Many, in the past—some, for want of knowledge, others, for want of opportunity, and others, through a lack of gratitude—have not given God his due, and yet have been prospered. Such can now redeem the past, not simply by giving as God is now prospering them. They actually have means which belongs to the Lord, in a special sense, and which he should have had, years ago. Will simply giving to the Lord a part of the present income from this portion of property in their possession, meet the claims he has upon them for the past? Nay, verily. These claims, in the cases before us, can be, at least, partly met by aiding to supply the financial wants of the cause, in different branches, besides paying Systematic Benevolence. Though this is not a matter of compulsion, yet the principles of justice remain the same, and how shall

* Those who compose this class are unanimous in the view that the Sunday festival was established by the church; and they all agree in making it their day of worship, but not for the same reason; for, while one part of them devoutly accept the institution as the Lord's day on the authority of the church, the other part make it their day for worship simply because it is the most convenient day.

† Such is the exact nature of the covenant mentioned in Ex. 24: 8; and Paul, in Heb. 9: 18-20, quotes this passage, calling the covenant therein mentioned "the first testament," or covenant.

they be met in the Judgment? What would professors, violating these principles, say, to see miraculously inscribed in bold and blazing characters on pieces of property over which they glory, "Stolen from God! Robbery in the first degree!" Although this may not be literally the case, yet it is as really so, in principle, as it was for Belshazzar to see the handwriting on the wall.

D. T. BOURDEAU.

Objectious to the Sabbath Answered.

TWENTY-FIRST OBJECTION.

It is a violation of the Sabbath to go out of the dwelling, or kindle a fire, or to drive our teams to meeting, on the Sabbath (Ex. 16: 29; 20: 8-10; 35: 3), hence it cannot be kept now.

Answer. To the first part of this objection, I answer that there is no such prohibition in the Bible, Old Testament or New. One occupation of the Sabbath, as specified by God himself, was that of coming together for religious meetings. Lev. 23: 3: "Six days may work be done; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of rest, an holy convocation." What is a convocation? Is it not a calling together, or a coming together? Yes. Could the people all come together, and still not go out of their dwellings? No. Shall we, then, charge God with contradicting his own laws, in one place commanding them not to leave their houses, and in another place to go to meeting, at the same time? The very fact that the pious Jews, during the old dispensation, were accustomed to assemble in the synagogues, and other places for meetings, on the Sabbath day (2 Kings 4: 23; Luke 4: 16), shows that they were ignorant of any law forbidding them to leave their houses on that day. Our opponents will admit that Jesus had to keep all the old law, till it was abolished at the cross. Very well; we find him constantly going to the synagogues on the Sabbath.

These facts show that our opponents have misinterpreted the text upon which they rely. It simply relates to the act of the people in going out of their places on the Sabbath day to gather food, which God had forbidden them to do; but does not contradict the other requirement, to assemble in meetings on that day. Thus the text reads: "And it came to pass, that there went out some of the people on the seventh day for to gather, and they found none. And the Lord said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day." Ex. 16: 27-29. Who can fail to see that this prohibition related only to the act of going out to gather food, but had no reference to going to meetings, or attending to other sacred duties belonging to that day?

The same strained and unnatural interpretation is forced upon Ex. 20: 8-10, to show that it is wrong to drive our teams to meeting on the Sabbath. "Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, . . . nor thy cattle," &c. We have just shown that the Lord required his people to go to meeting upon the Sabbath day, and that they all did so. Yet God forbids them to do any work, the same as in the case of the cattle. If their walking to meeting on the Sabbath was not a violation of the law, neither would it be for the cattle to walk there. God said, "Thou shalt not do any work," yet the hardest day's work of the whole week, for the priest, was done upon the Sabbath day, on which they had to do double work. Num. 28: 9. Still, Christ says they did not violate the Sabbath, in doing this. Matt. 12: 5. Why not? Because this was for God's special service, and was not their own work. The law simply forbids the doing of our work, either by ourselves, our children, our servants, or our cattle. But that which is for God's worship, is lawful on that day, as are all deeds of mercy and benevolence, for so Christ has decided. Matt. 12: 10-13. Hence it is lawful to drive our teams to meeting on the Sabbath.

Lastly, as to building fires on the Sabbath day, Ex. 35: 3, we may observe, 1. That this prohibition is not in the ten commandments, which we claim are still binding. 2. That it is in the law of Moses, which we and our opponents both agree has been abolished; so that, whatever its meaning once was, it does not concern us now. 3. There are many facts which show that this prohibition extended only to the Jews, while in the wilderness, but never applied to them after they reached Canaan. (1.) Palestine, in winter, is so cold as to require fire to keep the inhabitants from suffering. (2.) The Sabbath was not designed to distress men, then, more than now. (3.) In the warm climate of Arabia, where this law applied, no fires were needed for comfort. (4.) If this law had been carried out, in Palestine, it would have directly conflicted with the law of the passover, which required the lamb to be roasted on the evening following the fourteenth day of the first month, which would occasionally come on the Sabbath. But the passover was only once celebrated in the wilderness. Hence we conclude that this objection is unfounded, as the law against fires was only local, not extending even to the land of Canaan, but applied only for the few years the Israelites were in the wilderness.

naan, but applied only for the few years the Israelites were in the wilderness.

TWENTY-SECOND OBJECTION.

Stoning to death, the penalty for Sabbath-breaking, has been abolished; and as a law without a penalty is of no force, therefore the law of the Sabbath is void.

Answer. Stoning to death never was the final penalty for the violation of the Sabbath, or any other of the ten commandments. It was simply the penalty prescribed by the civil law of the Jews, the same as hanging or imprisonment is with us. A little reflection will show this. Suppose a Jew had murdered a man. For this he was arrested and stoned to death. Was that the penalty of the moral law? If so, as soon as he was dead, he had paid the penalty of the law, and would not, in justice, be made to pay it again. Hence, in the final Judgment, this man would go clear of the second death! God would not judge, condemn, and punish him twice, for the same crime. So he would go straight into the kingdom! This is too absurd to be believed. No; the stoning penalty was simply that prescribed by the civil law of the land, the same as hanging is with us. But the real and final penalty for the violation of the moral law, has always been death—the second death. There has been no change in this penalty. It has always been the same in the Old and New Testaments. Eze. 18: 20; Rom. 6: 23. Those who violate God's Sabbath now, will find, in the Judgment of the great day, that death is the penalty for Sabbath-breaking, the same as ever.

MISCELLANEOUS OBJECTIONS.

If the seventh day is the Sabbath, why has it not been found out before?

Answer. It was found out six thousand years ago, Gen. 2: 3, and has been frequently urged upon men's attention, ever since. There has never been a time when the Sabbath has not been observed by some of God's people. (See Andrew's History of the Sabbath.) But many of the most prominent truths of the Bible have, at different times, been perverted and finally lost by men, sometimes for ages. Then, when God raises up some one to restore these old truths, they are opposed as introducing new doctrines, and the strong argument against them always is, "If this is so, why was it not found out before?" Luther had this constantly thrown in his face. For hundreds of years, the truths he began to revive had been lost sight of. That generation had never heard of them. To them, they were entirely new. The first question, everywhere, was, "If these things are so, why have they not been found out before? Why have not our ministers preached them?" All Luther could say, was, that these truths were in the Bible, and he should preach them.

So we say of this truth. Why God suffered it to be lost for so long a time, by the mass of the people, and to be revived now, rather than at some other time, we may not be able to tell, any more than why he has suffered other truths to be lost for ages, and then restored the same as this. The violation of the second commandment, image worship, was nearly universal for about one thousand years previous to the Reformation. Then God raised up men who restored that down-trodden commandment. Why was it not done before? Who can tell? Was Wesley a reformer? Yes. Why were not the truths he preached found out before? To be consistent, those who raise this objection ought to reject all the light, all the improvements, all the reformatations, which have ever been received since Adam's day, and refuse to know or believe anything not revealed in the first chapter of the Bible!!

D. M. CANRIGHT.

Concord, Minn.

Conversation.

"Let your conversation be as cometh the gospel of Christ." Phil. 1: 27.

How full of excellent precepts are the Holy Scriptures. On every point we find explicit directions, and could we always remember to carry them out in our practice, how good it would be for us.

The above quotation, if always lived up to, would save us many a slip, and many a mortification. How many a tempted saint has mourned and wept. Alas! alas! that I should have forgotten this sweet injunction of Paul, when it is so clear, so distinct, so decisive.

Alas! that, when I had opportunity, I did not warn and instruct, or at least give a serious turn to the conversation. How often is the past regretted when some trifling theme has been discussed, or the precious time wasted in indifferent or insipid conversation, which might have been spent profitably in getting out the truths of the Bible. Alas! how many have passed out of sight, who might have heard the truth, who can never again listen to the living voice.

Continually, the hungry tomb is closing over the dead, and cutting short the probation of many; no more will they hear the precious voice of inspiration calling to repentance. Say, reader, has no one passed to the grave during the past year, within the sphere of your influence, who might have been helped by you?

That young person, so full of life, or that older one, who had seen more of life, whose confined corpse was yesterday lowered into the narrow house, appointed for all the living, have you

prayed for, and labored for, him? have you no reflection of personal neglect?

Our conversation, how important; the devoted minister enters the pulpit, only with fervent prayer, that every word may be with wisdom and power, and shall not we, who occupy more private positions, seek that our daily conversation may tell for the good of those who come within the sphere of our influence?

Instead of this, how often it happens that unprofitable conversation fills up the time, or, perhaps, improper subjects come in, and precious opportunities are lost forever, and those who, perhaps, longed for a word in season were disappointed.

Changes take place, and our associates are removed from our sight, one, by death, another, by removal, or other cause, and have we no sharp pangs of sorrow that these loved associates, now withdrawn from us forever, saw so little in us of concern for their salvation?

How great the promises to those who order their conversation aright; the subject here noticed is often alluded to in the Bible. Let us consider all the texts in which it is mentioned, and seek, hourly and constantly, to so order our conversation that we may glorify God and save souls.

A word in season for every one, how precious it would be; and if every one who professes the name of Christ would do this, how great, how important, would the result be. Let us each and all pray for wisdom, and love, and grace, to direct.

JOS. CLARKE.

Excusing Sin.

If we were only able to discern clearly the terrible nature and bitter consequences of sin, we would turn from it with loathing, and never seek to excuse it in ourselves or in others. But, with our dim vision, it does not look so extremely bad after all. Our sinful nature excuses herself because her besetments are "so natural." We quite forget that the carnal, or natural, mind is enmity against God, not subject to his law. Rom. 8: 7.

We excuse the sins of our little children, perhaps smile at their first acts of rebellion because they are "too young" for discipline, and our fond love indulges them until they are "too old" for us to control. We excuse them in their youth, because, as we say, "they must sow their wild oats," unmindful of the words of inspiration, "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth with his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption." Gal. 6: 7, 8. The sons of Eli "sowed their wild oats" and miserably perished at the hands of the Philistines.

Excuses are made for the sins of those who are advanced in years "because they are old." If people in their old age become idiotic, then are they like babes, not responsible; but if their intellect is continued, the claims of God's holy law are as strong upon them as ever, unless it can be shown that God is a respecter of persons. But this is so far from being true that one illustration is sufficient. In the early days of king Solomon, the Lord had shown him special favors by twice appearing unto him, imparting great wisdom and crowning him with riches and honor. But the sins of his old age brought the frown of God upon him. "For it came to pass, when Solomon was old, that his wives turned away his heart after other gods; and his heart was not perfect with the Lord his God, as was the heart of David his father. . . . And Solomon did evil in the sight of the Lord, and went not fully after the Lord, as did David his father. . . . And the Lord was angry with Solomon, because his heart was turned from the Lord God of Israel, which had appeared unto him twice." 1 Kings 11: 4, 6, 9. Old age afforded this wise and highly favored prince no excuse to do wrong, however unfavorable his surroundings might have been.

In times past, sin has involved people of all ages in one common ruin. 2 Chron. 36: 17; Deut. 32: 25; Lam. 2: 21. The old and the young have perished together. "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." This is as true of individuals, old or young, as of nations. The way of righteousness is the only safe way.

We are living in the hour of God's Judgment. Then, instead of seeking to cover up our sins with excuses, let us try hard to put them away, and warn others of the danger of a sinful course. Our probation lingers yet a little. May the long-suffering of our Lord prove our salvation at last. May we daily seek after purity and holiness of heart. Unless we do, we shall never see the face of God. In his love, he has provided a way whereby we may be saved if we will. If we are finally lost, the fault will be our own, and we shall be entirely without excuse.

S. A. H. LINDSEY.

I Will Come Again.

"In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." John 14: 2, 3.

"Surely I come quickly." Rev. 22: 20.

SWEET, precious, and comforting, is the message I bring to you. Jesus is coming! It is

no new story. Long years ago the angels said, "This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into Heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." Ever since these words were uttered, there have been those who believed in the doctrine, "Unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Is there no music in these words, does he say who has accumulated thousands, and is still engrossed in schemes of earthly aggrandizement? Though the Bible has said, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God," there is yet a chance for you. If you can be helped to see things as they are, your wealth may go to save the needy for whom Christ died, and thus a treasure be secured to you "eternal in the heavens." In a little while, your bank stock will be of no account. The gold and silver you now prize so highly will be thrown "to the moles and to the bats." There is a bank which cannot fail, "where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through and steal," and God has pledged his honor that this stock, through all the coming ages, shall never grow worthless. Soon a grander time will come than you even dream of now. Your costly dwellings, earthly elegance and grandeur, will be superseded by a city whose gates are built of pearl, whose streets are solid gold. Be persuaded to devote the few remaining moments to seeking a preparation for that blessed "second coming."

My dear young friends, would you, too, turn a deaf ear to these sweetly solemn words, "I will come again," hoping for long years of gaiety and pleasure? "Be not deceived; God is not mocked; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Your brightest plans, formed without consulting your Maker, may be defeated at any moment. The hopes so fondly cherished may be blasted long ere fruition, and these sad words, "My life has been a failure," or the more solemn ones, "The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved," be your lamentation. There is no need of failure here. Then come with whatever talent God has lent you, and work with a will; for the harvest moon is waning, and a place is being prepared in the "many mansions" for all the faithful ones.

Worn servant, you who have toiled "from early morn till dewy eve" 'neath summer's sun and 'mid winter's snow, well do you understand the language, "I will come again." Does the narrow path grow more uneven? Do the masses turn away with derision or indifference from the message you bear? Precious the promises: "My grace is sufficient." "He that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him." Through the long vista of years comes this pledge of remembrance: "I go to prepare a place for you. . . . I will come again, and receive you unto myself."

Grief stricken mourner, this "second coming" must be a subject in which you are deeply interested, for it is the "Life-giver" who is to appear, and "them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him" from "the land of the enemy," nevermore to be taken captive, for he who brought sin into the world and death through sin will be slain with his own weapons. Then trust in God and "wait for his Son from Heaven." Very soon will the resurrection morning restore your buried treasures, for "he is faithful that promised," "Surely I come quickly."

To you who are homeless, tired, and worn—your whose lives are only prolonged physical suffering, remember the "many mansions." Tenderly our Saviour speaks as he tells of a place he has gone to prepare for you, a place where pale lips will never quiver with anguish they would fain conceal, or the aching head turn away to hide the eyes heavy with their weight of tears, but, instead, will be "fullness of joy, and pleasures forevermore."

You who are surrounded by discouraging circumstances, scarcely knowing where the path of duty lies, are you still waiting for answers to prayer offered long ago, tempted to think God's ear is heavy, that it cannot hear? We may not live to fathom the mystery why God sees fit to lead us as he does, or know the full meaning contained in the lessons his providence would teach. It is enough that we know he is leading us, and if we are saved at last we may see the brink of the precipice from which we were kept only by severe scourging, while we in our human blindness never knew it was there. Then wait no longer for Satan to die, or your Heavenly Father to work a miracle; but arise, and come nearer to Him who has promised heavenly wisdom, and, with the strength which cometh from above, perform your life-work, for Jesus is coming.

What we know not now, hereafter,
Why and wherefore, we can trace;
Nevermore through a glass darkly,
But forever, face to face;
When life's dreary desert changeth
Burning sand for blushing rose,
And the way-worn traveler findeth
Home at last and sweet repose;
When the weary form, the burden,
Shall exchange for endless rest,
Then we'll know, as now we may not,
Why the thorny road was best.

MARY MARTIN.

New Hampshire.

GATHER THE WHEAT.

WHERE didst thou reap to-day, my soul?
My soul, where didst thou reap?
The fields are white on either hand;
The needy ones about thee stand;
The Christian may not sleep.

What hast thou reaped to-day, my soul,
Worthy the words, "Well done?"
A burden sweet of garnered sheaves,
Or but a few dry, withered leaves,
Marking thy "Harvest Home"?

How hast thou reaped to-day, my soul?
How hast thou reaped to-day?
The work is great, the field is wide,
The faithful few are by thy side;
Press on, and do not stay.

Go, find thy work, my soul, to-day,
And finding, do it well;
Put in thy sickle, sharp and bright:
Work on through all the morning light;
When night comes who can tell?

Progress of the Cause.

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

Minnesota.

FRIDAY evening, May 2, began meetings at Oronoco, in the Presbyterian house. A good delegation of our people was there from all around. The town's people turned out largely and filled the house. I had fair freedom in speaking the word. One was baptized, and several came forward for prayers. All appeared to be much encouraged. Brn. Grant, Edwards, Gibson, Phelps, and others were present. Eld. D. P. Curtis, Seventh-day Baptist, was also there and aided in preaching and other exercises of the meeting. Could he get out free, and give his whole time and attention to the ministry, he might do much good. He is well convinced of much of the present truth, and now feels it his duty to advocate it as far as he sees the light. I think the way is now open for him to give himself wholly to the work of God. Probably we shall labor together this season.

Monday, May 5, came home with Bro. Phelps to Pine Island. I wish all our people in Minnesota could see what he has done in the line of small fruits and gardening, and go and do likewise. He has apples on four-year-old trees; raspberry stalks seven feet high and nearly an inch thick, bearing wonderfully; strawberries; gooseberries; &c., &c. There is more profit in these things to a family than anything a farmer raises. Health reformers should take special interest in these things. A little time laid out in a good garden adds greatly to the comfort and health of a family.

May 7, had a meeting of the church to set things in order as far as possible. Found things in a very disorderly condition. Persons were still members of the church who had made no profession and who had not even kept the Sabbath for years. How can God smile upon such things? We did all that we could, for the present. Two were disfellowshipped, and several censured. A number of these will probably have to be expelled at the next business meeting. Four were baptized and five were received into the church. Several more are ready to join by letter. A leader was chosen, and regular Sabbath meetings were appointed. Some in this church are four years behind on their s. b.! Only about half are any where near up with their pledges. Several, I am glad to say, are entirely up. Something must be done in this State to correct this terribly slack way of doing church business or we never can come into a healthy condition. We closed with the ordinances, feeling that the church had begun to move in the right direction.

Friday, May 9, came to Kenyon with Brn. Ells and Phelps. Held four meetings with them. The church here numbers fourteen members, ten of whom lately embraced the truth under the labors of Brn. Ells and Phelps. I liked their appearance much. If they have the proper instruction, I think they may become a strong church. All take hold readily in the meetings, family prayer, &c. They take our papers and want to read and learn. I sold them thirteen dollars' worth of books. Baptized six. Organized s. b. to the amount of seventy dollars. All took hold of it readily. Would have organized a church, if it had not been that some are still using tobacco. This stood in our way. Hope they will soon abandon this bad habit, and open the way for a church organization.

The next day, Sunday, May 11, came to Concord and re-organized s. b., amounting to \$79.00; chose a delegate to Conference, and looked into the standing of every member of the church; inquired after those not in the church; appointed committees to visit them, and took other steps to set things in order. Found less difficulty here than in most other places. I think this is a good little company, and that many more can be added to it by a few lectures here, which we hope to give in the fall.

Wednesday, May 14, came to Greenwood Prairie, and had a meeting of the church. Carefully examined the church book and looked into the case of every one, whether in the church or not. Some were disfellowshipped, and others taken in. We did all we could to set things in order. One was baptized. The church record here, as in most of the places visited as yet, can hardly be called a record. So of the s. b. book. It is not kept so that anything can be told by it. I find, in nearly every church, that the church treasurer has a book separate from the regular s. b. book, in which he really keeps his account every one after his own idea. This is because neither clerks nor treasurers have ever received any instructions as to how to keep their books. I hope it is not so in other States.

Re-organized s. b. to the amount of about \$250, I believe. Several hundred dollars are back on old pledges. I hope these will soon be paid up. This is a large church and there are some excellent men and women in it. With the right management, it will be a strong church.

May 17 and 18, at Stewartville. Here are now about sixty Sabbath-keepers, but much scattered. Most of them are good, honest Christians. A few are quite doubtful. There was not a word of record as to the organization of this church. The names were there, that was all. We made the best of it, and straightened it out as well as we could. Spent a whole day in examining those present, and appointed persons to visit or write to all who were absent, whether members of the church or not. Six were added to the church, and three, baptized. Some difficulties were settled up, and other matters attended to, as far as possible; s. b. re-organized to amount to about \$250.00. This church has done the best of any visited as yet, in paying up their s. b. Nearly all had paid up.

A very rash and presumptuous act was committed by a few persons here. From a lack on some one's part, the ordinances had not been attended here for five years. This is bad, entirely wrong, for which there was no reasonable excuse. So three members of the church, one who never had belonged, and one who had been disfellowshipped, met together without any elder, deacon, or any other officer, and attended the ordinances. To me, this seemed like the height of presumption, and the most disorderly act one could well commit, showing a wonderful blindness and lack of reverence for the sacred things of God. After much arguing, they saw their error and confessed to the church. In justice it should be said that probably one person, and she was not a member of the church, was mostly responsible for it, the others being led into it. Trust we may never hear of such a thing again.

I feel a good deal discouraged on account of a difficulty in my throat, which gets no better, but rather worse. I don't know what to do. I see no chance to stop, and I fear to keep on preaching. I have to avoid speaking, as far as possible, and only attend to the business matters in the meetings we are having. Hence, brethren must not give out appointments for me to preach.

D. M. CANRIGHT.

Cattaraugus Co., N. Y.

THE quarterly meeting at East Otto, on the third Sabbath and first-day in May, was well attended, and the Spirit of the Lord was present, we believe, to encourage and strengthen his people. There were some present from Portville, Randolph, and Cottage. There is an increasing interest in the work of the Lord.

The T. and M. Society in this district held its quarterly meeting here, and the reports of tract distribution showed an increase over the past quarter. Something was contributed to the delinquent fund.

Quite a number of neighbors attended our meetings, and listened with interest to the word spoken. Since the meeting, I have begun meetings in Ashford, a new field of labor. May I have the prayers of God's people that my labor may not be in vain.

R. F. COTRELL.

Southern Missouri.

WE arrived at Milford, Barton Co., with the tent, May 8. Commenced meetings on the evening of the 9th. Several brethren from Avilla came and assisted in pitching the tent. The work was broken off here last season on account of sickness. A few had decided to obey the truth. We found them all firm, and a general interest among the people to hear more concerning our faith. The interest has spread for miles around.

We have now preached six discourses to an intelligent and increasing congregation. Last evening, the tent was nearly full, although this country is thinly settled. The weather, at first, was a little cool, but is fine now. The Disciples have challenged us for a discussion. We expect to stay here two or three weeks, as the interest may demand.

Bro. Blanchard's health is poor. He had a chill on his way to this place, and one since he came here, followed by fever. He has, through the blessing of God, been able to preach twice, through much bodily infirmity. Pray for us.

H. C. BLANCHARD,
JOS. G. WOOD.

Wisconsin.

APRIL 17, left home and attended meetings at Neenah. Remained there till the 20th. Held six meetings, then came on to Ashwaubenon, where I remained until the 2d of May, working and holding meetings. Then, in company with Bro. Nielson, went to New Denmark. Held meetings there Sabbath and Sunday.

May 7, we commenced meetings again at Ashwaubenon, and continued till the 13th. These meetings were characterized by the blessing of God and the presence of his Spirit. Four were baptized, and two united with the church, which now numbers eighteen. The brethren at New Denmark united with them. Just one year ago, we commenced meetings there, when there were none that kept God's Sabbath. The Lord has owned and blessed his truth, and when on the Sabbath we celebrated the ordinances of the Lord's house, just one year from the first Sabbath meeting held in the place, we could but rejoice for what the Lord has done for us; and we all shared his blessing in a large measure.

Systematic Benevolence was arranged for the coming year, and \$90.00 was voted to the Conference. The church decided to unite with the Conference.

J. C. NIELSON,
O. A. OLSON.

Hixton, Jackson Co., May 18, 1873.

An Encouraging Report.

REVIEW AND HERALD: My wife returned from Health Institute, where she had been under treatment, about the first of last September. She brought some tracts and pamphlets with her, on the Sabbath and other points of faith, which I then thought were contrary to the Bible, so I commenced to read, and compare with God's word, to prove them errors; but instead of being able to do that, they were the instruments, in the hands of God, of fully convincing us of their truthfulness; and the more we studied God's word, the more we became convinced that it was our duty to obey him.

But what could I do? My position as saw-filer in the saw-mill required my presence every day, and I was perplexed to know what to do. On the one hand was duty, staring me in the face; and on the other, the loss of position, and, possibly, home, as it is not yet clear of debt. We were anxious to obey God, and yet were waiting for a "convenient season," which never would have come without a move on our part.

In the meantime, Bro. R. F. Andrews was afflicted with sore eyes, and God, in his providence, sent him to Rock Island, where, hearing of us through a sister in the church (Baptist), he called on us about the first of April and pointed out our duty so plain, and urged us to it so earnestly, that I resolved that let come what would, loss of position, home, or anything, as for me and my house, we would serve God.

I went to my employer on the 10th of April and told him my determination; and when he saw that I meant it all, he had no objections, providing I did my work.

On the 12th of April, we kept the Sabbath of the Lord for the first time, and he blessed us in it; and, by his help, we mean to continue in the good way.

Our pastor, J. S. Maybe, called on my wife last September, shortly after her return, knowing just how she felt at that time on the Sabbath, and he went away requesting her to find some texts for him on that subject and he would come again soon after them. Time passed on, until the 27th of last April, when he preached a sermon on the Christian Sabbath. He had not called on us since the time mentioned above, and not a word had passed between him and myself on the subject.

The following Tuesday, the 29th, he called at our house simply to question me in regard to my belief in order to have us brought up before the church the next night for exclusion. This was the only conversation we had.

The next night, a committee was appointed to call on us. They came down the same week, and asked us a few questions, but not a word of entreaty, to give up these views, escaped their lips. One of the brethren, a deacon, refused even to investigate for the purpose of convincing us that we were wrong, after we had promised to give it up if he could show us where we were going astray from God's word.

Our case was brought up again on the 14th of May, and I went before the meeting and told them that I would sit at the feet of any one of them, and learn of them wherein

I had gone astray; but no one offered to show me, and we were formally excluded from the Baptist church, on what charges I know not. I read in God's word that "unto us is given, in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake."

Bro. Andrews has called on us several times, and we feel strengthened and encouraged by that man of God to hold on to this blessed truth, regardless of the cavils of men.

Yours in the truth,

THEO. F. KENDALL.

Rock Island Co., Ill., May, 1873.

The Statesman Articles.

[Continued from page 187.]

at one time that it was near "nine hundred years from the Saviour's birth before restraint of husbandry on this day [Sunday] had been first thought of in the east," he elsewhere records the fact that in the fifth and sixth centuries general unanimity respecting the exaltation to divine honor was reached. He writes: "The faithful, being united more than ever before, became more uniform in matters of devotion, and in that uniformity did agree together to give the Lord's day all the honors of a holy festival, yet this was not done all at once, but by degrees, the fifth and sixth centuries being fully spent before it came unto that height which has since continued. The emperors and the prelates in these times had the same affections, both earnest to advance this day above all others; and to the edicts of the one, and to the ecclesiastical constitutions of the others, it stands indebted for many of those privileges and exemptions which it still enjoyeth."—*Hist. Sab.*, part 2, chap. 4, sect. 1.

Thus it has been proved by citations from men, who have possessed the resources, as well as the disposition, to make themselves acquainted with the history of the first centuries of the Christian church, first, that the first day of the week was looked upon for a long time as a merely human institution; secondly, that the Edenic Sabbath was for centuries after the crucifixion of Christ quite generally celebrated; thirdly, that prejudice against it seems to have been strongest and to have originated earliest at Rome, where, in order to bring it into odium, it was made a day of fasting, while the Sunday was treated as a festival; fourthly, that after a struggle, which extended through hundreds of years, the ancient Sabbath was finally quite generally repudiated, and the Sunday, through the united efforts of prelates, councils, and emperors, was enthroned and enforced upon all.

Into the details of this long and varying conflict in which victory seems first to have favored the one side and then the other, we are restricted by the limits of our communication from entering. The intelligent reader can readily fill in the outlines which have been given, and will not be slow to perceive that the contest, from the very nature of things, must have been one of intense interest and heated debate. If he would satisfy himself most fully that the gentleman is mistaken in saying that it has left no traces, we refer him for a more full discussion to the authorities quoted.

Changing now the point of view, we will come to the present time. We return once more to the charge that the church of Rome, availing itself of the condition of things which preceded its rise, has consummated the terrible work which was begun with the great apostasy, long before the papacy proper was fully developed. In prosecuting the labor thus entered upon, the reader is invited to pause a moment and decide upon certain principles which ought to govern in the decision of the question. He will remember that if he has been educated in the observance of Sunday, he will be in danger of requiring more testimony than could reasonably be demanded, since his education, and personal interest, and standing, would all incline him to a conservatism which needs to be guarded with a jealous care, lest it should result in a bias which would terminate in the rejection of sufficient light. All that we ask him to do is to treat this subject the same as he would any other matter of fact. To illustrate: If the body of a murdered man were discovered upon the street, and if there should be found in the community one whose character was bad in every respect, concerning whom those who knew him best had given warning; if on the garments of this suspicious personage blood stains were found; if, in the meantime, a careful examination of the wounds

should show that they had been inflicted by a weapon peculiar to the notorious individual; and if, in addition to the foregoing, he should step forward and frankly confess that he had done the deed, no court in the world would hesitate to inflict the penalty of the law, because of any doubt regarding the guilt of the offending party. Now applying the same principles to the case in hand, if every one can be shown to hold good in every particular, then consistency demands that they should produce a conviction equally clear and strong with that in the mind of the court, in determining in the case of the homicide upon the infliction of punishment.

But is it true that the charge against the Roman Catholic church can be made out as conclusively as that against the individual mentioned above? Let us see. The first point there brought forward was the unquestionable fact that the man had been murdered. This was the starting point of the whole affair. That which answers to it in the case before us is the fact that the change of the Sabbath has been made out beyond reasonable doubt; for God commanded the observance of the seventh day, while, somehow, Christendom is generally observing the first, though utterly incapable of furnishing Scripture warrant for the change.

The second point was that respecting the bad reputation of a certain character in the community—its parallel in the persons of the popes, is found in the fact that, as we have seen, their rise and history was symbolized centuries before their appearance under the type of the "little horn" of the seventh of Daniel, by one who never errs in his analysis of character, and who declared of the "man of sin" that he should "think to change times and laws," and that they should be given into his hands for a "time and times and the dividing of time," thus proving that this blasphemous power who was to open his mouth in blasphemy against God is capable of attempting the transfer of God's holy Sabbath to a day different from that pointed out in the commandment.

The third point, which related to blood stains upon the garments of the suspected person finds its counterpart in the teachings of Romanism most clearly. We learn, in the writings of Moses, that the blood is the life of the individual. This, however, is not more true than it is that the fourth commandment is the life of the Sabbatic institution. If you mar that commandment, you mar the Sabbath in the same ratio. If you destroy that commandment, you destroy the Sabbath. But the assumed ability to alter this precept as well as others of the decalogue is one of the very crimes of which Rome has been guilty, by which she has blotched all over in the most loathsome manner the garments of a once spotless Christianity, and a profoundly reverent faith. That this is so will become manifest when we present a copy of the decalogue as it has been mutilated by the Romish church in the exercise of a pretended divine right to accomplish such a work. For this purpose we append the ten commandments as they stand in Butler's catechism.¹ "1. I am the Lord thy God. Thou shalt not have strange gods before me, &c. 2. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain. 3. Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day. 4. Honor thy father and thy mother. 5. Thou shalt not kill. 6. Thou shalt not commit adultery. 7. Thou shalt not steal. 8. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor. 9. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife. 10. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods."

Here it will be seen that the second commandment is dropped out altogether, and that the tenth is divided; a portion of it retaining its ancient number, and the remaining portion of it being numbered as the ninth commandment, thereby making the complement of the original ten which would have been reduced to nine by ignoring the one against image worship. It will also be perceived that with the exception of the words, "Remember that thou keep the Sabbath day," the fourth commandment is left out entirely. True, it may be that in the Douay Bible the original commandments are allowed to remain intact, but we shall see hereafter that the above arrangement is not accidental, and that the power to make these changes is unhesitatingly claimed.

The fourth point was that concerning the form and nature of the wound, whereby it

was discovered that it was made by a weapon precisely such as one possessed by the suspected party. The correspondence in this particular will be found in the boundary of the new Sabbath; in its beginning and ending, occurring as they do at twelve o'clock, midnight, are the unmistakable marks of the hand of one who most assuredly did not live at Jerusalem, and who left upon the creature of his own power the badge of its origin at Rome. The Jews, as we have seen heretofore, by the agreement of commentators and scholars generally, as well as by the testimony of the Bible, commenced and ended their days with the setting of the sun. At Rome, on the other hand, as well as in other parts of the world, the day began as we now begin the Sunday—at midnight. In this, it is made apparent that some one has been tampering with a day which it is claimed was hallowed by Christ eighteen hundred years ago; since, if it had originated at that time and in that place, it would have conformed in its beginning and ending to the weekly Sabbath, the day of Pentecost, and the other days in the Jewish calendar. The presumption concerning whom this person is, is already made out. The certainty respecting it will be established under the next heading.

The fifth point cited above was the confession of the culprit. Under ordinary circumstances, this alone would have made a conviction inevitable. Answering to it in the fullest degree are the oft-repeated declarations of Romanists, that they have changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, and that they had the ability and the right thus to do. Respecting these assumptions, we might introduce quotations almost without number, but we must content ourselves with a few brief but pointed ones.¹ "What are the days which the church commands to be kept holy?" "Ans. 1. The Sundays, or our Lord's day, which we observe by apostolical tradition instead of the Sabbath. 2. The feasts of our Lord's nativity, or Christmas day; his circumcision, or New Year's day; the Epiphany, or twelfth day; Easter day, or the day of our Lord's resurrection, with the Monday following, &c. * * *"

"Ques. What was the reason why the weekly Sabbath was changed from Sabbath to Sunday?"

"Ans. Because our Lord fully accomplished the work of our redemption by rising from the dead on Sunday and by sending down the Holy Ghost on Sunday; as therefore the work of our redemption was a greater work than that of our creation, the primitive church thought the day in which this work was completely finished was more worthy her religious observation than that in which God rested from creation, and should be properly called the Lord's day."

"Ques. But has the church power to make any alterations in the commandments of God?"

"Ans. The commandments of God, as far as they contain his eternal law are unalterable and indispensable, but as to whatever was only ceremonial they cease to oblige, since the Mosaic law was abrogated by Christ's death; hence, as far as the commandment obliges us to set aside some part of our time for the worship and service of our Creator, it is unalterable and unchangeable precept of the eternal law in which the church cannot dispense. But, forasmuch as it prescribes the seventh day in particular for this purpose, it is no more than a ceremonial precept of the old law which obligeth not Christians, and therefore instead of the seventh day and other festivals appointed by the old law, the church has prescribed the Sundays and holidays to be set apart for God's worship, and these we are now obliged to keep in consequence of God's commandment, instead of the ancient Sabbath."

"Ques. What warrant have you for keeping the Sunday preferable to the ancient Sabbath?"

"Ans. We have for it the authority of the Catholic church and apostolic tradition."

"Ques. Does the Scripture anywhere command the Sunday to be kept for the Sabbath?"

"Ans. The Scripture commands us to hear the church (Matt. 18:17, Luke 10:16), and to hold fast the traditions of the apostles. 2 Thess. 2:15. But the Scriptures do not in particular mention this change of the Sabbath. John speaks of the Lord's day (Rev. 1:10); but he does not tell us what day of the week this was, much less

does he tell us that this day was to take the place of the Sabbath ordained in the commandment; * * * * so that truly the best authority we have for this, is the testimony and ordinance of the church. And, therefore, those who pretend to be so religious of the Sunday, whilst they take no notice of the festivals ordained by the same church authority, show that they act by humor, and not by reason and religion, since Sundays and holy days all stand upon the same foundation, viz., the ordinance of the church."—*Cath. Christian Instructed*, pp. 209-211.

"Ques. Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept?"

"Ans. Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her—she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday, the seventh day, a change for which there is no scriptural authority."—*Doctrinal Catechism*.

"Ques. If keeping the Sunday be a church precept, why is it numbered in the decalogue, which are the commandments of God and the law of nature?"

"Ans. Because the substance, or chief part of it, namely, that the day be set apart for the service of God, is of divine right and of the law of nature; though the determining this particular day, Sunday, rather than Saturday, be a church ordinance and precept."—*Abridgment of Chris. Doz.*, pp. 57, 59.

Thus much for the connection of the papacy with the change of the Sabbath. The reader, repudiating the claim for apostolical tradition, which is of no value with Protestants, and rejecting as fallacious the assumed antiquity of the Roman Catholic church, will discover that there still remains the bold assumption of the ability on the part of that church to change the Sabbath, and also of the historic fact that it has done so. Mr. Gilfillan, while, of course, from his standpoint rejecting the notion that the pope has either in reality changed, or even possessed the ability to change, the divinely appointed day of rest, frankly acknowledges that he arrogates to himself the power so to do in the following language: "Rome, professing to retain, has yet corrupted every doctrine, institution, and law of Jesus Christ, recognizing, for example, the mediator between God and man, but associating with him many other intercessors; avowing adherence to the Scripture, but to the Scripture as supplemented and made void by the writings and traditions of men; and, in short, without discarding the Lord's day, adding a number of encumbering holidays, giving them in many instances an honor equal and even superior to God's own day, and claiming for the 'Vicar of Christ' lordship even of the Sabbath."—*The Sabbath*, p. 457.

Into the details respecting the fasts; the decrees of councils; the bulls of popes; the myths concerning the calamities which have befallen those laboring on the Sunday; the forgery of an epistle in its interests, which it was claimed fell from Heaven; and the astounding miracles with which the hierarchy has accomplished the prodigious task of making the transfer, we are not permitted to enter here, nor will it be required that we should do so. Any person acquainted with the arts usually employed at Rome will readily perceive the method which she has called to her assistance. All that a reasonable man could possibly ask is found in the transition from one day to another, in the fact that the law of God was to be tampered with by a persecuting power which was to continue its oppressions of the saints of God for twelve hundred and sixty years, and in the further consideration that no persecuting power except that of Rome has ever continued for that length of time.

Concerning the decree of Constantine, the only place which we assign to it in the controversy between the friends of the Lord's Sabbath and its rival, is that which it holds because of its having made the transition easy. The first day of the week being the one generally observed by the heathen and by this decree enforced by statute, had in its favor the practice and sympathy of the masses of men. This law, though passed by a heathen, and in the interest of the heathen religion, was, as would naturally have been the case, of great service to those who subsequently favored the change of day, since it gave to their effort not only the color, but also the material advantage of legality; by it, men, under certain circumstances, were compelled to celebrate the

day of the sun even though they had previously regarded that of the Lord. This, of course, was burdensome, and worked greatly to the advantage of the heathen festival.

One of two views must be taken of the statute of Constantine: If it were Christian, then it proves that Sunday observance at the time of its passage was exceedingly lax, since by its terms only men in the cities and towns were prohibited from laboring upon it while those in the country were by it allowed and encouraged to carry on the vocations of the farm. If, on the other hand, it were heathen in its origin, then the suggestion that it recognizes the venerableness of the day of the sun, even at so early a period as that of its promulgation, is entirely without force, since it thereby becomes manifest that it received this dignifying appellation, not because it had long been venerated by the disciples of our Lord, but because from time immemorial it had been honored by the heathen.—A doubtful compliment to the Christian Sabbath.

W. H. LITTLEJOHN.

Tract and Missionary Department.

Report of T. & M. Society, Dist. No. 4, Ill.

THE Tract and Missionary Society of Dist. No. 4, of the Illinois Conference, met, according to appointment, at the Marsh school-house. Prayer by Bro. S. N. Haskell.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and accepted. The reports showed, subscribers obtained for REVIEW, 11; *Instructor*, 2. Quite a distribution of reading matter had been made, but as the system of filling blank reports had not been fully understood, and therefore not adopted, nothing definite could be reported concerning it. At the close of this business meeting, remarks were made by Eld. S. N. Haskell on the nature and working of the tract and missionary society in other Conferences, whereupon it was considered important that certain steps be taken to bring about a system that had been successful in other Conferences. Eld. R. F. Andrews, J. R. Whitham, and G. W. Colcord, were appointed a committee to suggest recommendations to be adopted by the T. and M. Society of this State.

Adjourned to the call of the Chair.

SECOND SESSION.

Met at 1 p. m. Prayer by Bro. Whitham. The committee reported as follows:—

1. Recommend the holding of State quarterly meetings for the tract and missionary society of this Conference.

2. Recommend the holding of a district quarterly meeting at least two weeks previous to the general quarterly meeting; and that the secretary of each district forward to the State Secretary a report of said district quarterly meeting, in season for a report at the general quarterly meeting.

3. We recommend the choosing of a person to act as secretary in the absence of our present secretary.

4. We recommend the raising of the sum of \$500.00 as a T. and M. Fund, and to settle the delinquency on the periodicals which have been discontinued.

5. We recommend that all at this meeting be invited to donate by pledges, to be paid on or before Jan. 1, 1874.

Pledges were then called for. The brethren and sisters freely responded by pledging, including what was already paid, \$377.65.

Mary E. Douglass was appointed to act as secretary in the absence of the present secretary.

Meeting adjourned.

W. O. DUNGAN, *Director*,

MARY E. MILLER, *Dis. Sec.*

Aledo, Ill., May 14, 1873.

Report of T. and M. Society, Dist. No. 2, Wis.

THE third meeting for this district was held at Monroe, April 19, 20. After the opening exercises, the following report of work done the last quarter was read by the secretary:

Money received for membership, \$7.00

" " on delinquent fund, 2.00

No. new subscribers for REVIEW, 15; *Instructor*, 3; *Reformer*, 4.

No. REVIEWS, *Instructors*, and *Reformers* distributed, 80.

Tracts and pamphlets loaned, 9557 pages

" " " given away, 7349 "

Total, 16,906

No. of families visited, 53; No. of letters written, 22. H. W. DECKER, *Director*.

HAPPINESS is not the end of life. Character is. This world is not a platform where you will hear Thalberg pianos playing. It is a piano manufactory, where are dust and shavings and boards and saws and files and rasps and sandpapers. The perfect instrument and the music will be hereafter.

¹The commandments as given above are supposed to be repeated by the individual Romanist in response to the injunction, "Say the ten commandments of God."

¹The following citations will be found in a small tract published at the "REVIEW and HERALD" Office, entitled, "Who Changed the Sabbath?"

The Review and Herald.

Battle Creek, Mich., Third-day, May 27, 1873.

The next School Term.

For certain reasons, it is thought best to have a long vacation between the present term of the school and the next one. Probably the next term will commence not far from the first of September. Due notice will doubtless be given in season for all to prepare for it. We make this statement, so that all interested may understand the matter, and act accordingly. GEN. CONF. COM.

The Way of Life from Paradise Lost to Paradise Restored.

THE above is the title of an allegorical picture designed to illustrate the fall of man into sin, and his redemption therefrom. It presents to the eye, at a single glance, the object of the forms and ceremonies of the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian systems of religion, and illustrates the fact that the law of God and the gospel of Christ run parallel from the fall of man to the end of probation. It also shows the contrast between the ritual law of the Jews, and the moral law as expressed in the ten commandments, illustrating the manner in which the former ended at the death of Christ; while the latter remains as eternal and unchangeable as the throne of Heaven, being the basis of God's government over all intelligent beings.

The crucified Christ is made the central figure in the picture. At the left of this figure is a striking representation of the Jewish and Patriarchal ages, and the sacrificial offerings which shadowed forth the coming Saviour. These are represented by altars of burnt-offering, standing in the shadow of the cross, which extend to the margin of the picture.

At the extreme left of the picture is seen a representation of the garden of Eden, and the expulsion of Adam and Eve therefrom; also the angel that kept the way of the tree of life.

The shadow of the cross extends to the garden of Eden, and Adam and Eve are represented as walking in the shadow, toward Christ. This illustrates the fact that they had faith in the promise of a coming Saviour. Abel's offering is shown, also his death at the hand of Cain. He lies dead in the shadow of the cross, showing that he died in the faith.

Near the center of the picture is a graphic illustration of the saying of Christ in Matt. 22: 36-40. The all-seeing eye of God is represented as looking through his law to behold the children of men and compare their actions with the requirements of his law, and thus detect every sin.

At the right of the cross, is seen a representation of the Lord's supper and of baptism, ordinances to be observed in this age in remembrance of Christ, and to point the believer back to his death, just as the sacrificial offerings of past ages pointed the penitent sinner forward to the death of Christ.

The picture contains a representation of the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven; and represents the New Jerusalem coming down from God out of Heaven. It also gives a representation of the peace and harmony that is to exist in the animal creation after the earth shall have been made new, and the Paradise of God shall have been restored to it. There the wolf and the lamb shall feed together; there the lion shall eat straw like the bullock. There the leopard shall lie down with the kid, the calf, and the young lion, and the fating together, and a little child shall lead them. Appropriate figures are introduced, illustrating every point of our faith.

Several weeks of careful thought and labor were spent in designing and arranging this picture, so that while it should serve as an ornament, it might also serve to call attention to the great subjects which it illustrates, and assist the student of the Bible in obtaining a correct understanding of those subjects.

The work was executed in Philadelphia, in the best style of lithography. It is printed in two tints; on plate paper, suitable for framing; also on map paper, mounted on cloth and rollers, and varnished. The cost of drawing this beautiful and interesting picture on stone, preparatory to printing, was two hundred dollars. It is 19x24 inches in size. It is for sale at this Office. Price, post paid, by mail, on plate paper, \$1.00; on rollers, backed and varnished, \$2.00. Address REVIEW and HERALD.

M. G. KELLOGG.

Testimonials.

I HAVE examined with much pleasure the allegorical picture by Dr. Kellogg, entitled, "The Way of Life." A more comprehensive design I think I have never seen, nor one that deals with a more important subject; namely, the great features of the plan of salvation from Paradise lost to Paradise regained. Some engravings are valuable simply for their excellence as works of art; this has the advantage of being an important subject for study. The relation, not only of Christ but of the law, to each dispensation, is clearly shown, and the problem, so difficult to many minds, how the law and the gospel can exist together, is solved at a glance. Wherever this picture is exhibited, we believe it will be the means of helping to disseminate much needed information on this important point. U. SMITH.

I HAVE examined the allegorical picture designed by M. G. Kellogg, M. D., and lithographed in Philadelphia. It presents to the eye at a single glance a vast field of Bible truth. It sets forth the work of

redemption from its earliest development to its final triumph in the establishment of the everlasting kingdom of God under the whole heaven. It will interest the thoughtful Bible student, though these things were in the main already clear to his mental vision. It will, moreover, interest those who have never given these things any serious or continued thought. And here, perhaps, is the chief practical utility of this work. Careless persons who cannot be reached by the written word, nor by the living preacher, will, as it seems to me, certainly give attention to this admirable lesson of "The Way of Life." Even without the key, the picture tells its story with such distinctness that few persons could fail to take in the most essential of the truths which it illustrates. Certainly, it is lawful to set forth divine truth in any manner by which it can be brought to bear in its purity upon the hearts of men. Dr. Kellogg has, in this picture, given us a very instructive design. It is not merely a history of redemption, it is more than this; it is the way of life for each individual sinner, and few can fail to understand the lesson. In a few things of minor importance it seems to me that the picture could have been improved; but as a whole, I highly commend the work as happy in its conception and its execution, and with the carefully prepared key which accompanies it, furnishing to the studious mind a great body of divinity. J. N. ANDREWS.

I HAVE examined the picture designed by Dr. M. G. Kellogg, which is for sale at the REVIEW & HERALD Office, Battle Creek, Mich. This is no ordinary picture, intended merely as an ornament, but one which contains a great lesson of instruction. A glance at it brings before the mind the whole plan of salvation, from Paradise lost to Paradise restored.

A cherub, with flaming sword, is seen driving Adam and Eve from the beautiful garden. Cain is seen fleeing from the body of his murdered brother. The typical system of sacrifices, pointing forward to the cross, and the victim hanging upon it, under the old dispensation, shadows forth the same great offering for sin that the memorials of baptism and the Lord's supper point back to in the new, while the ten commandments, containing the principles of God's perfect and immutable law, his standard of righteousness for all dispensations and all time, stand in connection with the cross of Christ, the one showing the law which man has transgressed; the other, the only appointed remedy for such transgression.

From the cross, the "Way of Life" leads onward to Eden restored, and the glorious city of God. Thus, at a glance, as it were, a person takes in the plan of salvation, and all that is taught in volumes of theology. This picture most clearly shows the relation of both dispensations to Christ, the central figure.

We expect it will meet a very large sale, and will really be a means of instruction and profit to those who behold it. We can, therefore, consistently advise all, who can reasonably afford it, to purchase it. GEO. I. BUTLER.

I HAVE carefully examined "The Way of Life," as illustrated by M. G. Kellogg, M. D., and I think it the most interesting and instructive picture I ever saw. The expulsion of our first parents from the garden of Eden, the utility of the religious services, embracing the sacrificial lamb in the former dispensation, and the ordinances of the Lord's house in this, presenting Christ as the only source of hope and light, and the center of all religious faith, are so represented that the mind can take it in at a glance. Those essential truths that relate to man's salvation from Paradise lost to Paradise restored, are here vividly brought before the mind. The neatness with which it is executed, and the practical truths it teaches, should commend it to every believer in the Christian religion, and no such family should wish to be without one. I can heartily recommend it to all, believing it will give more correct and distinct views of the Christian religion than are generally entertained by the mass of the people. S. N. HASKELL.

S. Lancaster, Mass.

HAVING examined the picture designed by M. G. Kellogg, with the key of explanation, I would say that it cannot fail to interest every lover of the Bible. It presents Christ as the great central light of the world, and shows, in the clearest manner, that the people of every age and dispensation can only find salvation through Him, while at the same time, they are amenable to the moral law of God. The picture is well worthy of a place in every Christian family.

Truly Yours,
ELD. I. D. VAN HORN.

BRO. M. G. KELLOGG: The picture, "The Way of Life," is just received, and examined with much delight. All pronounce it beautiful, and withal very instructive and impressive. I have never seen anything so appropriate to adorn the parlors of Seventh-day Adventists. Hope it may have a wide circulation.

Yours in hope,
D. M. CANRIGHT.

Note from Bro. Canright.

My health is such that I shall have to withdraw all my appointments. Am very sorry, but it is the best I can do. Had made great calculations on visiting every church in the State and getting things into good order, but shall have to abandon it. If I am able to labor after the camp-meeting, I must go with the tent. Hope the brethren will remember me in their prayers. My address till after camp-meeting will be Medford, Steele Co., Minn.

D. M. CANRIGHT.

To the Churches of Wisconsin.

As the time of our State Conference is drawing near, I would impress the churches with the importance of attending to the duties connected with the early assembling of our yearly Conference. I would remind the churches that it is about time for their financial reports and pledges to be made out. If it is possible, do not wait until the time of camp-meeting before making out your reports. There are so many things for the officers of the Conference to do at this time, that, with this additional burden, they have but little time to enjoy the meetings. Please, then, forward your reports without delay.

There are quite a number of the churches that are

in arrears on s. b. Brethren, let us pay our vows to the Lord. Let us make an earnest effort to redeem our pledge. If it be in our power, let not this Conference year close with us in debt to the Lord.

If any of the churches are not supplied with blanks with which to make out their reports, send to me immediately. Remember that the financial report and pledge is made upon a different blank from the quarterly report.

Monroe, Green Co., Wis.

Special Notice.

We hope all who come to the camp-meeting will come in time to have their tents pitched Wednesday, without fail, and come to stay till the meeting is closed. Bring your interested friends with you. Let all bring empty ticks with plenty of bedding. Let none stay away because they have no tents, but come along and you will be provided for. Provisions, and feed for teams, can be had on the ground at reasonable rates.

I. SANBORN, } Wis.
P. S. THURSTON, } Conf.
H. W. DECKER, } Com.

Note from Bro. Sanborn.

I SEE that some of the churches are owing the Conference over two hundred dollars s. b. Now I ask how we can expect the Lord to pour out his blessing upon us, if we come up to the camp-meeting in debt to the Lord. I hope every church in the Conference will pay up all their s. b. pledges for this year, and send it to the treasurer, William Kerr, Monroe, Green Co., Wis., in Post-Office orders or drafts, or send it to Conference by their delegates.

Remember and send your quarterly reports to E. R. Gillett, Monroe, Green Co., Wis. The last quarter ends with the first of July next.

I. SANBORN, Pres. of Conference.

Notice.

THE meeting at Jo Davis, Fairbault Co., Minn., May 31 and June 1, will be held at the school-house near Bro. Shram's.

S. N. HASKELL.

Appointments.

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

* Services in Chicago, every Sabbath (seventh day), at 269 West Erie St. All Sabbath-keepers spending a Sabbath in Chicago, are invited to attend.

Western Camp-Meetings.

Washington, Iowa, June 5-9, 1873.
Milton Junction, Wis., " 19-23, "
Medford, Minn., " 26-30, "

Iowa and Neb. State Conference.

THE Iowa and Neb. Conference will hold its next annual session in connection with the Iowa Camp-meeting to be held at Washington, Iowa, June 5-9, 1873. We hope all the churches will immediately take the steps necessary to represent themselves fully at this meeting. Churches wishing admission should present their request and send their delegates. Let all the reports required by the constitution of the Conference be prepared by ministers, licentiates, and delegates. And especially let every church in the Conference be prepared with its pledges for the coming year, by at once re-arranging their s. b. Let all the churches represent themselves by delegates if possible; if not, by letter.

H. NICOLA, } Iowa & Neb.
J. T. MITCHEL, } Conference
Committee.

PROVIDENCE permitting, I will preach at Mount Hope, June 7 and 8. Meetings will begin Friday evening at 7 P. M., and on the Sabbath at 9 A. M., half-past ten A. M., and at 3 P. M.; the same on first-day. I hope to meet many from Waterloo at this meeting.

Will some one from Mount Hope meet me at Woodman, Thursday evening, June 5, at the arrival of the train from Madison? ELD. I. SANBORN.

QUARTERLY meeting of the following churches: Allegany Co., N. Y., Farmington, Tioga Co., Pa., and Ulysses, Potter Co., Pa., will be held on Sartwell Creek, Roulette township, Potter Co., Pa., June 14 and 15, commencing at 9 o'clock A. M.

As the brethren and sisters are few and scattered in the above-named places, it is thought best for their benefit and encouragement, and to get the T. and M. Society into working order, to have meetings in the several churches to call all together as often as once a month. As much depends on our first effort, it is hoped that all will come fully prepared to work for the Lord, and to make this meeting a success. Come one, come all; let all the churches be fully represented at this meeting.

By request, J. G. SAUNDERS.

QUARTERLY meeting at Bowersville, Green Co., Ohio, Sabbath and Sunday, June 14 and 15. Tract and Missionary Society will hold a business session at this meeting. All are invited to attend, or report.

WM. COTTRELL.

QUARTERLY meeting for Allegany County, at Monterey, June 7. Bro. Hutchins is requested to be with us in the meetings.

J. S. DAY, Clerk.

I WILL meet with the church of Dell Prairie, Sabbath, May 31, at 11 o'clock A. M., and in the evening; Plainfield, Friday eve, June 6, and over the Sabbath and first-day; Wautoma, Sunday eve, June 15. Shall remain in Plainfield and Wautoma till Conference. We hope the friends will be ready for organization. Let us have a general attendance at these meetings.

D. DOWNER.

QUARTERLY meeting for the Princeville church, will be held at Eugene, Ill., June 7 and 8. We hope as many from other churches as can will meet with us. Come to this meeting, friends, with the fear of the Lord before you, and with gratitude and delight let us worship our God.

B. F. MERRITT.

QUARTERLY meeting of the Liberty Pole church, will be held on the first Sabbath and first-day of June

next. We earnestly solicit the attendance of the Victory and Kickapoo churches; we also extend an invitation to all. H. VAN VLACK, Clerk.

QUARTERLY meeting of the Tract and Missionary Society of Dist. No. 11, at Poy Sippi, May 31 and June 1. We invite all the friends in this district to attend this meeting. Have your reports ready. The directors of the Wisconsin T. and M. Society are requested to send a report of all that has been done in their respective districts the present year, to N. M. Jordan, Sec., Lodi, Wis., two weeks before camp-meeting.

Prayer and social meeting Friday evening.
P. S. THURSTON, Pres. T. & M. Society, Wis.

THERE will be a gathering of the friends of present truth at Pleasant Valley, Pa., the second Sabbath in June, the 14th and 15th. Hope there will be a general attendance. D. OVIATT, Clerk.

BUNKERHILL, Mich., May 31, 1873.
Locke, June 7, "
Genoa, " 14, "
C. STODDARD.

CONVIS, Sabbath, May 31. A. S. HUTCHINS.

Business Department.

Not slothful in Business. Rom. 12: 11.

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 Factors. If money to the paper is not in due time acknowledged, immediate notice of the omission should then be given.

\$2.00 EACH. S A Craig 44-1, Charles P Whitford 43-24, B B Perkins 43-1, A M Card 44-1, John Wickman 43-20, G Kellogg 43-1, William Swartout 43-22, Charles Davis 44-1, H Howe 43-22, Wm C Gage 43-22, James Vile 44-1, J T Freeman 44-1, Mrs L Skinner 43-24, Mrs H S Jones 43-24, Vinnie C Walker 43-24, H H Pierce 43-24, Phebe Cash 44-1, P B Campbell 44-1, J Philo 44-1, Francis C Ross 44-1, Mrs C E Millard 44-1, Peter Fox 43-23, C J Woods 41-13, Fredrick Wilson 44-1, Robert Ladlee 43-24, A F Brown 43-24, Normal Reading Room 43-24, Mrs H Brown 43-24, Henry McGowan 43-24.

\$1.00 EACH. David Downer 42-23, R E Cossentine 43-24, S A Kelsea 43-1, M B Miller 43-1, Emma S Smith 42-22, Margaret Hyde 42-20, Charles Crane 43-1, F A Buzzell 44-1, M A Brigham 43-1, Lewis Martin 43-1, Joseph Eaton 43-9, R S Tilton 42-14, E W Darling 42-18, Thomas McKee 43-1, James Low 42-23, B F Merritt 42-24, Mrs L Robinson 43-3, Daniel Smith 42-21, A Hopkins 43-1, Wm Morton 42-24, G E Rust 42-24, A A Hough 43-24, E O Hammond 42-23, Mrs Adaline Humphrey 43-1.

MISCELLANEOUS. Mrs H M Casler \$2.75, G L Davis 5.00 44-14, Eld G I Butler 64c 43-1, Mrs C M Beebe 1.68 42-5, W H Littlejohn 4.00 44-1, G N Aldrich 1.50 44-1, John Noyes 8.85 50-9, S W Duke 1.50 40-1, G P Bailey 1.50 43-12, F R Richmond 50c 42-14, Emily Phinney 1.50 44-1, C D Ramsey 1.87 44-14, W C Taylor 5.00 44-14, Henry Branch 1.50, 43-14, Maria Snow 1.50 43-23, N J Moore 50c 37-14, Walter S Ernst 1.50 42-14, J G Walker 4.35 46-1, R A Gordon 1.50 43-24, Stephen Chance 3.00 44-24, M Honeywell 1.50 43-24.

75 Cents Each, Paying to Vol. 42, 22. Ira Spencer, William Lewis, Mary E Church, William S Bates, Almira Miller, Caroline Molly, Harriet Pratt.

50 Cents Each, Paying to Vol. 42, 22. J B Patton, Rebecca Hutchins, Eli Y Williamson, D B Walden, M Brown, F W Clough, Robert Anderson.

Books Sent by Mail.

Katie Shedd 35c, Andrew Schrock 10c, L A Marsh \$1.00, Judith Kelly 25c, Mary C Knapp 50c, Emma A Smith 50c, S A Cardell 50c, John Reed 2.00, Mrs Leonard 20c, Joseph G Cartwright 25c, Mrs M C Paul 1.00, A Rasmussen 1.60, Mrs C Briggs 25c, F Depas 2.50, Mary Dadds 45c, Mary A Eaton 15c, Eliza Margerson 30c, E V Reisman 25c, F C Ross 30c, A D Tyson 50c, John Noyes 2.15, Wm Hilton 30c, J B Ross 25c, Rev E Bates 10c, Thomas McKee 40c, Mrs Anna Strand 4.25, J P Siple 10c, Wm Lewis 30c, David Mannel 20c, Amanda L Silvers 50c, L Hackett 25c, D T Bourdeau 3.00, W H Rampton 25c, G F Evans 1.50, George H Jenks 15c, Wm Fox 25c, E O Fish 1.00, A D Galutia 50c, Hattie Parsons 50c, E Lake 1.00, Sarah Nettleingham 1.00, Agnes Perry 1.00, J J Townsend 1.00, Mrs J F Coville 50c, H A St John 1.25, Henry Revell 35c, John C Revell 40c, Nathan Davis 20c, J M Ballard 50c, S W Pack 8.00.

Books Sent by Freight.

A. C. Bourdeau, Enosburgh Falls, Vt., \$98.45, A. C. Bourdeau, Barton Landing, Vt., 60 85, H. Nicola, Washington, Iowa, 152.68, D. M. Canright, Medford, Minn., 63.26.

Books Sent by Express.

S. N. Haskell, Stewartsville, Minn., \$28.40, J. H. Morrison, Afton, Iowa, 9.08, James M. Baker, Allegan, Mich., 11.00.

Cash Received on Account.

M D Clark 75c, R M Kilgore \$18.50, Thomas Mc Kee 6.57, J N Loughborough 46 00, per M G Kellogg, D M Canright 20.00, G W Colcord 4.75.

General Conference Fund.

Susan Elmer s. b. \$1.00, L C Hutchins s. b. 1 00.

Michigan Conference Fund.

Rec'd from the church in Monterey \$45.00, Genoa 15.00, Allegan 50.00, Holly 17.87.

Donations for Advent Tidende.

D C Webster \$3.00, E H Root 5.00.

Review to the Poor.

Nancy Knight (thank-offering) \$5.00, A friend 1.00, A friend 1.00.

HYGIENIC BOOK FUND.

C Casler \$1.00, H L D Potter 10 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.