

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 42.

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

NUMBER 7.

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.

"THE LORD SHUT HIM IN."

The deluged earth, with billows vast
His swelling o'er the peopled plain,
Engulfing hills, the mountain's crest,
In one unbroken, boundless main—
No refuge gave to man accursed,
To nations steeped in hoary sin;—
But Noah's faith prepared him erst
An ark;—the Lord then shut him in.

What though the deluge come, and flood
On flood descend?—the raging deep
Vast fountains pour in angry mood,
All life and breath from earth to sweep,
And in a watery grave entomb
The world grown old and dead in sin?—
The man of God the fearful doom
Escapes;—the Lord has shut him in.

Thus ever finds the Christian soul,
When rising storms burst forth amain,
And seas triumphing darkly roll
O'er earth's proud sons; and visions vain
Become one waste of ruin wide,
And terrors grapple hearts of sin;—
That soul e'en then doth safe abide
In Christ;—the Lord doth shut him in.

This refuge, Lord, be ever mine;
This ark of Christ wherein I come.
Mid breaking seas it floats sublime;—
It shelters from impending doom.
The rest, the peace, profoundest joy
Herein I find, no blasts of sin,
No tempests wild can e'er destroy;—
For thou, O Lord, hast shut me in.

—Sel.

Was Judas Present at the Institution of the Lord's Supper.

In a recent REVIEW, in remarks upon the subject of the communion, I expressed the opinion that Judas was not present when Christ instituted the supper, and gave some reasons for thinking so. Several have expressed themselves dissatisfied with my view of the matter, thinking the Scriptures teach differently. In that article, I brought in this point concerning Judas, incidentally, as an objection which is sometimes urged against close communion, and noticed it as such, and, of course, did not say all I might have said concerning the question of Judas' presence at the institution of the supper. The point we are examining is one of some little interest, and, possibly, the readers of the REVIEW may not be disposed to complain if it is further noticed.

I will introduce, then, the following candidly written objections from Bro. Orcutt, because they set the opposite view, and the reasons for it, before our minds as well as anything, perhaps, which I could introduce:

"I have read with interest Bro. Butler's remarks upon this question in REVIEW of May 27, 1873, and, being unable to accept his conclusions, would respectfully ask a little space in our paper to state my difficulties with the result of his reasoning. I do this in order that if I am wrong, Bro. Butler, or some one else, may give the light that shall dispel those difficulties and enable me to see the right. In so doing, I claim only to speak my own individual sentiments."

"Bro. B. states that the institution of the memorial of the Lord's death 'occurred some time after he [Judas] received the portion from the hand of Christ,' after receiving which he went out immediately, 'so Judas had no part in the divine memorial.' Were this statement substantiated by testimony from the word, it would forever settle the question. But no proof is adduced. This is to be regretted, because upon this point—the relative time when the memorial was instituted and the passover partaken of—the whole matter turns.

"Our testimony upon this question must all be drawn from the four evangelists. Bro. B. says, 'We know that a casual reading of the evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, would seem to show that he was present and partook.' We ask of the reader a careful examination of their united testimony, before giving a final decision upon the question.

"That Christ sat down, or reclined, to partake of the passover with the twelve apostles, is proved by Matt. 26: 20; Luke 22: 14: 'Now when the even was come, he sat down with the twelve.' 'And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him.'

"During the meal, the divine memorial was instituted; 'And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed,' &c. Matt. 26: 26. With this agree the Emphatic Diaglott, Campbell, and Bible Union. The New Testament first published at Rheims, A. D. 1582, renders it: 'And whilst they were at supper.' 'And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed,' &c. Mark 14: 22. The Diaglott and Bible Union render this the same as Matt. 26: 26, common version. Campbell translates it: 'While they were at supper.' Rheims: 'And whilst they were eating.'

"Again, Our Lord and Master declares, after the institution of this remembrance of his death, as recorded by Luke 22: 19, 20, 'And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body, which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me.' 'But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table.' Luke 22: 21. This Scripture the Diaglott translates: 'But behold the hand of him who delivereth me is with mine on the table.' Campbell: 'Mark, however, that the hand of him who betrayeth me is on the table with mine.' Rheims: 'But yet, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table.'

"Some may urge a different application of this last scripture in order to harmonize it with John 13: 2: 'And supper being ended,' &c. We offer the following translations of this passage as proof that no such necessity exists:—

"And during supper."—*Tischendorf*, margin of Tauchnitz edition, London, 1869.

"And as supper was preparing."—*Emphatic Diaglott*.

"Now while they were at supper."—*Campbell*.

"And supper being served."—*Bible Union*.
"While supper was preparing."—*A. Clarke*, note on John 13: 2.

"In the light of this testimony, is it not, at least, possible, that instead of quite a space of time intervening between the close of the paschal feast and the institution of the divinely appointed memorial of the Saviour's death, that he took the bread and wine—the emblems used—from the table spread for that feast, and afterward the sop (John 13: 26-30), given to Judas from the same table?

"I have thus briefly endeavored to state my difficulties. Now I earnestly request some one, if he has, from the word, the evidence that necessitates the setting aside of the above testimony, to give us, through the REVIEW, the light, and inform us how we are to understand these scriptures. While aware of the strength of prejudice and preconceived opinions, I trust that the Lord will enable me to see, and accept, and exemplify, the whole truth.

"N. ORCUTT.

"Jamaica, Vt."

REPLY:—It is not my expectation to settle this matter to the complete satisfaction of every mind. There is, unquestionably, some difficulty in making the narratives of the four evangelists appear to harmonize, and yet we believe there is no real contradiction.

Matthew's account is as follows: "And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them; and they made ready the passover. Now when the even was come, he sat down with the twelve. And as they did eat, he said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every one of them to say unto him, Lord, Is it I? And he answered and said, He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. . . . Then Judas, which betrayed him, answered and said, Master, Is it I? He said unto him, Thou hast said. And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is the blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in

my Father's kingdom. And when they had sung an hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives." Matt. 26: 19-30.

The testimony of Mark is almost exactly like that of Matthew: so much so that it will not be necessary to quote his words. He distinctly states, as Matthew does, that the disciples went out to the Mount of Olives at the close of the supper, and introduces the institution of the supper as the last thing done in the room previous to their going out. And both of these evangelists introduce the conversation which occurred between the Lord and Peter concerning his denying him, and of the scattering of them all, and their being offended because of him, as taking place after they had left the room and previous to his reaching the garden of Gethsemane. Both of these accounts have every appearance of being a simple narration of facts in the order of their occurrence. And so I regard them.

Luke's account is as follows: "And they made ready the passover. And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer. For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves. For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come. And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise, also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you. But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me, is with me on the table. And truly the Son of man goeth as it was determined; but woe unto that man by whom he is betrayed. And they began to inquire among themselves which of them it was that should do this thing. And there was also a strife among them which of them should be accounted the greatest. Luke 22: 13-24.

Then Luke continues to give an account of this strife, and speaks also of Peter's denying him, and other matters, until he reaches the 39th verse, in which he says, "And he came out, and went as he was wont, to the Mount of Olives; and his disciples also followed him." From Luke's account one would naturally draw the conclusion, were it not for the other evangelists, that this conversation of the Saviour concerning their strife as to who should be greatest, and that Peter should deny him, as well as what is said concerning Judas' betraying him, and his hand being with him on the table, &c., occurred after the institution of the supper, and before they left the room to go to the Mount of Olives. But from reference to the other evangelists, we see it is positively stated that a portion of it was said after they had left the room; and some of it would seem to come in more naturally before the institution of the supper than afterward. And as Matthew, Mark, and John seem to corroborate each other as to the time when these things were said, and where, and as it is generally admitted by scholars that Matthew gives the events of Jesus' life more in a regular chronological order than Luke, while the latter rather aims to give the substance of them, and while the account of this passover supper, and the institution of the Lord's supper, as given by Matthew and Mark, agree so exactly and seem so clearly to give the events as they occur in due order, while that of Luke does not give evidence of this, I conclude, then, that Luke's narration is to be received, not as giving the due order in which they occur so much as to state what was said during this interesting period, at different times and places. In no other way can I make them harmonize.

John's account is as follows: "Now before the feast of the passover, when Jesus

knew that his hour was come that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end. And supper being ended (the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him), he riseth from supper; and laid aside his garments, and took a towel, and girded himself." Then follows the account of his washing the feet of his disciples. He proceeds again: "I speak not of you all; I know whom I have chosen; but that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me, hath lifted up his heel against me. Now I tell you before it come, that, when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am he." "When Jesus had thus said, he was troubled in spirit, and testified and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. Then the disciples looked one on another, doubting of whom he spake. Now there was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved. Simon Peter therefore beckoned to him, that he should ask who it should be of whom he spake. He then, lying on Jesus' breast, saith unto him, Lord, who is it? Jesus answered, 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. Then said Jesus unto him, That thou doest, do quickly. Now no man at the table knew for what intent he spake this unto him. . . . He then, having received the sop, went immediately out; and it was night." John 13: 1-30. I have omitted some verses which had no bearing on the question before us, for the sake of brevity.

In the second verse, which reads in our version, "And supper being ended," I have no question but the translation is wrong, as Bro. Orcutt proves. And in addition to the authorities which he quotes, I will mention Albert Barnes, who says in his notes, "The original means, while they were at supper." The order of events seems to be this, as far as I am able to see, comparing all the evangelists together. The disciples found the room according to the Saviour's directions, as shown by the connection, then prepared the passover, a lamb slain and roasted, to be eaten with bitter herbs, and unleavened bread; while the supper was preparing, or at its commencement, Christ "arises [from his place at table] beforehand" (Clarke's notes), and washes his disciples' feet, telling them plainly "that ye should do as I have done to you." At the conclusion of this service, they recline at table, and eat the passover supper. While eating this, Jesus speaks of his betrayal, and when asked, Who should do this, replied, "He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish." Matthew. "He that dippeth with me in the dish." Mark. "He to whom I shall give a sop when I have dipped it." John. While Luke does not mention this sign at all.

Here is one point I wish all to remember. This conversation in regard to his betrayal occurs during the eating of the passover supper, and there can be little doubt that all these three expressions, as given by these three evangelists, refer to precisely the same remark of our Saviour. The similarity of expression, the question of the apostles, calling out the remark from the Lord, and the likeness of the action, "dipping," mentioned by all three, prove this, to me. It would to me look unlikely that this subject would be called up by the Saviour, which must have been a startling one to the disciples, that one of his own chosen twelve apostles should betray their Lord into the hands of wicked men, and then, amid the intense feeling inevitable upon such a statement, in reply to their question of who it was, should reply as Matthew and Mark state, "He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish," and then the passover supper should go on till the Saviour should institute the memorial of his death, break-

ing the bread, offering prayer twice, and, after the cup, should have the same question asked again and should reply in nearly the same words as John has stated. It seems far more natural to me to suppose all these refer to the same remark. If that be granted, we know that this occurred before the Lord's supper was instituted. Nothing is plainer than that the Lord's supper was instituted after, or at the close of, the passover supper. In proof of this I offer the following:—

All of the evangelists who mention it speak of it in that order. Matthew and Mark both say in regard to it, that when the Lord's supper was ended, they sang a hymn and went out to the Mount of Olives; showing that the passover supper must have been eaten beforehand. While Luke, whose testimony is the only one that seems to teach that Judas was present at the Lord's supper, distinctly states that it was after supper when the cup representing the blood of the new testament was to be drunk. This supper, which was over, must have been the passover supper, for he was but just instituting the other, and drinking from this cup was a prominent part of it. The whole question of Judas' presence at the Lord's supper turns upon this point. Were the Lord and his apostles through with the passover supper when the Lord's supper was instituted? Or did they return again to partake of the former, after the institution of the latter? The record certainly teaches that the former view is the true one; for there is not the slightest hint, after the breaking of bread and circulation of the cup, of any further paschal celebration. There would be no propriety in it, and the next action spoken of is their going out to the Mount of Olives. While Luke distinctly states that it was "after supper" when the cup was passed. In view of these points, it seems hardly reasonable that Bro. Orcutt's suggestion that the Saviour gave Judas the sop, after the bread had been broken, and the wine was drunk, and the thanks were twice offered, and the passover supper all over, could have been true. It is very unlikely that a sop would have been dipped by the Saviour and given to him when none of them were eating, but all were through, especially so, when the record states that this very subject of who should betray him, had been up previous to the breaking of the bread, and he had before told them in substance who it was, according to Matthew and Mark.

It would seem a natural circumstance, as they were all eating the passover supper together, for the Saviour to take a piece of bread or meat and dip it in the sauce and hand it to Judas, as a sign to those who were inquiring for the wicked betrayer; but a very unnatural one, after they were all through eating, and had been having the memorials of his broken body and spilt blood before them, in silence, sorrow, and solemnity, and he had finished the instituting of this, to take a sop in this way and give it to Judas some time after his meal was concluded.

Having shown clearly, as I think, that the Lord's supper was after the passover supper, and after the giving of the sop to Judas, I next inquire at what point Judas left the rest, and went away to betray his Lord. Neither Matthew, Mark, nor Luke, speak of his going at all. But he must have gone beforehand, because, while the rest were together, listening to the words of the Lord, he was evidently away, getting ready the band of men who were to take the Saviour before the magistrates. It would take some time to conclude his bargain with the rulers, and arrange things for the betrayal. A "multitude" came with him, and these would not be gathered and led to the spot without considerable time in which to do it. So we know that he must have left the other apostles quite a length of time previous to the betrayal of Christ. The first three evangelists say nothing about this. But John is very definite in his statement. When asked who it was that should betray him, Jesus said, "He it is, to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it." He gave the sop to Judas. "And after the sop Satan entered into him." "He then, having received the sop, went immediately out." Jesus also said to him when he gave him the sop, "That thou doest, do quickly." The other disciples understood this remark of the Saviour to mean that he should buy something for the feast, or give something to the poor. But Judas, with wounded pride, at his being discovered, and covetousness in his heart, immediately left the

rest and carried out the plans Satan had instilled into his heart before. He had meditated this course previously, but from the moment he took the sop from the Saviour's hand, and thus became known to the others, he could not, of course, remain longer with them, but commenced to carry into execution the plan of Satan. It would be in the highest degree unlikely that he would remain with them a known traitor and finish the paschal repast, much less go through the solemn memorial designed to commemorate the breaking of Christ's body and the spilling of his blood, knowing himself that he was about to be a principal party in causing these, and knowing that the eyes of his eleven associates were upon him, regarding him with abhorrence. It was the last place he would wish to be. The record says, he went "immediately out." That settles the question.

Having shown previously that the giving of this sop, preceded the institution of the Lord's supper, we can but draw the conclusion, therefore, that Judas did not remain to participate in it. I can see no good reason why he should. This memorial was to be a token of union and fellowship. "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." 1 Cor. 10: 16, 17. This very memorial symbolizes this act, which shows our oneness. That this man, whose name was to be a synonym of baseness to all ages, and of whom the Saviour says, "It were better that he should never have been born," the man who betrayed his divine Lord into the hands of wicked men, thirsting for his blood, for the sum of thirty pieces of silver, or about fifteen dollars, should take part in this memorial of his Lord's death which he was to help bring about himself, and that with the sanction of Christ, would be, to me, unaccountable. I should want the strongest evidences to prove it was so, before I could believe it, but instead of such evidences, the record proves, to me, the contrary.

This position which I have taken is not peculiar to me, but eminent men have come to the same conclusion. Says Dr. Albert Barnes, in his notes on Matthew, "Judas was not, therefore, present at the institution of the Lord's supper." Mr. Barnes was a Presbyterian, and I do not know that his views of the design of the communion had anything to do with his conclusions concerning Judas' presence. From a careful examination of the record, he came to this conclusion as I have.

I freely admit that the words of Luke, "But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me, is with me on the table," seem to demand a different conclusion. And the only explanation I shall attempt to offer is that which is referred to in the former part of this article, that Luke is not giving a consecutive narrative of these events in the order of their occurrence, but rather the substance of them, while the others give them in their order. All the rest plainly tell us that the conversation concerning Judas took place during the passover supper, previous to the Lord's supper. It seems to me to do no violence to Luke's record to thus place this statement before that event also. The Saviour would not be likely to add this declaration after all that had occurred which the other evangelists had placed beforehand. It would be a mere repetition, without adding anything, and this the Saviour was not in the habit of doing.

I now leave it to the candid reader to judge whether I have proved my position. Of course, in all such investigations we are liable to draw wrong conclusions. I leave it to others whether I have, or not, in this case.

GEO. I. BUTLER.

Mt. Pleasant, Iowa, July 9, 1873.

DON'T GIVE LIQUOR TO CHILDREN.—One of the first literary men in the United States said to the writer, after speaking on the subject of temperance: "There is one thing which, as you visit different places, I wish you to do everywhere, that is, to entreat every mother never to give a drop of strong drink to a child. I have had to fight as for my life all my days, to keep from dying a drunkard, because I was fed with spirits when a child. I acquired a taste for it. My brother, poor fellow, died a drunkard. I would not have a child of mine take a drop of it for anything. Warn every mother, wherever you go, never to give a drop to a child."

DISCUSSION ON THE SABBATH QUESTION

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

FOURTH PROPOSITION.

"Do the Scriptures teach that the first day of the week is to be sacredly observed by Christians?"

ELDER VOGEL affirms; ELDER WAGGONER denies.

ELDER VOGEL'S FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE.

HAVING both the third and fourth negatives to review, and wishing to present a brief summary, I shall use the utmost brevity, intending to close with this number, unless Bro. W. violates the rules of debate in his rejoinder.

I did not say that "they who rely upon the plain word of God are only babes," but that babes, because "unskilled," can do little else. And while Paul speaks of higher truths, in Heb. 5: 13, 14, they are truths gathered by inference, "mere deductions," from various Old and New Testament facts, as Paul had just been gathering, and upbraided the people not only for insufficient attainments to gather and teach them themselves, but also for inability to hear them. What "pious frauds" Paul was guilty of!

We are abundantly told what Campbell, McGarvey, and others, teach, but in my simplicity I supposed the question was, "Do the Scriptures teach?" Had I only understood this matter sooner, what quotations might I not have made from Eld. W.'s brethren! Nay, as Beecher said of Calvin, so say I of others, "My first desire is to know what is true; and then I am very glad if Calvin agrees with me; but if he do not, so much the worse for him."

"Sunday" is a term of heathen origin (and no doubt the heathens created the day itself!), therefore, it cannot be put to a sacred, scriptural use! Bread and wine were offered by heathens to their gods; therefore the Lord's supper is a heathen institution! Well, logic is logic!

The Babylonians and the Romans reckoned their days from midnight (they were heathens, you know), therefore the Lord can't! Naughty heathens, these, to estop the Lord!

John 19: 14, "It was about the sixth hour." True, "about" is indefinite, but not sufficiently so as to convert the sixth into the third hour. Nor is it at all admissible to change sixth into third. Anderson's translation was from a text that read third, but at the time of his death he was at work upon a better text. The quotations from Bloomfield and Clarke amount to nothing; for (1.) But few manuscripts use characters instead of words to express numbers. (2.) Even when characters are employed, the chances for mistakes are overrated. The Greek letter for 3 has three different forms, and that for 6, has four; only one of the first three, and one of the last four, can be at all mistaken for each other, and even these are less alike than our numerals 8 and 3. A more likely presumption is, that some copyist supposed, from his knowledge of the other gospels, and on the assumption that all used the same reckoning, that his predecessor had made a mistake which he felt it duty to correct. (3.) But the most decisive fact, and that which places this matter beyond dispute, is this: The three oldest and best manuscripts, the Alexandrian, the Vatican, and the Sinaitic (the united testimony of which neither Bloomfield nor Clarke had), agree in reading "the sixth hour." "These three manuscripts," says Tischendorf, "stand at the head of all ancient copies of the N. T., and it is by their standard that both the early editions of the Greek text and the modern versions are to be compared and corrected." Again, in John 1: 39, we read, "They came and saw where he dwelt, and abode with him that day." It was about the tenth hour." The conjunction "for," in the common version, is rejected by the three manuscripts above named. Had John used the Jewish mode of reckoning, the tenth hour would have been four o'clock, and the expression, "abode with him that day," would have been out of place. There is no mistaking the reckoning John followed. And this fixes the reckoning of Acts 20: 7, in spite of all the learned authorities my brother may accumulate.

Others may apologize for Paul's traveling on the first-day of Acts 20: 7; I know he did not travel. He traveled, however, both the preceding Lord's day and the Sabbath before that; hence I do not hesitate to do likewise when necessity requires. By "the logic of facts," I set aside McGarvey's comment. He is no "oracle." As a people, we acknowledge none but "the living oracles."

Because "Paul had determined to sail by Ephesus," my brother thinks that the ship was under his control. This by no means follows. The vessel had its course marked out, and Paul could only have reached Ephesus by boarding another vessel, as he did on other occasions. The delay would have been small could he have controlled the vessel and gone to Ephesus; but to change once, perhaps twice, this would have caused much delay.

The rules regulating Sunday observance are called for. This demand would be just, were we under the law. Under the gospel, we are "sons," and are not governed after the manner of "servants." It is sufficient for a son to know that the day is "the Lord's."

The call for proof that the Jews ended their weeks with sunrising on Sunday, will be unheeded. The proof has already been given, and he has seen fit to ignore it; so it must go to the reader without a reply.

The assertion that the "eating the passover," of John 18: 28, and the statement that Jesus ate it before the appointed time, thus sinning! and also the assertion that the yearly and weekly Sabbaths came in conjunction that year, need no reply, having been forestalled in my third affirmative.

The quotation from Campbell on will-worship is perfectly gratuitous. I can show, and have shown, "an explicit revelation of the will of Heaven," as my summary will show.

Eld. W. closes his third negative with an attempted exhibit of the difference between the argument for the Sabbath and the Sunday. Every item, save one, has been considered before. For example, No. 11, "The Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath," was shown to be untrue in the sense he takes it; on the contrary, I proved that every Jew is lord of the Sabbath, in the same sense and to the same extent claimed by Jesus, in Mark 2: 27. See 1st Neg., 3d Prop., par. marked 3, near the end. The facts in No. 7 were shown to prove the Sabbath a positive institution. Indeed, I gave eleven different proofs of its being positive, without reply.

No. 6 contains a new statement, to this effect: The Sabbath commandment was put into the midst of moral commandments, therefore it is also moral! That is, if a negro were among nine white men, and engaged in every respect as they are, it would prove

him white! No; the Sabbath commandment, which is wholly positive—commemorative and typical—was, no doubt, put into the very midst of other constitutional precepts, in their nature moral, though then given as if positive, to rebuke those who would divide into two laws what God has joined into one.

REVIEW OF FOURTH NEGATIVE.

For some reason my brother has found it more convenient to accuse me of dishonest dealing, and to declare how he has lost respect for me, than to test my statement by calling for the proffered names. No doubt, this is honorable and worthy of all respect.

1. Paul indeed says that we are yet "groaning for redemption," but it is "for the redemption of our body; i. e., for the consummation in ourselves what Christ has long since consummated for us. When Jesus "was delivered for our offenses, and was raised for our justification" (Rom. 4: 25), he had completed the remedy for our sins. God could "be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Jesus rested from the preparation of the remedy; it is ours now to take it and experience its salutary effects—"the redemption of our body," &c. &c. "This man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down at the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till [as a result] his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." Heb. 10: 12-14.

2. Were it even true that I have nothing but inference, how would that disprove my argument in favor of the legitimacy of inference? "Is this reasoning?"

3. If the house of Rev. 1: 10, is built on sand, "this is the Lord's doing." He, not I, must bear the blame.

4. The meaning of *legoo* is material. *Logia* is the fruit of the tree *legoo*. "Can the fig tree, my brethren, bear olive berries? either a vine, figs?" My brief definition, on the basis of Liddell and Scott, is the substance of their longer one, and was given as such.

5. We are now informed that, in the sentence, "All the institutions of the gospel are positive," of denotes *origin*. Glad to hear it. Perhaps Eld. W. can now see that when the lexicons say that *kuriakos* (Lordic), in Rev. 1: 10, denotes of the Lord Jesus, as well as respecting him, they mean that the day originated with him. It is, hence, "of the gospel," and so "positive." After all, then, the "concession" is a concession. What "perversion!" yea, what "call for pity!"

6. "Jesus, the author and finisher of the faith," is a literal version of Heb. 12: 2. The article here is not the result of renewed mention, renewed from chap. 11, for that would make Jesus "the author and finisher" of the Mosaic dispensation! The article can here denote only that which is "the faith" by pre-eminence, namely, the gospel. As for 1 Cor. 2: 9, 10, I did it no violence; Paul himself makes a present application of that quotation. To refer it to the future, this is "garbling," ay, "wresting."

7. I did not reason, says my brother, in my reply to his deduction of proprietorship from the statement that all things were made "for" Christ. Very true; absurdities are not to be reasoned with any more than air-castles are to be bombarded. They need but to be unmasked to die of their own ridiculousness.

8. The prophecy respecting new heavens and earth (Isa. 65), finds indeed a (second) fulfillment when applied as in 2 Pet. 2 and Rev. 21. This new heaven and earth know neither sin (Rev. 22: 15) nor death (Rev. 21: 4), whereas Isaiah speaks of both (verse 20). In the one they do not marry (Matt. 22: 30); in the other, they bear children (Isa. 65: 23). In the primary application of Isaiah's new heavens and earth, the Jews reject the Saviour and the Gentiles accept the gospel (Gal. 3: 28); also the Jews, finally converted, will be successful missionaries among the Gentiles (verses 18-21). This marks it as primarily applying to the gospel dispensation. Nor can verse 23 be construed into a recognition of the existence of the Sabbath, any more than into that of the Jewish new-moon festival.

"If Eld. Vogel gets there he will have to be converted from his present position!" Here we get a glimpse of Eld. W.'s uncharitable creed. A mistake of the head, however true the heart and devoted the life, will consign one to perdition! This may smack of "law," but not of "grace." See, too, how presumptuously he impugns the motives of all those not with him on the Sabbath question: "They are determined to be satisfied with it [the testimony for the first day], however contradictory it may be!" When a man forsakes the faith of his kin at the risk of his life, and for no other gain than the truth can yield, is he "determined" to be wrong! Shame on the pen that can write it.

Having neither Jew nor Gentile, as such, in Christ Jesus (Gal. 3: 28), it is only necessary that I prove the Lord's day "commanded" upon Christians.

My brother quotes from Campbell, Sherlock, Taylor, Goodman, Burnet, Owen, Hopkins, and Baxter, to the effect that only that which is commanded or required by the Lord is acceptable as a positive institution; and that all other institutions, of human origin, are will-worship and damnable. To this, I have all along given assent. His quotations are a waste of space. It must strike every reader that his space could have been better employed by attention to numerous points against him, which he has now no more opportunity to notice.

Regarding me as the representative of the "Christian" brotherhood, Eld. W. says: "His [my] acknowledgment that inference is his [my] only dependence, is his acknowledgment." I have made no such acknowledgment, but have insisted that approved precedent or legitimate inference are satisfactory sources of proof. As Bro. Waggoner represents his brethren by special choice, his prevarication is his falsity.

The quotations from Kitto, Campbell, &c., are not to the point. If he means anything to the purpose, he means that these men testify that there was no observance of the Lord's day for several hundred years after Christ, whereas, they mean that there was no human legislation under Christian auspices till then. These quotations, then, are wholly foreign to the present proposition, which has only to do with what "the Scriptures teach." I notice them only because introduced, and so lengthen this article beyond my first intention. Take an example or two. Buck not only says, in the same article quoted from, that "the first day of the week has always been observed by the Christian church," but gives five N. T. reasons for its observance. And Mr. A. Campbell wrote in 1830: "The Jews were under a government of precepts—we are under a government of principles. Hence all was laid down to them in broad and plain commandments, . . . duties, accurately defined to the utmost conceivable minutia; inasmuch that nothing was left, to discretion—nothing to principle. There is nothing like this in the New Institution. We have no rit

ual, liturgy, nor manual. The New Constitution and Law of Love do no more than *institute* the converting act, the Lord's supper and the *Lord's day*. . . . The Lord's supper . . . and the Lord's day . . . though positive institutions, are not presented to Christians accompanied with directions for the mode of celebration, as were the former institutions under the Jewish age. There were more directions about the celebration of the passover and the observance of the Sabbath, than are to be found in the whole new institution. Nay, indeed, there is nothing of the sort in the Christian economy. No mode of eating the supper, no mode of observing the Lord's day is suggested in the apostolic writings. In this, Christians are left to the discretion of full grown men to the government of principle." *Chris. Baptist*, p. 657. These views, Mr. Campbell maintained throughout his studious life. In the very year referred to by Eld. W., though I do not know where he got his quotation, Mr. Campbell wrote against Christmas because it is an "unauthorized tradition;" for, said he, tradition, in the department of religious life, "ought, above every other, to be most scrupulously avoided." *Mill. Harb.* for 1848, p. 17. On page 280, he declares how he adopted the principle, in 1809, a principle held all his life, that "nothing ought to be received into the faith and worship of the church, or to be made a term of communion amongst Christians, that is not as old as the New Testament. Nor ought anything to be admitted as of divine obligation, in the church constitution and management, but what is expressly enjoined by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles upon the New-Testament church; either in express terms or by approved precedent." Continuing this subject, he informs us, pp. 344-5, how this led him to canvass every subject anew, resulting in the rejection of infant baptism and affusion (he was a Presbyterian then), and in the retention of the Lord's day. On but a single point, I will give a fragment of his reasoning, written more expressly in favor of weekly communion, but equally applicable to the Lord's day, and so regarded by himself. "If he [Luke, Acts xx: 7] had said that on a first day the disciples assembled to break the loaf, then I would admit that both the Sabbatharians, and the semi-annual or septennial communicants, might find some way of explaining this evidence away. The definite article is, in the Greek and in the English tongue, prefixed to stated times, and its appearance here is not merely definitive of one day, but expressive of a stated or fixed day." *Chris. System*, p. 318.

SUMMARY.

I take space to notice only a few points; the reader will remember the rest.

I. Rev. 1: 10, asserts in express terms that there is now a sacred day. Eld. W. has not only admitted this, but has further owned that this passage does not fix upon any day as that day, much less does it name the Sabbath.

II. This sacred day is a *new institution*. The term *Kuriakos* (Lordie or "Lord's") asserts this in the most explicit manner, being just as decisive on this point as *baptizo* is on the action of baptism. 1. It is a *new term*, coined by the apostles, and so expresses a *new idea*. To this there has been no reply. I called in vain for a new feature in the Sabbatic institution, unexpressed in the Old Testament. 2. While the term *Lord* has been applied to both the Father and the Son, *Kuriakos* is never applied to the Father, or to any institution belonging or having belonged to Him; hence, the *Lordie* day is not the Sabbath day, but a *Christie* institution.

III. Having the most explicit divine assurance of the existence of a new sacred day—no inference, but express statement—whatever may be necessary to the existence of such an institution, as express command or formal proclamation, is just as certainly known to have a real existence as a house is known to have a foundation. It is so necessary an inference that no express command could be stronger. "Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."

IV. When the existence of a new institution is not left to inference, there can be no reasonable objection to proving the time of its observance by good precedence and good inference. And this we have in all sufficiency.

1. Since no one has ever claimed or can claim any other day for this institution than either the seventh or the first day of the week, every argument offered in favor of a present binding force of the old Sabbatic institution, which monopolizes the seventh day, is an argument just as strong in favor of the first day as the time for this new institution. And this argument, so far as the first day is concerned, is intensified by every precedent and inference favoring the first day, so that it must always be stronger than that for the Sabbath can possibly be.

2. On the other hand, every argument for the abolition of the Sabbath is not only just so much proof for the *Lordie* day as a new institution, but the continued observance by Jewish converts for a time (if there be any such observance) of the Sabbath under the name of *Sabbath*, decides in favor of the first day for the new institution; and this decision is intensified by the precedents and inferences respecting the first day.

3. The first day is pointed out as a sacred day by the typical meaning of the Pentecost.

4. The first day is fraught with many stirring memories and most noted events pertaining to this dispensation, and so is pre-eminently suited for a commemorative institution. While fitness alone cannot prove the existence of a positive institution, yet, when that existence is known, fitness apprehended is a most beautiful drapery.

5. Analogy points to the fact that the rest which Christ's death and resurrection bring us, is memorialized by the *Lordie* day. If, under the law, the Pentecost could silently point back to the giving of that law, who may deny a similar right to this institution, in its nature a thousand times more vocal?

And now, indulgent reader, farewell. The Lord direct you into all truth, and bring you at last to his glorious presence. Amen.

ELD. WAGGONER'S FIFTH NEGATIVE.

1. I MUCH regret that the publishers in Quincy, Ill. omitted the Greek characters from my quotations from Clarke and Bloomfield on John 19: 14. This not only obscures them, but entirely destroys the sense of my paragraph referring to them. On this point, Eld. Vogel's conjecture as to how a change might have been made amounts to nothing. And it is but a poor relief that he can quote some authorities in his favor; for the reader will agree with me that a position denied by such scholars as Bloomfield, Clarke, Anderson, and "the best commentators," as Bloomfield says, is hardly safe to rest upon as ground of inference for positive duty!

2. He seems to fear I will pursue an unwarranted course in closing, and plainly shows what he consid-

ers would be such, in saying he has made arguments which I have no more opportunity to notice! In this we have another measure of the man. As if he could present arguments at any time which I cannot answer, even to the close. It may gratify the curiosity of the reader to turn back and examine Eld. Vogel's closing negative on the first proposition; but he will hardly realize the disagreeableness of the task of meeting a man who is so egotistical and arbitrary that he cannot endure to have another enjoy equal rights with himself.

3. His explanation of his position on Heb. 5: 13, 14, leaves him worse than before. He compares his inferences to Paul's "gatherings" of "deductions," when Paul was writing by direct inspiration! This shows the weakness and folly of his transferring to Paul the charge of "pious frauds." It rests only on himself.

4. He objects to my quoting from Campbell and McGarvey, because the proposition relates to what "the Scriptures teach," and hints of what he could have done had he understood the matter. But the reader will remember that in his very first affirmative he quoted twelve authorities and referred to four others, and especially recommended the writings of Campbell, and advertised them! I might properly have objected to his quoting mere human authorities to prove what "the Scriptures teach," but when he fails to give an iota of Scripture proof for Sunday, I have a right to show its origin by any testimony I please. His "simplicity" is indeed great if he cannot see that his course is anything but creditable to himself, and betrays a consciousness of the weakness of his position. (Not to be excelled, I will do the favor to the reader, of saying of a book which Eld. V. mentioned, that the *History of the Sabbath*, by J. N. Andrews, is a thorough vindication of Bible truth, and exposure of the falsities of the Sunday theory, published at the REVIEW AND HERALD Office, Battle Creek, Mich. Send for a Catalogue.)

5. Without any just reason, for it was irrelevant, he referred to what *somebody*, unknown to us as either a speaker or writer, believed. But when I disprove his position by Campbell and McGarvey, lo! they acknowledge no human authority! But "McGarvey on Acts" is a recognized denominational work amongst them. And again I say, Omit his quotations from human authority, and his inferences would be too bald to be presentable.

6. Being "sons," no "rules" for keeping Sunday are required! All that he has said on this subject may be adopted by the Catholic for every dogma of that church. As well might we say, that the "principle" of baptism being established, no rules are required to govern its observance, but we are left to our "deductions" for that. Let us see. 1. *Sprinkling* is spoken of by the prophet when referring to this dispensation—even sprinkling with water. 2. Peter based the reception of a promise upon baptism, and said, the promise is to you and to your children. 3. Following this, we find that whole households were baptized. From these, and others, I can frame a better inferential argument than Eld. V. has for Sunday, and sustain it by as many "great men." Let him show some established facts before he apostrophizes the "memorable day." Let him show that God blessed or sanctified it before he talks about "a blessed sacredness." This is begging what he needs to prove; all "pretty talk," but in an argument it is no higher than *pious cant*, and is fittingly rebuked by the words of the Saviour: "In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

Campbell's remarks, which he quotes about the Lord's supper and the Lord's day, are exceedingly faulty, and show that Campbell was inconsistent with himself. Because no prescribed form is given for eating the supper, therefore, no rule is required for keeping Sunday! But of the supper we have the express act and law of the institution; for the Sunday we have neither. A "babe" can see this difference.

Again, there is no question as to whether the Lord could adopt the heathen traditions as Christian ordinances; but, is there proof that he has done it? That the heathen consecrated Sunday might not "estop the Lord," but where is the proof that the Lord consecrated it? It does not exist, "and he knows it." As to the use of bread and wine in the supper, the Lord expressly enjoined it; but not so of Sunday. In name, dedication, and observance, it is only of heathen origin.

7. He says the work of Jesus in redemption is finished "for us," and "it is now ours to take it." But can we "take" the redemption of the body, without a further direct work of Christ? See 1 Thess. 4. His quotations on the sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice do not touch the point, and if he does not know it, it is but another evidence of his boasted "simplicity." Can we resurrect ourselves by virtue of what Christ has done for us? And can we be saved without his present mediation? Reader, this is a fair sample of the evasions which I have had constantly to meet throughout this discussion.

8. He referred to my disproof of the grounds of his inference, and said the opposing lawyer might deny, but still the man was hanged on circumstantial evidence. But if the colleagues of the leading prosecutor should rise up and deny that the "circumstances" existed, as claimed, the opposing lawyer would not have much to meet! And this is exactly the case here. His inferences, which are his only dependence, I disprove by Sunday-keeping authors—men of, at least as much candor as Eld. Vogel, and far greater study and critical knowledge. The reader can readily see the weight of this point.

9. To affect indignation is more convenient than to explain the fact, or to disprove, that some "are determined to be pleased" with anything that favors Sunday. And if he is satisfied with his own argument, he presents a remarkable instance in himself. If I am wrong, why do such contradictions combine? Why are they "of the churches" so well pleased with his effort, when they deny the very foundation of his argument? Who will answer? And I would say to him, that a man may do many things at great hazard, which are good in themselves, and yet have an impure motive for other actions. I do not measure the truth by men, however good they may claim to be. God knows the heart, and he will judge all by "his commandments." Eccl. 12: 13, 14. Perhaps he has forgotten that Israel, at the hazard of their lives, braving the wrath of the king, confessed the Lord and left Egypt at his command, yet fell in the desert. And this is for "our admonition." "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall."

10. My "call for proof that the Jews ended their weeks at sunrise on Sunday will be unheeded." I expected it, for what could he do where no proof exists? To say that he has given proof of it is simply an untruth. Having never seen any intimation of such a thing before, I referred it to some who, like Paul, have "profited in the Jew's religion," and are thoroughly acquainted with Hebrew literature, who unhesitatingly assert that the Jews had no such reck-

oning. He is deserving of something besides "pity" in this. The candid and God-fearing will look with suspicion upon a theory which is supported by such means. I cannot do this justice by any comment, and I leave it with all other "pious frauds" (minus the pious!) for which an account must be rendered to him who requires faithfulness in speaking his word, and who will crown only those who "strive lawfully." Jer. 23: 28; 2 Tim. 2: 5.

11. There are no first and second fulfillments of the prophecy of the new creation, for there are not two new earths. Nor does Isa. speak of births in that prophecy, as Eld. V. asserts. My proofs on this point stand untouched, and are a complete refutation of his professed argument for Sunday as a memorial.

12. He says Buck gives "five N. T. reasons" for Sunday keeping. But Buck acknowledges they do not amount to a "law," and they are only of human devising. "The Scriptures" never give any reason for it, "and he knows it." Learned men find more "reasons" than that for infant baptism, for the invocation of saints, for papal supremacy, &c., but they are not proof. "Do the Scriptures" give proof of the institution? That is what is demanded.

I will now examine his several points of argument, as follows:—

I. On the Lord's day. He infers that the term refers to Christ only. It is but an inference, for it no more mentions Christ than it mentions the day of the week. But he laid the foundation for this inference in the wild statement that "the term *Lord* belongs exclusively to Christ in this dispensation." To this I replied that it referred to the Father in more than three-score places in the N. T. Next, he said it referred to Christ in an "official sense;" that the Father "resigned, or gave this position to Christ during this dispensation, so that he is now 'Lord of all.'" This is the climax of all his absurdities. The Father never "resigned" any position. He never held, "officially," any position now occupied by Christ—he never was "mediator" as Christ now is. Christ is not now "Lord of all" to the exclusion of the Father, but is "by the right hand of God exalted," that "men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father."

He said: "If *Kuriakos* refers to the personal appellation of Jesus (Acts 2: 36), then *Kuriakos* signifies pertaining to Jesus as Lord."

If his assertion were true, that it refers exclusively to Christ, then this statement would be at least plausible; but it is not. Taking the Revelation alone, *Kuriakos* refers to the Father thirteen times; to the Son, five times; it is three times used where it may refer to either; once where it refers to neither. So far as facts are concerned, the testimony is entirely against him. Now I say—If *Kuriakos* refers to the appellation of the Father, as we know it does, then *Kuriakos* signifies pertaining to the Father. Having taken the text out of his hands, I will say, that I could admit all his claim without detriment to my position, for if it did refer only to Christ, I have already proved that Christ is Lord of the Sabbath, by his own words, and by the work of creation. But the disproof of his assertion here is fatal to his Sunday theory, for he does not pretend that sufficient evidence is found elsewhere for the "foundation" of his institution. With him, everything depends upon the correctness of his assertion that "the term *Lord* refers exclusively to Christ." That being lost, his cause is lost beyond the possibility of recovery; for his assumed proof is only a "deduction," and the life of his deduction rests upon an assertion which has not even a shadow of truth in it. I might safely rest the case here; but I will follow him further.

II. Having assumed that the first day is the Lord's day, without offering any Scripture proof, he next draws from 1 Cor 16: 2, that it was the day of Christian assemblies. But I have most conclusively proved, by Sunday-keeping authorities (in this sense I used "partisans"), that nothing of the kind is found in this text; that the inference is forbidden by the construction of the scripture. And, again, while his proposition depends upon the correctness of his inference, which I have disproved, I might admit his statement without detriment to my position; for the text does not speak of the Lord's day, nor of the sacredness of any day, nor of anything peculiar to a sacred day, even if they had to assemble to perform the duty indicated.

III. He infers that Acts 20: 7, shows the first day to be a day of observance, whereas it does not speak of the Lord's day; it does not speak of a sacred day; nor of the observance of any day. Not a fact is stated in this chapter inconsistent with my position on the Sabbath, or true Lord's day. Not a fact is stated to sustain his inferences. On the contrary, it is clear that it was not observed by Paul and his companions as a day of rest, or "sacredly observed;" having kept the Sabbath with the church at Troas, and being about to continue on his journey on the morning of first-day, he has a parting meeting with them on the evening of that day. To evade these facts, Eld. V. claims a change in the reckoning of the day, based on two points: (1) On John 19: 14, which is proved untenable by the best authorities; and (2) That the Jews ended the week at sunrise on Sunday morning; a statement which ought to cause his face to mantle with shame.

That Paul traveled on that Sunday is admitted by McGarvey, a Disciple Commentator. On this I might multiply authorities, but it is not necessary. I will mention only that Conybeare, so often referred to approvingly by Eld. V., also admits it. And, in regard to Eld. Vogel's last assertion that Paul traveled on both Sabbath and first-day previous to his arrival at Troas, I answer: it was a voyage which he had once sailed over in two days. See Acts 16: 11; Conybeare and Howson, chap. 20, p. 591. As it was but a two days' sail, there is no evidence that they were sailing on the Sabbath; or, otherwise, they were delayed by unpropitious weather: for, had they made the journey direct, in the ordinary time, without hindrance, they would have arrived at Troas at least a full day before the Sabbath. But how different his journey from Troas, which was commenced by deliberate determination on the first day of the week.

IV. He claims a *recognition*—mark, not even a mention—of the first day by the Holy Spirit descending on that day. Were this true it would not prove a recognition of the sacredness of the day, nor of the duty to observe the day, for no mention is made of either. And, the Spirit descended on other days besides that. But, the truth is, that *Pentecost* was not on first-day. This appears by the concession of the best authorities, and also by the fallacy of Eld. Vogel's argument on Leviticus. Briefly I will notice his exposition of Lev. 23:—

a. He says it was not "the morrow of the paschal sabbath," but, as he gathers from the Greek, "the morrow of the first day." But, then, of course, it would be second day; for "the morrow of the first day" could no more be first day, than "the morrow of the Sabbath" could be the Sabbath.

b. But the first day is not there, either in Hebrew

or Greek. That is another fiction of his romantic brain.

c. The article is used only in that verse, because *Sabbath* is in predicate in every other instance in that chapter, and therefore the article is understood "by construction."

d. Every day is a "holy convocation" on which a solemn assembly is convened. See verses 1-3.

e. Analogy is all against the Sunday in Acts 2, even granting the day, for the Holy Spirit did not mention it, but the *Pentecost*, which means the *fiftieth*. Therefore if a day was to be honored and perpetuated it was that fiftieth day, which surely does not come weekly! It needs a reason for continuing a fulfilled yearly type by a weekly observance!

f. Were it admitted that it was Sunday, it would disprove his reckoning, for he says it was the day succeeding the Sabbath, which ended at sunset. But he says the Sunday begins at sunrise: if that were true, there was an entire night of about twelve hours between the close of the seventh day and the beginning of first day! which is only equalled in absurdity by his cutting one night in two at midnight, and calling it *two different nights*! See his argument on the Passover.

g. If it was the weekly Sabbath, as he avers, then we have inspiration recognizing the Sabbatic character of the seventh day, seven weeks after the resurrection, which is a direct proof such as he would be glad to find for the first day. For,

h. If the seventh-day Sabbath were abolished at the cross, as he averred, there could be no morrow after the Sabbath, seven weeks thereafter. The morrow after a day that did not exist would be only a myth.

But again, the best authors admit that Pentecost was not Sunday, but the Sabbath; this admission is made even by eminent Sunday advocates, which they would not make did not the facts compel them to do so.

Dr. Clarke says not a word upon the subject, which is an argument of itself; for he never failed to note when an inference could be drawn for Sunday.

Prof. Hackett says: "It is generally supposed that this Pentecost, signaled by the outpouring of the Spirit, fell on the Jewish Sabbath, our Saturday."—*Com. on Original Text*.

Barnes says: "If the views of the Pharisees were followed, and the Lord Jesus had with them kept the Passover on Thursday, as many have supposed, then the day of Pentecost would have occurred on the Jewish Sabbath, our Saturday. *Kuinoel, Lightfoot*. It is impossible to determine the truth on this subject, nor is it of much importance."

Jennings, in *Jewish Antiquities*, says: "Since Christ eat his last passover on the same day with the rest of the Jews, as we have already proved, namely on the fourteenth of Nisan, which was Thursday; the next day, on which he was crucified, must be the feast of unleavened bread; therefore the sixteenth day, the Saturday, was the first day of the seven weeks betwixt that and the Pentecost; consequently the fiftieth day, or the morrow after the seventh sabbath or week, which was the day of Pentecost, must fall on the Saturday, or the Jewish Sabbath."

Olshausen says: "Now, since, according to the accounts given regarding the time of the feast, the passover, in the year of our Lord's death, fell so that the first day of the feast fell from Thursday evening at six o'clock till Friday evening at the same hour, it follows of course that it was from Friday evening at six o'clock that the fifty days began to be counted. The fiftieth day fell, therefore, it appears, upon Saturday."

Ripley, in his *Notes* says it "cannot be satisfactorily decided."

Smith, *Bib. Dict.*, says it is a point disputed, but favors the view that it was the Sabbath.

All these, as well as many others from whom I might quote, are strenuous Sunday men, and, knowing the use that is made of it, would have placed it upon Sunday would the facts allow. And to assert confidently, and make it the basis of duty, as does Eld. Vogel, that it was Sunday, is an unwarranted and bold proceeding, calculated to lead away from the revealed will of God.

It may be asked, if we believe that it was the Sabbath, why we do not use it as an argument for that day. I answer, *We do not need it*. We have the commandment of God, and his own express reason, for keeping it, and there is no requirement to keep it because the Spirit descended upon it. Such conjectures we leave for those who delight to deal in them, or find them necessary to their cause. In "the law and the testimony" we are "thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

And now, dear readers, I appeal at once to your reason and to your consciences: Are you willing to risk your acceptance with God on such a doubtful foundation as has been laid for the Sunday? I leave to your judgment the evidences of the Edenic origin of the Sabbath, of the perpetuity of the moral law, and of the recognition of the Sabbath by inspiration in the New Testament; while not a single fact has been given, not a precedent established, nor a necessary inference produced to prove that Sunday is to be "sacredly observed." In the entire absence of testimony in its favor, every scripture is reasonably and justly interpreted without the forced construction of making them allude to something which cannot be proved to have an existence.

Consenting to engage in this discussion in the midst of other pressing labor, traveling most of the time, so that but few of the articles reached me at any one post-office, away from my library and books of reference, I have regretted my unfavorable circumstances for such a work. The opposition has been presented as forcibly as it can be. But this investigation, under these conditions, has strongly confirmed my faith in the ten commandments as the moral law, and the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath of the Lord our God, and of the utter futility of the attempt to establish, by "the Scriptures," the Sunday as a day of observance. Eld. Vogel assured me that he had "something new and better" than the old Sunday arguments; but in that respect I have been disappointed. The same old round of inferences has been traversed, showing conclusively that the opposition to the holy Sabbath has exhausted its resources without finding any proof that the Sunday is a gospel institution.

As you make your decision on the question, remember that another decision is yet to be made. When "God shall bring every work into judgment," your decision will be passed upon. If you decide in harmony with the revealed will of God, that day will confirm and establish your choice. But if you decide contrary to "the statutes of Heaven," that day will reverse your decision, without leaving it possible for you to correct your errors.

May God, by the aid of his Holy Spirit, enable you so to judge, so to act and to live, that of you the angel may proclaim: "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14: 12.

The Review and Herald.

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

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

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

White Robes:

OR, THE PLAN OF SALVATION BY JESUS CHRIST,
FROM PARADISE LOST TO PARADISE
RESTORED.

THE white robes of the redeemed, or the plan of salvation by Jesus Christ, and what will be finally accomplished by it for all those who accept it, and comply with its conditions, is a theme upon which we have more recently dwelt with great delight. And we propose to give a series of articles upon the subject, in which we hope to successfully expose popular errors, and set forth important truths in contrast with the common errors of our time.

The seventh chapter of the book of Revelation relates to two classes of the redeemed. It first introduces the definite number of an hundred and forty and four thousand, and gives distinct specifications relative to them, of which we shall fully speak in a future article. The closing portion of the chapter then describes the great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, as clothed with white robes, and bearing palms of victory. One class is numbered; the other cannot be numbered. One is manifested and sealed at a definite period of time; while the other is redeemed, not only from all the nations existing at any one time, but from all people who have lived upon the earth from the time of the offer of salvation to fallen man, to the close of human probation.

"After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb." Verses 9, 10. The prophet had just before taken a definite view of the one hundred and forty and four thousand, which were to be manifested and sealed near the close of probation. He next beholds with astonishment the numberless hosts of the redeemed, which make up all the saved. And as his prophetic eye runs back over all time, he sees them gathered from all the nations, in all the different ages of the world. Hence the expression, "After this I looked, and, lo, a great multitude."

These stood before the Lamb. They had been redeemed by the blood of Christ, and stood before him as the dear purchase of his precious blood.

They were clothed with white robes. We shall not understand by this that the saints in this world, or in that which is to come, are to wear literal garments of white linen to represent inward holiness. The white robe must be understood as a figure of purity of character. The redeemed of the Lord had obtained this purity during the period of their probation. They had availed themselves of the matchless cleansing power of the blood of Jesus Christ, while, at the same time, they had, in his strength, wrought righteousness.

These, also, held palms in their hands. They were victors. They had conquered the world, the flesh, and the devil. They had overcome by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony.

And, let it be borne in mind, these were the saved "of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues." Abel and Enoch will be there; righteous Noah, faithful Abraham, and all the holy prophets of God, with robes washed in the blood of the Lamb, and bearing palms of victory, through his redeeming power, will stand before him, as well as the apostles and martyrs of Jesus, the reformers and those saved in the nineteenth century.

Hark! Do you hear that universal shout of victory from unnumbered voices? Salvation's hour complete has come! And now the heavenly plains are ringing with the significant notes of "Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb." The patriarchs, prophets, and saints of past dispensations, join those saved in the present dispensation in ascribing the praise of their salvation to Jesus, the

Redeemer. While those who are saved in the present dispensation join the patriarchs and those saved in the Jewish age in honors to the Creator and Law-giver. Hence, the law of Him that sitteth upon the throne, and the gospel of the Lamb of God, both reach across all the ages of human probation, and are in perfect harmony in the execution of the great plan of man's salvation.

In the name of reason and of revelation, we protest against the heresy that the law of the Father and the gospel of the Son of God are opposed to each other; the one to take the place of the other, as if the men of former dispensations were saved by the law, and those of the present dispensation, saved by the gospel. For if this were possible, the redeemed would be divided in ascribing the praises of their salvation. There would be two distinct songs heard in Heaven, and both would differ from that universal one heard by John, pealing forth from all the saved of all the ages. While the patriarchs, and those saved from the Jewish age, would be shouting, "Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne," and ascribing the praise of their salvation to the divine law, those who are saved in what is called the Christian age would be shouting, "Salvation unto the Lamb," and ascribing their salvation to the gospel! This view of the subject is not only anti-scriptural in the highest degree, but is preposterous.

It has been the object of the father of falsehood and error, in order to confuse the glorious plan of salvation in the minds of the people, to make it appear that the law of the Father and the gospel of the Son are in contrast. The Jews were incited by the spirit of error to reject Jesus and his gospel while they clung to the law, their interpretations of which were fearfully warped by their traditions. And many Christians, led by the same spirit of error, reject the law of the Father, while they profess with great tenacity to cling to the cross and the gospel. The cry of the one was, The law! the law! but away with Christ! The cry of the other is, The gospel of Christ! the gospel! but away with the law.

The grand scheme of the salvation of men in all the ages of probation is one plan. There is but one. And the victorious song of all who are saved by it will be one. The gospel is not one of the plans by which men are saved from sin, and by which they secure a moral fitness for the life to come. There is but one plan, and the gospel is a part of that great plan. Neither has it been possible for sinful man in the ages past to secure a fitness for the inheritance of the saints in light, by the divine law alone. There is no ability in the law to redeem the transgressor. It is not the province of law, human or divine, to redeem the transgressor of law. The law is a rule of right actions, condemning the transgressor, and holding him as such until he suffers the penalty. The divine law can do no more for the sinner than this. Without the gospel, which alone offers pardon and salvation to the repenting sinner, the men of the patriarchal and Jewish ages would all have been lost.

The gospel of the Son of God is the good news that there was pardon and salvation for fallen man through Jesus Christ. That good news was proclaimed to Adam, and embraced by Abel, Enoch, and all the patriarchs and prophets. Jesus is the only Saviour of men. "There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4:12. Hence he is the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Rev. 13:8.

Next week we will speak more fully of the gospel in former dispensations.

Moses and Aaron.

UPON Mount Hor Aaron died and was buried. Moses, Aaron's brother, and Eleazar, his son, accompanied him. The painful duty was laid upon Moses to remove from his brother Aaron the sacerdotal robes and place them upon Eleazar, for God had said he should succeed Aaron in the priesthood. Moses and Eleazar witnessed the death of Aaron; and Moses buried him in the mount. This scene upon Mount Hor carries our minds back and connects it with some of the most striking events in the life of Aaron.

Aaron was a man of amiable disposition, whom God selected to stand with Moses and speak for him, in short, to be mouthpiece for Moses. God might have chosen Aaron as leader; but he who is acquainted with hearts, who understands character, knew that Aaron was yielding, and lacked moral courage to stand in defense of the right under all circumstances irrespective of

consequences. Aaron's desire to have the good will of the people sometimes led him to commit great wrongs. He too frequently yielded to their entreaties, and in so doing dishonored God. The same want of standing firmly for the right in his family resulted in the death of two of his sons. Aaron was eminent for piety and usefulness, but he neglected to discipline his family. Rather than perform the task of requiring respect and reverence of his sons, he allowed them to follow their inclinations. He did not discipline them in self-denial, but yielded to their wishes. They were not disciplined to respect and reverence parental authority. The father was the proper ruler of his own family as long as he lived. His authority was not to cease, even after his children were grown up and had families of their own. God himself was the monarch of the nation, and from the people he claimed obedience and honor.

The order and prosperity of the kingdom depended upon the good order of the church. And the prosperity, harmony, and order of the church were dependent upon the good order and thorough discipline of families. God punishes the unfaithfulness of parents to whom he has intrusted the duty to maintain the principles of parental government, which lie at the foundation of church discipline, and the prosperity of the nation. One undisciplined child has frequently marred the peace and harmony of a church, and incited to murmuring and rebellion, a nation. God has enjoined, in the most solemn manner upon children, their duty to affectionately respect and honor their parents. God required, on the other hand, of parents to train up their children, and with unceasing diligence to educate them in regard to the claims of his law, and to instruct them in the knowledge and fear of God. These injunctions which God laid with so much solemnity upon the Jews, rests with equal weight upon Christian parents. Those who neglect the light and instruction given of God in his word, in regard to training their children and commanding their household after them, will have a fearful account to settle. Aaron's criminal neglect to command respect and reverence of his sons resulted in their death.

God distinguished Aaron in choosing him and his male posterity for the priesthood. His sons ministered in the sacred office. Nadab and Abihu failed to reverence the command of God, to offer sacred fire upon their censers with the incense before him. God had forbidden them to use the common fire to present before him with the incense, upon pain of death.

Here was seen the result of loose discipline. As Aaron's sons had not been educated to respect and reverence the commands of their father, as they disregarded parental authority, they did not realize the necessity of explicitly following the requirements of God. When indulging their appetite for wine, while under its exciting stimulus their reason was beclouded. They could not discern difference between the sacred and the common. Contrary to God's express direction they dishonored him by offering common fire instead of sacred. God visited them with his wrath—fire went forth from his presence and destroyed them.

Aaron bore his severe affliction with patience and humble submission. Sorrow and keen agony wrung his soul. He was convicted of his neglect of duty. He was priest of the Most High God, to make atonement for the sins of the people. He was priest of his household, yet he had been inclined to pass over the folly of his children. He neglected his duty to train and educate his children to obedience, self-denial, and reverence for parental authority. Through feelings of misplaced indulgence he failed to mold the characters of his children with high reverence for eternal things. Aaron did not see any more than many Christian parents now see that their misplaced love and the indulgence of their children in wrong, is preparing them for the certain displeasure of God, and for his wrath to break forth upon them to their destruction.

While Aaron neglected to exercise his authority, the justice of God awakened against them. Aaron had to learn that gentle remonstrance, without exercising, with firmness, parental restraint, and his imprudent tenderness toward his sons, were cruelty in the extreme. God took the work of justice into his own hands and destroyed the sons of Aaron.

When God called for Moses to come up into the mountain, it was six days before he was received into the cloud, to the immediate presence of God. The top of the mountain was all aglow with the glory of God. And even while the children of Israel had in their very sight the glory of God upon the mount, unbelief was so natural to them, because Moses was absent they began to murmur with discontent. While the glory of God signified his sacred presence upon the mountain, and their leader was in close converse with God, they should have been sanctifying themselves to God by close searching of heart, humiliation, and godly fear. God had left Aaron and Hur, to take the place of Moses. The people were to consult and advise with these men of God's appointment in the absence of Moses.

Here Aaron's deficiency as a leader or governor of Israel was seen. The people beset him to make them gods to go before them into Egypt. Here was an opportunity for Aaron to

show his faith and unwavering confidence in God, and in firmness and with decision meet the proposition of the people. But the natural love of Aaron to please, and to yield to the people, led him to sacrifice the honor of God. He requested them to bring their ornaments to him, and he wrought out for them a golden calf, and proclaimed before the people, "These be thy gods O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." And to this senseless god, Aaron made an altar, and proclaimed on the morrow a feast to the Lord. All restraint seemed to be removed from the people. They offered burnt-offerings to the golden calf, and a spirit of levity took possession of them. They ate, they drank, and rose up to play. They indulged in shameful rioting and drunkenness.

A few weeks only had passed since they had made a solemn covenant with God to obey his voice. They had listened to the words of God's law, spoken in awful grandeur from Sinai's mount, amid thunderings and lightnings and earthquakes. They had heard the declaration from the lips of God himself, "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments."

Aaron had been exalted, also his sons, in being called into the mount, to there witness the glory of God. "And they saw the God of Israel; and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in its clearness."

God had appointed Nadab and Abihu to a most sacred work, therefore he honored them in a most wonderful manner. God gave them a view of his excellent glory, that the scenes they should witness in the mount would abide upon them, and the better qualify them to minister in his service, and render to him that exalted honor and reverence before the people, which would give them clearer conceptions of his character, and awaken in them due obedience and reverence for all his requirements.

Moses, before he left his people for the mount, read to them the words of the covenant God had made with them, and they with one voice answered, "All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient." How great must have been the sin of Aaron, how aggravating in the sight of God!

While Moses was receiving the law of God in the mount, the Lord informed him of the sin of rebellious Israel, and requested him to let them go, that he might destroy them. But Moses plead before God for the people. Although Moses was the meekest man that lived, yet when the interests of the people were at stake over whom God had appointed him as leader, he loses his natural timidity, and with singular persistency and wonderful boldness, pleads with God for Israel. He will not consent that God shall destroy his people, although God promised that in their destruction he would exalt Moses, and raise up a better people than Israel. Moses prevailed. God granted his earnest petition not to blot out his people. Moses took the tables of the covenant, the law of ten commandments, and descended from the mount. The boisterous, drunken revelry of the children of Israel reached his ears, long before he came to the camp of Israel. When he saw their idolatry, and that they had broken in a most marked manner the words of the covenant, he became overwhelmed with grief and indignation at their base idolatry. Confusion and shame on their account took possession of him, and he there threw down the tables and broke them. As they had broken their covenant with God, Moses, in breaking the tables, signified to them, so, also, God had broken his covenant with them. The tables, whereupon was written the law of God, were broken.

Aaron, with his amiable disposition, so very mild and pleasing, sought to conciliate Moses, as though no very great sin had been committed by the people that he should feel thus deeply over. Moses asked in anger, "What did this people unto thee that thou hast brought so great a sin upon them?" "And Aaron said, Let not the anger of my Lord wax hot; thou knowest the people, that they are set on mischief. For they said unto me, Make us gods, which shall go before us; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what has become of him. And I said unto them, Whosoever hath any gold, let them break it off. So they gave it me; then I cast it into the fire, and there came out this calf."

Aaron would have Moses think that some wonderful miracle had transformed their golden ornaments into the shape of a calf. He did not relate to Moses that he had, with other workmen, wrought out this image.

Aaron had thought that Moses had been too unyielding to the wishes of the people. And if he had been less firm, less decided at times; if he had made a compromise with them, and gratified their wishes, he would have had less trouble,

and there would have been more peace and harmony in the camp of Israel. He, therefore, had been trying this new policy. He carried out his natural temperament of yielding to the wishes of the people, to save dissatisfaction and preserve their good-will, and thereby prevent a rebellion, which he thought would certainly come if he withstood their wishes. But had Aaron stood unwaveringly for God; had he met the intimation of the people for him to make them gods to go before them to Egypt, with the just indignation and horror their proposition deserved; had he cited them to the terrors of Sinai, where God had spoken his law in such glory and majesty; had he reminded them of their solemn covenant with God to obey all he should command them; had he told them that he would not at the sacrifice of his life yield to their entreaties, he would have had influence with the people to prevent a terrible apostasy. But when his influence was required to be used in the right direction in the absence of Moses, when he should have stood as firm and unyielding as did Moses to prevent them from pursuing a course of sin, his influence was exerted on the wrong side. He was powerless to make his influence felt in vindication of God's honor in keeping his holy law. But on the wrong side he had swayed a powerful influence. He directed, and the people obeyed. When Aaron took the first step in the wrong direction, the spirit which had actuated the people imbued him, and he took the lead, and directed as a general, and the people were singularly obedient. Here Aaron gave decided sanction to the most aggravating sins, because it was attended with less difficulty than to stand in vindication of the right. When he swerved from his integrity in giving sanction to the people in their sins, he seemed inspired with decision, earnestness, and zeal, new to him. His timidity seemed suddenly to disappear. He seized the instruments to work out the gold into the image of a calf with a zeal he had never manifested in standing in defense of the honor of God against wrong. He ordered an altar to be built, and with assurance, worthy of a better cause, he proclaimed to the people that on the morrow would be a feast to the Lord. The trumpeters took the word from the mouth of Aaron and sounded the proclamation from company to company of the armies of Israel.

Aaron's calm assurance in a wrong course gave him greater influence than Moses could have had in leading them in a right course, and subduing their rebellion. What terrible spiritual blindness had come upon Aaron that he should put light for darkness, and darkness for light. What presumption in him to proclaim a feast to the Lord over their idolatry of a golden image! Here is seen the power that Satan has over minds that are not fully controlled by the Spirit of God. Satan had set up his banner in the midst of Israel, and it was exalted as the banner of God.

"These," said Aaron (without hesitation or shame), be thy gods O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt." Aaron influenced the children of Israel to go to greater lengths in idolatry than had entered their minds. They were no longer troubled lest the burning glory like flaming fire upon the mount had consumed their leader. They thought they had a general who just suited them. They were ready to do anything he suggested. They offered peace offerings, and sacrificed to their golden god, and gave themselves up to pleasure, rioting, and drunkenness. They were then decided in their own minds that it was not because they were wrong, that they had so much trouble in the wilderness; but the difficulty, after all, was with their leader. He was not a right kind of a man. He was too unyielding, and was continually keeping their sins before them, warning and reproving them, and threatening them with God's displeasure. A new order of things had come, and they were pleased with Aaron, and pleased with themselves. They thought, if Moses had only been as amiable and mild as Aaron, what peace and harmony would have prevailed in the camp of Israel. They cared not now whether Moses ever came down from the Mount or not.

When Moses saw the idolatry of Israel, and his indignation was so aroused at their shameful forgetfulness of God, that he threw down the tables of stone and broke them, Aaron stood meekly by, bearing the censure of Moses with commendable patience. The people were charmed with Aaron's lovely spirit, and were disgusted with Moses' rashness. But God seeth not as man seeth. He condemned not the ardor and indignation of Moses against the base apostasy of Israel.

The true general, then takes his position for God. He has come direct from the presence of the Lord, where he plead with him to turn away his wrath from his erring people. Now he has another work to do as God's minister, to vindicate his honor before the people, and let them see that sin is sin, and righteousness is righteousness. He has a work to do to counteract the terrible influence of Aaron. "Then Moses stood in the gate of the camp, and said, Who is on the Lord's side? Let him come unto me. And all the sons of Levi gathered themselves together unto him. And he said unto them, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Put every man, his sword by his side, and go in and out from gate to gate throughout the camp, and slay every man his brother, and every man

his companion, and every man his neighbor. And the children of Levi did according to the word of Moses; and there fell of the people that day about three thousand men. For Moses had said, Consecrate yourselves to-day to the Lord, even every man upon his son, and upon his brother; that he may bestow upon you a blessing this day."

Here Moses defines genuine consecration as obedience to God, to stand in vindication of the right, and to show a readiness to carry out the purpose of God in the most unpleasant duties, showing the claims of God are higher than the claims of friends, or the lives of the nearest relatives. The sons of Levi consecrated themselves to God to execute his justice against crime and sin.

Aaron and Moses both sinned in not giving glory and honor to God at the waters of Meribah. They were both wearied and provoked with the continual complaining of Israel, and at a time when God was to mercifully display his glory to the people to soften and subdue their hearts and lead them to repentance. Moses and Aaron claimed the power of opening the rock for them. "Hear now, ye rebels: must we fetch you water out of this rock?" Here was a golden opportunity to sanctify the Lord in their midst, to show them the long-suffering of God and his tender pity for them. They had murmured against Moses and Aaron because they could not find water. Moses and Aaron took these murmurings as a great trial and dishonor to them. They forgot that it was God whom they were grieving. It was God they were sinning against and dishonoring, not they who were men appointed of God to carry out his purpose. They were insulting their best friend in charging their calamities upon Moses and Aaron; they were murmuring at God's providence.

This sin of these noble leaders was great. Their lives might have been illustrious to the close. They had been greatly exalted and honored; yet God does not excuse sin in those in exalted position, any sooner than in the more humble.

Many professed Christians look upon men who do not reprove and condemn wrong, as men of piety, and Christians indeed, while men who stand boldly in the defense of right, and will not yield their integrity to un consecrated influences, they think lack piety and a Christian spirit.

Those who stand in defense of the honor of God, and maintain the purity of truth at any cost, will have manifold trials, as did our Saviour in the wilderness of temptation. The yielding temperaments, who have not courage to condemn wrong, but keep silent when their influence is needed to stand in the defense of right against any pressure, may avoid many heart-aches, and escape many perplexities, and lose a very rich reward, if not their own souls.

Those who in harmony with God, and through faith in him, receive strength to resist wrong, and stand in defense of the right, will always have severe conflicts, and will frequently have to stand almost alone. But precious victories will be theirs while they make God their dependence. His grace will be their strength. Their moral sense will be keen, clear, and sensitive. Their moral powers will be equal to withstand wrong influences. Their integrity, like that of Moses, of the purest character.

The mild and yielding spirit of Aaron to please the people, blinded his eyes to their sins, and to the enormity of the crime he was sanctioning. His course in giving influence to wrong and sin in Israel cost the lives of three thousand men. The course of Moses, in what contrast! After he had evidenced to the people that they could not trifle with God with impunity; after he had shown them the just displeasure of God for their sins, in giving the terrible decree to slay friends or relatives who persisted in their apostasy, after the work of justice to turn away the wrath of God, irrespective of their feelings of sympathy for loved friends and relatives who continued obstinate in their rebellion, Moses was now prepared for another work. He evidenced who was the true friend of God, and the friend of the people.

"And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses said unto the people, Ye have sinned a great sin; and now I will go up unto the Lord; peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin. And Moses returned unto the Lord, and said, Oh, this people have sinned a great sin, and have made them gods of gold. Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin—; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written. And the Lord said unto Moses, Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book. Therefore now go, lead the people unto the place of which I have spoken unto thee; behold, mine Angel shall go before thee; nevertheless in the day when I visit I will visit their sin upon them. And the Lord plagued the people, because they made the calf, which Aaron made."

Moses supplicated God in behalf of sinning Israel. He did not try to lessen their sin before God. He did not excuse them in their sin. He frankly acknowledged they had sinned a great sin, and had made them gods of gold. Then he loses his timidity, and the interest of Israel is so closely interwoven with his life, that he comes with boldness to God, and prays for him to forgive his people. If their sin, he pleads, is so

great that God cannot forgive them, if their names must be blotted from his book, he prayed the Lord to blot out his name also. When the Lord renewed his promise to Moses, that his Angel should go before him in leading the people to the promised land, Moses knew that his request was granted. But the Lord assured Moses that if he was provoked to visit the people for their transgressions, he would surely punish them for this grievous sin also. If they were henceforth obedient, he would blot out this great sin out of his book.

ELLEN G. WHITE.

Black Hawk, Colorado.

Talking Discouragement.

Of all unprofitable employment, perhaps nothing is more entirely so than talking discouragement. It takes the life out of any enterprise. Its only tendency is toward failure. Whenever any cause is embraced, and its prosecution resolved upon, and our interests are united with it, it is reasonable to suppose we have done these things because we believe the cause a good one, and that it will succeed. Had the thing been of a questionable nature, those questions should have been considered before embarking in it. To be sure, we may discover reasons which cause us to conclude we have been mistaken many times. If so, like honest people we can confess such mistake, and renounce the whole thing. This is the only honorable way out. But when we still think the cause good and right, and bound to triumph, there can be no excuse for murmuring, complaining, and talking discouragement. Faith, courage, and hope, are the necessary elements to success in any enterprise. Without these, little can be done. What wonders have men not realized, when they have labored in faith for the accomplishment of any purpose!

No man can make great efforts when there is no courage to back them up. Every stroke will be weak. But let faith and hope nerve his arm, and his blows are given with a will. Faith is especially important in God's cause. The Lord has chosen to work through human agencies, but these must be of such a character that he can consistently work through them. The man who has satisfied himself that he is truly engaged in the work of God, that the Creator is on his side, has then reason to have hope and courage. Not only has he human efforts to rely upon, but he can consistently expect help from him who has never failed of success. To talk discouragement under such circumstances is nothing short of sinful.

The case of the Israelites, going through to the promised land, is in point. When they had come near to its borders, Moses sent twelve men, one from every tribe, to go through and see what sort of a country it was, and what obstacles they would have to encounter. They searched the land through, and brought back wonderful evidences of its fruitfulness. One cluster of grapes, which they carried upon a staff between two men, was a surprising evidence of fertility. The land was one indeed which flowed with milk and honey. But they had also seen huge giants there, in whose sight they were as grasshoppers. The walls were thick and high. The inhabitants were very numerous, and they concluded they could not conquer. The effect of their testimony was to greatly discourage the people. It was in vain that two of their number tried to talk faith. Man's heart being naturally unbelieving, and the devil being very anxious to have people doubt, the balance turned that way, and the people had no heart to go farther. God was greatly displeased with these ten men, and they died with the plague before the congregation. Why? Mainly because they discouraged the people. That great multitude had to return over their weary course, and wander forty years in those deserts, till all the multitude died for that act. These things were our "examples upon whom the ends of the world are come."

It is not necessary that we lie, or commit crime, to lose God's favor. We may question his dealings, his power, his readiness to work, until we doubt ourselves into darkness as gross as Egypt; till the sky will look blacker than a thunder cloud, and devils will be seen at every corner, where shining angels of hope might as well appear, in our mind's imagination. There is no blessing pronounced in the Bible upon unbelief; but great and mighty are the promises to hope and faith. God is pleased to have us expect great things from him, when we try honestly to serve him. He is a gracious Father, who loves to do his children good. He is not so well pleased to see us hiding and shrinking in a corner, fearing he will inflict the lash of his anger upon us, as he is to see our faces full of hope and courage and joy and peace, feeling that our Father is gracious, loving, and one who will care for us. He wants us to work with this spirit, and he will bless us in our work. This faith will enable us to do great things in his service, make our efforts felt, and fill our very bones with health.

I am satisfied from experience and observation that a large portion of the sickness among our ministers and people arises from discouragement, looking upon darkness till hope dies out of our hearts. What excuse can there be for those of us who firmly believe this is God's work for the last days, to get discouraged? Has that

mighty arm become weak? Does he who rules the universe lose his interest in this, his closing work of warning, before the grand scene closes up? Are the obstacles in the way so great that God cannot overcome them? Will he who has never lost a single case now fail up in his closing work? Our faith is being tested, and I am sorry to say the test shows that it is far too weak.

The fact is, talking discouragement never yet removed a single obstacle, but generally adds several more. Looking at darkness never brightened a single cloud, but turns us into the same image. Every one of these difficulties will have finally to be met by us manfully, sooner or later. What then is the use of lying down in cowardice and dreading the matter, and suffering an age, till we are almost ready to despair, and then have to overcome these things at last? We want men of faith, ministers of faith, to talk faith to the people. A minister has no business out discouraging others. He might better stop at home, by far. It is not whistling to keep our courage up, that is wanted, but calm, settled conviction of the truthfulness of our position; and having become settled upon that, to go forward. I need not refer to the evidences of our position; they are familiar to most readers of the REVIEW.

The Lord is coming. The Bible teaches it. A message of warning is to be proclaimed before the Saviour appears. The prophet says so. That message has the law of God in it; the foundation principles of morality are to test the world. Could we want a better platform than the law of Jehovah?

This movement has been in progress for years, and in spite of every kind of opposition, it has made headway in all directions. Its enemies have prophesied its fall; but somehow it don't fall. It is unpopular, but it is true. It started from nothing, and now the nations and the peoples are beginning to inquire after it. Nothing stands in the way to hinder its mighty onward march to certain victory, but the sad, feeble, discouraged state of many of its adherents. If they would take hold as the providence of God opens the way before us, with all their hearts, and live faith, talk faith, and work by faith, their souls would warm with an unwonted fire, their countenances would beam with new emotions.

It is time to look up. God lives. This is his work, and let us act as though we thought he was capable of caring for it. Let us do our duty, and let us lay aside this talking discouragement, ministers and people. Let us talk faith, hope, and courage. "When we are almost overcome," says one, "how can I?" That is just the time you should do so. You need it. You are dying for lack of it. Feed yourself upon this diet and your sickness will depart. Darkness is the very time when light is wanted. When faint and weary toiling, faith and hope will strengthen us; nothing else will. "Pilgrims on, the day is dawning." This should be our watchword. We have a great work to do, and but a short time to do it in; and therefore we must work in faith and hope and good courage.

GEO. I. BUTLER.

Mt. Pleasant, Iowa, July 15, 1873.

Elohim, Singular or Plural.

THE form of this word, ELOHIM, has led many to suppose it includes the Trinity of the Godhead, viz., the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; I therefore thought of giving a brief criticism on this word as to its original meaning, whether singular or plural.

Those who have studied etymology are well aware that most words now in use were formed by *onomatopæia*; that is, the formation of words in such a manner that they shall imitate their sense; as *buzz*, *crash*, *roar*, etc. The Hebrew may unhesitatingly be called the first language, and originated in the garden of Eden; or, as all admit, at least, it originated with Heber, Gen. 10:21; it is certain that the whole language was not complete at either time; but kept on increasing its words in accordance with the necessity of its usage. Hence, things animate or inanimate that were unknown in the past, we now suffer the loss thereof, and are obliged to form our own words to things coming up anew. As of *railroad* (MASLOOL BARZEL), *iron path*; the *nightingale* (SHEERATH LAYEEL), *night singer*, etc. Since we arrive at the conclusion that this is the origin of words, let us now try to find out what about ELOHIM.

This word also belongs to *onomatopæia*; if we should throw off the last syllable, IM, from ELOHIM, and leave it ELOH in the singular, we can see at a glance that its sound does not imitate the *majesty*, *power*, *strength*, *judgment*, intended; whereas if we affix IM to ELOH and sound it ELOHIM, the sound thereof does positively indicate *majesty*, *power*, *strength*, *judgment*; the true nature of God.

ELOHIM, is really the singular term for God, as is *shama-IM*, for *heaven*, and *cha-IM*, for *life*. Its so-called singular form, ELOH, is only used in poetical style and in the later Hebrew.

M. B. LICHTENSTEIN.

Battle Creek, Mich.

A GOOD conscience is better than two witnesses—it will consume your grief as the sun dissolves ice. It is a spring when you are thirsty—a staff when you are weary—a screen when the sun burns—a pillow in death.

THE END OF ALL THINGS.

"The end of all things is at hand; be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer."—1 Pet. 4:7.

The end of all things is at hand,
The end of each relation here—
Nor kindred tie, nor friendship's band,
However strong, however dear,
But must at one fell stroke be riven,
Unless their roots be fix'd in Heaven.

The end of all things is at hand,
The end of our probation's space,
None then can linger on the strand,
Nor for repentance find a place.
Hark! how it sounds along the shore!
Then time shall be no more—no more.

The end of all things is at hand;
The end of pain, the end of sin;
Of exile in this foreign land,
Assaults without, and strife within;
The end of Satan's short-lived hour,
The end of death's terrific power.

The end of all things is at hand;
Yes, of our faith the end draws nigh:
Now watching, waiting, Lord, we stand,
Soon will thy glory meet our eye;
Amidst creation's funeral wail
Thy longed-for advent we shall hail.
—Charlotte Elliott.

Progress of the Cause.

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

Indiana.

At the time of our last report, we had given at Michigantown, Clinton Co., fourteen discourses. Since that time, we have held meetings when circumstances would admit. The weather has been very stormy since we pitched the tent. We have been here nearly six weeks, and we can safely affirm that the tent has been wet one half of the time. We have encountered some severe storms. The fourth of July, just before the commencement of the Sabbath, this portion of the country was visited with as hard a storm of wind, rain, and, in some localities, hail, as has been known for several years. Trees were torn up by the roots, and in some places, houses were unroofed. The tent was blown down. Through the protection of the Lord, we were not injured, nor was the tent damaged in the least. Evening after the Sabbath, and first-day morning, assisted by kind friends, we were enabled to pitch the tent and resume the meetings.

The congregations have been large, considering the busy period of the year. We have given thirty-eight discourses. Have received much opposition from the ministers of the Christian denomination. Three discourses have been given against the positions we take concerning the Kingdom and Sabbath. These discourses were given in such a manner as to displease a large majority of the people who listened to them, and the result has been to make the people more friendly to our positions.

We have held three Sabbath meetings. Have experienced some of the blessing of the Lord, and hearts have been reached. Fifteen have, by a rising vote, publicly declared their determination to keep the Sabbath. Others are interested, and we look for some more to take a decided stand. Have disposed, thus far, of twenty dollars' worth of books. We remain here one week longer, and then expect to pitch the tent at Rossville, in this county. We hope that success may attend the effort. We ask an interest in the prayers of God's people. S. H. LANE,
E. R. JONES.

Michigan.

My last report left me at Locke. June 14 and 15, visited the church at Genoa. Found this people still holding on in the good work. They had been earnestly praying that the Lord would direct and bless the labors of his messenger, that good might be done. The Lord did direct, and we received his blessing. All were encouraged to press on with better cheer, finally to receive the overcomer's reward.

June 21 and 22, met the friends at Alaidon. It being their regular quarterly meeting, it was a season of much interest, so much so that they had been earnestly praying the Lord would make it a rich season of grace. Our social, ordinance, and prayer meetings were what might be expected, good. There was one added to the church by baptism. The young in this church, as in Genoa, are still holding on in the good way. May the Lord have a special regard for the youth, is my heart's desire, and shall ever be my prayer to God.

June 28 and 29, met the church at Hillsdale. There was a fine gathering, and a good interest manifest in all the services. The ordinances were celebrated with good effect, s. b. arranged and pledged to Conference. They need to move out in greater efforts in the missionary and tract work. The cause demands it, and they need the strengthening experience it would give them.

July 5 and 6, at Ransom. Commenced labors at this place on Thursday and contin-

ued until the close of first-day. After taking care of a few little foxes that had been disturbing the vines, there came the healing balm, and we had a good, stirring meeting. Seven were added to the church by baptism, four of whom were the fruits of Bro. St. John's labors in Ohio. Three of them, the tender lambs of the flock, have lived from the labors of last winter. The ordinance was administered by Bro. St. John. Bird Lake was the place of burial, four miles distant. The day was fine, and the scene solemn and interesting.

Monday morning, started for home. On my way, had an attack of ague. After a week's trial of my patience, I am feeling better. I shall try, with the blessing of the Lord, to fill up the remainder of the time from this to camp-meeting, as best I can.

C. STODDARD.

The New Tent of Iowa and Neb. Conference.

FROM some cause, this tent did not arrive as soon as we expected; but is now here and pitched in the village of Ft. Calhoun, a small place of about three hundred inhabitants. We commenced meetings last evening. Dear brethren, pray for us, that God will bless our labors to the honor of his own cause.

J. BARTLETT,
CHAS. L. BOYD.

Ft. Calhoun, Neb., July 18, 1873.

West Burke, Vermont.

THE tent remained at West Burke, over four weeks. We held thirty-six meetings in all. Two of these were Sabbath meetings. The interest was confined to a few. Two of Bro. Litchfield's sons started for the kingdom. May they press on in the narrow way, performing every duty, and grow up into strong men in God, that they may have a gathering influence on those around them.

Yesterday (Sabbath), we had a good meeting at Eld. Cleaveland's, West Burke. The Spirit of the Lord was with us in power. Eld. C. took a firm stand for the truth. May he and his wife be revived in the work of God, and be instrumental in gathering souls into the truth.

I have settled at Burke, a retired little village, two miles east of West Burke. I shall lecture in a meeting-house in this place on Sunday, and shall spend the rest of my time until camp-meeting in attending monthly meetings, and setting things in order, as far as circumstances will permit. Then I shall be ready to labor as providence will open the way. D. T. BOURDEAU.

Burke, Vt., July 13, 1873.

Wisconsin.

ACCORDING to appointment, we met with the church at Kickapoo Center, Vernon Co., Sabbath, July 5; preached in the forenoon, in the afternoon the ordinances of the Lord's house were celebrated. The meetings were continued nine days. Sixteen sermons were preached, mostly practical; two discourses on the perpetuity of spiritual gifts, one on tract and missionary labor. Re-organized T. and M. Society; received \$5.82 for membership.

We found the church very much on the background, and difficulty among some. We visited the brethren and neighbors, labored with them at their homes in the daytime, and preached in the evening. With the help of the Lord, we were enabled to get the difficulty settled. Confessions were made, and the Lord, by his good Spirit, came into our meeting. Truth had its desired and designed effect on the hearts of those that heard it. Sinners were convicted of sin; four were converted; five were baptized; six were added to the church; one name dropped. One brother acknowledged that his tobacco cost him twenty dollars a year. He and another brother resolved to give up this filthy habit. May the Lord bless this church, and add to their number such as shall be saved.

P. S. THURSTON,
JOHN ATKINSON.

Liberty Pole, Wis., July 15, 1873.

Southern Iowa Tent.

WE closed tent labor at Kellogg on the 13th because there was not sufficient interest to warrant us to stay longer. We spent three weeks laboring as best we could, giving twenty-nine discourses. Bro. Olds of Nebraska preached three times. While some are willing to concede the truthfulness of our positions, none are ready to obey; but we trust the seed which was sown may be like bread cast upon the waters.

But two families were keeping the Sabbath here. Their lives, we are glad to say, have been exemplary. They bore the burdens of these meetings cheerfully, for which they will not lose their reward, if they prove faithful unto the end. We shall not forget these dear friends in our prayers; nor Bro. and Sister Baker for their hospitality which we shared.

The tent is now pitched at Marengo, Iowa

Co., and meetings begin to-night. This is a city of about two thousand inhabitants. The people are courteous, and we hope for good results. Our trust is in God, and we most sincerely ask the prayers of God's people.

This will now be our address, Marengo, Iowa Co., Iowa. R. M. KILGORE.
July 17, 1873.

Minnesota Camp-Meeting.

I WISH to give public expression of my gratitude to God for his Spirit's presence at the Minnesota camp-meeting. No human instrumentality, unaided by God, could have produced such glorious results. The blessing attending the labors of Eld. Canright for the past year in Minnesota, prepared the way, and the clear and harmonious manner in which Elders Butler, Canright, and Matteson, showed our relation as a people to prophecy, removed every doubt from the minds of the brethren, and convinced the gainsayer. Probably the majority of the brethren in Minnesota, while fully believing some of the prominent parts of our faith, and standing committed on it as a whole, while they could not disprove any of it, looked upon some of the connecting links of it as rather nonessential. This was unavoidably a cause of barrenness of soul, and when these seeming nonessentials were shown, beyond a possibility of a doubt, to be indispensable in the last message to mankind, as these truths were gradually brought to bear on the mind, an unmistakable evidence lit up the countenance, and soul-felt testimonies, burning with love to God and man, compelled outsiders (who care for none of these things), to say, Of a truth, God is with you.

The fruits of that meeting, the Judgment will unfold. As an occasion offered, I embraced the opportunity of conversing with many of the prominent citizens of the place, all of whom give evidence that their hearts are touched by what they have seen and heard, and they expressed a desire to be permitted to give of their substance to secure our meetings permanently at that place.

Dear brethren and sisters, we who were permitted to enjoy that meeting will have to render an account how we improve and use the light we received. Will our families and neighbors be benefited by us, and so share the blessing, or will we ungratefully and selfishly hide our light till it dies for want of air? Dear friends, many of us have admitted present truth long enough; let us from henceforth feel it, and act accordingly.

JOHN McMILLAN.

Osego, Mich.

I EXPECTED to leave here to-day. The interest is such, I dare not. The best meeting last Sabbath I have had in the State. Some one dozen up for prayer. Baptized two yesterday.

Old difficulties in the church are moving off. Union is being restored. Good reports from old Monterey. Brethren here from there and Allegan last Sabbath.

Pray for us. A. S. HUTCHINS.
July 21.

Isanti, Isanti Co., Minn.

IN this place, I have labored a week among our Swedish friends in company with Bro. Lee. There has been a good interest to hear. We have held two meetings each day, most of the time; no evening meetings. Number of hearers, from thirty to seventy. The people are busy with their hay, otherwise we would have had many more hearers. A church is organized, with fifteen members. Seven or more, besides these, are keeping the Sabbath, and there is a good prospect of many more embracing the truth in this vicinity when more labor can be bestowed. Bro. John Larson was unanimously chosen and ordained as local elder. They have pledged \$44.00 s. b. to the Conference for this year, and desire to unite with the Conference. The address of the Secretary is: Andrew Norin, Isanti, Isanti Co., Minn. I have enjoyed much freedom in speaking the word among these friends. The Lord has worked among them, and they manifest such a love for the truth that we cannot but praise the Lord for his goodness to them and to us.

JOHN MATTESON.

Litchfield, Meeker Co., July 23, 1873.

Wisconsin Tent.

I HAVE been here one week. The interest to hear is increasing. The congregations average from thirty-five to two hundred. The country is new; people are very busy haying; and the first-day Adventists are holding a tent-meeting only a few miles distant. Some go there who would otherwise attend our meetings.

There is, as is usually the case, some opposition by the professors in other churches. I think, however, the truth is winning the people here. I am, and have been, entirely alone; no tent-master, or any one to assist me in speaking. Bro. Sanborn will not be

here till August, being detained at home with his wife.

The tent is old, and badly worn. It demands my almost constant care, and would not stand a common wind storm, unless in a forest, and well protected. I am preaching nights, and three times Sundays. Dear brethren, I need your prayers, and God's help. Don't forget us at the throne of grace.

This is an entirely new field. The people are a hardy, hard-working class, and if they can or will turn their attention to religion as earnestly as they have to clearing up the forests, we shall hope to see the truth established here permanently. D. DOWNER.
Modena, Buffalo Co., July 20, 1873.

SISTER M. J. CHURCHILL writes from Olmstead Co., Minn.: As I did not have the privilege of attending our camp-meeting, I felt that I was denied a great blessing; but I hope those who are able to attend these yearly gatherings will profit so much by them as to be prepared to help and encourage those who have to remain away.

My mind runs back to the camp-meeting, three years ago, when I was buried with Christ in baptism. I have many times regretted that I walk so contrary to the perfect Pattern, but I feel like putting forth renewed efforts to get rid of all my sins. The Lord has been very good to me. In afflictions he has not left nor forsaken me. There are many reasons why I should love and serve him.

I realize as never before that time is short, and I mean, by the grace of God assisting me, to be one that can say, "Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us."

My Sins

FOR four or five years in the past have separated me from my Heavenly Father, and kept me in a state of doubt and fear, at times almost causing me to make entire shipwreck of my faith. But God in his infinite mercy has preserved me from such a rash step.

For some time previous to attending the late Wisconsin Camp-meeting, I had been trying to humble myself and examine the evidences of our faith in a more thorough manner than I had done before for years. I believed in the perpetuity of spiritual gifts, but had for several years been in great doubt as to the genuineness of sister White's visions. For three years, I had not cared to attend our camp-meetings; but now began to feel that I should like to join with our people in their approaching meeting, to seek God in earnest. We began to pray God to open the way, which was all hedged up in many ways, and he did so in a remarkable manner, even raising my wife from a bed of sickness in answer to prayer.

While there, listening to the testimonies of God's servants, I realized more fully than ever the terrible deception and darkness under which I have been. My mind became perfectly clear that this entire work is the Lord's, as I listened to the most powerful and convincing defense of the Testimonies of sister White that I ever heard, and that direct from the word of God. My eyes were opening. I could scarcely believe that such language could be found in the Bible. But there it was, showing her condition in vision to be precisely the same as those to whom God gave visions anciently. The Spirit of God rested down upon Bro. Butler as he spoke, and the prejudice of that large congregation of unbelievers seemed to vanish away with mine. Oh! could I have heard that sermon years ago, it would have saved me much trial, and I should not have been left to reproach the cause of truth, and to be ashamed of my Master's cause as I have.

The truth looks more glorious than ever, and I can no longer doubt that the whole of this work is the Lord's. I will not doubt any longer. Henceforth I will believe. I had courage and faith to believe that if I sought God with true humility of heart, he would not despise my efforts, but would for Christ's sake forgive my sins and raise me above doubts and discouragements, and this he has done in a measure, for my faith in this work never rested on surer foundations, and the way never seemed clearer or brighter.

We have tried to consecrate ourselves to God with everything we have in this life, and are henceforth resolved, by the help of the Lord, to lead humble, devoted lives to our Master, and place ourselves entirely in his hands, that he may use us to his glory, not shunning, or any longer being ashamed of, the testimonies which God in mercy and love has placed in the church. We are trying to walk in the light of the truth, and carefully live out all the reforms as revealed by the Spirit of God, not forgetting our past mistakes, or to keep low at the foot of the cross, looking forward only a little way from this, when we may be delivered from sin and sorrow, and share in the final triumph of God's dear, united people. May we have true humility and heavenly wisdom.

E. G. RUST.

Chicago, Ill., 270 Sedgwick St.

COMMON THINGS.

THEY lie around on every side,
For every day some blessing brings;
We look upon them without pride,
For what are they but common things?
So common that we have not known
The loss that we should feel to-day
If they were gathered, one by one,
And hidden from our sight away.

So common that we use or waste
As if they were our very own;
We sweeten this or that to taste,
And revel in our joys full blown.
We lay them down, or take them up,
No thankful thought about them elings,
We do not care to fill our cup,
Life's golden cup, with common things.

We want some rare and precious pet
That common people cannot buy;
We want the best that we can get,
No matter if the price is high.
Our birds are all too commonplace,
Bring us some foreign one that sings,
Some beauty that our halls would grace;
We've had enough of common things!

We want the best the world affords—
Pray who should have it if not we?
We want the gold the miser hoards,
We want the pearls that gem the sea.
The world moves slow—we long to fly,
How many of us sigh for wings,
Yet we should pass them coldly by,
Were they once classed with common things.

Whatever is most rich and grand,
Whatever others most desire,
We fain would hold within our hand—
To things like these our thoughts aspire.
We would have stars to light our way;
Our choice of all Dame Fortune brings;
Let us remember when we pray,
That many lack for common things.

—CLARA B. HEATH, in *Watchman and Reflector*.

Spiritualism.—No. 2.

BY M. E. CORNELL.

MRS. CHAMBERLAIN, a speaking medium came to Woodland and attracted some attention, but most of her positions were similar to those of Dr. Morrill. The spirit operating professed to be that of some celebrated doctor, and there was considerable ability in the use of medical terms, and philosophy. Whenever the spirit referred to our position, it did so with much energy, and at times was very spiteful!

The spirit said, If you ask us to prove the immortality of the soul by the Bible, we cannot, the Adventist would gain the advantage. A well-instructed Adventist will tell you more of the phenomena than we dare tell. Why? Because they have such a grand way of accounting for it. All they have to do is to cry, "Demons, demons, forever."

Reply. The spirit seems to be very much troubled because we have "such a grand way of accounting for the phenomena." It is grand, indeed! Taking the Bible, does give us a glorious "advantage," and even the spirits seem to appreciate it. The Bible explains it all, and exposes the deception, and this is why the spirits are so universally opposed to it. If they could only get the Bible out of the way there would be fair sailing for them.

Spirit. The man who says it is the devil, is bigoted. If God made all and called them good, where does the devil come from? You see there is no room for a devil.

Reply. That same Bible explains how it was that the angels fell. They were created good, and were perfect in their way, until iniquity was found in them. They were free agents, but kept not their first estate, and abode not in the truth. There was no evil or sin until it was found in Satan. He first introduced it by his rebellion.

Spirit. In a former lecture we said that we rather liked his Satanic Majesty, and some persons took fright and left the hall.

Reply. They might have left the hall because they were disgusted. Spiritualists often speak in favor of Satan, but who ever knew one to speak in praise of the God of the Bible? Evidently, it is because like those who crucified Christ, "ye are of your father the devil, and his works ye will do." This spirit, speaking through Mrs. Chamberlain, is, no doubt, one of Satan's angels, and of course he rather likes his master.

Spirit. The Bible is inferior to the Koran in many respects.

Reply. The spirits seem to like the Koran best. Just what we would expect of Satan, for he is the author of the Mohammedan religion. Hence, we often hear those under spirit influence speak in favor of the Koran, but never, in favor of the Bible.

Spirit. But there is no use talking to an Adventist, for they are out of our reach.

Reply. Why not? Because they cannot blind the eyes of one who really goes by the Bible. In that book, we are advertised of the deceptions of Satan, and we learn the fact that all these wonders, professing to be by the spirits of the dead, are in fact the work of fallen angels under Satan.

Spirit. What about the spirits that came to the Wesley family? They did act like the devil, sure enough! Were the Wesleys bad people?

Reply. No doubt that was the devil's troop assailing a good man. But the Wesleys believed they were the spirits of devils, and so declared at the time. They also thought they acted like

the devil, and were prepared to resist them. What a pity that many people now do not act with as much wisdom.

Spirit. Do the Adventists suppose they can find the soul—that subtle, gaseous substance that pervades all nature? It always existed. Man is a sponge, and absorbs the memorizing power of the lower animals. Life in the animal is tantamount to life in man.

Reply. We have no trouble in finding the soul which the Bible speaks of, but that immaterial, "gaseous substance," which pervades all nature, which exists as much in the aroma of the flowers as anywhere else, we are free to admit we cannot find. According to this spirit doctor, then, the soul is the memorizing power of the lower animals! So it may be that the "memorizing power" of a hog or a polecat may have become the immortal soul of some noted spiritualist lecturer.

Spirit. There is one thing I have thought much of, and I will throw it out here for your consideration. It is this: Bee comb is not made by the bees, but is a natural growth the same as a plant.

Reply. Then thousands of persons who have watched the making of the comb by those natural mechanics, through the glass hives, have all been mistaken! They supposed they saw the busy bees actually building up, day by day, and skillfully forming the cells all after the same pattern. But now it turns out that these latter-day wisacres, who believe that their souls are composed of the memorizing power of some lower animal, have discovered that it is all a mistake. Bees don't form the comb for the honey, it grows of itself! Oh! spirit doctor, what lower animal could have furnished brains for such a sublime idea? The spirit of some animal has at last found a human organism that is sufficiently developed to be a medium of such wonderful intelligence! That spirit must be highly gratified at the progress of human development!

Spirit. Mind or spirit is of far greater power and knowledge in the spirit world.

Reply. If we take the bee-comb discovery as a specimen, we must say they have a queer way of manifesting superior knowledge. But we regard it as a downright slander to attribute such sentiments to any human spirit, nay, we were about to say that an intelligent dog would know better. We would rather conclude it was the talk of some third-class demon, simply prating for his own amusement, or to see what fools he could make of humanity. The celebrated Dr. Spirit Demon, may even now be amusing himself over the idea that some will believe any absurdity that comes from invisible spirits.

Spirit. The immortality of the soul can easily be proved by science, independent of the Bible and everything else.

Reply. Spiritualists have generally claimed that the principal object of the mission of spiritualism was to convince the world of the immortality of the soul. That as it was not taught in the Bible, there was no way to establish the doctrine but by the return of the spirits of the dead. But now it can easily be proved by science. We heard the spirit's arguments from science, and certainly we have read better arguments from science in old works written before the advent of spiritualism. So, then, it turns out that there was no need of spirits returning, for the object could have been accomplished by science, and that was in the world all the time.

Condition of Religion in Germany.

THE following from the *Christian Union* of May 14, 1873, gives a lively picture of religion as it now is in Germany, right at the birth-place of Protestantism. This is the condition of the millions of Protestant Christians of Europe! Read this, and then tell us if Babylon has not fallen.

"A GERMAN COUNTRY TOWN.

"The little German country town where I am staying—Blankenburg am Harz—is situated in the Duchy of Brunswick, where the established church is Lutheran. Just to the south, lie Mansfeld and Eisleben. So you may say that it is close by the fountain of the Reformation. It became, in early times, so thoroughly Protestant that to-day it contains only two Catholic inhabitants. Here, then, one might expect to find German Protestantism at its best estate.

"On entering the church for the first time, I was surprised to see, in a town of 5000 inhabitants and only two churches, so few at church. In the gallery were about fifty soldiers, who were detailed to go to church. Besides these, I counted thirty-six persons. Since the first Sunday, the pastor of the other church has been removed by death, and no service has been held there. But our congregation has not by this means been perceptibly enlarged.

"The average has remained about the same through the summer—from thirty to fifty of the towns-people. In the last eight weeks, the soldiers quartered here have been absent on a "manœuvre," as they call it, and without them the church appears almost empty. Six or seven old men are in their places every Sunday. The rest of the willing church-goers are mostly women. The boys in the gymnasium are obliged to go to church once in three weeks, but complain of the tyranny. It is noticeable that among

willing church-goers appears hardly a single young man. The boys are, as a matter of course, confirmed when they come to suitable years. To outward appearance, they are, for the most part, confirmed in indifference to the church.

"In the afternoon of every Sabbath, a service is held especially for the candidates for confirmation. It is not so well attended as the morning service. It takes the place of a Sabbath-school, an institution which is almost entirely unknown in this country. There is one Sabbath-school in Braunschweig, started by some ladies who caught the Sabbath-school spirit from England. This school has struggled forward under much opposition from the clergy, till it is now in a flourishing condition. It has not yet been able to secure male teachers.

"It seemed to me a pity that the good sermons of our pastor here should have so few hearers. But I was informed that he was quite fortunate in this respect; and that the pastor in the neighboring village of Timrode has been often obliged, for want of an audience, to go home with his undelivered sermon under his arm.

"Once our church has been full. The second of September, the anniversary of Sedan, was celebrated with great zeal throughout all North Germany. A part of the celebration was a church service in the morning. On that occasion we had at least 400 in the church. Then came the doctors, the lawyers, the town officers and the aristocracy.

"To the outward eye, the social element here makes more of a display than the religious. By every object of interest in the neighborhood, be it an old castle, or a high rock, or a wild waterfall, stands a hotel of some kind. It is the regular practice of the families in good society to take coffee or beer at one or another of these hotels every afternoon. If the weather is good, the question always arises: "Where shall we take our coffee this afternoon?" Social life centers around these hotels. Here the children meet for play; and here, too, the young men and maidens rejoice in each other's company. Of course a good deal of beer is drunk at these gatherings; or, at least, what seems to an American a good deal. A steady, temperate man in this part of Germany drinks on an average four glasses a day. The people here speak of the Bavarians as beer-guzzlers, because they drink on an average seven glasses a day. In Munich, children drink beer as soon as they are weaned. The reason is that the water is not fit to drink, and beer is cheaper than milk. Here, although the children do not begin quite so early, young men often come up to the Bavarian standard of seven glasses a day; but always with the disapprobation of the parents. * * * *

"Sunday is of all days the social day. All marriages, picnics, and shooting feasts, are, if possible, made to come on Sunday. On my first Sunday afternoon here, having just recovered from the shock occasioned by the almost empty church, I took a walk of some four miles into the woods to see some of the richest scenery in the Harz mountains. From one high rock I looked down and saw seven lager beer saloons, or gardens. In several of them were bands of music. And gathered about these points of attraction were, at a moderate calculation, 4,000 persons. An American unacquainted with the customs of the country, might think, Here are the wicked ones of Germany. Not so. Here are the church members who were missing at the church in the morning, as well as the few who were present. Hither also have come the pastors from the neighboring villages, for relaxation after their morning and afternoon work.

"If a man should undertake to teach German children not to play on Sunday, I venture to say the majority would not understand what he meant. The older ones might take him for an American or an Englishman. But the little ones, who know nothing about foreigners, would very likely think he was crazy.

"The distinction between religious and irreligious people is not so sharply drawn here as with us. Besides the matter of church going, many of the outward distinctions between church members and "world's people," which exist with us in such matters as dancing and card-playing, are unknown here. The pastor's wife asked me if it was really a fact that there were people in America who held it wrong to dance?

"Judged by our standard, the people here are shockingly profane. A little girl of the sweetest temper sits at the piano, and when she strikes a wrong key, says: "God!" or "Lord Jesus!" She is no more ruffled than an American girl would be when she could express her feelings with an "Oh, dear!" These expressions are not branded with the name of profanity here. What is a little comical is, that the parents will generally scold their children if they hear them say, "Donnerwetter!" which, translated, means "By thunder!"

"If an orthodox New England Christian of the stricter sort were appointed to run the dividing line here between the elect and the non-elect, he would probably give it up and pronounce the whole population "medium sinners." As far as I have seen, there are very few atheists here. It seems to be an axiom, handed down from father to son, that to suppose a world without a Creator is nonsense. This is the whole creed of many. A man who holds so much is religious. The rest is optional. The Germans

ought to be apostles of toleration; for, no doubt, the great mass of the laymen think much as the dentist thought who told me: "I have come to the conclusion that one religion is just as good as another.

"A New England preacher, if he were to preach here, would have to leave behind him such expressions as "Experiencing religion," "Change of heart," "Finding the Saviour." The corresponding ideas are not current. The expressions would be untranslatable.

"On one topic of theology are young and old zealous. Though the pastors are often to the contrary, the intelligent laymen are almost unanimous in asserting that there is no personal devil. When one notices what a prominent feature the devil plays in the German nursery tales, and how many objects are named after him here in the mountains, for example, "Devil's Wall," "Devil's Bridge," "Devil's Mill," "Devil's Kettle," it seems as if this new feeling is only a natural reaction from an excessive belief in the devil."

While the church may be gaining a few thousands in the heathen lands, millions are apostatizing at home. Surely this does not look like the millennium at hand!

D. M. CANRIGHT.

Christian Humility.

If the Lord saw fit to place you in a position most obscure, or to assign to you a service the most menial, not calculated to catch the eye or win the applause, but rather the oversight and the slight, of your fellows, it would be one of the sweetest tests of the reality of your love for Him. When Morrison, the Chinese missionary, the man of God who first gave the Bible to China in its vernacular, offered himself to the directors of the London Missionary Society, as a missionary to the heathen, his appearance was so uncultivated and unpromising, that, hesitating to accept him as a candidate, they inquired if he were willing to go simply as an assistant in one of the missionary schools. "Gentlemen," was young Morrison's noble reply, "while the temple of Christ is building, I am willing to be a hewer of wood or a drawer of water." In a moment, they decided that a man who so loved his Saviour, who was willing to undertake any service for Christ, was the fittest for the higher office of missionary to the heathen. They accepted him as such, and the result proved they were not mistaken in their judgment. If you love Christ, you will be willing to undertake any service your Lord and Master may appoint you. Love will make drudgery for Jesus pleasant and welcome.—*Advocate and Guardian*.

OUR graces, like evergreens, grow most in the low vale of affliction, even as stars are most luminous and lovely when nearest the horizon.

It is astonishing what apologies half-Christians will make for those worldly inconsistencies which would cover a true believer with the deepest humiliation.

Obituary Notices.

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

DIED, in Sumner, Jefferson Co., Wis., July 13, 1873, of typhoid fever, Sherman Bickle, aged eight years and five months, son of B. G. and Ann Bickle. His sickness was very severe for about two weeks, when death relieved him from further pain.

Discourse at the funeral by the writer, from Job 1, last part of verse 21, to a large and sympathizing congregation.

E. M. CRANDALL.

DIED, in Clarke Co., Ohio, near Yellow Springs, July 14, 1873, of lock-jaw, Mary C., youngest daughter of Isaac H. and Sarah Moser, aged 13 years, 5 months, and 9 days. She was a very great sufferer, yet without a murmur or complaint. This family accepted the present truth over three years ago.

Words were spoken on the occasion by the writer to a large audience from Job 14: 1, 2. We hope that this affliction will draw them nearer to the Lord, and each other.

WM. COTTRELL.

DIED, near Forestville, Chautauque Co., N. Y., of quick consumption, Bro. Oscar S. Eddy, aged 48 years and five months. This Bro. embraced the truth about eleven years ago. The last three months of his life, though in very feeble health, he was unusually devoted to missionary labor. He has left, to his mourning companion, three saddened children, and many friends, good evidence that he sleeps to be awakened by the last trump. Said he, with almost his last breath, "I am willing, and long, to go."

Funeral discourse by the writer from 1 Cor. 15: 57.

W. W. STEBBINS.

DIED, in Woodbridge, Hillsdale Co., Mich., May 9, 1873, of spinal fever, Charles Irvin, our youngest son, aged one year and four months. Funeral address by Wm. Branch, first-day Adventist, from 2 Samuel 14: 14.

W. I. MCFARLAND.

The Review and Herald.

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

The Eastern Camp-Meetings.

We give the time of these meetings, and their order, as follows:—

Table with 2 columns: Location and Dates. Locations include New York, Vermont, New England, Maine, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana.

ELD. GEO. I. BUTLER will spend next Sabbath, Aug. 2, in Battle Creek. Brethren and sisters from adjacent neighborhoods are invited to meet with the church here.

Special Notice.

ALL drafts or money orders sent to the REVIEW AND HERALD Office, on business with the Publishing Association, or for remittances on REVIEW, Reformer, and Instructor, or for books, or other business, should be made payable to the order of James White.

New England Camp-Meeting.

THIS meeting will be held on the camp ground near South Lancaster, Aug. 21-26. It will close Aug. 26. We entreat all who propose to attend, that they come on Wednesday, Aug. 20, in season to complete their preparation on that day.

All trains on the Worcester and Nashua R. R. will stop at our camp ground, except the morning express going north, which stops at Clinton, only one-half mile from the depot.

Let all who purpose to attend, prepare their hearts now to seek God, and let us have a general attendance. Eld. George I. Butler and others are expected to be present as preachers of the word.

H. B. STRATTON, JAB-Z C. TUCKER, SAMUEL MARTIN, Camp-meeting Com.

Camp-Meeting Tents.

QUESTIONS about tents we referred to Bro. E. G. Rust (270 Sedgwick St.), Chicago. He sends us the following price list from Geo. E. Foster:—

Table with 4 columns: Tent size (e.g., 12x12, 14x14), and prices for 8 oz., 10 oz., and 12 oz. materials.

The 10 oz. is considered most suitable. The first four sizes are four feet-wall; the next two, five; the last one, six.

Bro. Rust can obtain a commission on those which may be ordered through him, which he offers to give to the brethren ordering.

Answers to Correspondents.

1. THE question has been asked me, Has the Saviour two bodies? if one was born of the seed of David, what became of the one Joshua saw? Josh. 5: 13.

The Scriptures, speaking of the pre-existent Word, say he "was made flesh." How this change in the manner of his existence took place is beyond our comprehension. The "mystery of godliness" is a mystery still, in some respects; we can no more fathom such questions than we can comprehend the self-existence of God, or the infinity of space.

2. Is the taking of photographs a violation of the second commandment? A. ncv.

Not necessarily. The commandment forbids the making of a likeness of any thing as an object of worship. But Moses was commanded to make images of cherubim, in making the sanctuary. It is no more a violation of the precept to make the picture of a man than it is to make the picture of a horse, unless there is an impious motive in it.

Bismark and Christianity.

A FOOLISH story is going the rounds of the papers to the intent that Bismark told a newspaper reporter, who "interviewed" him, that the recent movements in Prussia were not directed specially against the Catholic church, but against Christianity; that it was his intention to root out all ideas of Christianity, and to lead the people to acknowledge no allegiance except to the empire; and that neither the emperor nor the prince were aware of his designs.

We call this a foolish story, so foolish that we wonder that it is so extensively published, and more that some seem to credit it. Bismark would scarcely talk over to a newspaper reporter, matters of State policy which he had concealed from the prince and the emperor; and it is exactly what the Catholic church would like to have the world believe. The days of "pious frauds" have not passed away.

J. H. W.

SOME have got a wrong idea of the notice headed "Proposed Discussion," which we published last week. Eld. Whitmore is not a believer in time-setting, and he only takes up a challenge which the timists said no one "dare" accept.

News and Miscellany.

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

Foreign.

In the British House of Lords, yesterday evening, Lord Cranmore and Browne read the Archbishop's reply to the Church Association, showing a tendency in the Church of England toward Catholicism, and moved that a committee be appointed to consider what legislation is needed to check the evil.

He supported the motion in a long speech, in the course of which he read passages from the petition of 483 clergymen of the Established Church, asking for the appointment of confessors, and the restoration of other popish practices which the Reformation abolished. He wanted to know by what casuistry English clergymen holding such doctrines retained their positions in the church.

The Archbishop of Canterbury said it was no wonder that public feeling was waking up on this subject. There was good cause for alarm. The power of the Bishops to remedy abuses should be increased.

Horrible Murder and Robbery in Iowa.

On the night of July 21, an express train on the Chicago, Rock Island, and Pacific Railroad was thrown from the track, about sixty miles west of Des Moines, by the removal of a rail. The rail had previously been loosened and a rope fastened to it so that parties out of sight could displace it when the train was too near to stop.

Six men masked in "Ku Klux style," ran up to the express car and firing into it drove out the messenger and others, and some proceeded to rob the car while others watched the train, threatening, with horrible curses, to shoot any one that dared to show himself outside. The passengers were thrown from their seats by the sudden stopping of the train, and terribly frightened at the danger of their position. A more desperate and murderous proceeding has never occurred in the country.

An idea of the fearful ravages of cholera may be learned from the following:—

EVANSVILLE, Ind., July 18.—Advices from Mt. Vernon, Indiana, report that the cholera is abating in that place. It has almost depopulated the town. All persons who could get away, have left, and the banks and business houses are all closed, and the town seems without population. Resin, pine tar, and coal, have been burned in the streets, and in every house, disinfectants have been placed. People who cannot leave are removing to the healthiest parts of the city. Families are living in ware houses, etc. Every person in the place has had the cholera, and of some large families, only two members are left. There seems to be no apparent cause for the ravages of the epidemic.

THE Chicago Journal (evening), of July 26, brings accounts of heavy fires in Portland, Baltimore, and Norfolk, Va., the latter burning at last advices. Smaller fires are "too numerous to mention," of the fire in Baltimore, a dispatch says: "The fire in several portions of the burned district swept rapidly through the roofs and left the lower portions of whole rows scarcely damaged. This seemed to be caused by the large number of shingle roofs which are so exceedingly dry as to burn like grass. In this way, the fire actually crossed over streets in which the engines continued to work, and left a portion of the fire brigade working in the center of the burning block."

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.

THE Lord willing, I will meet with the churches in Iowa, as follows:—

Table with 2 columns: Location and Date. Locations include Monroe, Decatur City, Siam, Taylor Co., Afton, Adel.

Quarterly Meetings in New York.

Table with 2 columns: Location and Date. Locations include Dist. No. 2, N. Y., Roosevelt, Adams Centre, Kirkville.

MEETING of Tract and Missionary Society of Dist. No. 3, Mich., will be held at Hillsdale, Mich., August 9 and 10. We hope to have a full report from all members of this district at this meeting. Bro. E. H. Root is expected to meet with us.

STEPHEN D. SALISBURY, Director.

GENERAL quarterly meeting for Washington, N. H., will be held at New Ipswich, August 23; also tract and missionary meeting for district No. 4.

C. K. FARNSWORTH.

THE quarterly meeting of the church at Vernon, will be held at Vernon, the second Sabbath and first-day in August.

THEO. PHINSEY.

THE next quarterly meeting for the churches of Burlington and Newton will be held at Burlington, August 9 and 10. A general attendance of all is expected.

HICKMAN MILLER.

THE persons appointed at Orange, Mich., to meet with the churches in that District, not all being notified, we publish the names as follows:—

- Orange, August 2, Wm. Alchin, S. Alchin. Deerfield, " 9, S. H. King, J. Fargo. Danish church, August 16, W. A. Towle, F. Richmond. Vergennes, August 23, A. W. Maynard, M. B. Cyphers. Orleans, August 30, M. Aldrich, D. Warren. COMMITTEE.

QUARTERLY meeting of the churches of Alaiedon Locke, Bunker Hill, and Genoa, will be held at Genoa, Aug. 16, 17, 1873. Bro. Root will be expected. Hope for a general attendance.

F. H. CARPENTER, Clerk.

Vermont T. & M. Society.

THE next annual meeting of the Vermont T. & M. Society will be held in connection with the Vermont Camp-meeting at Wolcott, Vt., Aug. 14-18, 1873. Officers for the year will be appointed; important changes in the constitution of the Society, and other matters of interest will be considered; and it will be expected that agents and other officers shall be prepared to present the reports required.

A. C. BOURDEAU, Pres.

I WILL hold meetings as follows:—

Table with 2 columns: Location and Date. Locations include Chesaning, Greenbush, Ithaca, Alma, E. Saginaw.

C. STODDARD.

New-York Camp-Meeting.

THIS meeting will be held on the old camp ground at Kirkville, Aug. 7-11.

Trains on the N. Y. Central Railroad going east, that stop at Kirkville, leave Syracuse at 7 A. M., 2 05 and 5 P. M. Trains going west stop at Kirkville, 10.15 A. M., 12.45 and 8.55 P. M. Those coming over the Rome, Watertown, and Ogdensburg, and the Syracuse Northern, Railroads, will receive free return passes.

Teams to convey passengers to the ground will meet all trains. Tents can be rented as usual. Let all who can, provide tents for themselves and their friends; but none need hesitate to come who are unable to do so, as arrangements will be made for the accommodation of such.

Provisions and straw will be furnished on the ground as heretofore. It is hoped that an earnest effort will be made by the brethren in all parts of the Conference, that there may be a full attendance at this meeting. CAMP-MEETING COMMITTEE.

N. Y. & Pa. Conference.

THE N. Y. and Pa. Conference will hold its next annual session in connection with the camp-meeting at Kirkville, commencing Wednesday, Aug. 6, 1873. Delegates should be on the ground as early as Tuesday. The Conference is appointed one day in advance of the camp-meeting, in order to get its business out of the way of the religious services of the meeting as much as possible, the time appointed for that purpose being unusually brief. Let all the churches and scattered brethren be well represented, as the present indications are that this will be the most important meeting of the kind ever held in this Conference.

P. Z. KINNE, Conf. E. B. GASKILL, Com. B. L. WHITNEY, Com.

New England Conference.

THIS Conference will hold its next annual session in connection with the camp-meeting at South Lancaster, Mass., Wednesday, Aug. 20, 1873. Delegates should be on the ground at the latest by Wednesday morning. The Conference is appointed one day in advance of the camp-meeting in order to get the business out of the way of the religious services of the meeting as much as possible. Let all the churches and scattered brethren be well represented. It is expected that each church will send delegates according to the constitution. Also let each s. b. Treasurer see that all pledges are paid up to July, 1873. The Conference Secretary will furnish each s. b. Treasurer with a blank to fill out.

S. N. HASKELL, N. E. H. B. STRATTON, Conf. A. W. SMITH, Com.

T. & M. S. Meetings.

THE N. Y. & Pa. T. & M. Society will hold its next annual meeting in connection with the camp-meeting at Kirkville, Aug. 7-11, 1873.

The general quarterly meeting for this Society will be held on the camp-ground at Kirkville, Wednesday, P. M., Aug. 6.

As I do not expect to attend any of the district meetings this quarter, the directors will arrange them to suit their convenience.

P. Z. KINNE, Pres.

Maine State Conference.

THE Maine State Conference will hold its next annual session in connection with the camp-meeting to be held one mile above Pishon's Ferry, on the Portland and Kennebec R. R., on the same ground occupied last year, commencing Aug. 28, and continuing to Sept. 1. Let all our churches in this Conference immediately take the necessary steps to fully repre-

sent themselves, by delegates; also, let all see that their s. b. pledges are paid up to Sept. 30, if possible. "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in mine house, and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of Heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it." Mal. 3: 10.

We earnestly request all to see that their tents are put up, and things set in order, and be ready to commence with the first day of the meeting and remain until the close.

J. B. GOODRICH, Maina G. W. BARKER, Conf. WM. MORTON, Com.

Business Department.

Not slothful in Business. Rom. 12: 11.

Business Notes.

S. N. HASKELL: The telegram was received, and change made. If there was an error, it must have been in the telegram.

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

\$2.00 EACH. Edward Schuapp 41-4, R. Covell 44-6, Wilson Thompson 44-4, Jane Demarest 44-4, Mary A. Clement 44-4, S. Steele 44-7, Ellen M. Morse 42-1, B. B. Warren 44-5, E. W. Rice 44-4, K. V. Temple 44-11, Reuber A. Kale 44-4, J. D. Hull 38-1, J. L. Lewis 43-1, Rosa Pazyk 44-4, Bell Simonton 44-7, Melinda McDearmon 44-4, H. M. Hadden 44-4, Andrew Dratt 43-1, S. E. Elder 44-4, Margaret Yunt 43-7, W. J. Rhodes 44-4, H. A. Mead 44-6, O. Wordin 44-4.

\$1.00 EACH. W. B. Davis 42 18, C. F. Worthen 43-4, Justus Hunt 43-4, Sophia Brigham 43-4, A. G. Heaton 43-7, Sarah M. Clark 44-4, M. B. Clark 43-6, C. T. Jensen 43-5, Geo. Hendry 43-9, Mrs. D. H. Randall 43-7, Mrs. Joseph Mares 44-7, A. S. Osborn 44-1, Mrs. Jennie Benn 44-4, George Bickel 43 11, M. A. Winchell 43-4, L. L. Larned 44-4, A. H. Hiltard 43-4, Mrs. A. L. Ott 43-4, Carrie McIntyre 43-4, E. J. Paine 43-4, D. Heckman 43-4, Wm. Stuff 43-14, Mrs. M. Bruner 44-9, B. F. Winkles 44-4, M. F. Tindale 44-4, W. J. Simonton 44-4, Ann Adams 43-4, George W. Davis 43-4, G. W. Mitchell 43-1, H. M. Van Slyke 44-4, J. M. Rees 43-4, Alanson Reynolds 43-4, J. D. Ballard 43-8, G. W. Bard 43-8, J. I. Stewart 43-14, Carrie E. Dolby 41-1, Mrs. P. Hobson 43-4, Dr. J. Grover 43-9, B. Caffee 43-4, Sarah Mc Can 43-4.

50c EACH. Hattie E. Martin 43-7, Lyman E. Crow 43-4, E. D. Secret 43-4, Adison Parlow 43-4, Eld. J. L. Blitch 43-4, H. H. Fisher 43-4, J. P. Briggs 43-4, F. M. Davis 42-20, Charles Davis 43-4, John Alieff 43-4, Michael Rife 43-4, J. Bartlett 43-1, John Mekre 43-4, Alvin Kale 43-4, J. L. Davis 43-4, E. Morehouse 43-4, Martha J. Hooker 43-4, Mary McDonald 43-4, Daniel Weaver 43-4, Samuel Lehman 42-4, Duane Sumner 43-4, Roselinda Lowell 43-4, John Toulouse 43-4, J. Larice 43-4.

75 CENTS EACH. W. H. Foster 43-4, Henry Fehr 43-4, Elizabeth Dowell 43-4, Charles Ettridge 43-4, Thomas Davenport 43-4, Sarah Symonds 43-4. MISCELLANEOUS. Dr. L. Smith \$1.50 41-14, Olive McKean 1.25 43-14, A. M. Holcomb 2.34 44 14, Jas. Backer 3 00 44-1, F. C. Chappell 1.50, D. R. Leighton 4 00 46-4, J. H. Mallory 2.34 44-14, Perry Kysor 1.25 43-14.

Books Sent by Mail.

D. Azro P. Raleigh 15c, R. M. Johnson 70c, Mrs. Fred Margach \$1.00, J. S. Braunsford 20c, J. A. Kendrick 15c, E. G. Rust 2.10, Mrs. Barclay Ivis 41c, R. P. Stewart 50c, H. A. Mumao 10c, Mrs. R. S. Whitney 1.00, Emily Vescelius 2.00, Mrs. G. W. Pierce 2.00, H. C. Blanchard 2 00 L. H. Russell 2.00, Thomas Breeding 2 00, Charles Dreed 2 00, Miss Harriet Carr 25c, Thomas A. Zoller 15c, Steward Randall 1 00, Patrick Murtagh 30c, Allman and Wolf, 50c, Orrin G. Gridley 25c, F. R. Richmond 1.00, John H. Dorsey 20c, N. P. Allen 1.00, Dora Peabody 20c, Stephen Walkley 3.20, J. W. Bell 20c, D. T. Bourdeau 4 00, Kahrenia Hale 2.00, Charles P. Whitford 2 00, David F. Randolph 2 00, Gilbert Brown 2 00, Mrs. N. H. Davis 2.00, Richard Osman 2 00, Mrs. Mary J. Shattuck 25c, R. W. Durham 50c, R. T. Payne 1.00, J. M. Baker 70c, W. N. Pile 60c, C. S. Veeder 1.00, George Foreman 2.00, Eunice Hebron 20c, S. S. Marden 20c, Thomas Brown 10c, M. P. Stiles 25c, E. Zykoskes 2 20, W. H. Wild 4.00, A. N. Allen 2.00, Noah Farrar 2.00, Caroline Colson 2.00, D. E. Carr 2 00, S. A. Howard 25c, A. J. Scott 1.00, J. R. Stone 50c, Eld. D. Deland 1.00, S. J. Platt 25c, M. H. Brown 15c.

Michigan Conference Fund.

Received from the church at Cedar Springs \$20.00, Tuscola 45.18.

General Conference Fund.

G. W. Mitchell \$3 50 (s. b.).

Review to the Poor.

R. Stickney \$7 00.

Instructor to the Poor.

E. Steele \$1.00, R. Stickney 3.00.

Indiana Tract and Missionary Society.

Wm Price 90c.

Ohio Tract and Missionary Society.

E. M. Haskell \$5.00.

Cash Received on Account.

Vermont Delinquent Fund \$2.33, Ill. Delinquent Fund 45c, New England Delinquent Fund 90c, California Delinquent Fund 25c, J. N. Loughborough, per M. G. Kellogg, 212 20, J. H. Morrison 5 00, A. C. Bourdeau \$85.00, J. B. Goodrich 50c, J. N. Andrews 7.00.

HYGIENIC BOOK FUND.

R. B. Thomas \$5.00, Hattie Tuttle 1.00.

Donations for the Danish Monthly.

R. Stickney \$4 50, P. Conklin 2 00, Mrs. Hale 2.00, Betsey Osgood 10.00.

The Review and Herald.

TERMS:

One year in advance.....\$2.00 " " " when paid by Tract Societies, or by individuals, for the poor, or to other persons on trial.....1.00. Address, REVIEW & HERALD, BATTLE CREEK, MICH.