

# 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 43.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, MARCH 24, 1874.

NUMBER 15.

### 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.

#### TIME SPEEDS AWAY.

Time speeds away, away, away;  
Another hour, another day,  
Another month, another year,  
Drops from us like the leaflet sere;  
Drops like the life-blood from the heart.  
The rose bloom from the cheeks depart;  
The tresses from the temples fall,  
The eyes grow dim and strange to all.

Time speeds away, away, away,  
Like torrents in a stormy day;  
He undermines the stately tower,  
Uproots the tree and swamps the flower,  
He tears from our distracted breasts  
The friends we've loved, the friends that blest,  
And leaves us weeping on the shore,  
To which they can return no more.

Time speeds away, away, away;  
No eagle through the sky of day,  
No winds along the hills can flee  
So swiftly or so smooth as he;  
Like fiery steeds, from stage to stage,  
He bears us on from youth to age,  
Then plunges in the fearful sea  
Of fathomless eternity.

Time speeds away, away, away;  
O sinner, turn without delay,  
With rapid strides you onward go,  
Down to the tomb, and future woe;  
Make haste, the door will soon shut fast,  
In outer darkness you'll be cast;  
Then what will be your fearful state,  
To hear the words, too late! too late!

Time speeds away, away, away;  
O Christian, work without delay,  
The time is short, the moments fly,  
The end, the end is drawing nigh;  
The harvest's ripe, the workers few,  
A great deal must depend on you:  
The Judge is standing at the door,  
The angel swears "Time is no more!"

—Sel.

#### THE RELIGIOUS AMENDMENT.

WE are sometimes perplexed to account for the singular operations of the human mind. When we see men of good natural ability, and of superior privileges of mental and moral culture, persistently clinging to the weaker side in argument, and seeming able to discover light only on the darkest side of a proposition, or endeavoring to sustain themselves by taking contradictory positions, our charity is taxed to the utmost to give them credit for the ability they seem to possess, and for the integrity of purpose they claim. Seldom have our reflections been more forcibly turned in this direction than in viewing the course pursued by the advocates of the Religious Amendment. A late number of the *Christian Statesman*, speaking of the Seventh-day Adventists, says:—

"From the beginning of the National Reform movement, they have regarded it as the first step toward the persecution which they as keepers of the seventh day will endure when our Sabbath laws are revived and enforced. One cannot but smile at their apprehensions of the success of a movement which would not harm a hair of their heads, but their fears are sincere enough for all that."

We propose briefly to examine this subject to ascertain, I. If we are justified in expecting that persecution will arise on this point; II. If there is anything in the profession of the Amendment party which, carefully considered, will serve to quiet our fears in this respect; and III. What their purposes really are according to their own avowals.

I. As our denominational name indicates, we are students of the prophecies. From these, and not from any indications which at first appeared, our views were formed and our expectations were raised in regard to the coming persecution. A few points brought to view in prophecy will show the reasons of our belief.

1. The line of events set forth in chapters two, seven, and eight, of the book of Daniel, and continued in chapters twelve, thirteen, and fourteen, of the book of Revelation, concerning the kingdoms and powers of the earth, clearly identify the papal hierarchy as being represented by "the beast" power of Rev. 13:1-10. This will hardly be disputed by any Protestants.

2. The "deadly wound" received by this papal power was inflicted by France in 1798, when the pope was taken a prisoner, and carried away, where he remained and died in exile. The deadly wound was healed when another pope was elected and permitted to occupy his place in the Vatican, though civil power to the extent which the popes before possessed it was never restored.

3. Another beast is seen by the prophet, coming up out of the earth, at the time when the first beast went into captivity, which was lamb-like in appearance. This symbol we apply to the United States; and of necessity, too. For, the first beast represents all the beasts or dominions of Dan. 7; the ten horns of the fourth beast, Rome, the body of the leopard, the third beast, Greece, the feet of the bear, the second beast, Persia, and the mouth of the lion, the first beast, Babylon. "Another beast," coming up at that time in another locality, must be outside of the old dominions of Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome. We can find it only on this side of the Atlantic.

4. The characteristics of this beast are such as to fitly represent the United States government. Besides its lamb-like appearance, as already noticed, it is a power doing great wonders. These wonders are wrought in the sight of the beast, showing that it is not a part, or particular phase, of the first beast, as some have taught, nor does it supersede the first beast, or take its place. It says to them that dwell on the earth ("the earth" being the representation of its locality in prophecy, as "the sea" is that of the first beast), that they should make an image to the first beast whose deadly wound was healed. This shows that the action is that of the people, and it is therefore a representative or republican government; also that this action cannot be located centuries in the past, where some have endeavored to locate it, as the deadly wound was not then given and healed.

5. From these and other considerations which we have not now time to notice, we have concluded that an image to the first beast will be made in the United States, and that this image will consist in the union of church and State in this country. And we read that this image will have power to pass strong decrees against those who refuse to worship the first beast, and to enforce these decrees by severe penalties.

6. In Rev. 14:9-12, the Lord gives a message of warning against the worship of the beast and his image, and indicates, by contrast, those who do not worship these powers, as keeping the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus.

7. In Rev. 12:17, the church is represented by a woman, and war is made against "the remnant of her seed," which we think must be the last part of the church, because they keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ. This is, and has been, proof positive to our minds that the worship and mark of the beast which will be enforced by the image, is something in opposition to the commandments of God. And while we could see no chance for persecution to arise against those who keep the commandments of God except in regard to the fourth commandment, and to the Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day, we could plainly see from the strong hold which the Sunday has obtained upon the popular mind, and from the spirit of the times, that the agitation of the Sabbath question, and the increase of Sabbath-keepers, will bring persecution upon those who keep the fourth

commandment of the decalogue as it was given by Jehovah.

We can readily understand how it is that the truths presented in these prophecies and the events now transpiring, do not appear as "signs of the times" to such as have never examined the chart nor studied the waymarks, but we invite them to examine with care and candor the facts which we set before them, and then judge whether our faith is not well founded, and whether our opponents do well to laugh at our apprehensions.

It may be worth mentioning, incidentally, that our publications, for twenty years or more, have abounded with statements setting forth our belief and evidences therefor, that the churches and the civil power in this land will yet be closely allied, and that persecution will arise against those who keep the seventh day. And if we present evidence that these things are coming to pass, we cannot be accused of framing our views to fit existing events, but it will be plain to see that events are now transpiring which prove that our positions on the fulfillment of prophecy have been well and carefully taken, and that we have the most abundant reason to believe that our expectations of the future, based on the same prophecies, will be realized.

II. If a profession of good motives and of a desire to avoid persecution and to steer clear of a union of church and State—if such a profession on the part of the Amendment party could give us assurance and quiet our apprehensions—then might we rest in peace and cease to notice this subject. On this point, they are very explicit. A few quotations will suffice to present their claims. Said Hon. Mr. Patterson in the Pittsburgh Convention:—

"Be not misled by the assertion that the movement agitated by this Convention tends to religious intolerance, to wedding church and State. No such tendency exists. On the contrary, this movement claims nothing but to secure in the preamble of our National Constitution an acknowledgment of the supremacy of God and the Christian character of our nation, such as is now generally and authoritatively conceded to be the law of our land."

This, surely, is lamb-like enough to throw us all off our guard. The following remarks of President Brunot (pronounced Bruno) on taking the chair are equally innocent to view:—

"The fourth Article of the Constitution declares that 'no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States,' and the first amendment in the Constitution provides that 'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.' We have not proposed to change these. We deem them essential, in connection with the amendment we ask, to the preservation of religious liberty, and, with it, an effective guard against a union of church and State."

And again:—"The attempt to destroy the inalienable right of freedom of conscience in religion in this our favored land would meet with its very first organized resistance from this association."

And Dr. Kerr said:—

"We want no union of church and State. Let that question be raised in this country and there is no element of the opposition that would rise against it that would be more decided and determined than that represented in this Convention. We wish no restraint of the rightful liberties of any man."

These utterances are pleasant to read, and doubtless they and others like them have had much to do in enlisting so strong interest in favor of the Amendment. And were these sayings, or those of like nature, all that they had put forth, we should feel constrained to regard the men and their work in a light somewhat different from that in which we now view them.

III. We come now to examine another

class of expressions of a positive nature. What we have quoted is negative, a disclaimer, a relation of what they do not wish to do. Very explicitly have they stated their desires and intentions. True, we cannot reconcile what they have said under these two heads, and it is this which so perplexes us in regard to their professions. It is to be hoped that they will sometime attempt to show that their statements may be harmonized, or else confine their avowals to one side of the question that all may understand, without study or doubt, just the position they occupy.

Dr. Stevenson, Corresponding Secretary of the National Association, and editor of the *Statesman*, in the opening address at the Convention, said:—

"Through the immense largesses it receives from corrupt politicians, the Roman Catholic church is, practically, the established church of the city of New York. These favors are granted under the guise of a seeming friendliness to religion. We propose to put the substance for the shadow, to drive out the counterfeit by the completer substitution of the true."

These words are somewhat abiguous, but none the less important on this subject; for, taken in any possible way they are full of meaning. It may be a question whether this "seeming friendliness to religion" is the shadow, and real friendliness to religion in politics is the substance, or whether the Catholic church is the counterfeit and Protestants the true; but in either case the establishment of the church, or a church, or churches, more completely than at present though practically existing now, is the object aimed at in this paragraph. The latter form, the establishment of the churches, appears to be the object, for, in the next sentence he says:—

"What we propose is nothing of a sectarian character. It will give no branch of American Christians any advantage over any other."

A remark made by Prof. Blanchard is a complement to the above. He has given us a definition of "union of church and State" as opposed by them. Thus he said:—

"But union of church and State is the selection by the nation of one church, the endowment of such a church, the appointment of its officers and oversight of its doctrines. For such a union none of us plead. To such a union we are all of us opposed."

In reading this, we are reminded of the turn taken by the spiritualists when they deny that they are opposed to marriage; they explain by defining marriage to be a union of two persons not to be regulated nor guarded by civil law, and which exists only as long as the parties are agreed thereto, requiring no law to effect a divorce! To such marriage the most lawless libertine would not object. We are sorry that the respectable advocates of the amendment take a position so nearly parallel to the above cited position of spiritualists. They give a definition of union of church and State such as no one expects nor fears; such, in fact, as is not possible in the existing state of the churches, and then loudly proclaim that they are opposed to union of church and State! But to a union of church and State in the popular sense of the phrase; a union, not of one church, but, of all the churches recognized as orthodox or evangelical; a union, not giving the State power to elect church officers nor to take the oversight of church doctrines, but, giving the churches the privilege of enforcing by civil law the laws, institutions, and usages of religion according to the faith of the churches, or to the construction put upon those institutions and usages by the churches—to such a union, we say, they are not opposed. They are, essentially and practically, despite their professions, open advocates of union of church and State.

President Brunot and others have referred to the first amendment to the Constitution as a safeguard against establish-

ing a national religion. Yet in the face of this reference he says:—

"We propose 'such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States (or its preamble) as will suitably acknowledge Almighty God as the author of the nation's existence and the ultimate source of its authority, Jesus Christ as its Ruler, and the Bible as the supreme rule of its conduct,' and thus indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages, on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

Now the question arises, If all this were accomplished, would the Christian religion be established in and by this government? If it be answered that it would not, then another question: Would individuals be at liberty under the law of the land to disregard those Christian institutions and usages? If not, if both of these questions be answered in the negative, then what would be the existing state of things? Could it be defined?

This will never do; such talk is idle. To place Christian usages on a legal basis is to enforce them by law, and to enforce them is to "establish" them. When they are placed on "an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land," they are fully established, and to deny this is only to trifle with language. But again, you cannot distinguish between "all Christian laws, institutions, and usages," and the Christian religion. By establishing them you establish it, of necessity. To deny this is to manifest a lack of discrimination or of candor. We speak with due respect, but we have to deal with facts of the greatest magnitude and importance, and which affect us in those things which we hold most sacred and dear. The advocates of this movement are able men. We hope they will not ignore these points, but so explain them as to reconcile themselves with themselves if it can be done.

Their desires and intentions are made known and their future action foreshadowed in the speech of Prof. C. A. Blanchard; "which was frequently greeted with enthusiastic applause," as the report says. We have already quoted from him to show what kind of a union of church and State they do not indorse. The heading of his speech is, "The Conflict of Law." This conflict, which he says exists in the United States, he deprecates and argues against. It amounts to this: the first Amendment to the Constitution declares that Congress shall pass no law respecting an establishment of religion; that this being in our fundamental law is expected to indicate the form and action of our government; but, in the face of this, chaplains are elected or appointed in Congress and in the army; Sunday is recognized, if not legally enforced, in many ways; certain so-called religious practices are discountenanced, as polygamy among the Mormons, &c. The reader will readily understand the quotations given below:—

"The Constitution declares that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, and also that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States. These statements are very general. No law may be made prohibiting the free exercise of religion. But who is to decide what is religion? The citizens, of course, for Congress may make no law respecting an establishment of religion. Every man may choose his religion or make a new one, and Congress may not prohibit its free exercise. Tartar, Confucian, and Hindoo, may bring their gods many and lords many. The Moslem minaret may shine in the setting sun from every hill. Every graveyard may become a temple for celestial worshippers of the dead. Every one of India's three hundred million gods may leave that land where the snows of Himalaya stand silent sentinel, and Cape Cormorin looks out upon the summer sea. Every one of them may come to this Christian land, and here find a congenial home.

"We cannot say, as a nation, that they do not have good religions, for we must pass no act respecting the establishment of religion. We cannot forbid their practices, for we must not prohibit its free exercise.

"It answers no purpose to say that wife burning, man sacrificing, and babe killing are not religious practices. These things are done by millions of people in the name of religion. When we say they are not religious acts, we make a law respecting the establishment of religion. When we

prohibit them, we prohibit its free exercise. . . .

"The American people must say that the Bible is the word of God, and that Christianity is the religion of this country, or the exclusion of such religious practices as have been named is prohibiting the free exercise of religion, and hence unconstitutional. This is the Constitution which the infidel likes, and to which he wants our laws adapted. . . .

"But," says the Christian objector, 'the laws of the States do not permit wife-burning and man-eating religions. Bigamy is punished by law in every State of the Union, and the mother found tossing her babe to a hungry shark would be locked up in the prison or the mad-house. Sabbath laws, chaplains, and chapels, in every department of public service, attest the national regard for religion.' True again. But what right has government to tax me to sustain a chapel or chaplain, when it has nothing to do with religion and I don't believe in any God? What right to interfere with the Suttie when my religion demands it? What right to imprison for bigamy if my religion teaches it and I am free to practice any religion I choose? The answer is plain. Just no right at all. No law which forbids the free exercise of religion which calls for human sacrifice, adultery, or blasphemy, can stand a suit in the Supreme Court of the United States.

"Nay, more. Suppose, (and you but suppose a fact) that a body of voters say that their church has authority over the State in civil concerns. Suppose, further, that these voters honestly believe that their salvation depends on implicit obedience to their priests in temporal as well as spiritual matters. Suppose, once more, that the priests teach the people to set up another sovereignty on this soil, to collect arms and train soldiers in pursuance of this religious conviction, and, finally, suppose that they (in obedience to religious instruction) make war on the United States. What then? Why, then our officials and people are bound to stand still and have their throats cut. For we cannot say that this is not a religious service, and if it is, have no right to prohibit it. You say: 'This is absurd.' Of course it is. That is precisely what we wish to show the American people. To say to the world that we will have no law prohibiting the free exercise of religion, and then putting men in prison or hanging them for exercising theirs, is to advertise ourselves to the world as liars or fools, or both. This conflict of law is inevitable and irrepressible. Our laws will be heathenized or our Constitution Christianized, and Americans must soon decide which they will have done.

"To settle this conflict by Christianizing the Constitution is only an act of justice to the men who come here to live under our laws.

"Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measures, and of course Congress establishes a standard for money, weight, and measure. So Congress must establish a standard of religion, or admit anything called religion."

More to the same intent might be quoted; but surely this is enough to show the drift of the argument. If this is not a direct plea for the abolition of the first amendment to the Constitution, then such a plea could not be expressed by the English language. It may be claimed, indeed, that his positions are reasonable and just. We do not now stop to argue the difference between morality and usages which are purely religious, but for brevity's sake confine ourselves to the one point before us. However reasonable and just his argument is claimed to be, it is certainly inconsistent with those other declarations made in the same Convention that that body would be the first to oppose the establishment of religion or the abolition of the first amendment to the Constitution. We cannot admire the judgment of those who so earnestly argue or loudly applaud both sides of so plain a proposition, nor could we trust to their leadership in a movement so vitally affecting our dearest rights.

We admit that their arguments are plausible, though often fallacious, and are well calculated to captivate. And herein lies the danger. If they cannot see that their declarations are inconsistent and contradictory we pity their blindness. As at first remarked, their professions give us no assurance that their misguided zeal will not result in religious persecution.

Their disclaimers embrace two points. One, that they do not seek nor desire the abolition of the first Amendment to the

Constitution. To what this amounts, we have now seen. The other, that they do not seek the abolition or change of that Article of the Constitution which forbids any religious test being required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States. On this point, we make a quotation from the *Statesman*, where it speaks of certain Congressmen who traveled on Sunday. It said:—

"Not one of those men who thus violated the Sabbath is fit to hold any official position in a Christian nation. . . . Give us in the National Constitution the simple acknowledgment of the law of God as the supreme law of nations, and all the results indicated in this note will ultimately be secured. Let no one say the movement does not contemplate sufficiently practical ends."

Studying the prophecies to which we have referred, we came to the conclusion that the privileges of citizenship would soon be denied, in the United States, to those who would not observe the Sunday, and this view we have published to the world for more than a score of years. And already the *Statesman* openly declares that, when the amendment they seek is procured, no one who does not keep Sunday shall be eligible to any office in the United States. And yet it affects to smile at our fears that our rights will be infringed upon by the passage of the Amendment! If they already avow that we shall be ineligible to office for not keeping Sunday, can we hope that they will not utterly disfranchise us when their general Sunday law is in full force, if our consciences will not permit us to observe it? All this is plainly revealed in the prophecy when "the image of the beast" is made, that is, when church and State become united in this nation. They may laugh, but, as in the fable of the boys and the frogs, it is not a matter for laughter to those on the other side, only as they look beyond this persecution to the deliverance which God has promised in that "time of trouble."

The *Statesman* has even claimed that, inasmuch as the Sunday-Sabbath is better than no Sabbath at all, they who observe the seventh day ought to favor the proposed amendment. As far as obedience to the fourth commandment is concerned, Sunday is, to us, no better than no Sabbath at all. But waiving this point, and keeping close to that under consideration, we fail to see, in any of the writings in favor of Sunday legislation, that spirit of toleration toward keepers of the seventh day which is necessary to secure our approval of, and co-operation in, the movement. A prominent writer on this subject, who is also a vice-president of the National Association, said:—

"But it may be asked, Would not the Jew be denied equality of rights by legislation protecting the Christian Sabbath and ignoring the Jewish? The answer is, We are not a Jewish, but a Christian, nation; therefore, our legislation must be conformed to the institutions and spirit of Christianity. This is absolutely necessary from the nature of the case."

Of course, when it is arbitrarily decided that the keeping of the seventh day is inconsistent with Christianity, all who keep the seventh day will fall under the same ban that it is intended to put upon the Jews. And this was yet more clearly stated by Pres. Blanchard, one of the foremost advocates of the Amendment, in a speech which was published some months since in the *Statesman*, in which he enumerated their opposers, and placed those who keep the seventh day with infidels and lawless ones, who stand opposed to Christianity and its institutions. We regret that we have not the speech at hand to give a verbatim quotation, but assure the reader that we have not overstated its position.

Now, in the face of such facts as these, how can the *Statesman* vindicate its own consistency when it says that the success of their measure would not harm a hair of the heads of those who keep the seventh day? And may we not safely appeal to the reader that our position on the fulfillment of prophecy, a position which we have occupied for more than twenty years, is vindicated by the events now transpiring and impending? Our faith is strengthened by every omen of success on the part of the Amendment party. That "the image of the beast" will soon be formed, and "the mark of the beast" enforced, in opposition to the fourth commandment of God, we have no doubt.

If we have spoken in a deprecating man-

ner of the impending crisis, it is only because we think that modest speech becomes the people of God, and we would carefully avoid every appearance of the spirit or bearing of the bravado. But we assure the reader, and the *Statesman*, and all concerned, that we have no fearful forebodings of the coming storm. When the Saviour foretold the distress, perplexity, and trouble, of the last days, he said to his disciples, "And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh." The hour of darkness will be succeeded by a morning of bright glory; the time of trouble only ushers in everlasting deliverance to the people of God. The hour of trial will be short for all those who fear God and keep his commandments. But they who set themselves in opposition to the plain word of God and his law have reason to fear and tremble. They may laugh now, but their laughter will be turned into weeping. They may triumph here, but the time of their triumphing will be short. While we love our blessed Lord, and pray for his appearing, and long to see his face, we shall spend no time in lamenting that we see the evidences of his near approach.

To the reader who is not acquainted with the progress of this movement, it may be interesting to state a few facts. It is well understood that it is the intention to throw it into the political field as soon as the way is sufficiently prepared. To this point, they are already turning, and making definite calculations. Dr. McFall, in reporting meetings in a certain place, said:—

"This is a hopeful community. The Methodist brethren largely predominate, and a grateful acknowledgment is due to them for the free use of their church in the cause of National Reform at any time. We believe the entire district will vote the National Reform ticket as soon as presented."

Dr. Kieffer, who resides in Franklin Co., Pa., said that every man with only one exception, in his neighborhood, could be counted on to vote for that ticket. Many expressions show that they are canvassing for the vote wherever they go, and feel secure in counting on a number large enough to control the election when they see fit to raise the question. The *Statesman* of Feb. 14, 1874, contains a very interesting article on this subject, as follows:—

"A PREDICTION HASTENING TO ITS FULFILLMENT."

"Fifteen years ago a clear-headed writer in one of our leading quarterlies gave utterance to a notable prediction. Five years before the formation of the National Association for the Religious Amendment of the Constitution, this writer saw the incipient reaction against the exclusion of all acknowledgment of God and Christianity from our Constitutions and most solemn national acts. After appealing to all good men and true patriots to advocate such Constitutional reforms as will guard the most precious rights of a free Christian nation, the writer says:—

"The time is not far distant, as we are persuaded, when some capable man, putting himself at the head of a movement which is already making itself felt, to vindicate our national religious liberty, our inalienable right to worship God as a nation, will become the most popular candidate for the presidential chair. A Christian and Protestant people, when patience has become exhausted by intolerable political corruption, and indignant at the demoralization of its educational interests, will stand by him. Raising his voice in behalf of a nation's right to worship God, his words will speak into clear consciences their own struggling thoughts; and they will hasten to crown him with their highest honors."—(Prof. J. H. McIvaine, in *Princeton Review* for Oct. 1859, p. 699.)

"When these remarkable words were written, 'the movement which was already making itself felt' had not taken shape. But now it is well organized and thoroughly before the nation. Its progress for the last two years is something amazing. No other movement in the country could bring together such a Convention as that which met in Pittsburgh on the 4th and 5th of this month. With thousands of workers scattered all over the land, the movement will and must progress with ever-accelerating rapidity. Nor does the movement want a head. 'A capable man' stands conspicuously at the front—one who dared to face obloquy when the movement was sneered at; one who had the moral courage to stand up and speak for the truth when the press generally tried to ridicule or ignore it; one whose untarnished Christian character would honor the place of the chief magistrate of the nation as it has never been honored yet, is already attracting thousands upon thousands of American citizens. His words have spoken into clear consciences the struggling thoughts of multitudes, and the day is not very far distant when they will crown him with their highest honors."

This reference is to Mr. Brunot, whom they evidently intend to bring forward as their candidate for President of the United States. In connection with this, the following from the report of the Pittsburgh Convention has peculiar significance:—

“Mr. McAllister stated that the National Conventions were very expensive, and it was suggested that the next National Convention should be postponed until July, 1876, the centennial of the Declaration of Independence. In the meantime, five or six local conventions would be held—one in Boston, one in Baltimore, one in Chicago, one on the Pacific slope, and two in the Southern States. In 1876, a grand National Convention should be held in Philadelphia, by which time the petitions for the Religious Amendment would be signed by several millions of citizens, and a united effort would be made at Philadelphia to lay those petitions before the Congress of the United States, and secure the Amendment proposed.”

If they have anything near the success they anticipate, it is not too much to expect that at the Philadelphia Convention they will put their candidate in the field for the election in the fall of 1876. This we believe is their intention. The Pittsburgh Convention as compared with previous ones, and their great success during the past year, seem to warrant them in making large calculations.

The *Statesman* of Feb. 28, 1874, says: “The one thing most needed for the Christian reformation of the government, is the organization of Christian men for political purposes.”

One other phase of the agitation of this subject claims a brief notice. It is that of political opposition to the Amendment. There are many foreigners, especially the Germans, who claim the privilege under our Constitution of making the Sunday a holiday as is the custom in their native land. It is well known that in all Catholic countries Sunday is regarded and kept as a *festival* day, not as a *Sabbath*. Indeed, a writer on this subject claims the Sunday as peculiarly an “American Sabbath,” because of the fact stated, that so little of a Sabbath character is assigned to it in Europe, especially on the Continent. These foreigners, coming to our country under a Constitution of religious freedom and toleration, will offer a most determined opposition to the Amendment.

And there is another class, of native born Americans, who will be as determined in opposition as the other. Those composing this class, planting themselves on the fact that our fathers fled from oppression, both political and ecclesiastical, in Europe, and founded here a government of civil and religious liberty which they do not intend shall be perverted to a despotism, either of church or State, openly declare that which their fathers fought and died to establish they will as readily and persistently fight to maintain. With these parties we have no affinity. Our opposition will never be that of force. But, though we cannot join with such opposition, it is that which appeals to the patriotic feelings of thousands, and may not be turned aside by mere words of scorn as the *Statesman* affects to do. We think it is safe to predict, on the success of this Amendment and on the attempt to enforce laws giving it effect, the sorest trouble that our nation and country has seen, not excepting the late terrible war. That was to a great extent sectional,—the South against the North. This will engender strife in every neighborhood, and raise a conflict in every community.

While the Amendment party class us with infidels and lawless opposers of “Christian morals,” we expect to receive as little favor at the hands of those who shall oppose the movement by political action or force of arms. We plant ourselves on the commandment of God, and his blessed assurance that “the angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them.” Here is our only hope and trust. J. H. WAGGONER.

**The Divine Thought in the Bible.**

ALL the blessings we receive are ascribed in the gospel, not in the least to our desert or merit, but wholly to God’s free grace. “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us.” Thus in every unchristian scheme, there reigns a reliance upon man for the securing of the divine favor, while Christianity proclaims this favor as a free gift, founded on the merits of Christ and the mercy of God alone.

It shows a wonderfully shallow acquaintance, therefore, with the whole subject, when certain writers classify Christianity with other systems, and the Bible with other books, as though they were all only utterances, in different forms, of man’s religious nature. This is true of Mohammedanism, Buddhism, Brahminism; of the Koran, the Vedas, and so on; these are utterances, sometimes pathetic, and often very profound, of man’s sense of need and dependence, and also of his strivings for that divine fellowship which he feels he needs. But the Bible does not so much declare the human sense of want, as it does the divine supply. It is an utterance to man of the divine fullness. The difference between it, therefore, and all other books of religion is infinite, and any one who puts it into the same category with them shows a lack of discrimination, incapacitating him for any sound criticism of it, or of them.

This peculiarity of the Bible shows it to be superhuman. God’s love to man, his mercy, his willingness to forgive, are thoughts which man could not originate. The proof of this is seen, not only in the fact that, Christianity excepted, no religion has ever given a glimpse of such a thought, but the thought itself is not suggested by anything around us or within. —Prof. Seelye, in the *Advance*.

**The Truth.—No. 3.**

HAD the truth always been obeyed, earth had still remained an Eden. But the truth has been transgressed and opposed; hence the great controversy between truth and falsehood. The first to leave the truth was Satan; angels and men have followed his example. Jesus said to the unbelieving Pharisees, “Ye are of your father, the devil; and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth.” John 8:44. To say that he abode not, or remained not, in the truth, is an acknowledgment that he was once in the truth. Pride and exaltation caused him to leave the truth by the transgression of the law of God, and in the beginning of our world he became the murderer of our race by leading man into sin, the wages of which is death. He was the first to leave the truth—to break God’s law—and for this reason the everlasting fire, into which the wicked will be driven, is “prepared for the devil and his angels.”

Since sin entered, opposition to the truth has raged. The ancient pagans turned the truth of God into a lie by worshipping the creature instead of the Creator. Rom. 1:25. But the great apostasy of the present dispensation, “the man of sin,” or “the lawless one,” has outdone all in exalting himself above God, and casting down his truth and trampling it in the dust. 2 Thess. 2. Daniel was forewarned of the arrogant and blasphemous work of this great abomination of desolation in the following words: “And an host was given him against the daily by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground, and it practiced and prospered.” Dan. 8:12. “And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws.” Dan. 7:25. The law of God is the truth. Hence to think to change his times and laws is precisely equivalent to casting the truth to the ground.

And this opposition to the truth is not all in the past, but will continue to the end. Amid the perils of the last days, the apostate church, those who still have a form of godliness, will be, as the apostle says, “ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth;” but, on the contrary, they will “resist the truth,” as did Jannes and Jambres. See 2 Tim. 3:1-8. Hence Paul most solemnly charges the gospel minister “before God and the Lord Jesus Christ,” and in view of the approach of the Judgment of the living and the dead, to “preach the word,” the word of God, which is truth, and assigns the following reason: “For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears, and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.” 2 Tim. 4:3, 4. And any one who will carefully read Isa. 59 will see that when the day of vengeance comes upon the last generation of earth, it will come because “truth is fallen in the street, and equity cannot enter.” “Yea,” says the prophet, “truth faileth; and he that departeth from evil maketh himself a prey.” To de-

part from evil is to leave off sin, which is the transgression of the law. Hence we learn that the evil doer, that “hateth the light,” will be arrayed against, and strive to devour like a beast of prey, him that shall venture to do the truth. The Lord seeing it will be displeased, and will “put on the garments of vengeance for clothing,” and “repay fury to his adversaries.”

But the “Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob.” Here is described the final conflict between truth and error. It is described in Rev. 12:17: “And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.” But the doers of the truth shall be the victors; they shall stand on the Mount Zion with the Lamb, and shall sing the song of deliverance on the sea of glass, when the judgments of God shall have been made manifest against their persecutors, as the host of the Egyptians were swallowed up in the Red Sea. Rev. 14:1; 15:2-4.

R. F. COTTRELL.

**The Two Laws.**

“BUT ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law.” Mal. 2:8.

The prophet here gives a fitting reproof to those who make no distinction between the law which God spoke with his own voice from the summit of Sinai in the hearing of Israel, and that law which was given in addition, consisting of types and ceremonies, because of the transgression of the former.

To take the ground that there is but one law spoken of in the Bible is to furnish the skeptic with a mighty weapon to wield in his warfare against the divine authority of that sacred volume. If but one system of law has existed, and is referred to where the phrase, “the law,” occurs, then, certainly, the cavils of the objector cannot be disproved, and in the contest he comes off victorious. But to maintain that there are two laws, one, the transgression of which, brought death into the world, Rom. 5:12, the other, which owes its origin to sin, and which could have had no existence if man had not become a transgressor, is to wrest from the hands of the cavalier his objection, and to make a beautiful harmony in the word of God respecting this question, over which so many stumble.

But why is this position taken? Simply to avoid the claims of the fourth commandment of that moral code, which requires the observance of the seventh day for the Sabbath. This is termed “Jewish,” therefore, its obligation ceased with all the types and ordinances peculiar to that dispensation and that people. But this cannot be true, for God rested upon it, blessed and sanctified it (set apart to a holy use), at the close of creation week, twenty-three hundred years before there was a Jew, a descendant of Judah. Gen. 2:23; 29:35. It was set apart in the garden of Eden, not as a type, or shadow, pointing forward to things to come, for no sin then existed, hence no need of a type; but as a memorial, or keepsake, for man, to keep in mind God’s creative work, therefore, it always points backward and never forward, Ps. 111:4; 135:13; Ex. 20:11, and is called “the Sabbath of the Lord thy God,” “My holy day,” and the “Lord’s day.” Ex. 20:10; Isa. 58:13; Rev. 1:10; Mark 2:28.

That there were Sabbaths peculiar to that people and dispensation, which were typical, and shadows of things to come, is readily admitted. These were connected and associated with “new moons,” “meats and drinks,” “feasts” and “holy days,” and were called “sabbaths,” “her sabbaths” and “your sabbaths,” which were to expire by limitation, and to cease with all the typical service. Lev. 23:24, 32, 39; 1 Chron. 23:31; 2 Chron. 2:4; Neh. 10:33; Isa. 1:13, 14; Lam. 2:6; Hosea 2:11; Rom. 14:1-6; Col. 2:16, 17. These “sabbaths,” feasts, and holy convocations were proclaimed “beside the Sabbaths of the Lord.” Lev. 23:38. Here is made a clear distinction between these Sabbaths.

In the bosom of that code, which grew out of the immutable relations which man sustains toward God and toward his fellow-man, was incorporated a commandment respecting the sacred observance of his holy rest-day. By the transgression of this law, death came upon all men, and a necessity at once existed that another system of laws, consisting of types and shadows,

should be added, pointing forward to the great sacrifice which should take away the sin of the world; by whose obedience shall many be made righteous. Rom. 5:19.

Between these two codes there is the clearest distinction, and the following comparison is subjoined, that it may be seen at a glance:—

The Moral Law.	The Ceremonial Law.
1. Was spoken by God. Deut. 14:12.	Was spoken by Moses. Deut. 1:1-6.
2. Was written by God on tables of stone. Ex. 24:12.	Was written by Moses in a book. Deut. 31:24.
3. Was “right,” “true,” and “good.” Neh. 9:13.	Was “not good.” Eze. 20:25.
4. Was a law, “which if a man do, he shall even live in” it. Eze. 20:11, 13, 21.	Was a law “whereby they should not live.” Eze. 20:25.
5. Was a “perfect law.” Ps. 19:7.	“Made nothing perfect.” Heb. 7:19.
6. God declares that it should stand forever and ever. Ps. 111:7, 8.	The apostle declares, “there is made of necessity a change.” Heb. 7:12.
7. Christ did not “come to destroy.” Matt. 5:17.	He “abolished it.” Eph. 2:15.
8. He came to magnify and make honorable. Isa. 4:21.	He took out of the way at his death. Col. 2:14.
9. Every “jot” and “tittle” of this shall stand “till heaven and earth pass” away. Matt. 5:18.	Was only “added till,” and passed away when the seed came. Gal. 3:19.
10. Of this Christ said: “Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments shall be called the least in the kingdom of Heaven.” Matt. 5:19.	Of the other the apostle said: “We gave no such commandment” that ye should “keep the law.” Acts 15:24.
11. Was a “law of liberty.” Jas. 2:12.	Was a “yoke of bondage.” Gal. 5:1.
12. Paul delighted in. Rom. 7:22.	Neither he nor the fathers could bear. Acts 15:10.
13. Is established through faith in Christ. Rom. 3:31.	“Was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ.” Gal. 3:24, 25.
14. “Is spiritual.” Rom. 7:14.	Is “the law of a carnal commandment.” Heb. 7:16.
15. Is “holy,” “just,” and “good.” Rom. 7:12.	Is “enmity against us” and “contrary to us.” Eph. 2:15; Col. 2:14.
16. Was written with the finger of God, and is called the “royal law.” Ex. 31:18; Jas. 2:8.	Was the “handwriting of ordinances.” Col. 2:14.
17. Is written on the hearts of the Gentiles; and to it all mankind are amenable. Rom. 2:12-15; 3:19.	Served as a “middle wall of partition between” the Jews and the Gentiles. Eph. 2:14.
18. Was proclaimed by Jehovah himself, “and he added no more.” Deut. 5:22.	“Was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.” Gal. 3:19.
19. All the commandments of one law, David says, “are righteousness, and are founded forever.” Ps. 119:152, 172.	But the other law, Paul says, “stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation.” Heb. 9:10.
20. Contains the commandments of God which it is the whole duty of man to keep. Eccl. 12:13, which are brought to view in the third message, Rev. 14:12, which the remnant of the seed of the woman were keeping when the dragon made war upon them, Rev. 12:17, and which will insure to those who observe them access to the tree of life. Rev. 22:14.	Is “the law of commandments contained in ordinances,” Eph. 2:15, “a shadow of good things to come.” Heb. 10:1, and was disannulled “for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof.” Heb. 7:18.

“Surely these two codes should not be confounded. The one was magnified, made honorable, established, and is holy, just, spiritual, good, royal; the other was carnal, shadowy, burdensome, and was abolished, broken down, taken out of the way, nailed to the cross, changed, and disannulled, on account of the weakness and unprofitableness thereof.”

“Those who rightly divide the word of truth will never confound these essentially different codes, nor will they apply to God’s royal law the language employed respecting the handwriting of ordinances.” R. M. KILGORE.

AN UNSPOTTED CHARACTER.—Money is a good thing, especially in these hard times, but there is something a thousand-fold more valuable. It is character—the consciousness of a pure and honorable life. This it should be a man’s first aim to preserve at any cost. In times of commercial distress, while some are proved and found wanting, others come forth tried as by fire. Here and there one comes out of that furnace far more of a man than before. Amid the wreck of his fortune he stands erect—a noble specimen of true manhood. We have occasionally witnessed an example of courage in such a crisis, of moral intrepidity that deserves all honor. Let it be the aim of every business man above all things else to keep his purity unstained. This is his best possession—this is a capital which can never be taken from him—this is the richest inheritance which he can leave his children.

## The Review and Herald.

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

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, MARCH 24, 1874.

JAMES WHITE,  
J. N. ANDREWS,  
URIAH SMITH.

EDITORS.

### The Third Angel's Message.

THIS message is found in Rev. 14: 9-12. The numerical order is given in the prophecy itself: "And the third angel followed them." Commencing with verse 6, two messages are brought to view before this; and as this is called the third, the two preceding must be the first and second. This is our authority for speaking so often as we do of the first angel's message, the second angel's message, and the third angel's message, of Rev. 14.

This message, like the first, is proclaimed with a loud voice. "Saying with a loud voice," says the prophecy. The first message went to nations, kindreds, tongues, and peoples. Being proclaimed with a voice equally loud, this third message must be equally extensive.

The matter of the proclamation is then introduced in these words: "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand." Here is a work clearly defined and distinctly specified. It constitutes the burden of the proclamation; and when it is given, these things will be kept before the people, the terms will be clearly explained, and the nature of the sin be distinctly pointed out. It is a sin that is exceedingly offensive in the sight of God; for of those who are guilty of it, the message continues:—

"The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation." It may well be questioned whether any judgment has yet been inflicted upon any portion of the human race in which there was no mixture of mercy, or whether any such judgments can be inflicted while Christ continues to act as mediator between the Father and the human family. As this message is the last message of mercy, and ceases only with the close of human probation, so the judgments it threatens may well be said to be without mixture of mercy, as they are poured out after all have made their final choice. The message defines what their punishment is to be in the following language:—

"And he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." A denunciation of wrath more terrible is not to be found in the word of God; and it is certainly not unbecoming any one to inquire carefully what this judgment is, when it is to be inflicted, and how he may escape it.

The result of the message is then declared. A company is brought out of whom it is said, "Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." And the scene that immediately follows is the appearing of one like the Son of man on the great white cloud, which can represent nothing else but the second advent of Christ in the clouds of heaven.

We have shown in previous articles (See REVIEW, Nos. 4, 6, and 9, of present volume) that the first and second messages of this series have already been heard, and that, too, in our own day. As the third message follows them in numerical and chronological order, the time has now come for this message to be given. And as this message has its place just before the second coming of Christ, reaching to that event, if that coming is now at hand, as all evidence combines to show, this is another proof that this message is now due, and must in some form be in progress in the land.

Is such a movement anywhere seen at the present time? There is a movement now in progress which claims emphatically to be doing this work. For many years already it has been before the people, small at first, as from the nature of its work it must be, but destined soon to go with a power commensurate with the magnitude of the issue it has in hand. It has secured its foothold, and counts its adherents in every northern State from Maine to California. The ADVENT REVIEW and five other periodicals are published in its interest; and the reader whose eye may fall upon these lines is reading that which is written in its defense with the most absolute and unbounded conviction that what it claims is truth. The movement is here and doing its work.

We now call the attention of the reader to an important consideration. Since the great Advent movement of 1844, various classes of Adventists have been developed. Their positions are contradictory, and hence cannot all be true. But the truth must be found with some of them, if the coming of Christ is at hand, and if that is the great truth for this time. Some class of Adventists must be following on in the order of the fulfillment of God's word, and so in the order of his providence. Which class is it? Answer: It is that class which is giving the third angel's message; because, as we have seen, that is the last true Advent movement previous to the appearing of Christ. Those who are giving the genuine proclamation, and doing the true work on this question, will inscribe this message on their banners. The burden of their work will be to warn against the worship of the beast, his image, and the reception of his mark. They will make these themes prominent in their sermons, books, and papers, and reason, urge, exhort, and entreat, in reference to them. What shall we think of those who claim to be Adventists, who are preaching that the coming of Christ is near at hand, and yet ignore this message? who never speak of those things which the prophecy under examination shows will be the important themes for the people just preceding the Lord's appearing? Such certainly have mistaken the truth. They are off the track. They are not doing the true work for this time, and it is useless for them to claim it.

What class, then, we ask, claim to be giving this message, and explain the symbols therein brought to view in a way to show the people a present duty in relation to them? None but Seventh-day Adventists. And we pledge ourselves to do this, supporting our claims by an array of evidence which we think must be conclusive to every reasonable and unprejudiced mind. U. S.

### More Trouble with Moses.

THE *Restitution*, of March 5, 1874, says:—

"We learn that there are certain Seventh-day Adventists who are muddling the brains of a number of honest-hearted persons in different parts. Their specious arguments are presented in such a way as to deceive those who are but young in the cause of truth, and the result is, that not being able to answer them they are almost persuaded to yield obedience to the law of Moses."

Inasmuch as Seventh-day Adventists never try to turn people to the law of Moses, it is utterly unaccountable how inability to answer their arguments should lead people to such observance. This is one of the false issues that are continually held up by those who assert that God's law has been abolished. And if the arguments which prove the perpetuity of the moral law could be answered, there would be no need of resorting to such an artifice.

They claim that every argument used by the advocates of the law has been met and answered. What they have answered is just such false issues as is here noticed. They have simply attacked men of straw of their own creation.

"There is nothing clearer," says the writer, "to our mind than this, that there is no such thing as mixing the two dispensations—that of Moses and Christ." Any mind to which such a point as this is not clear must be marvelously obtuse. Who claims that the two dispensations are mixed? It is evident that the conductors of the *Restitution* are the ones who are "muddled" in this matter. The dispensations are just as distinct as type and antitype, shadow and substance. But who does not see that the dispensation of Moses related in figure to the same thing that the dispensation of Christ relates to in fact? That was the type, this the antitype; that the shadow, this the substance; that the figure, this the reality.

And what was the object of that dispensation? and what is the object of this? To take away sin. The object is the same under both dispensations. Sin is the transgression of the law. There was real sin in the former dispensation, a real law transgressed. Men did not sin figuratively back there by transgressing a figurative law, which was in time to give place to something real. Sin was real, and the moral law, written upon the tables of stone, and deposited in the ark, the center of the sanctuary worship, was a real law. Sin, under that dispensation, at least, consisted in the transgression of that law; but the forgiveness of sin, or the atonement for these transgressions, was a work then done in figure; for the blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin. The blood of Christ alone can do this.

Those offerings prefigured the sacrifice of Christ as the true offering for sin. Now does his offering relate to a different law from that to which those offerings related which were types of his? We can scarcely conceive of a greater absurdity than to suppose such a thing. In such case, how could those offerings be typical of Christ's offering? How could an offering made back there for one purpose be a figure, type, or representation of the offering of Christ, if his offering was made for another purpose?

The typical work of the former dispensation related to the ten commandments written on the tables of stone, and deposited in the ark, and the very fact that a figurative or typical service was performed to that law showed that a real or antitypical work was to be performed to it, else the figures were figures of nothing, and the types had no antitype. But all antitypical work is connected with Christ; hence his offering and ministration relate to the same law.

And Paul assures us that this is the case; for he says that the death of Christ not only provides eternal redemption for us (Christians), but was also "for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament." Heb. 9: 15. Now does Christ's one offering atone for acts in the case of one individual, which are permitted in the case of another? Does God's standard of moral rectitude vary in different ages? Are some things sin at one time and all right at another? Will God curse the men of one age, for doing the very things which in the men of another age are acceptable to him?

To such questions, arising of necessity from that view, the no-law system absurdly answers, Yes. And this is what we want the people to see, that nothing but absurdity pertains to the no-law system throughout. How much better to accept that which the Bible so clearly teaches: that God is unchangeable; that his great rule of right is the same from beginning to end; that the transgression of this is sin in every age, 1 John 3: 4; that this is the only instrument to show what sin is, Rom. 3: 20; that previous to Christ, the people of God received forgiveness for their transgressions of that law in figure through the blood of the typical offerings; and that we now receive forgiveness for our transgressions of the same law, in fact, through the offering of Christ.

Says the *Restitution*, "We are either under the law or under Christ." Well, who does not believe that? But will our opponents show us a passage which says that any one is under grace who has not a personal interest in Christ? The fact is, all except converted persons are under the law, not under obligation to practice the Mosaic or typical law, which came to an end with that dispensation, but under the condemnation of the moral law; and so they will remain till their guilt is taken away by their acceptance of the offering of Christ. Rom. 3: 19, shows that this is the sense in which Paul uses the expression, "under the law," in this epistle.

Again the writer says: "From Paul's reasoning in Rom. 7, it is clear that all who are married to Christ are released from their obligation to the law. They cannot be married to both at the same time, any more than a woman can be married to two men at the same time." Who are married to Christ? Only those who have made a profession of Christ. Then, on his own showing, sinners are not released from their obligation to the law. On Rom. 7, our opponents betray the most astonishing confusion of ideas. Paul there illustrates the condition of a person before and after conversion by the figure of marriage as regulated by the law of the land.

In the illustration, there are four parties: the woman, the law regulating the marriage relation, the first husband, and the second husband.

In the thing illustrated there are also four parties: the penitent, the law of God, the condition before conversion, and the condition after conversion.

Let us see how these answer to each other. The woman represents the penitent. The law of marriage represents the law of God. The first husband represents that to which we are united before conversion. The second husband represents that to which we are united after conversion.

When we are married to another, to the second husband, Paul says we are united to Christ. Christ, then, in the illustration is the second husband. Now what is the first husband? Is it the law? The *Restitution* speaks about our being married to the law! Look at Paul's illustration. Was the woman married to the law of marriage? Such an idea is worse than nonsense; but it is no more palpably absurd than to speak

of the sinner before conversion as being married to the law of God. No, the first husband is that to which we are united before conversion. And what is that? It is the carnal mind, Rom. 8: 7, "the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts," Eph. 4: 22, "our old man," which must be "crucified with" Christ, Rom. 6: 6, the "old man" which must be put off with his deeds. Col. 3: 9. And when this old man, the first husband, is crucified, put off, and dead, then we are at liberty to "put on the new man," or be married to Christ.

And as the law of marriage shows the standing of the woman, so the law of God shows our standing. The law says that the woman can have but one husband. If, therefore, she takes two, the law pronounces her an adulteress. But if her first husband be dead, Paul says she is loosed, or released from the law of her husband. Is the law dead because she is loosed from it? Does the law of marriage come to an end when her first husband dies? No, but she is loosed from the law because the law does not bind a living woman to a dead man. The law which bound her to that one man so long as he lived, ceases to bind her to him when the man is dead. Then she can be married to another man, and still not violate the law. But the law exists all the while, and regulates her relation to both husbands.

How is this as applied to the sinner? The law shows what sin is. So long as we live in sin, or maintain a union with the old man, the carnal heart, the law of God reveals that fact, it shows that union; and it prohibits any other so long as the old man is nourished and kept alive by us; for it is sin which gives the law its claims upon us. So then, if, while keeping up our union with this first husband, we attempt to unite with Christ, if we seek a union with him and with sin at the same time, we commit spiritual adultery. James 4: 4: "Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God?" We cannot have God and the world, Christ and sin, the old man and the new man, at the same time. That is adultery in the sight of God.

What must be done? The first husband, the old man of sin, must die. And this is done in the body of Christ. In the 6th verse of the preceding chapter, Rom. 6, Paul has explained this. He says, "Knowing this that our old man is crucified with him that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." And when this is accomplished, the law, which before showed us to be sinners, and while we continued in sin would allow of no other union, now sanctions our union with Christ, because it has no claims upon us as sinners; just as the law of marriage sanctions the union of the woman with the second husband after the first is dead, which it would not have sanctioned had that husband continued alive.

The crucifixion of our old man, Paul calls our death. Sin dying in us, or our dying to sin, are with him synonymous expressions. Read Rom. 6: 6, 7, and 8. In verse 6 he says, "Knowing that our old man is crucified with him." Then in verse 8 he says, "Now if we be dead with Christ." By these expressions he means the same thing. And when this occurs, we are dead to the law, because a death has been accomplished in us which meets the demands of the law. And in all his illustration in Rom. 7: 1-6, Paul never once says or intimates that the law dies or ceases to exist, but every time it is the individual in which the death occurs. Yet men will deal so superficially with Paul's reasoning and so distort and destroy his illustration as to talk about being married to the law! May Heaven look with compassion and pity upon such blindness and confusion. U. S.

### A Strange Conclusion.

A WRITER in the *Herald of Life*, of Feb. 18, 1874, says:—

"The passing of 1873 without the appearing of Jesus has proved that the papacy did not attain its supremacy in 538."

The statement of history is very explicit that the supremacy of the papacy did there commence; and the fulfillment of the 1260 years of its continuance ending in 1798, is still more explicit. How, then, does the fact that 1873 has passed, disprove these facts? Dating the 1335 days (years) from 538 they end in 1873. Supposing them to extend to the coming of Christ, the fact that he has not come shows that they have not ended, and consequently that

they did not commence in the year named, and that papal supremacy did not there begin.

This is the argument. It has two fatal defects: 1. The 1335 days do not mark the setting up of the papacy. They date from the taking away of the daily abomination (paganism) to set up the abomination that maketh desolate (papacy). Dan. 12:11, margin. But paganism was taken away preparatory to the setting up of the papacy, in 508, thirty years before the papacy was established. 2. The 1335 days do not extend to the coming of Christ. No prophetic period extends to that point. This is the great fallacy on which all time-setters founder. It is impossible to set a time for Christ to appear. We have no data on which to base a calculation. The prophetic periods, all of which can be located without difficulty, bring us to great events to transpire in close connection with the coming of Christ, so that we know that it is near. Daniel stands in his lot (the decisions of the investigative Judgment, not the lot of his inheritance—that is another word in the Hebrew) before Christ comes.

Feeling himself driven from 538, the writer looks for another date, and finds none till he comes to 553. The 1335 days, if commenced in that year, extend to 1888. But the 1260 dating from, that point reach to 1813 with nothing whatever to mark their termination. This throws him into perplexity; and there we leave him racking his inventive powers to find a new adjustment for his periods. So long as men will ignore this fundamental fact that no prophetic period reaches to the coming of Christ, so long we suppose they will go on with the work of setting new times for that event—a work futile in itself and a reproach and disgrace to the Advent name. u. s.

**How a Roman Catholic Feels about Us.**

THE *Western Home Journal*, a Roman Catholic paper published in Detroit, Mich., in its issue of March 7, 1874, thus speaks of us:—

"Incomparable! If you want to read the most nonsensical, bigoted, sanguinary, and ridiculously ignorant paper, not only of the United States, but of the round globe, just read the 'Advent Review' of Battle Creek, Mich. In fact, it exhibits the most delicious mental food for lunatics, fanatics, and all kinds of visionary ignoramus. Here are a few specimens of this 'highly enlightened' gospel-paper doctrines, truly and really printed in the edition of Feb. 17: 'The Catholic Church, the great beast of the prophecies, has butchered fifty millions of saints for the faith.' The Roman mother has ordered the adoration of images. The priests of the papacy forgive sins even before they are committed.' People indulging in such sublime stuff, even if they are so styled 'Reverend Pastors of the true Gospel,' surpass in ignorance the cannibals and in wild frenzy the worshippers of the fetich. We would not have believed such nonsense possible in the nineteenth century. There are evidently people whose want of shame is more to be wondered at than their want of knowledge. To this description belong the managers of the incomparable Battle Creek Advent Review."

The reader will perceive the point more clearly when we remind him that the number of the REVIEW referred to above is the one which contains the illustrations of the four beasts of Dan. 7, the last one, in two forms, representing pagan and papal Rome. In preparing that illustration we endeavored to throw into it the spirit of Daniel's description. He calls it a beast diverse from all others, strong exceedingly, terrible and exceeding dreadful, with teeth of iron and nails of brass. This it seems was too much for the amiability of our Catholic friend, and in attempting to disprove the application of that symbol to his church he unwittingly strengthens it by manifesting the same spirit which that beast, judging from an inspection of his countenance, seems to possess.

But the *Journal* does not regard the REVIEW as such a nonsensical, ridiculous sheet as it pretends. If it does it would pass us by unnoticed. What sensible person would care for the ignorance of a cannibal, or the ravings of a fetich worshiper? And it must have cost no little effort to get up such an amount of venom, unless it deals in that commodity so largely that it has a stock always on hand.

We wonder if the statements above quoted are a specimen of Roman Catholic veracity. Although it puts them in quotation marks, and says they were "truly and really printed in the edition of Feb. 17," not one of the expressions quoted occurs in that paper! It is said, to be

sure, that the Catholic church has been a persecuting power; and history abundantly proves it. Happily it is now restrained by the better spirit of its neighbors. It is said also that they worshiped images and granted indulgences; and they must admit these facts or repudiate their own writers and historians. But we suppose we must excuse their false statements on the ground that their beautiful religion allows them to lie without restraint when dealing with a heretic.

The application of the fourth beast of Dan. 7 to Rome, and the second phase of it, to the papacy, is so apparent that it cannot be reasonably disputed. It can be answered only in the way the *Journal* has attempted in the foregoing quotation. It has done as well, perhaps, as could be expected under the circumstances. u. s.

**More Authority for Sunday.**

THIS is found, not in the Bible, but in a French letter which a Protestant French lady of Serena, Illinois, handed me a short time since. This letter claims to have been written by "God, the Almighty, the Lord of Heaven and earth." It purports to have been communicated to man in a wonderful manner. It claims to have been first seen suspended in the air and magnificently written in gold letters, before the city of Magdenburg, Prussia, June 2, 1816. It opens with a curse against those who labor on Sunday, and reads thus:—

"Whosoever worketh on Sunday, or the Lord's day, is cursed. I, Jesus Christ, ordain that you should not work on Sunday, but that you should spend that day in going to church with that devotion which is requisite. . . . Thou shalt labor six days, but shalt sanctify the seventh, which is the Lord's day. Consider that I created heaven and earth in six days, and that it is in my power to destroy them: If thou dost not sanctify the Lord's day, I shall send you war and pestilence, or I shall send you incendiaries, inundations, and famine. I shall poison your fields and chasten you with swellings as I chastened the Egyptians. If you do not repent, but continue to sin before the Lord, the Eternal, I shall punish you in the abyss of hell as I punished Sodom and Gomorrah.

"I, Jesus Christ, command you to not work late Saturday night, but to rest, that you may be able to get to church early Sunday to confess your sins, repent sincerely and reform, that you may be forgiven. Labor not for gold and silver, or for great riches which lead to perdition. Abstain from fornication, which is abhorred by Heaven, and will be punished in time and in eternity. Cease to swear and to speak evil of others. Keep your children under strict discipline. A slack discipline will prove their ruin. And you who fail in your duty shall be punished in body and in soul. Thou rich man, cause the poor to rejoice. Thou virtuous poor shalt be recompensed by my blessings. . . . Children, honor your parents by your piety, and you will receive the crown.

"I, Jesus Christ, Son of God, have written this letter with my own hand. Whosoever shall contradict it shall be excluded from my power and favor, and shall be cut off from the Christian church. He who shall have this letter in his house and shall not communicate it to the children of men, shall be cursed with his house. But if your sins are as numerous as the sand of the sea or as the blades of grass in all the earth, they shall be forgiven you, if you repent sincerely and reform. I shall call you to a strict account in the day of Judgment if you have had this letter in your houses and have not communicated it to others. If you have committed this error, you shall not be protected against inundations, against incendiaries, or against the lightning; but he who shall communicate this letter to his neighbor and shall keep it constantly on his person through love for me, to keep my ordinances, such a one shall be recompensed publicly.

"Communication made by an angel, June 2, 1816."

I was surprised to learn that even some Protestants in France as well as in this country respect this letter and preserve it as a choice relic. But I do not know as this is a greater error than to reject such documents and yet receive Sunday for the Sabbath on the authority of the Roman Catholic church. The curses that are here threatened are calculated to frighten the timid, who are kept in darkness, while the blessings that are promised, being associated with some good instructions, will lead some truly conscientious, but uninformed, souls to render implicit obedience to all that is here enjoined.

But if the Bible is not a sufficient rule of faith and practice, and if the Catholic church is the only authority for the first-day Sabbath, why is not the letter before us as good argument in favor of Sunday-keeping as any that can be produced? Here is a letter claiming to have been written by God, the Father, and by the very hand of Jesus Christ! At the same time, it is a "communication made by an angel!" It also presents curses and blessings which relate to this life and to that which is to come. If you obey it strictly you will have the privilege of going early to a Roman Catholic

church every Sunday morning, and of confessing your sins to a Catholic priest. And you may derive as much virtue in carrying this letter on your person as you would in wearing any other relic of the Catholic church. Why should not those Protestants who so scrupulously observe the first day, knowing that they have no other authority than the Church of Rome for their practice, receive this document, and turn Catholic?

The first lesson I ever learned on the authority of the change of the Sabbath was in an interview with a Roman Catholic priest eighteen years ago this winter. I claimed that as a true Protestant I took the Bible and the Bible alone as my rule of faith and practice, and promised that if he could show me that I did not follow the Bible, I would correct my faith and practice. The priest replied: "We, the Catholic church, take the Bible and tradition. We have changed the Sabbath to the first day by our tradition, and not by the Bible, which says not a word in favor of a change of the Sabbath. You Protestants are very glad to adopt this relic of our tradition. Why not come wholly over to the mother church?"

Thank God for this lesson, and that I was disposed to correct myself by the Bible on the Sabbath question.

D. T. BOURDEAU.

**The Breath of Lives.**

NOR long since, I heard a funeral sermon preached by a minister of the M. E. church, who mentioned that in Gen 2:7, "the breath of lives" (plural) is said to have been given to man, and he affirmed that a two-fold life was given to him, or, rather, two lives, one of the body and one of the soul or spirit. And then he challenged the world to prove that it did not mean that man was possessed of immortality or an immortal soul! But "the world" probably thought it was unbecomingly to accept a challenge at a funeral, as it certainly was to give one, and therefore it very properly held its peace.

It may be worth while to look at this point to see if any conclusion can be rightfully drawn from this text in favor of natural immortality.

1. The man *who became a living soul*, not to whom an immortal soul was imparted, was made of the dust of the ground. It was into this man, made of dust, that the breath of lives was breathed.

2. That nothing can be claimed on the term "living soul" is proved in that the same term is applied to the creeping things of the earth, in the first chapter of Genesis.

3. That the plural—lives—is not decisive of man's immortality is shown in Gen. 6:17, and 7:21, 22, wherein the same form of expression is used in reference to the lower animals. The last cited text is very strong—"the breath of the spirit of lives," applied both to man and to other animals.

4. It must be admitted that man was deprived of access to the tree of life in order to the execution of the sentence that he should die; that is, he was deprived of the means of perpetuating his life. Said the Lord, "Lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever; therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden."

5. It is clearly shown by this that if man had been permitted to eat of the tree of life, he would have lived forever, or have been immortal; and that he could not continue to live because not permitted to eat of that tree.

6. But the word *life* in the phrase, "tree of life," is always in the Hebrew in the plural; literally, *tree of lives*; and therefore if the plural in the breath of *lives* proves that two lives were given to man, the plural in the tree of lives proves that the continuance of these lives was suspended on his partaking of the tree. If he had a plurality of lives, yet when he was shut out from the tree of *lives* lest he should live forever, evidently both or all his lives were involved in the loss.

7. Therefore it is seen that it is not enough for the advocates of natural immortality to merely show that lives, plural, is found in Gen. 2:7, nor to assert that immortal life was imparted; but it must be proved that one of his lives was immortal or eternal, and that it could not be affected by his being deprived of the *tree of lives*, which is contrary to the obvious meaning of Gen. 3:22-24.

8. It is neither frank nor honorable to draw a conclusion from an expression or a word in the original which a harmony of the original plainly contradicts. But if they who put forth the claim referred to, do not know what the harmony of the original is, it does not increase our respect for their frankness or ability to hear them "challenge the world" to meet them on a point on which they are so evidently ignorant.

9. The more this subject is examined the more evident it appears that man is a weak, perishing mortal, entirely dependent on Jesus Christ for eternal life, which will be given to the righteous in the first resurrection, over which "the second death hath no power;" and that men, instead of exalting themselves and boasting of their strength and glory, would do well to acknowledge that they are vanity, and of the dust, and pray as one of old, "Lord, make me to know mine end, and the measure of my days, what it is, that I may know how frail I am." May a sense of our frailty lead us to seek "eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."

J. H. WAGGONER.

**Experience and Character of the Living Christians at the Second Advent.**

WE often hear it asserted that it is of no importance to us to know when the advent is near, if we are only prepared for it; as if one could live in the day of God's preparation, amidst the fulfillment of signs in heaven and on earth, and pass the last conflict between truth and error, and the last persecution of the church in the time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation upon the earth, from which all of God's people are to be delivered in connection with the resurrection from the dead, Dan. 12:1, 2, and not be aware that the end is at hand, and yet be a believer in Christ and the Bible! and hence perfectly prepared for what is coming, prepared for the last trial and the final deliverance!

For the benefit of those who entertain such a view, we call their attention to the fact that the experience of the last of the church is clearly foretold in prophecy. In the first place, from the fulfillment of signs in the sun, moon, and stars, they will know that the advent is near, even at the doors. Matt. 24:29-35. Then, the prophetic numbers being unsealed, which were sealed up to the time of the end, a message is heard to the ends of the earth, "Fear God, and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment is come," the fall of Babylon is announced, and the final warning is given against the worship of the beast and his image, and the impending day of wrath proclaimed. Rev. 14:6-12. The order of events is foretold, the programme is laid down, the experience of the church is clearly foreshown. What believer in God and his word can pass through all this, and still not be aware that the end is at hand? Who, without the benefit of hearing and heeding the last warning, will be all prepared to be delivered in the day of wrath? The living church, at the second advent, will have passed this, their foretold experience. Can they be believers who can pass all this and not know it?

Again, the character of the church at the second advent is foretold. They will be distinguished from merely nominal Christians from the fact that they "keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." The fact that under a terrific warning a people are tested out from nominal Christianity that keep the commandments of God is proof positive that the others are not keeping them. This separation, effected by the last message, will lead to the last persecution. This persecution will come upon them because they "keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." Rev. 12:17; 13:15. From this they will be delivered, and they will stand with the Lamb upon Mount Zion, because they have his Father's name written in their foreheads, and not the mark of the name of the beast. Rev. 14:1. Here are two distinguishing characteristics.

1. They keep the commandments of God. If any desire to know what commandments are here referred to, the answer is, The very ones on which the Christian world is divided—the ones which are now in agitation among the people. Nothing can be plainer than this. Let those who would obey God keep those commandments of God which are in dispute. There is no dispute about the ceremonial or Jewish law. The contention is on the moral law or ten commandments. These, then, are the commandments. The Sabbath of this law is especially the bone of contention. This, then, is of special importance at the present time. And what is the only safe course? Keep the commandments.

2. The remnant of the church are distinguished from the others by having "the testimony of Jesus Christ." This is defined to be "the spirit of prophecy." Rev. 19:10. Compare Rev. 22:9. This is their second characteristic, and the second ground of the final war upon them. Amid the false spirit manifestation of these days, where will the true be found? The answer is, With those who keep the commandments of God. They will certainly be found with the last of the true church.

R. F. COTTRELL.

**The Dark Day.**

THE testimony of a living witness of the dark day, May 19, 1780.

The venerable centenarian, Miss Hannah Worcester of Berwick was one hundred and one years old on Saturday, and appears to be in the enjoyment of perfect health. She has never been troubled with sickness of any consequence, has never taken snuff or used tobacco in any form, and believes it to be "poor business for any one." She has a remarkably clear voice, articulates every word distinctly, and has sound front teeth. She seems to take pleasure in telling of things that happened five and ninety years ago, and remembers well how she watched at the window for the return of her father from the Revolutionary war. She remembers, though she was only eight years of age at the time, the dark day, May 19, 1780, and said it commenced to grow dark in the middle of the forenoon. Candles were lighted, hens went to roost, and all day long the darkness continued. She has seen the cars, but never rode in them. She has a good appetite. She sits up usually from ten in the morning until after dark, and sometimes does not retire until nine o'clock. —*Boston Transcript*, 1874.

TRUTH is tough. It will not break, like a bubble, at a touch; nay, you may kick it about all day, like a foot-ball, and it will be round and full at evening. Does not Mr. Bryant say that truth gets well if she is run over by a locomotive, while error dies of lockjaw if she scratches her finger?

## GIVE ME SOME WORK TO DO.

In the wide harvest field, O Heavenly Father,  
Give me some work to do for thee, I pray;  
Although I may not stand among the reapers,  
I'd glean the handfuls scattered by the way,  
Or e'en a cup of cooling water bear  
To cheer some fainting, weary toiler there.

I know thou needest not my humble service,  
Before thy throne myriads of angels bow;  
But Jesus died for me and all unworthy,  
I come to thee; O Lord, accept me now.  
The day is spent; the evening shadows fall;  
Some tribute I would offer howe'er small.

For how shall I behold in glory shining  
That form that once was agonized for me,  
Once crowned with thorns and marred with cruel  
scourging?  
How, in his hands and feet the nail-prints see?  
I cannot, by a life of selfish ease,  
Share blessings won through sufferings like these.

O eager spirit, thou hast passed unheeded  
The work thy Father did to thee confide,  
Go, feed the hungry, cheer the heart of sorrow,  
And lead the wanderer to the Crucified.  
Behold, these wait for thee on every side;  
Delay no longer; for the field is wide.

To scatter seeds of truth be thy endeavor,  
Sow them in prayer and water with thy tears;  
Fatter thou not, for in the bright forever,  
Theripened sheaves shall crown the toiler's years.  
Work on in faith until the Master come,  
And thou shalt share the joyful harvest-home.

The time is short; already does the dawning  
Light up the hill-tops with its golden ray—  
The eventide of earth, the glorious morning  
Which ushers in the glad, eternal day.  
Press on with courage then, the end is nigh;  
Ye weary ones, "there's resting by-and-by."

M. A. DAVIS.

Battle Creek, Mich.

## The Atonement.—No. 8.

As an atonement is designed to repair the honor of the law which has been dishonored by rebellion, and to vindicate the authority of government which has been trampled down, it is necessary to inquire what will meet these objects so as at once to honor the government and open a way of salvation for the condemned; or, What are the demands of the law?

The first claim or requirement of the law is *obedience*. Where this is not rendered, the next demand is that the penalty be enforced or inflicted. But the universal infliction of the penalty upon man would result in universal destruction or death, for, "All have sinned," and, "The wages of sin is death." Therefore all are condemned, and deserve to die. Herein is found the necessity of atonement.

It has been noticed in our investigation of the principles of government that, to pardon the offender, and still to honor the demands of the law, it is necessary that a voluntary substitute should bear the penalty in his behalf. Then to ascertain how an atonement is to be made we must ascertain what is the penalty of the law, or, what the substitute must suffer to vindicate the honor of the violated law.

The idea of *substitution* requires that the penalty and nothing less than the penalty be inflicted. It cannot be reconciled with justice nor with Scripture that which is so often advanced, that Christ did not suffer the penalty of the law, to which the sinner was subject. If the law be just, if its penalty is but the demand of justice, then justice is robbed of its due if the penalty be not inflicted. Many systems of theology have had that error incorporated into them to avoid other apparent difficulties; but it is evidence of defects in the systems that demand a conclusion at variance with reason, with justice, and with Scripture.

Dr. Barnes says: "It will be impossible for a substitute to endure the same sufferings which the sinner himself will endure in the future world for his sin. There are sufferings caused by sin which belong only to the consciousness of guilt, and these sufferings cannot be transferred to another. The sin itself cannot be transferred; and as it is impossible to detach the suffering from the consciousness of guilt, it follows that a substitute cannot endure the same kind of sufferings which the sinner would himself endure. Remorse of conscience, for example—one of the keenest sources of suffering to the guilty, and which will be a most fearful part of the penalty of the law in the future world—cannot be transferred."—*Atonement*, p. 228.

And again: Remorse of conscience is manifestly a part of the penalty of the law; that is, it is a portion of what the law inflicts as expressing the sense which the law-giver entertains of the value of the law and of the evil of its violation."—*Id.*, p. 235.

Remorse of conscience is no part of the penalty of the law. That view, which is indeed the corner-stone of Universalism, is as contrary to reason as to Scripture, and grows out of the error before noticed of making no distinction between the penalty of the law and mere consequences. The penalty is a *judicial infliction*, prescribed by the statute, administered by authority, and its in-

fiction must be subsequent to the judgment. Consequences are various according to circumstances, and not according to desert, and may flow immediately out of the action without any relation to the penalty. The wicked all suffer more or less remorse in this present state, but the Bible informs us that they are *reserved* "unto the day of Judgment to be punished." 2 Pet. 2:9.

There are two kinds of sorrow for sin: a "godly sorrow," and a "sorrow of the world." 2 Cor. 7:10. The first is that of the penitent, sorrowing that he has violated a holy law and grieved a holy God. The other is that of the worldling, sorry that he is detected in crime, or in danger of punishment. No one doubts that the sorrow of the God-fearing penitent is deepest; that his remorse is the keenest. Yet the nearer he is to God, the finer his sensibilities, and the deeper his hatred of sin, the stronger will be his remorse for his sin. Therefore, if this be part of the penalty of the law, it is evident that this part is inflicted more severely on the penitent than on the impenitent and incorrigible.

Again, Paul speaks of those whose conscience is seared with a hot iron. 1 Tim. 4:2. That is, they run to such lengths in sin that their sensibilities are blunted, and they feel little or no remorse of conscience. Now, both reason and revelation teach us that the punishment must be proportioned to the guilt; but if remorse of conscience be a penalty, it is executed by inverse proportion; that is, the punishment decreases according to the increase of crime.

But we are led to inquire, Where did Dr. Barnes (or any other person) learn that remorse of conscience is a part of the penalty of the law? As it is the duty and sole prerogative of the governor to reveal his law, so he alone can define the penalty. This he has done in his word; "The wages of sin is death." Any effort to evade this plain truth, or to make it anything but a plain truth, involves difficulties and contradictions. For it will not obviate the difficulty to *spiritualize* the term death, so as to make it embrace remorse of conscience; for if that be included in death, whatever will remove the remorse will remove so much of the penalty, or of death, and bring a proportionate degree of life. But sin does this, as the apostle shows; therefore, according to that theory, sin removes a portion of its own penalty; which is absurd.

Dr. Barnes asserts that Christ did not suffer the penalty of the law, but something *substituted* for the penalty. There is no cause for such a declaration, except it be found in his theory.

In the teachings of the Bible there is no uncertainty in this matter. They plainly inform us that "the wages of sin is death;" and that "Christ died for our sins." Rom. 6:23; 1 Cor. 15:3. As sin is the transgression of the law, death, the wages of sin, is its penalty; and as Christ died for our sake, the penalty was laid upon him for our sake. Now that "Christ died" is not only plainly declared in the Scriptures, but it is a fundamental truth in the gospel system; for it is easy to show that, if Christ did not die, there can be no atonement and no redemption. It appears evident, then, that those who assert that Christ did not suffer the penalty of the law, do not so assert because the fact is not revealed in the Bible; but as before intimated, because of certain difficulties supposed to lie in the way of that fact. These difficulties are concerning the nature of the penalty, death.

It is assumed that death, the penalty of transgression, is three-fold in its nature, consisting of temporal, spiritual, and eternal death. If this assumption were true, we must at once give up the atonement as a thing impossible. Yet it has been advanced by men of eminence, and incorporated into works recognized as standard. Let us examine it.

1. The death of man is temporal only by reason of a resurrection. But the resurrection belongs to the work of Christ, and as his work was not necessary or a subject of promise till after the transgression, it cannot have any place in the announcement of the penalty. When death was threatened to Adam, it was not said that he should die temporally, spiritually, and eternally; nor that he should die a first or second death; nor the death that never dies; but that he should *surely die*. It was death—simply death. Had not a promise been given afterward, of "the seed" to bruise the serpent's head, it would necessarily have been eternal death. But Christ, introducing a resurrection for Adam and his race, causes it to be temporal. But since this time, this death, temporal, has not been the penalty for personal transgression. This is evident from two reasons: (1.) Infants die who never have transgressed; and (2.) In the Judgment, we stand to answer for our deeds, and the second death is inflicted for personal sin. But on those who are holy, "the second death hath no power;" the penalty does not reach them. So it appears that the death we now die is occasioned by Adam's

transgression, and is rendered temporal by the second Adam, and comes indiscriminately upon all classes and ages, thus precluding the idea that it is now a penalty, except as connected with that first transgression, in which we are involved only by representation.

2. Spiritual death cannot be a penalty at all. A penalty is an *infliction* to meet the ends of justice. But spiritual death is a state of sin, or absence of holiness; and to say that *God inflicts unholiness* upon man is not only absurd, but monstrous. That is confounding the crime with its punishment. God does not make man wicked or sinful as an infliction; but man makes himself wicked by his own actions, and God punishes him with death for his wickedness.

Again, there will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust: for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. Now if the penalty upon Adam included spiritual death, the resurrection through the second Adam would be to spiritual life, or holiness; and if all were restored to spiritual life through Christ, there would be none to fall under the second death; for it falls not on the "blessed and holy."

3. The wages of sin is death; and as the death of Adam became temporal by reason of a resurrection, so we may say that the infliction for personal sins, the second death, is eternal, because no resurrection will succeed it. Thus, it appears plain, that from the beginning death was the penalty of the law of God, circumstances determining the duration of it. This view, which is in strict harmony with the Bible, really removes all difficulty in regard to Christ's having suffered the penalty due to sin.

J. H. WAGGONER.

## Temporal Power of the Papacy.

## ITALIAN AND OTHER TESTIMONY.

I PROMISED to call attention to the speech of the Italian, Splivalo, on the occasion of the celebration of "Italian Unity."\* As I said before, this speech presents another phase of this subject. I would that I had room to insert the entire speech, but I shall have to content myself with a few of its plain statements. In speaking of the temporal power of the pope, he says, "I am a Catholic, and I shall treat the question as a Catholic. . . . There is nothing in the Catholic religion that banishes a man from the pale of the church because opposed to the temporal power of the popes. . . . In this country such principles as those embodied in the Roman question, in that unnatural and unholy amalgamation of church and State, are unknown anomalies."

Referring to the celebration in San Francisco, held a month before in honor of the twenty-fifth year of the pontificate of Pius IX., he says: "You are marched out in a solemn procession to perform, as you think, a religious duty; but read the words of your orator, full of venom and bitterness, insult and calumnies; ponder over the resolutions passed, and carefully examine the spirit of the occasion, and answer me frankly, Was it not a rabid political demonstration? . . . The pomp and glory of this world was the sole object and only purpose of that procession."

The existence of the Roman government in the nineteenth century was an anomaly, the blending of the temporal and spiritual power, producing of necessity intolerance and opposition to the liberal ideas of progress.

"The religious pontiff could not as such give support, aid, or abet in any way, any form of religion but the Catholic; were he only head of his church, Protestant, Jewish, and other chapels and synagogues could be opened in Rome, without his interfering pro or con, but being spiritual and temporal, in an inseparable manner, the king could not allow what would be impossible for the pontiff to even tolerate, or he must separate the two powers, and then he would of consequence fall into what we contend, that the two powers are separate and distinct.

"The Italians are not opposed to the august head of the Catholic church; but they were, and with reason, bitter enemies of the political ruler of the Roman States, who for a thousand years was the cause of war and discord among the people of Italy, who hired mercenaries and called foreign powers to support the phantom throne which at last has crumbled to pieces."

"We are told that 'Rome belongs to the Catholics.' . . . Any man who would undertake to say to an American citizen that the Catholic clergy are the rulers of the people in temporal matters, and that he owes political allegiance to the court of Rome, would be speaking in open rebellion to the law of the land, which says that all powers emanate from the people, and are vested in those legally chosen by them.

\*This lecture was delivered in San Francisco, Aug. 6, 1871.

"No, gentleman, no free and enlightened citizen of any nationality acknowledges the pope as political superior, nor Rome his capital, nor the Romans his slaves. A costly independence, indeed, obtained at the price of over four thousand Romans, who, to please the rest of Catholicity, should sacrifice their rights and their freedom.

"And here I must say that, as an American citizen, I cannot close my eyes and ears to a new opinion that seems full of danger, and contrary to all our principles, and that is the opinion entertained by many as to the power of the pope over the citizens in non-religious matters. . . . It is high time to look around us when we have in our midst a class ready to ignore order and commit open riot, and seem only obedient to the voice of their ministers, while deaf to the mandates of the law."

Splivalo gave some very interesting facts, to a few of which only we call attention. He says: "After the fall of the Roman Empire and the transfer of the seat of government to Byzantium (Constantinople), Italy became a prey to the many barbarian invaders, who divided it among themselves to suit their fancies and tastes. The Lombards, after their irruption over the northern portion, settled themselves permanently on the conquered soil and embraced Christianity. The most beautiful provinces were divided among their leaders, who, among themselves, elected their kings. As children of the church, they respected Rome and the country around, which, while under the temporal power of a Greek exarch, received also that spiritual protection which the pope willingly gave it. The exarch resided at Ravenna, and extended his sway over the marshes of Romagna, Ferrara, Ancona, and Rimini, and in all things represented the emperor."

"The weakness of the exarch, continually exposed to the powerful attacks of the Lombards, the distance and neglect of the Byzantium Court, the strife between the Greeks and Romans, all tended to lessen the ties between Rome and Byzantium. . . . The many convents, monasteries, and landed estates belonging to the church throughout Europe made the pope one of the richest landed lords; and at that time, when landed property was the prime motive of power, these immense estates began to give the pontiff certain temporalities unknown before to the successors of St. Peter, and to the representatives of Him whose kingdom is not of this world."

With this state of things, he says: "The imperial authority was but a shadow, and the exarchati a nonentity, and the pontiffs, who had now assumed all the paraphernalia and rich pomp of earthly sovereignty, were gradually becoming the real masters."

He states that in this move of the papacy in obtaining civil power "we have a vassal, although a pope, rising in open rebellion against his liege lord, and taking advantage of his weakness, conspiring to wrench from his grasp his dominion. . . . It was treason. . . . A principle engendered in treason and robbery could not but produce the dark results which have followed it till its fall.

He gives many interesting facts concerning Italy's struggle for her liberty, claiming that, in the act of Victor Emmanuel's taking Rome as the capital of united Italy, he is only taking what belongs to the Italians. My space will allow no further quotations from Splivalo, but I will proceed to consider facts from other sources concerning the rise and overthrow of the papacy, as predicted by Daniel in chapter 7, and by John in Revelation 13.

In Daniel we read of the little horn, that "saints, times, and laws" were "given into his hand until a time, times, and the dividing of time." In Revelation the same work is spoken of in these terms: "Power was given unto him to continue forty and two months." This period of symbolic time (1260 days, Rev. 12), on the rule of a day for a year (Eze. 4:5, 6), is 1260 years; not that the pope was to be recognized among the nations of the earth for 1260 years as a temporal king, even Catholic writers themselves, you see, as quoted above, call that dominion about one thousand years. These prophecies above take cognizance of that dominion, and the taking of it away at the expiration of the 1260 years. But the event to which they seem to call our attention for the commencement of that period is the giving of the saints, times, and laws, into the hands of the blasphemous usurper.

The events of A. D. 538 seem to clearly mark the commencement of this work and period. I will first quote from Gavazzi's New York lectures, delivered in 1853. He says, "The celebrated letter of Justinian to the pope in the year 533, not only recognized all previous privileges, but enlarged them, and entitled the pope and his church to many immunities and rights, which afterward gave origin to the pretensions displayed in the canon law." That is the real point. We have already quoted from the canon law on the power of the pope. If this decree of Justinian gave rise to these claims, then

this decree is the point for the date of the 1260 days. This decree was not effective till 538; for in 533 Rome was controlled by those opposed to the decree. From 533 to 538, Sylvester was pope, and he opened Rome to Belisarius, the Greek general. Vigilius was pope from 538 to 555, and in the first year of his reign the Ostrogoths left Rome, and Justinian's decree took effect. It was Vigilius that began at that time to assume authority over the church, in matters which belonged really to the emperor to control.

Concerning the course of Vigilius, I will quote from a Catholic history of the popes, De Cormenin. "He says, Theodore Acidas, bishop of Cesarea, appeared before Justinian to plead against the arrogance of Vigilius. Theodore says of Vigilius: "Under pretext of reserving them for the judgment of a council, he dares, on his own authority, to reverse the edicts of the emperor, and impose his belief even on Constantinople. The whole world knows your great piety; your edicts have been received by all the churches! And now, what will people think, when they see a stranger reverse, by a single word, acts so solemn in your own presence, in contempt of four patriarchs and a great number of bishops, who have come together at your bidding to cause the edicts to be executed? What has become of your authority, great prince, if you cannot command your subjects until they have received the permission of Vigilius? What would the empress, that virtuous princess, whose recent loss we mourn, say, if she saw Justinian so far abuse his royal dignity as publicly to be contradicted by a proud priest?"

The Emperor Justinian had denounced the three chapters of Theodoros of Mopsuestia. "The edicts of the emperor were received by all the bishops in the east, and Vigilius alone, ruled by the Roman clergy, opposed the propagation of his principles in the west."

Justinian called a council in Constantinople to consider the matter of the three chapters. Vigilius struck against the emperor and excluded persons from the council that favored Justinian's views of the subject. "The Pontiff then protested against the violence which had been used toward him, and refused to make any determination without the consent of the Latin bishops. On his side, the emperor preserved no restraint toward the holy father. . . . Said Vigilius, Recollect that Peter, whose place I occupy, has lost none of his liberty. I thought I was coming to the court of a Christian emperor, and I find myself in that of a Diocletian, the most cruel of tyrants. . . . Seventy prelates then assembled, when the pope declared the council dissolved, before they had arrived at any decision."

Here are daring feats, surely, and although the emperor did not submit to all Vigilius' usurpations, yet, as he had got possession of Rome through the help of Belisarius, his successor soon carried out to its fullest extent the powers he had usurped. Even Vigilius himself obtained laws from the emperor enforcing some of his religious tenets: "He obtained also from Justinian a decree in favor of Italy, in which the prince confirmed all the donations made to the Romans by Athalric Almasontus, and Theodatus, and revoked those of Totila. He also declared that the marriage of ecclesiastics with virgins consecrated to God, were null in the eyes of the law."

As we thus ascertain by facts the clear date for the commencement of the 1260 years, we will inquire at once about their termination. Adding the 1260 years of the papal usurpation to 538 A. D., the point of the commencement, we have 1798 as the period of the termination of this work. 1798 is the time of Pius VI., who, in the month of February of that very year, was taken a captive to France, where he died in captivity in 1799.

De Cormenin says of Pius VI. in his captivity; "He addressed a brief to all Christian bishops, to announce that the time was near in which the papacy would sally forth, radiant from the dungeons in which it had been crucified in his person." In Rev. 13, John says of this power, "I saw one of its heads wounded to death." Above is the acknowledgment, that, at the end of the forty-two months, it was crucified in its head—the pope. J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

\* De Cormenin, Vol. 1, p. 114.  
† Ibid. Vol. 1, p. 113.  
‡ Ibid. Vol. 1, p. 114.  
§ De Cormenin, Vol. 1, p. 116.  
¶ Thiers' French Revolution, Vol. 4, p. 246.  
‡ De Cormenin, Vol. 2, p. 417.

Iowa.

I HAVE just closed my labors, for the present, in Iowa Co., on account of high water and bad going. I left the friends of present truth well established and rejoicing in the blessed hope. I leave them for a time that their strength may be tested. In God there is strength, and in him alone can they stand, and through him they can endure unto the end. I now design to return to them in May. R. M. KILGORE.

The French and Americans in Illinois.

ALTHOUGH the roads have been very bad most of the time since I reported last, I have labored to keep up the interest started in the church in Serena, have done all I could for the French, and have spoken about twenty times at Wedron, four miles south of Serena.

In connection with our labors for the church, four started out to serve the Lord and two others took their stand publicly for the commandments. If the church at Serena will keep their mind on the great work for these times, and thereby crowd out petty trials, they will yet witness a greater work accomplished for themselves, for their children, and for the world around them. This church is composed of members from three different nations, and can, if faithful, do much by their influence to advance the cause among those of other tongues. They have faithfully stood by us in our labors, and have a large place in our affections. It was no small privilege for us, two weeks since, to enjoy the labors and counsel of Elds. Butler and R. F. Andrews.

We held our first Sabbath meeting at Wedron yesterday. The Lord was with us in power. Several started in the service of God to keep all the commandments and the faith of Jesus. As far as we can learn, ten or twelve have already commenced to keep the Sabbath. Have obtained four subscribers for the REVIEW, two for the *True Missionary*, and one for the *Advent Tidende*. This is more than we expected in view of the bad roads we have had, and in view of the fact that this is one of those fields in which a partial effort had been made years ago. But this deficiency was more than made up by the consistent life of Bro. Adam Rudd by which he gained the confidence and affections of the people, and made our labors comparatively easy. Calls now come to us for labor both from the city and the country. And there is work enough within eight miles of this place to keep every minister in Illinois busy till camp-meeting.

In connection with our efforts for the French, the man who was under conviction at the time of my last report has taken a firm stand for present truth. Prejudice has been created against us in the minds of some by two opposition discourses by the French preacher, who utterly refused us the privilege of replying. Howbeit I wrote a brief defense of the truth against his attacks, which were published in tract form. Fifty copies are being read and more are called for. D. T. BOURDEAU.

Wedron, Ill., March 15, 1874.

Monroe, Iowa.

JANUARY 8, I commenced meetings at Fremont, Wapaca Co., and continued them until March 12, with some interest. There were a few here that were keeping the Sabbath. As the result of the meetings, thirty-four signed a covenant to keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. We feel to give all the praise to God. I am willing to labor on, trusting in the Lord. C. W. OLDS.

March 14, 1874.

Wisconsin.

I AM now holding meetings in the town of Hartland, Pierce Co., among the Scandinavians. Bad roads and prejudice made the congregations small at first, only four attending the first meeting. But the interest has been growing, and last evening about thirty were present. Six have commenced to keep the Sabbath. May God give me wisdom to labor to his glory. O. A. OLSON.

Maiden Rock, Wis., March 16, 1874.

Iconium, Iowa.

SINCE my last report, I have been at Iconium, Appanoose Co., Iowa. Remained there over four weeks, and gave thirty-six discourses. The people showed their interest to hear. The house, which will hold about three hundred people, was well filled. The meetings continued with increasing interest until suddenly brought to a close by a protracted meeting thrown in upon us by the owners of the house.

There was an effort made before this to have a meeting commence a week before it did, but failed. Mine closed without any immediate results. The people hoped their minister was able to patch up their shattered theology. J. H. MORRISON.

Prayer.

It is said of Elijah that "he prayed earnestly that it might not rain: and it rained not on the earth by the space of three years and six months. And he prayed again, and the heaven gave rain and the earth brought forth her fruit." James 5: 17, 18.

The word of God is rich in its promises to those who in the exercise of living faith approach God in humble prayer. The most hardened sinner when in his extremity of

want and woe comes to God for relief finds his heart made tender and pure by this approach to the Majesty on high. And the most devoted Christian is wholly dependent upon this means of access to God to aid him in all the exercises of faith and love and labor which, without prayer, would be barren and useless; insipid, lifeless, and unmeaning.

To pray to God often, in faith, and unceasingly, is a duty, a command; but who would imagine that such a command would be necessary when for the asking, we may have the greatest blessings? This is truly a great favor; and prayer is a privilege and a pleasure when rightly offered and persevered in, with corresponding works.

Every day we find answers to prayer; and such answers should be most thankfully acknowledged. We should not more anxiously seek for favors than we should thankfully receive them and recognize the gift; for it would be stupid indeed to be continually asking and receiving and never recognizing the liberal giver in the many gifts received.

In all the busy walks of life, from the most humble to the most exalted, let prayer attend us. Let us pray without ceasing. JOS. CLARKE.

Waukon, Iowa.

The quarterly meeting at Waukon, Iowa, was held March 7 and 8, and was a success. Although the weather was very bad, several came over forty miles, part of the way through a pelting storm of rain and hail; but we all felt that it was good to be there. The melting Spirit of the Lord seemed from the commencement to rest upon all present. Tears flowed freely, and the sweet spirit of tenderness and love seemed to pervade every heart.

But what added greatly to the interest of the meeting on first-day was the appearance of four Swedish brethren. One was a preacher by the name of C. L. Hamren. He has preached seventeen years, but can speak no English. Another was a local elder by the name of H. E. Sweedberg. He speaks English to some extent. The other two were young men. These, with four others, have lately embraced the truth by reading a few periodicals and tracts which have been sent them. Although living only eight or nine miles from the Waukon church, they were wholly unknown to us before. Truly our hearts were filled with gratitude, and we joyfully anticipated the time when God will return to the people a pure language. These Swedes have belonged to the Baptist church, but in consequence of embracing the truth, they have been expelled.

NASON HOYT.

Cresco, Howard Co., Iowa.

Difficulty in Deciding to Keep the Sabbath.

ONE year ago last June, I thought it seemed like mockery to use the Lord's day as a preparation day for the Sunday rest. After considering the subject thoroughly, to count the cost, I saw the great difficulty of following "the Lamb whithersoever he goeth." But as I was not captain—nothing but a soldier—I determined to leave all, to obey orders. I bought the truth and have not yet sold it. I went through fire and through water. On the Sabbath day, the first day of last March, I was expelled from the church by the almost unanimous vote of the quarterly Conference of the Methodist church, because I taught that Sunday was not the Sabbath, but that Saturday, sometimes called the seventh day, was the Sabbath. They make void the law of God that they may keep their own tradition. But they also deny their own foundation, that the Bible "is the only rule, and the sufficient rule, both of our faith and practice." This foundation principle I claim for myself. No man or set of men has any authority to annul the observance of this day, or fix any obligation upon any other day.

The difficulty of deciding to keep the seventh day does not arise with many from a difficulty of understanding the Bible, but from the idea of coming out from the world, the great and good, and being alone. The great have not the moral power to become little and unpopular, and the good are afraid to commit such a sacrilegious act as to question the foundation of the church, and so they pass on from generation to generation.

The substance of the world was created on the first day of the week. The seventh day is the day of God's rest, significant of the week's work. God rested on, blessed, and sanctified, that particular day, and not the first. For these reasons it was commanded to man. "Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you forever, that ye may know that I am the Lord that sanctify you." The first day has nothing in common with the Sabbath, except that it is a day; and there is no reason for substituting it for the Sabbath—except that man sets up its claim as a rival institution. God has never blessed, sanctified, or

rested on it, nor called it the Sabbath, nor commanded it. Jesus was not his Father's rival. He did not abolish the institution nor the day that he was Lord of. He never called any other day his but the Sabbath day, and did not set up any rival institution nor rival day. J. A. BALDWIN.

Deloit, Iowa.

I AM still at Deloit, and the interest is still good. Some, however, are falling off as the cross is presented to them. They like to hear the theory of the truth, but when it comes to the practice of it, the cross is too heavy. But thank the Lord, there are some who are receiving the truth.

March 1, the Baptist minister of Deloit spoke on the Sabbath question. He took the position that Monday is the first day of the week. He said that the Lord's seventh day was our first day, and that Sunday is the seventh day of the week. But he became confused himself, and did not make one point plain. I replied last night with freedom. He said that after he had retired to his bed, the devil told him that he would make a failure, so he got up and looked his theory all over. I told the people that it was not the devil that told him so; for I never knew the devil to tell so much truth. There is one Swedish family keeping the Sabbath here. J. BARTLETT.

Professing Christ.

A DYING man, who had for several years given much evidence of conversion, but had not publicly professed Christ, said to his pastor: "I deeply regret that I have not followed the Saviour in the ordinance of his appointment. I felt unworthy, and so delayed; but now I am sad that I did not move forward in the evident path of duty."

There are cases like this to be met in nearly every community—persons who give good evidence of repentance and trust in the Saviour, but who have never joined themselves with the visible people of God. Like the dying man referred to, a sense of unworthiness keeps them back. They may be honest in this, but their course is a serious mistake. When one has a sense of forgiveness and of humble trust in the atoning Saviour, the question of a profession of religion is not to be decided by a sense of unworthiness. Of course all sense of personal unworthiness is given up in conversion; and then we are to be willing to follow the Saviour in all his requirements. He is worthy, infinitely worthy, to be obeyed, and this must decide the question with every honest, penitent heart.

Christ has appointed the ordinances of his church, to be observed by his followers to the end of time. No one is at liberty to be indifferent to them. Though no indiscriminate haste should be used in inducing converts to enter the church, and though such persons should prayerfully meditate such a step beforehand, yet it should always be viewed as a duty of one who trusts in Christ and is desirous of doing the duty of the Christian life. If to any these words apply, let a pastor assure you, dear friends, that thoughts of neglected duty will be as thorns in your dying pillow.—*American Messenger*.

Obituary Notices.

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

DIED, near Patricksburg, Ind., Feb. 27, 1874, sister Elizabeth, daughter of sister Nancy A. Beatty, in the twenty-third year of her age. For some time she had been suffering with lung disease; recently she took the measles, which hastened her death. She embraced the present truth about three years ago under the labors of the Brn. Lane, since which time she has been striving for a home in the kingdom of God.

Also, March 1, 1874, her brother, Robert, the only son of sister Nancy A. Beatty, of measles, in the twenty-first year of his age.

Also, March 3, 1874, sister Anna, of the same family, in the eighteenth year of her age, of measles, followed by lung fever and erysipelas.

Thus in one week's time death has taken three from one family. A widowed mother and four sisters mourn their loss. W. W. SHARP.

DIED, Feb. 19, 1874, in Prescott, Wis., after a brief illness, Nelson E. Olive, aged fourteen years, six months, and ten days. His sudden death leaves his parents in great grief. From the time that his case seemed hopeless he appeared unconscious, and died without one farewell word to those who loved him. "Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble. He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down." J. S. OLIVE.

DIED, in Stratford, Fulton Co., N. Y., August 12, 1873, my mother, Mrs. Betsey Cady, aged 84 years. She commenced keeping the Sabbath in New Bedford, under the labors of Bro. Bates. MRS. E. C. BRAZEE.

DIED, in Williamstown, Oct. 25, 1873, at the residence of her son-in-law, Holton Dillingham, Mrs. Rhoda Bailey, aged 86 years. L. B.

DIED, in Nashua, N. H., Feb. 26, of consumption, sister Ellen W. Searles, aged fifty years. Her life was for many years that of a devout Christian, and her last days were eminently peaceful and blessed. J. N. ANDREWS.

The Review and Herald.

Battle Creek, Mich., Third-day, March 24, 1874.

Organization of the Seventh-day Adventist Educational Society.

THIS Society was organized in Battle Creek, Mich., at a meeting called for the purpose, Wednesday, March, 11, 1874, at 9 o'clock A. M. The articles of Association were filed in the office of the Secretary of State of the State of Michigan, March 16, 1874, by which the Society became a body corporate according to law. A pamphlet giving the law of Michigan relative to the establishment of institutions of learning, together with all the steps taken in the organization of this Society, will soon be issued to the stockholders.

U. S.

The Pope's Lament.

In the pope's encyclical of November last, he, as usual, deprecates the melancholy condition of the church; calls Bishop Reinkens "a pseudo bishop, a certain notorious apostate from the Catholic faith," and excommunicates him and all who took part "in his election and sacrilegious consecration." The pope adds:—

"From the facts, to which we have referred in brief rather than at large, you are well assured, venerable brethren, how grave and full of danger is the condition of Catholics in those countries of Europe which we have mentioned. Neither are matters more favorable or the times more peaceful in America, where some countries are so hostile to Catholics that their governments seem rather to deny in deeds than to profess the Catholic faith. Some of you may perhaps be surprised, venerable brethren, that the war which is carried on at this time against the Catholic Church extends so far and wide. But whoever is acquainted with the character, the aims and the purposes of the sects—be they Freemasons or by whatever name they are known—and compares them with the character and extent of the strife, which throughout nearly the whole world is waged against the church, cannot hesitate to assign the cause of our present calamities to the craft and conspiracy of the same sects. From them is made up the Synagogue of Satan, which is marshalling its forces and preparing to engage hand to hand against the church of Christ."

Who can read these utterances, and not almost hear the voice of the prophet Daniel, saying; "They shall take away his dominion to consume and destroy it unto the end?"

U. S.

Labor vs. Capital.

AMONG the irrepressible conflicts of the day, that between labor and capital holds an important place. The numerous strikes, and the formation of combinations and secret organizations, among the working people, show the progress of the agitation, and foretoken a conflict of no small magnitude in the future. A writer in the Sabbath Recorder, of Dec. 4, 1873, thus speaks of it:—

"The non-producing class, or the 'drones' in the hive, are shielded by the arm of the law while appropriating the honey, and the workers are driven out to starve. God hasten the time when the hand-toilers and brain-toilers shall rise in their majesty, and purge our legislative halls, and set their feet upon that kind of law-making which 'makes the rich richer and the poor poorer.'"

More of a revolution may be involved in this change, than the writer is aware. Nevertheless we look for it soon to come. The spirit of Communism is taking possession of large masses of the lower people, and the Internationals are growing arrogant in their demands and bold in their threats.

U. S.

To Correspondents.

J. A. : See article on Secret Societies in general, and the Grange in particular, in REVIEW, Vol. 41, No. 1, Dec. 17, 1872. Also see a short note on the same subject in No. 9, present volume.

J. W. MEDLIN : For an answer to your queries, see the work published at this Office, entitled, "A Refutation of the Doctrine called The Age to Come."

F. GOULD : According to the Conference Address on Organization, issued by the S. D. A. Conference of Oct 5 and 6, 1861, elders can administer the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper in the absence of any higher officer.

J. BARTLETT : See our views on the three days and three nights of Matt. 12 : 40, written out in full in REVIEW Vol. 37, No. 8, Feb. 7, 1871.

Luther on the Sleep of the Dead.

In Michelet's life of Luther, Bohn's edition, p. 133, is the following statement in Luther's own words respecting the sleep of the dead. It is under date of Jan. 13, 1522. It shows his views at that time, though he was not always consistent with this view. He says:—

"As to purgatory, I think it a very uncertain thing. It is probable, in my opinion, that, with very few exceptions indeed, the dead sleep in utter insensibility till the day of Judgment. As to purgatory itself, I do not agree with the sophists in thinking it a determinate place. Who will venture to give an assured opinion on the subject? On what authority can it be said that the souls of

the dead may not sleep out the interval between earth and Heaven, or hell, or purgatory, in the same way that the living pass in profound slumber the interval between their downlying at night and their uprising in the morning?"

These words indicate that Luther looked at the period between death and the resurrection as a blank, at least in the cases of most persons. Perhaps the fact that he made some exceptions may explain his apparent contradictions of himself, and perhaps he afterward changed his views. But these were his thoughts in 1522. J. N. A.

A. W. C. : Redemption from death does not mean saved from dying, but, raised from the dead. If, as you infer, faith was to prevent God's people dying, then there could be no resurrection of the just, or of the blessed and holy, for none such could die. Those scriptures which speak of being saved from death refer, of course, to "the second death."

W. M. : I have never changed my mind, nor the manner of my preaching, on the two-horned beast. It is presented in Rev. 13 as a power which acts inconsistent with its profession; and on this I have often referred to the profession of the Pilgrims, and to the persecutions in New England; also to the Declaration of Independence and the toleration of slavery, and I do so still. But I have always held and preached that the speaking like a dragon has especial reference to the persecution when the image shall be made and the mark shall be enforced. And so far as I have had opportunity to know, I have, in this, always been in harmony with my brethren on this point. I do not know of any one of our ministers who has changed his views on the two-horned beast.

J. H. WAGGONER.

The True Missionary.

THOUGH I subscribed for this paper at the first, yet, being from home I did not see it till near the time for the third number. I am much pleased with its contents. The lovers of the cause cannot afford to do without it. May all be inspired with the true missionary spirit which it breathes, and be the better prepared for the important duties which devolve upon us in giving the light of the present truth to the world.

R. F. COTTRELL.

STUDY the graces; not the graces of the dancing-master, of bowing and scraping; nor the foppish infidel etiquette of a Chesterfield, but benevolence, the graces of the heart, whatever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, and of good report. The true secret of politeness is to please, to make happy—flowing from goodness of heart—a fountain of love.

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.—A late dispatch received at the Indian office, London, from George Campbell, Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, gives a most alarming report of the condition of the people of that Presidency. He says fully 170,000 persons are starving to death in the districts affected by the famine, and that all the poorer classes are beginning to feel the want of food.

Accounts from Calcutta to March 6 show that the famine is increasing in Tirhoot. In Rungpore where there has been no actual suffering as yet, the stores of the poor people are becoming exhausted and starvation is imminent. The relief organization in Calcutta is working excellently, but it can hardly meet the immense demands which will be made upon the government.

Decline of Romanism in Rome.

THE following item of interest, clipped from the Church Union, indicates the waning condition of papacy at its foundation:—

Gavazzi is giving lectures in Rome in refutation of the pope's late encyclical. This is indeed bearding the lion in his den. Only a few years ago his life would have paid the forfeit of such a venture. One requires to live in this once stronghold of the church to realize the great change that has befallen the once mighty papal power. The monasteries and convents, those monuments and aforesaid instruments of its despotism, are being turned into more useful purposes than living tombs for God's creatures. The kitchens belonging to the monks of the exconvents of the Carmina, at Rome, consisting of fifty spacious apartments, are undergoing transformation into soup kitchens for the poor and needy. His Majesty, Victor Emanuel, is contributing largely to their support. The presence of four Jesuit priests in Florence the other day necessitated a guard of soldiers to prevent the citizens from doing them bodily harm. Even His Holiness, in these his last days of action, seems to be with his own hand striving to efface its visible strength and glory. He has sent forth an order to have all the relics in the churches transported to the Vatican. This order implies not only the relics, but also the silver and gold cases in which they are contained. Some of the latter are very precious, even from an artistic point of view. The heads of the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, which were preserved on the high altar of St. John, in the Lateran, were among the first of the relics to be removed.

THE famine is likely to prove as sweeping in India this year, as it was in Persia last year. The cause, too, is much the same in both cases, which is lightness of rain fall. One correspondent estimates that 40,000,000 persons will be affected in India in a greater or less degree by the scarcity of food. The difficulty is aggravated by two other causes, namely: the difficulty of reaching the sufferers with supplies, by any practicable means of communication; and also by the peculiar religious and social customs and prejudices of the Hindoos,

which lead them to prefer starvation rather than eat the food which would perhaps do them most good.—Battle Creek Journal.

NEW SECT IN INDIA.—A remarkable movement, headed by a native, says The Friend of India, has set in among the people of Eastern Bengal. The leader has a number of followers, who read the Scriptures and endeavor to live after the example of the apostles and the early Christians. They are vegetarians, and discard the use of medicine, seeking the cure of sickness by prayer to Christ. Such movements, outside of the church, and mingled as they are with error, show how the gospel influence is growing strong in India, and is awakening men's attention to its truths.

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.

PROVIDENCE permitting I will meet with the friends of the cause at Bordoville, Vt., Sabbath and Sunday, April 4 and 5, 1874. I desire a general attendance of the brethren and sisters, so far as consistent, from all parts of the State. I shall expect to meet Eld. A. C. Bourdeau at this meeting. Let us have a general rally.

GEO. I. BUTLER.

QUARTERLY meetings in California as follows:— San Francisco, March 28, 29. Woodland, April 18, 19. Bloomfield, April 25, 26. Healdsburg, May 23, 24. Petaluma, June 20, 21. Green Valley, July 18, 19.

CAL. CONF. COM.

THE next monthly meeting for Oakland, Johnstown, and Little Prairie, Wis., will be held at Little Prairie, April 18 and 19, 1874. All the members of the last-named church are requested to report. Eld. I. Sanborn and C. W. Olds are expected.

H. HUNTER, Clerk.

GENERAL quarterly meeting of the Iowa and Nebraska T. and M. Society at Sigourney, Iowa, April 25, 26, 1874. Bro. Haskell is expected. Let there be an effort on the part of all the members of the society, officers especially, to make this meeting what it should be. Meeting to commence Friday evening.

H. NICOLA, Pres.

ST. CHARLES, Sabbath, March 28.

A. S. HUTCHINS.

Hillsdale, Mich., April 4, 5. There will be a quarterly meeting of Dist. No. 1 in connection with this meeting; also, the general quarterly meeting of the Tract Society of Mich., at Potterville, April 11, 12. There are special reasons why the officers of these Tract Societies and others should attend these meetings.

S. N. HASKELL.

QUARTERLY meeting of the church at Hundred Mile Grove, Wisconsin, April 4, and 5, 1874. We cordially invite Eld. Isaac Sanborn to meet with us on this occasion.

N. M. JORDAN.

HOOKE POINT, Hamilton Co., Iowa, April 4, 5; Horton, Bremer Co., Apr. 11, 12; will also meet with the brethren at Bradford and Fredericksburg after the close of the Horton meeting. We expect Eld. C. A. Washburn to meet us at Horton, also our friends from Bradford and Fredericksburg.

J. H. MORRISON.

QUARTERLY meeting at Kickapoo, Wis., the first Sabbath and first-day in April.

LORENZO HILL, Clerk.

QUARTERLY meeting of the Allegany church at Niles Hill, N. Y., April 4 and 5, 1874. Members requested to be present or report.

D. C. PHILLIPS, Clerk.

At Bro. Solomon Wilson's, near Robinson, on Sabbath, April 4. Friends in Crawford Co., please meet me there.

Jeffersonville, Wayne Co., where Bro. Scott may appoint, Sabbath and first-day, April 11 and 12, 1874.

G. W. COLCORD.

Business Department.

Not slothful in Business. Rom. 12:11.

THE address of Eld. D. M. Canright is Walla Walla, Washington Territory.

FOR the benefit of the officers of the Wisconsin T. and M. Society, we are requested to state that the P. O. address of Mattie A. Babcock, State Secretary, is Monroe, Green Co., Wis.

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 for the paper is not in due time acknowledged, immediate notice of the omission should then be given.

- \$2.00 EACH. I W Barker 45-1, R Richardson 45-14, David Emerson 45-14, D W Crandall 45-6, Amos Morel 45-14, Jacob Hare 46-1, J W Bond 45-20, A A Dodge 45-7, A B Atwood 45-14, T D Babcock 45-10, H P Leighton 45-13, Daniel Newcomb 45-22, E B Saunders 45-14, E Boyer 45-2, Chas Seaward 45-14, H H Weld 45-14, P C Truman 44-14, E P Daniels 45-14, C B Osborne 45-9, Dora F Rowe 45-15, Frank Morrison 45-17, Pierce Hackett 45-1, Mr Ariel Slater 46-1, Mary Cram 45-16, Charles Stratton 45-6, A G Hart 45-5, Henry S Green 45-14, Lida Davis 45-14, A H Fleisher 45-14, Mrs M Acradock 45-1, G W Varney 45-14, Cora C Chase 45-12, Lib Showalter 45-14, Mary Sharp 45-15, Wm Dickie 45-14, Edward Whipple 45-14, H Crowell 47-1, Sarah Miner 44-13, John King 45-13, Champlain Smith 45-7, R H Stewart 43-1, Mary Castle 45-6, W V Field 45-14, J Olive 45-14, S A Harrel 45-14, Mary F Aldrich 45-10, Salmon Farrar 45-14, G W Rathbun 45-14, Albert Erway 45-14, Stephen Maxson 45-22, Catharine C Rice 45-14, Mary R Miller 45-14, Elizabeth Miner 45-5, Mrs Esther Washbond 45-18, Charles Chittenden 45-11, Thomas Wyatt 45-15, Jesse Hiestand 44-14, Chas Prince 45-6, H W Pierce 45-10, Esther Smith 45-13.

- \$1.00 EACH. Henry Hall 44-14, C Brudlove 45-14, L Hoxie 45-14, N Carpenter 45-14, M A Sparrow 45-14, L A Chamberlin 44-14, Royal Peck 44-15, Joseph B West 45-14, Mrs Wm Chesbro 44-28, Almema Knight 44-1, E A Stillman 44-10, Chas H Chapman 44-13, Mary Corbin 44-13, Robert Dowsbury 44-18, Phiny Kimball 44-18, Wm Wellman 44-13, Marcia Dunham 44-13, J S Chapman 44-13, J S Waldron 44-13, M H Rose 44-13, Chloe Carter 44-13, Samuel W Walker 44-14, W L Stiles 44-14, Mrs Lydia A Sprague 44-14, Mrs Margaret Owen 44-14, Joseph M Haines 44-14, E Emery 44-6, Martha Howland 45-14, Isaac Crowl 44-14, Dexter Ball 44-14, Mrs M Pierce 45-2, Lucretia Bliss 44-14, John Roushey 44-14, C Carpenter 44-14, Wm Tawner 44-12, Warren I Carver 45-14, Robert Spear 45-14, E J Naurth 44-14, R Moran 44-14, C G Daniels 44-14, A F Sala 44-6, Sarah Farrar 44-10, Michael McBride 45-14, Henry Lininger 44-14, Rev James Morrison 44-14, Rev Fergus Ferguson 44-14, Rev John Kirk 44-14, J H Bedford 45-1, G G Green 43-15, Mary Hall 45-14, Henry S Priest 44-14, Wm Ashley 44-14, Lucy R Holden 44-18, Judson Van Martyr 45-14, I Hagaman 45-14, Henry Miller 45-14, C I Titus 44-14, J G Gaines 45-14, E A Barton 44-14, C W Smith 45-14, N Auten 44-6, James Lamphier 44-14, Wm McQueen 45-14, J B Alexander 44-14.

- MISCELLANEOUS Joshua Bailey 75c 45-1, H F States 50c 43-26, J P Carter 75c 44-14, J Anderson 75c 44-14, G Haman 75c 44-14, M C Parish 75c 44-14, C G Gardiner \$1.50 45-14, H W Thomas 1.50 45-14, H W Forgy 1.50 45-14, H Parke 1.50 45-14, P Teutsch 1.50 45-14, Jane Higley 3.00 45-24, Tamsou Cudworth 50c 43-26, Mrs James Curtis 50c 43-26, Eliza Rousseau 50c 44-1, R B Smith 2.50 45-1, A N Allen 1.75 45-7, John D Chapman 75c 44-14, Mrs H C Wilkinson 1.25 44-20, J F Wood 1.50, 45-1.

- 50 CENTS EACH, Paying to 44-15. G H Stoffer, James Holtzer, Spencer Laws, Theodore A Marshall, Elica Easley, F Q Tucker, Dr U E Traer, Nathan Paddock, George W Paddock, Mrs A Walbrath, R T Tinkham, John Golding, Sdney Baller, Orin S Hall, Miss Cornelia Burnett, R H Lott, P B Vandermark, I M Lippitt, A Kinnamon, Peleg C Tabor, E Voss, Henry Birds-eye, Wm Love, George T Taylor, Sarah Thorn, Mrs Henry Dubois, H H James, Frank Bacon, Rely Woodford, Lydia Utter, Miss Susan Chaney, Rachel Cosper, Wm McConnell, James Dunnington, W S Potwin, O Crissey, E W Keasey, John Wilson, S S Jordan, C S Martin, A Turgason, J I Wheeler, Wm Little, J C Yoenum, Joseph Eells, A R Tirrill, Farmer Burdick, Eld James Rogers, Walter Brown, Edwin Babcock, Hellen Brandon, George Barlow, J M Sanborn, A Bean, John Fathertlos, Gustav Coffitt, Hannah Barton, Martha Bakeman, Lewis Buckley, Fred Johnson, Louis Stansburg, M G Sperbeck, Jennie Sweet, Ann Robertson, A Fairbanks, James E Northup, H C Card, Henry Brown, W W Arbuckle, George Dunn, O B Nelson, Janet Howe, Casper Place, Jesse Stanley, Nelson West, Mrs Elihu Carpenter, Martha L Hooker, Jesse Olive, Dr Wallace, Walker Kimbler, Jane Layman, John Hays, D J Adams, Mrs W W Wipple, Mrs J F Topping, Mrs M H Root, Mary Hoffman, J T Showalter, Mary M Cookingham, Mrs Elvira Cross, Wm Semple, Mrs George White, M H Bump, Mrs Florence Passmore, Charles Helay, Asa Coats, Wm Sherwood, George Ingle, Joseph Ingle, James Condy, James Rogers, Joseph Curvo, Thomas Flowers, Mrs Sarah Goodrich, Daniel Ryan, Wm H Needham, John Clark, I I Hill, Eld Pratt, Susan Trembley, Wm R Burroughs, Garvar Sullivan, Christian Zimmerman, Mrs George Sanborn, Eld James Phelps, Mrs George F Wiselogle, C H Poland, F Swingle, Miles Clines, Dea Myron Peak, Lansing, Clute, John Mason, Rev Mr Smith, Mary E Bliss, Catharine Beard, Phebe Hornbeck, Ira Hutseler, George Helay, W P Baker, C Fox, Eld J M Haughey, James Smith, L S Collins, Isaac Simmons, Charles Ericson, Oliver Pervi, Mrs A Jennet, T M Linehard, Mrs Sarah Maker, Obndiel Marsh, Philip Ghosh, Mrs Phebe Call, Edwin Field, Eljah Fowler, Mrs M Whalen, David Rock, A K Maryott, James Brewer, F A Hays, L L Clark, Israel I Dodge, O F Elliot, Calvin Peters, Mrs Julia Parks, Benj Heath, Benj Hoar, Henry Saterlee, Catharine Saterlee, Elizabeth Mc Kenion, H C Malory, Joseph Naregany, John Hamer, Andrew Deboice, Cynthia Parker, George Lewis, Julia Wear, Mary Dart, Eld Z Campbell, I H Orcutt, C M Holland, Rachel Mc Reynolds, G W Van Dyke, Thomas Henion, Jane Southard, I R Henton, Wm Zumnatt, I Y Atherton, I Hays, Drury Overton, S A Holsinger, Prof I A Roberts, Mrs Maggie Teed, John Wear, Mrs H M Grant.

Books Sent by Mail.

- Emma Webber 30c, Wilson Pierce & Co \$1.00, W S Hopkins 15.00, Mary A Eaton 4.60, C W Stanley 2.00, Wm Pitt 50c, C W Olds 2.75, M Barnes 75c, E Warren 1.00, J F Addir 20c, Miss Harriet Carr 1.00, Rev Geo S Pratt 50c, G W Field 2.25, Sarah Hatch 70c, I N Russell 2.00, W H Littlejohn 1.25, E T Rouse 50c, Noah Carabooft 1.10, J S Maxson 1.50, D Niver 25c, T W Van Meter 25c, W B Godfrey 25c, Anna C Stewart 1.00, David Morbie 1.00, Mrs Fanny F Jump 1.00, James P Mahoney 25c, John D Gowell 30c, John D Chapman 25c, E Davey 90c, A N Allen 1.25, O A Olsen 1.25, D C Hunter 1.00, Frank Baldwin 1.40, J A Hamilton 30c, Thomas W Davies 1.55, Griffith Davies 3.45, W R Randolph 20c, T C Welcome 1.25, Calvin Peters 1.00, Eld James White 61.20.

Books Sent by Express.

- Sands H Lane, Kokomo, Howard Co., Ind., \$15.35, Mary E Phinney, Cassville, Grant Co., Wis., 7.20, H Nicola, Osceola, Clark Co., Iowa, 27.04, F H Chapman, West Union, Iowa, 2.50, L Bean, Enosburg Falls, Vt., 34.88, P Strong, Osseo, Hillsdale Co., Mich., 16.85, Henry Braekin, Prescott, Hillsdale Co., Wis., 5.00, Harrison Grant, Medford, Steele Co., Minn., 49.85, S N Haskell, South Lancaster, Mass., 181.88, Rufus Baker, Marquette, Green Lake Co., Wis., 10.20, Geo A King, Wyoming, Out 8.20, R F Cottrell, Medina, N. Y., 4.92, Rufus Baker, Markesan, Wis., 10.00, Wm Covert, Sharpville, Ind., 28.94, H C Jorgensen, Neenah, Wis., 5.00, Jeremiah Rhodes, Osceola, Iowa, 11.59, N W Brown, Lynn, Mass., 20.00, M D Mathews, Okemos, Ingham Co., Mich., 11.45, Alex Carpenter, Brighton, Livingston Co., Mich., 11.07.

Books Sent by Freight.

C E Moser, Sigourney, Iowa, \$62.06.

Watch Sent by Express.

W W Sharp, Freedom, Owen Co., Ind., \$14.00.

Cash Received on Account.

Mike Hornaday \$10.80, Louisa Upson 6.00, D M Canright 25c, L McCoy 52.25, S N Haskell 500.00, Jesse Hiestand 10.00.

Danish Monthly.

Mary Haskill \$1.00, H E Haskill 1.00, Wm Harris 4.50.

Michigan T. & M. Society.

G W Allen, District No. 4, \$3.00, District No. 12, 6.00.

Foreign Mission.

Dan W Clay \$5.00.

S. D. A. Educational Society.

- \$200.00 EACH. Jonathan Lamson. \$100.00 EACH. D W Johnson. \$50.00 EACH. Friends in Ohio, S N Haskell, J W Lucas. \$30.00 EACH. Lucius Winston. \$25.00 EACH. L Mc Coy, James King, M L Huntley. \$15.00 EACH. John McMillan. \$10.00 EACH. Thomas Hare, T K Henry, John Sisley, Geo Fifield. \$5.00 EACH. J L Lewis, Mrs Mary Lewis, A Friend, B King, John Cardell Jr, Sarah A Cardell, H S Priest & wife, Nellie F Heald. \$2.50 EACH. Mary Eaton. \$1.00 EACH. Florida Hall, Rebecca Tinkham, Cynthia McCoy.

The Review and Herald.

TERMS:

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