

THE ADVENT REVIEW

And Herald of the Sabbath.

"Here is the patience of the Saints: Here are they that keep the Commandments of God, and the Faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:12.

VOLUME 42.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, JUNE 17, 1873.

NUMBER 1.

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.

OUT OF THE NIGHT.

ROUGH, cold, and dark, and dreary, now,
And sunless is my way;
My cry is wild:—My Father, show
Some prophecy of day,
Above the shadowed tops of woe,
That tower so.

My God, thy heart is tender, kind;
How oft my heart has known
The conscious calm, the lull of mind,
When storms have wildly blown;
Thou did'st not leave thy child alone;
Thou gaurd'st thine own.

Dear Father, come I close to thee,
While tumults toss me so;
I look to thee—look thou on me;
Let thy sweet grace o'erflow;
In bright skies, reveal thy bow
That cancels woe.

I hold, dear child, thy hand in mine,
Thy Father knows thy way;
He leads thee, thou art weak and blind;—
Thou art not far from day;
Remember, saved one, thou art mine,
And I am thine.

Kind Father, well my faint heart knew
That thou did'st fold thy love
Around me, perfect, full, and true;
Thou would'st thy promise prove;
But faith forgot:—My God, anew,
With faith imbue.

—Christian Observer.

THE STATESMAN ARTICLES.

ARTICLE ELEVEN.

THE TRUE THEORY OF THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

THE third theory of the Christian Sabbath, in the order in which we have been considering the different theories, affirms that the Sabbath was instituted at the creation of man, and that it has never been abolished or superseded. This theory further maintains that the essential idea of the law of the Sabbath is not the holiness of any particular portion of time, but the consecration of a specified proportion of time, viz., one day in seven; that, in accordance with this essential idea of the Sabbath, a change of day was admissible; that a change was actually made by divine warrant, on account of, and dating from, the resurrection of Christ; and that the first day of the week, the Lord's day, is the true Christian Sabbath, having its moral sanction in the fourth commandment.

Enough has already been written in these columns, in disproving the opposing theories, to show that this theory of the Sabbath is the true one. Two things being admitted, there appears to be no escape from this theory. Let it be admitted, first, that God instituted the Sabbath for all mankind, and that its law is of unchanging, as well as universal, application. This is readily conceded by those with whom we are now in discussion. Then, in the second place, let it be admitted that the inspired apostles, under the guidance of Christ and his Spirit, and with their manifest approbation, ceased to observe the seventh day, and actually observed the first day, of the week. This our opponents are very loth to admit. But the testimony given by us at considerable length is simply overwhelming and incontrovertible. The third theory, and it alone, harmonizes the immutable law of the Sabbath with the actual change of day.

In further confirmation of the correctness of this theory, it remains for us, in concluding this discussion, to show that this third

theory accords with the fourth commandment, and meets every aspect of the design of the institution of the Sabbath.

The principal feature of the design of the Sabbath is the setting forth of God's sovereign control, as Creator, of man and the time of man, as God's creature. Called into being by the Creator, and made lord over the irrational and material creation, man was taught that his time was to be used for God's honor. It was a trust from the Creator; and that man might not forget this, one-seventh of the time in regular recurrence was marked out to be consecrated specially to the Lord of all. This is the very idea in the commemoration of the work of creation. It is to keep alive the knowledge of God as the Creator and Sovereign Ruler of man. To commemorate the creation is to keep before the mind, week by week, the duty of using our time for the honor of the Author and Upholder of our being.

Nor is the example of God's resting the seventh day made insignificant by this theory of the Christian Sabbath. "In six days God made the heavens and the earth, and rested the seventh day." God's people, in different parts of the world, do and must begin their work at different times, and yet in each locality they labor six days and rest the seventh. It is the proportion of time which is the law of the commandment enforced by the divine example; and, hence, the Christian Sabbath, in the true import of the commandment, is as really the seventh day as the Jewish Sabbath. The Christian labors six days and not the seventh, according to the divine example and the divine command.

In this way, also, the true theory of the Christian Sabbath meets the design of the institution, as it was intended to arrest the current of the outward life and lead up the soul to unseen and eternal verities. And here there is a most important argument for the change of the day for Sabbath observance. It is most reasonable to believe that, if there be any work which more gloriously manifests the perfections of God, and serves better to turn the thoughts of men to things above, than the work of creation, the day which commemorates such a work would be the appropriate time for Sabbath observance.

So far as the essential idea of the Sabbath connects itself with a particular day, the argument is of great weight in favor of a change from the seventh to the first day of the week. The weekly division is the main thing, let the week begin when it may. It may begin on what we now call the third or fourth, or any other day. It will matter little. But as the first day, in our enumeration of the days, will always bring to mind the great work of redemption accomplished by the Saviour, who, on the first day of the week, rose from the dead, the observance of this day as the Sabbath best answers one of the principal designs of that institution.

And then, how fittingly does the observance of the first day, the day of the Lord's resurrection, correspond to the design of the Sabbath as a foretaste of the heavenly rest—the *Sabbatismos*, or Sabbath-keeping, that remains for the people of God. Rejoicing here on the Christian Sabbath in what our Redeemer has done for us, we look forward with joyful anticipations to the many mansions which he has gone before us to prepare, that we may be "forever with the Lord."

"Bright shadows of true rest; some shoots of bliss;
Heaven once a week;
The next world's gladness prepossessed in this,
A day to seek.

Eternity in time; the steps by which
We climb above all ages; lamps that light
Man through his heap of dark days; and the rich
And full redemption of the whole week's fight.

The milky way chalked out with suns; a clue
That guides through evening hours; and in full
story
A taste of heaven on earth; the pledge and cue
Of a full feast; and the out-courts of glory."

—The Christian Statesman.

"THE TRUE THEORY OF THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH."

A REJOINDER.

It is a peculiarity of this discussion that we are prevented, in our rejoinders, from anticipating the positions which our opponent has in store for us. Were it possible to proceed upon principles of consistency, in debate, and conclude that he, having adopted such and such views, would continue to maintain them steadily for the future, there would be a sort of satisfaction found in preparing material to be employed hereafter. But we have learned, by actual experience, that in this debate such anticipatory action would be labor lost. For example: In the last reply which had to do with the seventh-part-of-time theory, we had intended to show that, were it true, and that, were the observance of one day in seven all that is now required, even then Sabbatarians stood upon a footing as safe as that of their opponents, since the observance of the seventh day answered to the keeping of one-seventh part of time, equally with that of the celebration of the first day of the week. Being prevented by want of space from indulging in these reflections, we laid them over for another week, supposing that they would come in play equally well at this time. Alas! what a mistake! We should have struck when the iron was hot. Unfortunately, we are not now confronting the no-day-in-particular doctrine, as we were then, but it is the "Lord's day" again, the first day of an indefinite week, "a particular, definite day, enforced by the command and the example of Christ and the apostles," which once more stands before us. How it is that we have been borne so rapidly over the space which separates these antagonistic positions, the reader will have to decide for himself; for we confess to a perfect want of ability, on our own part, to render him any assistance. Without the slightest attempt at logical deduction, we are first informed that the essential idea in Sabbath observance is not that of the keeping of a particular day, but the consecration of one day in the week, allowing the week to begin wherever it may. This, we are told, would suitably commemorate God's rest at the creation of the world; and, also, that if, in addition, we make the day of our residential with the first day of the week, we can thereby celebrate both creation and redemption. For this very purpose, we are informed that the Sabbath commandment was changed, so as to admit of the introduction of a new day. But pause a moment. Has the gentleman told us just what change was made? Has he told us what words were stricken out? and how it now reads? The reader has not forgotten that this is the very thing the opposition were challenged to perform. He will perceive that this, also, is the very thing which the gentleman has failed to accomplish, and cannot hereafter do, since the reply under review is the last of his series. If it be said that he has cited us to the fourth commandment, as given in the twentieth of Exodus, as containing the law as it now reads, then he is self-condemned; for he admits that the phraseology of that commandment did enforce a definite day, and that, the last day of the week.

But once more: Passing over the absurdity of claiming a change in the law, where there is no ability to produce the statute as amended, let us go back from Sinai to Eden, along with the gentleman, and see if we cannot find, independent of the commandment, evidence that the creation Sabbath was not a portable institution, to be trundled about at the caprice of any and every individual. Mark it, now, it is granted that what is called the Jewish Sabbath law enforced the keeping of the seventh day, and admitted of no other as a substitute. But whence is this conclusion drawn? Undeniably, from the words, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work."

But where has the gentleman learned that the creation Sabbath was enjoined in the use of language less explicit and limited in its meaning than are the words of the decalogue? If he knows anything about the original decree of Jehovah, and the limitations with which he guarded the Sabbath in the outset, he, like ourselves, is compelled to go to the sacred record for information. If, in going there, he has been able to find anything which would prove that the Edenic Sabbath was less fixed in its character than that of Sinai, then he has made some progress. The only scripture which will throw any light upon the subject, will be found in Gen. 2:1-3. Unhappily for the gentleman, however, it is fatal to his conception that the original Sabbath varied in any way from that of the Jews—so-called. In the account of its institution, the language employed is almost precisely the same with that subsequently traced upon the tables of stone. It is there declared that God sanctified (*i. e.*, set apart to a holy use), the *seventh day*. The reason for this action is the fact that he had rested upon it. Now, it will be observed that it was the "*seventh day*" that God blessed and sanctified, and no other. It is submitted, therefore, as the gentleman concedes, that the same expression (*i. e.*, the seventh day), when employed in the commandment given to Moses, did locate the Sabbath institution immovably upon the last day of the week, until the law was changed; that the same language, when employed originally, must have produced the same result; in other words, if the command to keep the seventh day, as given on Mount Sinai, held the people strictly to the observance of the last day of the week, so, too, Jehovah, in the beginning, restricted the whole race to a Sabbath which was, equally with the other, the seventh, and, therefore, the last day of the week.

In order to avoid this conclusion, it will be required that, by some means, he should be able to show that the same terms which were employed by God, at one time, have a different meaning from that attached to them, as employed by him at another time. Not only so, the Sabbath in Genesis, like that in Exodus, is further limited and defined by two additional facts. First, it was the day on which God rested; secondly, it was the day which he blessed because he had rested upon it. Therefore, before any other day could be substituted for it, these two things must be true of it, as matter of history. This, however, can never be the case, as it regards any day of the week, save the last; consequently, he who celebrates any other is not celebrating the one which God imposed in the beginning. So much for the definiteness of the Sabbath which was given to Adam.

Should it be replied that what has been remarked is correct, and that it is not argued that any one was at liberty to keep any other day than the seventh of the week, until Christ changed the law, and thereby authorized them so to do, we reply, Very good; that brings us back again to the original proposition, which is, Did he make such a change? If he did, then it is just as important that we should have clear and conclusive evidence that such an alteration was made by him, as it is that we should have the abundant testimony which we now possess that a definite Sabbath was originally given to mankind. All this speculation in regard to what might have been done with perfect consistency under a given state of facts, is worse than idle. What we demand, is this—What *has been* done? Instead of concluding that Christ did a certain thing because it would have been right so to do, first show us, by actual Scripture quotation, that he really performed the work in question, and the consistency of his action will take care of itself. A theology which has no broader, firmer basis than individual conception of the propriety of certain occurrences which may never have taken place at all, is not worth the paper on which it is drawn out. This, neverthe-

less, is the very material with which we are dealing. Eleven articles, ostensibly written to afford divine authority for the change of days, are concluded; and, from beginning to end, there is not found in them a "Thus saith the Lord," for the transfer. Again and again it is inferred that such and such transactions meant so-and-so. Again and again it is concluded that such and such things are admissible, not because of any scriptural warrant, but because they seem good in the eyes of those with whose practice they best conform. The reason why this is so, the reader will readily perceive. It is found, not in the fact that the learned gentleman who represents the opposition is insensible to the superiority of positive Bible statements over individual surmise, but in the necessity under which he is placed, to employ the only material which he has at hand. Meeting him, therefore, where he is, let us prove the unreliability of such deductions as he is indulging in by actual test. The points which he is attempting to establish, are these: 1. The original idea of the Sabbath can be met by the observance of the first day of the week, as well as by that of the last. 2. That the commemoration of Christ's resurrection can only be suitably carried out by hallowing the first day of every week.

Now, as to the first of these propositions, it will only be safe to decide that it is correct, after giving it mature reflection. We have already seen that God's original plan for preserving the memory of creation week, was that of setting apart the last day of each subsequent week for the imitation, on our part, of his rest thereon. To say, therefore, that it would have answered just as well to allow the individual to take any other day—say the first day of the week—for this purpose, is to argue that God acted without cause in making the selection which he did, and enforcing it for four thousand years. If the question were one of indifference, why did he not leave the day unfixed? Why not allow them, then, to commemorate his rest on the first day, as the gentleman would have done now, arguing that the ends of the original Sabbath would, in this way, be fully met? Certain it is, that no good reason can be assigned why it would now be more proper to commemorate the rest of Jehovah by a variable Sabbath, than it has been heretofore. This being true, the gentleman's logic is fully unsound, or else the action of the Deity was inconsiderate.

Turning, now, to the second proposition, the reader will be instantly struck with its unqualified antagonism to the first point which is sought to be made out.

Remember, now, that the gentleman is arguing stoutly for first-day sanctity. He is not so particular when the week begins, but it must have just seven days, and the first of them must be devoted to the commemoration of the Lord's resurrection. Should you ask him why he is thus particular in the selection of the first day of the week, he would reply, "Why, that is the day on which the Lord arose! and it is his resurrection, as the crowning act in the work of redemption, which we seek to honor." But, reader, would it not occur to you, immediately, that this is a repudiation of all which he has said concerning the Edenic Sabbath? Now, mark it; what God demands, is, that we should honor the seventh day of the week, as the one which he rested upon, blessed, and sanctified. If, therefore, the rest, the blessing, and the sanctification, of that day can be suitably remembered by the observance of another day differing from it, then the assumption that an event is most impressively handed down by the dedication, for this purpose, of the very day on which it transpired, is unsound. But if this assumption be unsound, then all of the gentleman's talk in regard to the necessity for a change of days, in order to the suitable commemoration of the resurrection of Christ and the completion of the work of redemption, is without force. For, assuredly, if he is right in supposing that God's rest in Eden, on the seventh day, can be commemorated as well on the first day as on the seventh, then the same principle will hold good in regard to the events which transpired on the first day of the week, *i. e.*, they can be kept in remembrance by the hallowing of the seventh day as well as by that of the first. But this being true, his argument for the necessity of the change of Sabbaths is gone, and his philosophy of the change proved to be unsound. The only purpose which it has served in this controversy, has been the revelation of that which is really the conviction of its author, as it

is that of men generally, that there is no time in which great transactions can be so suitably commemorated as that of the time on which they took place. When the nation wishes to celebrate the anniversary of its independence, it sets apart for this purpose the fourth of July, which answers exactly to the day of the month on which the Declaration of Independence was made. Substitute for this another day, and you have marred the impressiveness of the occasion.

So, too, with God's rest on creation week; it must be so celebrated that all the associations connected with it will be calculated to lead the mind back to its origin and object. Turn it around, as the gentleman proposes to do, *i. e.*, substitute the first day of the week in the place of the last, and you have precisely reversed God's order. You have put the rest-day first, and cause the six laboring days to follow; whereas, God, knowing that rest was only needed *after* labor, worked six days and then rested the seventh, not because he was weary, but because he desired to put on the record for us an example to be strictly followed. The gentleman, however, without the slightest warrant, has, with a rash hand, laid hold of the divine procedure, and now says that the order pursued was not necessary to the inculcation of the great lessons which God designed to impart. To this, I reply, 1. That God's actions are never superfluous. 2. That if we err at all, it is safer to err on the side of the divine example. 3. That if the idea of God's working six days is in any way connected with a proper Sabbath rest, then it is indispensable that the Sabbath should follow, and not precede, the working portion of the week. 4. That if the rest of God, merely, is the object which we should keep before our minds by a proper regard for the Sabbath institution, the gentleman has himself shown, by the logic which he has employed, that the only suitable period for the keeping of that rest is found in that portion of the week on which God ceased from his labors.

The remark of the gentleman that the work of redemption furnishes a subject worthy of being remembered by observance with Sabbath honor of the day on which it was completed, is worthy of passing notice. The idea which he advances is one which is quite prevalent, and employed with great satisfaction by clergymen generally, when controverting the claims of God's ancient rest-day. The strength of the position lies in the fact that it distinguishes between redemption and creation, assuming, perhaps correctly, that the latter is more exalted than the former. Having won the assent of the mind to this proposition, the reader is quietly carried over to conclusions much less obvious than the first. Almost unconsciously he is led to decide, with his instructor, that, since redemption is a greater work than creation, it ought, therefore, to be honored by a day of rest. Now we shall not enter into this matter largely, but we simply suggest that either this decision is the result of human, or else it is the product of divine, wisdom. If it is human wisdom, then its teachings should be followed with extreme caution. If it is divine wisdom, then they can be obeyed with the most implicit confidence. Just at this point, therefore, it is all-important that the test be applied. Has Jehovah ever said that the commemoration of creation week had become less desirable on account of the possible redemption of a fallen race, by the death of his Son? The most careful reader of the Bible has failed to find any such language; in fine, the intimation that such is really the fact, is rather a reflection upon the Deity himself, since, from it, it might be inferred that the glory of his work had been dimmed by the fall of the race.

But, again, if the Lord has not said that he would not have the memory of creation cherished still, has he ever said that he would have the work of redemption signalized by a weekly rest? Once more the student of the Scriptures unhesitatingly answers in the negative; but if God has failed to make this declaration, who shall presume to put words in his mouth, and read the thoughts of his mind, as those having authority so to do? The man who will undertake to do it is venturing upon ground which lies hard by that of blasphemy. God never neglects to say that which ought to be said; he never calls upon any man to go beyond his commandments, for in them, says Solomon (Eccl. 12:13), is found the whole duty of man. Furthermore, were we to reason upon this matter at all, every consideration would lead us to

the conclusion that the inference of our opponents is not correct. In the first place, redemption is not yet fully completed in the case of any individual. In the second place, the scripture says we have (are to have) redemption through his blood (Col. 1:14). But his blood, it is generally supposed, was shed upon Friday, and, therefore, it is not impossible that the hallowing of that day would more suitably commemorate redemption than that of any other day. In the third place, it was proved at length in a former article, that if creation was suitably commemorated by a day of rest, redemption, which is an event entirely opposite in its character, would naturally be celebrated by some institution of an entirely different nature. In other words, the Sabbath inculcates cessation from labor by the indulgence of inaction, while all the events connected with the resurrection of Christ rendered inactivity impossible.

But finally, we are not left, in a matter of this significance, to the unreliable decisions of the human mind. Not only is it true that God has never appointed a day of septenary inactivity, as the Heaven-chosen memorial of the resurrection of the divine Son of God; but it is also true that God himself, in the exercise of a wisdom which will hardly be impugned by finite beings, has selected an institution entirely different from that under consideration for the illustration of that phase of the work of redemption which was seen in the resurrection of Christ. Says the great apostle to the Gentiles: "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." Rom. 6:4, 5. "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also we are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." Col. 2:12. Baptism, that is, Bible baptism, or the immersion of the individual beneath the water, most forcibly commemorates the death of our Lord. As the administrator lowers the body of the passive subject beneath the yielding wave, by the very necessity of the case, breathing is, for the time, suspended, and the person, as nearly as may be while in life, as he lies motionless in the hands of the individual to whom he has committed himself in the exercise of an act of faith, shadows forth the death and burial of his Lord in a most impressive manner. As he rises, also, from that position, and, proceeding to the shore, unites once more with the throng of living beings who surround him, he most forcibly illustrates the coming back again of our Lord from death and the grave to a life of infinite activity and glory. All, therefore, which is necessary in order to the remembering, by outward expression, of that most glorious event, which gave back to the disciples, from the nations of the dead, the body of the beloved Master, is that we go forward in the fulfillment of an ordinance which has been provided for that purpose, and which sets forth the events which are thought worthy of a memento in a manner as superior to that in which it could be done by mere inaction, as God's conception of what would be suitable under such circumstances, is higher than that of man. The wonder is that any one should have lost sight of the original design of an institution which is remarkably expressive of the purpose for which it was created. In fact, had not the same power which has changed the Sabbath, also tampered with the ordinance of baptism, by changing the original form into one less expressive of its historic associations, we believe that the view which is now passing under consideration never could have suggested itself to any mind.

But, reader, it is now time that our labor should be drawn to a close. In the providence of God, we have walked together over the territory devoted to the great and important Sabbath question. With pleasure, we are about to lay down our pen for the last time, and submit the whole matter to you for the pronouncing of the final verdict of your individual judgment. As we do so, it is with feelings of most profound gratitude to God for a truth which, while there is underlying it a cross so heavy that it cannot be lifted by human strength unaided, is, nevertheless, so plain that its mere statement is its most complete demonstration. Were it not true that society is at present so organized that the keeping of the seventh day involves social, political, and

pecuniary sacrifice, much greater than he is aware of who has not considered the matter, we would not hesitate to say that a complete and speedy revolution could be wrought upon this subject in a brief space of time. Never, in the history of any reformation which has heretofore occurred, were men covered with a more complete panoply of defense, and armed with more destructive weapons of offense, than are God's commandment-keeping people at the present period. The only mystery connected with the subject is, that, being as plain as it is, the fact of the change should not have attracted universal attention before. Traversing again the ground over which we have come with the gentleman who has managed the opposition in this debate, the poverty of his resources is most striking. In all that he has said, he has proved nothing which has in any way relieved his case, nor can his failure be attributed to any lack of capacity on his part. In the handling of the material with which he has had to do, he has displayed not a little ingenuity. The arguments which he has employed and the positions which he has taken are those of the orthodox ministry generally at the present time. His failure is entirely attributable to the natural weakness of the position which he has sought to defend. His was indeed a hard task. He felt the moral necessity of a Sabbath, as a Christian man; and, finding the religious world keeping the first day of the week, he sought to defend this practice from the Bible stand-point. But, alas for his cause! The more he has appealed to this source, the more certain has it become that the Bible, and the usages of Christendom in this matter, can never be harmonized. Turning over its pages, we do indeed find the most ample authority for a day of rest, which is generally honored as such. As we have seen, the record in brief stands as follows:—

1. There is a Sabbath. 2. That Sabbath is the seventh, and not the first, day of the week, for the following reasons: (1.) In the beginning God rested on the seventh day, thereby laying the foundation for its Sabbath honor (Gen. 2:3); whereas, he never rested upon the first day. (2.) He blessed the seventh day; whereas, he never blessed the first day. (3.) He sanctified the seventh day, or devoted it to a religious use; whereas, he never sanctified the first day. (4.) The day of his rest, his blessing, and his sanctification, he commanded to be kept holy, in a law of perpetual obligation; whereas, he never commanded the observance of the first day. (5.) The Lord Jesus Christ recognized the obligation of the seventh day by a life-long custom of observing it (Luke 4:16); whereas, the Lord Jesus Christ never rested upon the first day of the week; but always treated it as a secular day. (6.) He also recognized its perpetuity forty years after his death, when speaking of events connected with the destruction of Jerusalem, by instructing his disciples to pray that their flight might not occur thereon (Matt. 24:20); whereas, he never spoke of the first day as one to be honored in the future, nor, indeed, so far as we know, did he ever take it upon his lips at all. (7.) It is the day which the holy women kept, according to the commandment, after the crucifixion of our Lord (Luke 25:56); whereas, there is no account that any good man has ever rested upon the first day out of regard for its sanctity. (8.) It is the day on which Paul, as his manner was, taught in the synagogue (Acts 17:2); whereas, Paul never made the first day of the week, habitually, one of public teaching, a thing which he would have been sure to do had he looked upon it as sacred to the Lord. (9.) Being mentioned fifty-six times in the New Testament, it is in all these instances called the Sabbath; whereas, the first day is mentioned eight times in the New Testament, and in every case it is called, simply, the first day of the week. (10.) In the year of our Lord 95, it is spoken of by John as the Lord's day (Rev. 1:10); whereas, the first is in no case mentioned in the use of a sacred title. (11.) It is mentioned not only as the Sabbath; but it is also spoken of as the next Sabbath, and every Sabbath, thus proving that it had no rival (Acts 13:4; 15:21); whereas, the day before the first, and the sixth day after it, being spoken of as the Sabbath, it is classed with the other days of the week. (12.) In the Acts of the Apostles, and, in fine, in the whole canon of the New Testament, there is not a single transaction which is related as having occurred upon the seventh day in the least in-

compatible with the notion that it continued to be regarded as holy time, while the law which enforces its observance is inculcated in the clearest and most emphatic terms (Matt. 5:17-19; Rom. 3:31; Jas. 2:8-12); whereas, the first day was one on which Christ indulged in travel on the highway in company with others, after his resurrection, without informing them of its character, or rebuking them for sin. It is also a day on which two of the disciples walked the distance of fifteen miles on one occasion, while on another, Paul performed the journey of nineteen and one-half miles on foot, while Luke and seven companions worked the vessel around the headland for a much greater distance (Luke 24:13, 29; Acts 20:1-13).

In view of the above, the whole question of obligation may be summed up in the following words: Shall we keep a day which God has commanded, which Christ inculcated, and which holy men regarded from the opening until the close of the canon of Scripture? or shall we disregard that, putting in its place one which neither God, nor Christ, nor a holy angel, nor an inspired man, ever, anywhere, under any circumstances, enjoined, and which, in addition, God and Christ, and holy men and women, are everywhere in the sacred word brought to view as treating in a manner such as they would only treat a day of secular character? In fine, it is simply the same old test applied once more to human action, which has in all ages been the measure of moral character, *i. e.*, Shall we obey God? or shall we not? Shall we gratify our own inclination and have our own way by pertinaciously persisting in a course of action for which we have no Scripture warrant? or shall we take the Bible in one hand and, accepting its doctrines as the words of life, follow them to their legitimate consequences in our daily walk? Says John, "This is the love of God, that ye keep his commandments." Says James, "Show me your faith without works, and I will show you my faith by my works." Sublime sentiments, indeed! In them is expressed the moving, controlling principle, of every Christian heart. Oh! that all men in the ages of the past had held to the noble purpose of taking God at his word, believing that he meant just what he said, and walking out with a noble courage upon their confidence in his wisdom to legislate, and his right to command. Had they done so; had they been willing to be taught instead of going uninstructed; had they submitted to be lead instead of insisting upon independent action, how much misery would have been spared our kind! Take, for example, the case of Eve—God exempted one tree in the garden from the rest, saying, "Thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Unhappily, the mother of all living ventured to deviate from the command of God in what appeared to her an unimportant particular, and, as the result, a race was plunged into the terrible consequences of rebellion. It would seem as if this should have been enough to teach all, that it is only safe to do just what God requires in small, as well as great, things. Alas! however, this has not been the case. Nadab and Abihu, with the example of Eve before them, contrary to the directions of the Lord, ventured to substitute natural fire for the hallowed fire of the altar. To them, there was no apparent difference; but in a moment the curse of God fell upon them and they were borne lifeless, and without the honors of an ordinary funeral service, away from the camp of Israel. Uziah, despising the commandment of the Lord, by which the Levites alone were to touch the ark, in an unguarded moment reached out his hand to steady it, and God made a breach upon him in the presence of the people. Uziah fell lifeless before the ark which contained the same law which is under consideration. It was not the ark that sanctified the law; but, rather, the law that sanctified the ark. If, therefore, God was so jealous of that which was merely the vehicle of the ten words spoken by his voice and written by his finger, how must he feel in regard to those words themselves? In them is found the embodiment of the whole duty of man. With them, God now tests, as he has always tested, the characters of men. "Know ye not," says Paul, "his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?"

True, it may be, that we can transgress that law at the present time without suffering the *visible* displeasure of God, as did those whom, in the past, he set forth as ex-

amples of his wrath. But let us not deceive ourselves on this account; God is no respecter of persons. Moral character is what he admires, exact obedience is what he demands. In his providence, at the present time, it is our fortune to live in an epoch when great light is shining upon the long dishonored and mutilated Sabbath commandment. A worldly church, having departed from the simplicity of gospel teaching and gospel method for the propagation of truth, has called to her aid the elements of force and the appliances of law. Closing their eyes to light, ample in itself for all the purposes of duty and doctrine, they have entered upon a crusade, determining to venture the experiment, so oft repeated, of enforcing, as doctrines, the commandments of men. The end of this matter God knows, and has pointed out in his word. With outward success they may meet; but it will be at the terrible cost of that vital godliness which is alone found where the arm of God is made the arm of our strength. For those who, in the past, have ignorantly broken the law of Jehovah, God has ample forgiveness; but for those who, in the face of God's providential dealings, and in diametrical opposition to the plain teachings of his word, to which their attention is being called, shall still persist, not only in disobedience, but, also, in acts of oppression against those who prefer the narrow and rugged path of Bible fidelity, there can be nothing in reserve but the terrible displeasure of him whose right it is to command.

Reader, whoever you may be, and whatever may have been your past convictions and life, we turn to you in final appeal. As you revere God, as you love Christ and his precious word, we exhort you in this matter to seek wisdom from the only true source. Be not discouraged by the disparity in numbers, neither tremble before the hosts which may frown upon you in the coming contest. "The Lord he is God." Under the shadow of his wing we can safely abide. No nobler destiny was ever vouchsafed to the obedient among the children of men, than is prepared for those who shall prove their fealty to the God of Heaven by a noble testimony to their love for him, by the keeping of his holy Sabbath, under circumstances, in the near future, which shall indeed try the souls of men.

May God grant that both reader and writer, nay, more, also our opponent in this discussion—toward whom we entertain none but the kindest feelings—also, all, everywhere, who are indeed the children of the living God and the brethren of our blessed Lord, may come to see eye to eye in this matter, so that, finally, we shall be brought safely through the perils of this last great conflict, which the true church is to endure, and stand victorious over all our enemies upon the Mount Zion of our God, there to sing the song of a deliverance complete and eternal, in a world where, from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, all flesh shall come to worship before the Lord. (Isa. 66:23.)

W. H. LITTLEJOHN.

Allegan, Mich.

DISCUSSION ON THE SABBATH QUESTION

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

FOURTH PROPOSITION.

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

ELDER VOGEL affirms; ELDER WAGGONER denies.

ELDER VOGEL'S SECOND AFFIRMATIVE.

I wish to confine myself strictly to this proposition, and hence will say as little as possible concerning matters belonging to the past. Whether Elder W.'s brethren have discussed points "broached by us" the reader can decide for himself by sending for the REVIEW of the dates given. And as to the position formerly occupied by at least some of Elder W.'s brethren, I simply mean what I said, namely, that they have argued that the first covenant was not abolished. I am quite willing to believe on his mere word that he never so held. Nor have I charged him with this.

I most emphatically deny Bro. W.'s positions marked I., II., III., contending as to the first that the observance of the first day is "written on the heart in the new covenant" in the same sense that the Sabbath would have been had it been extended to this dispensation.

My brother speaks lightly concerning "inference," yet he must be aware that circumstantial evidence, which is nothing but inference, has hung many a man. Are we, in religious affairs, to lay aside all the laws of evidence save such as he may dictate? Did ever a pope ask more?

Whenever as good proof can be given for sprinkling or infant baptism as I give for the Lordic day, I shall preach it with all my might. Bro. Campbell is misconstrued whenever he is represented as inveighing against legitimate inference, or, in his own words, things "logically inferred."

I grant that faith comes by the word of God; but is legitimate inference no part of his word? Should

I so speak as to imply that my brother is a liar and a thief, would he not consider it slander? Or is it only in religious affairs that we are to be denied our common sense? No, no; even inferences reached with such difficulty that the babe in Christ is not able to draw them, are "faith" to him having made the deduction, and therefore "the word of God." Only in such cases, Paul says, "Hast thou faith? Have it to thyself before God." Rom. 14:22. For "strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age; even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil." Heb. 5:14.

But, with reference to the binding force of a sacred day in this dispensation, I have something clearer than inference. Of Rev. 1:10, even Bro. W. says, in his first affirmative on the third proposition: "(1.) I claim that this text *proves* that one day is 'the Lord's day' in this dispensation; that his claim and right to that certain day is as clearly established as was his right to a day established by Ex. 20:10, or by Isa. 58:13. And I insist that this text is *decisive* on this point. (2.) But I do not claim that this text furnishes any proof as to what day of the week is 'the Lord's day.' In this respect, it defines nothing. That must be settled by other scriptures."

Having left so "decisive" a text, it was not necessary that the apostles should record "the act of instituting," and give the "record of appointment;" these are necessarily implied, and known to have a real existence, for without them such a text would have been an impossibility. Henceforth let there be no more call for a "formal proclamation."

And that this day is a new institution is as clearly asserted by *Kuriakos*, *Lordic*, as the action in baptism is by *baptizoo*. "And I insist that this text is decisive on this point." Having read my Bible rather than human treatises, I was unaware that any one had ever, in modern times, written "a Lordic day." This may be more euphonic, but "Lordic" is truer to the facts in the case.

With respect to the time of observing the Lordic supper there is no conflict between Acts 20:7, and the time of its institution; for at that time the disciples did not "commune," but merely ate bread and drank wine. The death of Jesus had not yet transpired, nor did they believe that it would, and hence there neither was nor could be a "commemoration" or a "communion." Nor has the time of instituting anything to do with the time of observing an institution, else all the commemorative institutions of the O. T. (see Lev. 23) would have fallen on different days than they did, and nearly all on the same day!

My argument from Isa. 56, I leave with the reader, as I consider it untouched. I gave my reasons for the use made of that passage, and would have cited many similar prophecies, did I not aim at brevity. Ps. 69 is not a prediction, but a simple record of David's experience. It applies no more to Jesus than to any one else of the present day who happens to be "hated without a cause," &c., &c., and so has a history tangent to David's in certain points. I turn now to the

CONTINUATION OF THE AFFIRMATIVE.

My first affirmative closed with the citation of lexical authority, proving that *kuriakos*, as an adjective, describes things having originated with, or "of," the Lord referred to. And so indelible is this meaning that even the few instances where it is turned to secular uses, still reflect its native sense. Thus Cremer, in his N. T. Lexicon, gives, as its *extra* N. T. use, "that which belongs to the ruler—*herrscher*—as, *e. g.*, to *kuriakon*, state or fiscal property—synonymous with *basilicon*—but seldom so occurring."

Shall we inquire of the commentators? The answer is the same. In his comments on Rev. 1:10, Barnes says of *kuriakos*, "It properly means *pertaining to the Lord*; and, so far as the word is concerned, it might mean a day pertaining to the Lord in any sense, or for any reason—either because he claimed it as his own, and had set it apart for his service; or because it was designed to commemorate some important event pertaining to him; or because it was observed in honor of him."

If we turn to the English adjective formed after the analogy of *kuriakos*, namely, *Lordic*, the result is the same.

Let us now inquire as to *who* is meant by Lord, in Rev. 1:10; whether the Christ or the Father. Barnes says, "This was a day particularly devoted to the Lord Jesus, for (a) that is the *natural* meaning of the word, *Lord*, as used in the New Testament, and (b), if the Jewish Sabbath were intended to be designated, the word *Sabbath* would have been used." Hackett, in his Com. on Acts 1:24, says, "*Kuriakos*, when taken absolutely in the N. T., refers generally to Christ." The point aimed at by both of these writers is about the same as my former statement that, "under this dispensation, the term, *Lord*, refers exclusively to Christ." Mark well, however, that I do not say that this is the case in the entire N. T. Scriptures. Jesus was not yet "made Lord" (Acts 2:36) during the period covered by the four gospels; hence such passages as Matt. 11:25, come not within the bounds of my statement; nor do most of such passages as are quotations from the O. T. Acts 4:26, for example, is a quotation of Ps. 11:2, and refers to God, while Heb. 1:10, though a quotation, refers to the Christ. Lord (Jehovah, the self-existent One, refers in these quotations to the nature, or to one of the attributes, of God and of the Word. But in the official sense we have now but "one Lord" (Eph. 4:5), namely, Jesus, who was "made Lord" at the beginning of, and for, this dispensation (Acts 2:36), and is, hence, "Lord of all" (Acts 1:36), and "Lord over all" (Rom. 10:12), being "the head over all things to the church" (Eph. 1:22); for "all authority is given into his hands" (Matt. 28:18). In 1 Cor. 8:6, this matter is most explicitly stated. "Lord" and "Jesus Christ" are here two distinct appellatives, and in apposition, as "God" and "the Father" are appositives. To this, not only the context disposes us, but also the answering of one member of the sentence to the other, requires it. The heathens, says Paul, have "gods many" and "lords many," but to us, there is only "One God—the Father—of whom, &c., One Lord—Jesus Christ—by whom, &c."

It is not a decision between two or more rival "Lord Jesus Christs," as any other construction would make it, but between several alleged "Lords," in which "Jesus Christ," as an appositive, is definitive of the "one only Lord," in whose favor the decision falls, as "the Father" is definitive of the "one only God."

It is only official "authority" and "lordship" which, in the case before us, is, or can be, conceived to be, "given" or "made." Hence, it is in an official sense, respecting this dispensation, that Jesus has "all authority," and is "Lord of all" and "over all." Under this official jurisdiction, come, of course, all the institutions now binding on us. Hence, "Lord's day," "Lord's supper," "Lord's table," and such like, can only refer to Jesus as the Lord.

If anything were yet wanting to complete the proof, even the word *kuriakos* would cry out. So distinctly and decisively is its voice heard in 1 Cor. 11:20—the *kuriakon* (Lordic) supper—that no one, in even his wildest fancy, can fail to hear Jesus named. And if *kuriakos* came first and purposely into being to hail him as Lord, then, when it speaks again, and by inspiration finally—"the *Kuriakos* [Lordic] day"—what puny mortal shall dare to misunderstand it? Reader, did you note how the lexicons quoted have interpreted this voice? The facts before us declare them wise in this.

IV. The day which is to be sacredly kept in this dispensation, "the Lord's day," recurs weekly, and upon the first day of the week.

Having seen that one day in this dispensation is the Lord's, and that this day is a new institution, we can easily determine which day it is, by observing what day the first Christians gave to him, for, under apostolic oversight and instruction, they certainly acted right in this matter. And this practice, on their part, answers to us every purpose of a direct command, since it is the fruit of one. Let us, then, inquire into what day they were in the habit of devoting to religious purposes. However, one source of error is here to be carefully guarded against. If even instances could be found of their meeting on the seventh day of the week for their own religious purposes, this, *of itself*, would not determine it to be the day sought, unless there be no other day on which they met, since they might do this from the same motive, and for the same reason, that led them to observe other Jewish days and feasts. Should even precedents determine in favor of the seventh day, it would, nevertheless, not be on account of the same reasons for which God's ancient people met on this day, for the day now binding is a *new* institution. But if the first Christians gave a day to the Lord which was not devoted to religious purposes, under the former dispensation, then this will determine it to be the sacred day, since there is but one such day, as the phrase, "the Lord's day," unmistakably declares. And here a single hint speaks volumes. For even the faintest shadow of a reason might induce a people to honor a day revered by their fathers for ages, in the worship of the true God; but to devote a new day, never before so honored, this has a potent meaning in it. Was there, then, such a day so given? This I answer in the affirmative, and proceed to the proof.

1. "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." 1 Cor. 16:1, 2. So writes Paul to the Corinthians. Or, as McKnight renders the second verse, "On the first day of every week let each of you lay somewhat by itself, according as he may have been prospered, putting it into the treasury, that when I come there may be no collections." So, in substance, also, that recent and most critical translator, J. B. Rotherham.

a. Whether we should render "by him," or "by itself," cannot be dogmatically decided, since the Greek, *par' heautou*, is indefinite and may express either equally well. Those who render "by him," decide in favor of the use to which these words are more frequently put; while those who translate "by itself," are governed by the context, "that there be no gatherings when I come." If we adopt McKnight's version, it is plain that there was a meeting on every first day, when the money was put into a common treasury, "that there be no gatherings" when Paul might come. If we render "by him," *i. e.*, "at home," then it is clear that Paul expected that, as a rule, Christians would be "at home," on that day, *i. e.*, not absent on business. In either view, it marks the day as not their own.

b. Giving, when properly done, is a religious work, an act of worship, in the broader sense of the term. Hence, this contribution is elsewhere called a "grace" (2 Cor. 8:1, 6, 7). And this religious act—an act in every way fitted for such a day, and all the more impressive when done on such a day—was directed to be performed on the first day of the week.

c. Nor was the first day thus observed in Corinth only, but the command extended to all the churches of Galatia (1 Cor. 16:1), and perhaps also to "all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ: our Lord (1 Cor. 1:1), for to all such was this epistle addressed. Why name the first day of the week in all Galatia as well as in Achaia?

d. Nor was it simply "once thus done, but, as McKnight well expresses the force of the original, "On the first day of every week." For, he adds, "as *kata polin* signifies every city; and *kata meena*, every month; and, Acts 14:23, *kat' ekklesian*, in every church; so *kata mian sabbaton* signifies the first day of every week." So, also, says Winer, N. T. Gram., p. 401, this passage should be construed. We find, then, Sunday after Sunday, in regular succession, and by a large number of churches, both in Europe and Asia, devoted to this "grace!"—"Continuous action."

2. From Acts 20:7, it appears that another act of worship—partaking of the Lordic supper—was performed on the first day. "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow." Instead of "when the disciples came together to break bread," the better texts and versions read, "we gathered together to break bread." This "we," who gathered, includes Paul's companions, together with the disciples of Troas, the "them" to whom he preached.

Let us not be too eager to finish our lesson here; we may be amply repaid for our leisure. There are three different ways of reckoning the day recognized in the Scriptures; viz., From evening to evening, from morning to morning, and from midnight to midnight.

a. The first-named, from evening to evening, originated with the Jewish Sabbaths, and was peculiar to their sacred days. "From even unto even shall ye celebrate your Sabbaths" (Lev. 23:32), would not have been a necessary law, if the Jews had been in the habit of so beginning their days. And this law passed away with the Sabbaths.

b. The other style, from morning to morning, is as old as creation, and belonged to the so-called "civil" reckoning of the Jews. I can here, perhaps, do no better than to quote from Conant's Genesis. He translates the 5th verse of chap. 1 thus: "And God called the light day; and the darkness he called night. And there was evening, and there was morning, one day." On this, he comments as follows: "And there was evening; namely, the close of a period of light by the coming on of darkness; and there was morning, the close of a period of darkness by the return of light; the two periods making a day. This is the true idea of morning. By evening is meant, in He-

(Continued on page 7.)

The Review and Herald.

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

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, JUNE 17, 1873.

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

Testimony of the Fathers.

TESTIMONY OF THE CHURCH AT SMYRNA.

THE epistle of Polycarp makes no reference to the Sabbath nor to the first day of the week. But "the encyclical epistle of the church at Smyrna concerning the martyrdom of the holy Polycarp," informs us that "the blessed Polycarp suffered martyrdom" "on the great Sabbath at the eighth hour." Chapter xxi. The margin says: "The great Sabbath is that before the pass-over." This day, thus mentioned, is not Sunday, but is the ancient Sabbath of the Lord.

TESTIMONY OF THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS.

This was written by an unknown author, and Diognetus himself is known only by name, no facts concerning him having come down to us. It dates from the first part of the second century. The writer speaks of "the superstition as respects the Sabbaths," which the Jews manifested, and he adds these words: "To speak falsely of God, as if he forbade us to do what is good on the Sabbath days—how is not this impious?" But there is nothing in this to which a commandment-keeper would object, or which he might not freely utter.

The "Recognitions of Clement" is a kind of philosophical and theological romance. It purports to have been written by Clement of Rome, in the time of the apostle Peter, but was actually written "somewhere in the first half of the third century."

TESTIMONY OF THE RECOGNITIONS OF CLEMENT.

In book i., chapter xxxv., he speaks of the giving of the law thus:—

"Meantime they came to Mount Sinai and thence the law was given to them with voices and sights from heaven, written in ten precepts, of which the first and greatest was that they should worship God himself alone," etc. In book iii., chapter lv., he speaks of these precepts as tests: "On account of those, therefore, who by neglect of their own salvation please the evil one, and those who by study of their own profit seek to please the good one, ten things have been prescribed as a test to this present age, according to the number of the ten plagues which were brought upon Egypt." In book ix., chapter xxviii., he says of the Hebrews, "that no child born among them is ever exposed, and that on every seventh day they all rest," etc. In book x., chap. lxxii., is given the conversion of one Faustinianus by St. Peter. And it is said, "He proclaimed a fast to all the people, and on the next Lord's day he baptized him."

This is all that I find in this work relating to the Sabbath and the so-called Lord's day. The writer held the ten commandments to be tests of character in the present dispensation. There is no reason to believe that he, or any other person in that age, held the Sunday festival as something to be observed in obedience to the fourth commandment.

TESTIMONY OF THE SYRIAC DOCUMENTS CONCERNING EDESSA.

On pages 35-55 of this work is given what purports to be "The Teaching of the Apostles."

On page 36, the ascension of the Lord is said to have been upon the "first day of the week, and the end of the Pentecost." Two manifest falsehoods are here uttered; for the ascension was upon Thursday, and the Pentecost came ten days after the ascension. It is also said that the disciples came from Nazareth of Galilee to the mount of Olives on that selfsame day before the ascension, and yet that the ascension was "at the time of the early dawn." But Nazareth was distant from the mount of Olives at least sixty miles!

On page 38, a commandment from the apostles is given: "On the first [day] of the week, let there be service, and the reading of the holy Scriptures, and the oblation," because Christ arose on that day, was born on that day, ascended on that day, and will come again on that day." But here is one truth, one falsehood, and two mere assertions. The apostles are represented, on page 39, as commanding a fast of forty days, and they add: "Then celebrate the day of the passion [Friday], and the day of the resurrection," Sunday. But this would be only an annual celebration of these days.

And on pages 38 and 39, they are also repre-

sented as commanding service to be held on the fourth and sixth days of the week. The Sabbath is not mentioned in these "Documents," which were written about the commencement of the fourth century, when, in many parts of the world, that day had ceased to be hallowed.

TESTIMONY OF JUSTIN MARTYR.

Justin's "Apology" was written at Rome about the year 140 A. D. His "Dialogue with Trypho the Jew" was written some years later. In searching his works, we shall see how much greater progress apostasy had made at Rome than in the countries where those lived whose writings we have been examining. And yet nearly all these writings were composed at least a century later than those of Justin, though we have quoted them before quoting his, because of their asserted apostolic origin, or of their asserted origin within a few years of the times of the apostles.

It does not appear that Justin, and those at Rome who held with him in doctrine, paid the slightest regard to the ancient Sabbath. He speaks of it as abolished, and treats it with contempt. Unlike some whose writings have been examined, he denies that it originated at creation, and asserts that it was made in the days of Moses. He also differs with some already quoted in that he denies the perpetuity of the law of ten commandments. In his estimation, the Sabbath was a Jewish institution, absolutely unknown to good men before the time of Moses, and of no authority whatever since the death of Christ. The idea of the change of the Sabbath from the seventh day of the week to the first, is not only never found in his writings, but is absolutely irreconcilable with such statements as the foregoing, which abound therein. And yet Justin Martyr is prominently and constantly cited in behalf of the so-called Christian Sabbath.

The Roman people observed a festival on the first day of the week in honor of the sun. And so Justin, in his Apology, addressed to the emperor of Rome, tells that monarch that the Christians met on "the day of the sun," for worship. He gives the day no sacred title, and does not even intimate that it was a day of abstinence from labor, only as they spent a portion of it in worship. Here are the words of his Apology on the Sunday festival:—

"And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read; as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying, Amen; and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well to do, and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succurs the orphans and widows, and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us, and, in a word, takes care of all who are in need. But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead. For he was crucified on the day before that of Saturn (Saturday); and on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the sun, having appeared to his apostles and disciples, he taught them these things, which we have submitted to you also for your consideration." Chap. lxvii.

Not one word of this indicates that Justin considered the Sunday festival as a continuation of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. On the contrary, he shows clearly that no such idea was cherished by him. For whereas the fourth commandment enjoins the observance of the seventh day because *God rested on that day* from the work of creation, Justin urges in behalf of the Sunday festival that it is *the day on which he began his work*. The honor paid to that festival was not therefore in Justin's estimation in any sense an act of obedience to the fourth commandment. He mentions as his other reason for the celebration by Christians of "the day of the sun," that the Saviour arose that day. But he claims no divine or apostolic precept for this celebration; the things which he says Christ taught his apostles, being the doctrines which he had embodied in this Apology for the information of the emperor. And it is worthy of notice that though

first-day writers assert that "Lord's day" was the familiar title of the first day of the week in the time of the Apocalypse, yet Justin, who is the first person after the sacred writers that mentions the first day, and this at a distance of only 44 years from the date of John's vision upon Patmos, does not call it by that title, but by the name which it bore as a heathen festival! If it be said that the term was omitted because he was addressing a heathen emperor, there still remains the fact that he mentions the day quite a number of times in his "Dialogue with Trypho," and yet never calls it "Lord's day," nor indeed does he call it by any name implying sacredness.

Now we present the statements concerning the Sabbath and first-day found in his "Dialogue with Trypho the Jew." The impropriety, not to say dishonesty, of quoting Justin in behalf of the modern doctrine of the change of the Sabbath, will be obvious to all. He was a most decided no-law, no-Sabbath writer, who used the day commonly honored as a festival by the Romans as the most suitable, or most convenient, day for public worship, a position identical with that of modern no-Sabbath men. Justin may be called a law man in this sense, however, that while he abolishes the ten commandments, he calls the gospel, "the new law." He is therefore really one who believes in the gospel and denies the law. But let us hear his own words. Trypho, having in chapter eight advised Justin to observe the Sabbath, and "do all things which have been written in the law," in chapter ten says to him, "You observe no festivals or Sabbaths."

This was exactly adapted to bring out from Justin the answer that though he did not observe the seventh day as a Sabbath, he did thus rest on the first day, if it were true that that day was with him a day of abstinence from labor. And now observe Justin's answer given in chapter twelve:—

"The new law requires you to keep perpetual Sabbath, and you, because you are idle for one day, suppose you are pious, not discerning why this has been commanded you; and if you eat unleavened bread, you say the will of God has been fulfilled. The Lord our God does not take pleasure in such observances: if there is any perjured person or a thief among you, let him cease to be so; if any adulterer, let him repent; then he has kept the sweet and true Sabbaths of God."

This language plainly implies that Justin held all days to be alike, and did not observe any one day as a day of abstinence from labor. But in chapter eighteen, Justin asserts that the Sabbaths—and he doubtless includes the weekly with the annual—were enjoined upon the Jews for their wickedness:—

"For we too would observe the fleshly circumcision, and the Sabbaths, and in short, all the feasts, if we did not know for what reason they were enjoined you,—namely, on account of your transgressions and the hardness of your hearts. For if we patiently endure all things contrived against us by wicked men and demons, so that even amid cruelties unutterable, death and torments, we pray for mercy to those who inflict such things upon us, and do not wish to give the least retort to any one, even as the new Law-giver commanded us: how is it, Trypho, that we would not observe those rights which do not harm us—I speak of fleshly circumcision, and Sabbaths, and feasts?"

Not only does he declare that the Jews were commanded to keep the Sabbath because of their wickedness, but in chapter nineteen he denies that any Sabbath existed before Moses. Thus, after naming Adam, Abel, Enoch, Lot, and Melchizedek, he says:—

"Moreover, all those righteous men already mentioned, though they kept no Sabbaths, were pleasing to God."

But though he thus denies the Sabbatic institution before the time of Moses, he presently makes this statement concerning the Jews:—

"And you were commanded to keep Sabbaths, that you might retain the memorial of God. For his word makes this announcement, saying, 'That ye may know that I am God who redeemed you.' [Eze. 20:12.]

The Sabbath is indeed the memorial of the God that made the heavens and the earth. And what an absurdity to deny that that memorial was set up when the creative work was done, and to affirm that twenty-five hundred years intervened between the work and the memorial!

J. N. A.

(To be Continued.)

BLESSED is he who employs all his time profitably, is silent on subjects that do not concern him, and passes through this tumultuous world like one that is dumb and heareth not, for the Lord's sake.

The Importance of our Cause Being Properly Represented.

THE real success of every religious cause will be shown finally by the number of those who are saved by it, in the kingdom of God. The number of those who are thus saved will depend upon the way the people are affected in this world by those who have any such cause committed to them to advocate. The prosperity of the cause we love will depend upon the impressions made upon the public mind by those who represent it, just as much as any other. The salvation of certain men, and the damnation of certain others, is not fixed by some immutable decree, established from eternity. If it were so, what we might do or say in regard to ourselves or others would not change the result one whit. That decree of an omnipotent God would be brought about with a certainty, in spite of our puny efforts. But God has placed man's salvation upon the voluntary acceptance of a plan devised by himself, involving repentance for past sin, faith in Jesus Christ, and a life of cheerful obedience to his righteous laws, and the development of a character consistent with the principles of the government of Heaven. The plan thus devised is fixed by the decree of an omnipotent God. There is salvation in no other. Sure results are certain to follow from its faithful acceptance. We shall be conformed to the image of Jesus Christ, and he will be the elder among many brethren.

It will be readily seen, if these positions be admitted, that men's salvation will be affected by their own course of action and by the influence of others in bringing about that action. Nothing is surer in this world, than that we mutually affect each other by word, act, and demeanor. It is this fact which makes it certain that the blood of souls may and will be found in others' garments, for the reason that such have not used their influence to bring about good results, because they have not been careful to have their influence always tell on the right side.

We claim to have a truth which is to test the world, and, unless we are wholly deceived and deluded, it must come in some way before all the enlightened people of our earth, either by the personal example of our people in the communities where they live, the circulation of written documents, or by the news of its progress among the peoples, or more directly, by those specially engaged in its dissemination as public speakers. The means last spoken of must ever be a principal one for the propagation and dissemination of religious views among those unacquainted with them. The living speaker can more readily affect ordinary minds, those which compose the rank and file of every cause, than any other means that can be adopted. It must, therefore, be very important that such represent the cause correctly.

We know very well that unbelievers in any doctrine judge of its character by what they observe in its supporters. It cannot be otherwise than that every community will judge of our doctrine by what they see in those who profess it. And why should they not? When people claim to have religious views preferable to others, what do such views amount to, unless they make those who understand them better people than they were before they held them, or better than those around them who do not profess them? If their acceptance really benefits no one, what are they good for, any way? The practical test is the best of any. For example, if a believer in our doctrines, living in a community, is inclined to overreach in his deal, or is slack in paying his debts, careless of fulfilling his engagements, stingy, and little-souled, instead of being generous or accommodating; or boastful and contentious and abusive, is not the cause he represents sure to receive the discredit of it? A great deal that is called persecution by our people many times arises from the fact that their lives are unlovable, selfish, narrow and bigoted. Their religious views, instead of making them kind, tender of others' feelings, and meek and humble, and ready to listen patiently to others' objections, as they would if they would put them in practice, seem to have the effect to puff them up with spiritual pride, and give them an idea of their own superiority. The views they hold do not teach them to do this, but there were unpleasant characteristics existing in their hearts before, and the acceptance of these views are but the occasion for their expression. The practical carrying out of these views would broaden out their characters, and make them meek and charitable, and yet courageous and firm for right and truth. How powerful might be our influence, as a people, could all Sabbath-keepers, in the different communities where they live, be living illustrations of the religion of Jesus Christ, careful of others' feelings, ready to do good, honest, benevolent, charitable toward those differing from them, yet firm and true where principle is concerned, showing by daily walk and conversation that the principles of God's law and Christ's Spirit, were the guiding-star of their conduct. How many exceptions are seen, where contention, narrowness, and tattling, are manifest! Right principles must be held before our people, and practical religion urged upon their attention in plain and forcible terms, till these things are rightly understood by all, and practiced by all.

And here comes in the importance of the ministry. If the importance of our people setting

a right example be so great, how much more that of the ministry who go before the world as the special representatives of these doctrines. The people have a right to expect them to be living illustrations of the things they teach, for that is what they profess to be. And, to judge of the doctrines they teach by the men who teach them, are they not the accredited agents of the system of doctrines they teach? Does not each State Conference select them and send them forth provided with documents showing them to be duly authorized to represent the body of our people? Would they thus be sent forth, unless such bodies considered them proper representatives? There cannot be the slightest question but that people who know but little of us have a right to judge of the character of our people, and of the nature of our work, by the duly accredited agents sent forth to represent it. I bring this subject up in this manner that our people, and especially our Conferences, may realize the importance of selecting right men when they send individuals out to represent them.

It has evidently been felt by some that a person receiving a license to preach among us had only to go out and spend his time laboring as it should seem proper to him, and he was entitled to draw his pay from the Conference whether such labor was a real benefit or not; and some have felt aggrieved if their claims were questioned. Now I am satisfied that the cause could far better afford to pay some for staying at home and being perfectly quiet there, than to pay them for representing us before a scrutinizing public.

It is not merely ability to stand up in the desk and go through the set arguments of our theory that we want. Many a person could do that who would be a curse to the cause. A great many seem to think this is about all that is required. Many a boaster, full of self-conceit, unrefined in life and expression, and calculated to entirely misrepresent the real spirit of this work, could do that. But when they got through, what would be the result? They might have brought in quite a number who were like them, who would carry on the work of improperly representing us still further, till their lives would so disgrace us that at last we could bear with them no longer, and we should be compelled to cut them off. But the cautious, the refined, those who had a real position in their several communities and a reputation to lose, those who had some just idea of the real spirit of Christianity, would have gone home in disgust. And from that time on, it would be a moral impossibility to reach the very class we shall have to build up our cause with, if it is ever built up at all. Such as these are the real strength of any cause. We are in crying need of good, sensible laborers; men with discerning minds, and enough modesty to keep from bragging in the pulpit, or challenging the world to come and combat with them. But we cannot afford to send out the other class for nothing; much less to pay for such labor. We want men of piety, who fear God and who love humanity, whose souls are drawn out for the perishing; who are little in their own eyes, but mighty in God, with courage to go out into the strife for Christ's sake, and to pluck souls as brands from the burning. Men who know something about good manners as well as the reasons of our faith, who will be preachers in private as well as public, and upon whose souls the burden of the cause rests. Oh! how we need such men everywhere; we have room for one hundred where we have one.

At our Conferences, there should be committees of our most discerning and judicious men, to consider applications for licenses and credentials, who will act for the good of the cause regardless of personal feelings. In their action, they should be exceedingly careful not to stand in the way of those who could help the cause, but should encourage such, while they should not grant licenses or credentials until they have some evidence that the applicant would be of real benefit to the cause. In case of those with whom we are unacquainted, and who know but little of our doctrines or the spirit of our work, we had better wait till we can act understandingly. A person who goes forth duly accredited with a license to represent us may, in presenting our views, leave impressions which will ever keep those receiving them from having favorable views of us; and they themselves are not prepared to go, even if they have good ability, until well acquainted with the nature and spirit of the work. We are in crying need of laborers, but we want the right kind. May God send us such plentifully the present season. Then will the work prosper and our strength greatly increase.

GEO. I. BUTLER.

Ma. Pleasant, Iowa, June 4, 1873.

Men, and Things.

THE LIQUOR TRADE.

It is well to keep the magnitude of this terrible evil before us. Every one who uses a drop of this worse than poison, should consider that he is doing so much to help on this work of misery and death.

"The sales of liquors in the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1871, it has been calculated by Edward Young, the chief of the Bureau of Statistics, amounted to

six hundred millions of dollars. This total is made up as follows: Sixty million gallons of whisky, at six dollars a gallon retail, \$360,000,000. Two and a half million gallons of imported spirits at ten dollars a gallon, \$25,000,000. Ten million seven hundred thousand gallons of imported wine at five dollars a gallon, \$53,500,000. Sixty-five million barrels of ale, beer, and porter, at twenty dollars a barrel, \$130,000,000. Native brandies, wines, and cordials, in unknown quantities, it is estimated, have been consumed, involving an expenditure of \$31,500,000. These figures, although not so large as some that have been published, yet give a total that should astonish the consumers of ardent spirits. This sum of six hundred millions of dollars a year would, in less than four years, pay off the National debt, or if invested in works of internal improvement, would complete all the unfinished and projected works in the United States."

D. M. CANRIGHT.

The Present Truth.

(Concluded.)

4. *The Scriptures teach that when Jesus appears, there will be two classes upon the earth.* One class, the saints brought out by this proclamation, who will not be in darkness with regard to that event, and who will be looking and waiting for him; the other class, the wicked and unbelieving, who do not believe the signs nor regard the warning, and are scoffing at these things, upon whom that day will come as a thief in the night. These facts are clearly stated by Paul, in 1 Thess. 5:1-6: "But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night."

"Yes," replies one, "that is just what I believe. That day will come as a thief in the night. This shows that the Adventists are mistaken, thinking that they can know something about it." Not too fast, my friend. The next verse shows that all who are overtaken as of a thief by his coming will be destroyed. "For when they say, Peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child; and they shall not escape. Verse 3. This verse gives us the class who will thus be surprised by that event, viz., those who are crying, Peace and safety. But the next verse brings to view the other class—the saints. "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief." Verse 4.

Nothing could be plainer than this statement. One class will be overtaken as of a thief; the other class will not. Those who are thus surprised by his coming are found crying, Peace and safety; but what are the other class doing? This class are found in the light and watching. Watching what? Not simply their hearts, but watching the signs of the times. Here are one class, preaching that the world is growing better and will so continue to do until the whole world shall be converted. They have no idea that the Lord is coming, they see no signs of it. They do not believe he is. Now, suppose that the Lord should come to-day; would it not come upon them as a thief in the night? It most certainly would, for they do not even dream that such an event is at hand. Hence they would certainly be destroyed, for this is the very class spoken of. Christ says it shall come upon them as a snare. Luke 21:35. They have got their attention on something away in the future, and are utterly blind with regard to the great and terrible events of the end of all things. The first they will know of it they will find themselves overtaken by it, and utterly unprepared for it.

2 Pet. 3:3, 4, brings out additional facts touching these two classes in the last days. "Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." The time mentioned is the last days. What will come there? Scoffers. A scoffer is one who ridicules and makes sport of what somebody else is saying. But what is the subject that they are scoffing about? Their words show plainly what it is, viz., the coming of the Lord; for they sneeringly ask, "Where is the promise of his coming?" This shows that another class is preaching with regard to the promise of his coming. These scoffers proceed to argue the case. Why, say they, all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation. This language lets us into the subject of their scoffing. They are scoffing at those who are preaching it, opposing them in their work and trying to meet their arguments.

This shows, 1. That in the last days one class will be found opposing and making sport of the coming of Christ. 2. That another class will be doing exactly the opposite of that, viz., preaching it, and proving it. This again shows that there will be two opposite classes, the same as my proposition asserts. Daniel gives us some information on this. Speaking of the time of the end, the angel said to Daniel, "Go thy way, Daniel; for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end. Many shall be purified, and made white and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly, and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand." Dan.

12:9, 10. This is in harmony with the other texts showing that the wicked will not understand with regard to the end, but the wise will understand. The same fact is brought out in Matt. 24:44-51: "Therefore be ye also ready; for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh. Who then is a faithful and wise servant, whom his Lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his Lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Verily I say unto you, That he shall make him ruler over all his goods." Verses 44-47.

This is the position of the faithful and wise servant. When the Lord comes, he finds him giving the household meat in due season. We have already shown what that means, viz., to be teaching truths which are applicable at that time. Now, what would be present truth just before the Lord comes. Would it not be the signs of the times, the fulfillment of the prophecies, and a warning to the people of the approaching Judgment? Most certainly it would. The context shows that this is just what the wise servant is doing; for that is the very subject that is under consideration. This fact is further proved by what the evil servant says, whose work is exactly the opposite of that of the wise servant. Listen, therefore, to what the evil servant is saying. "But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My Lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to smite his fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken; the lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." Verses 48-51. By this we see that the evil servant is saying that his Lord delays his coming; that is, that the coming of Christ is not near at hand, as the other servant affirms. Now, while the evil servant is thus preaching against the coming of the Lord, and is feasting and making merry with the ungodly, the Lord suddenly comes upon him and he is destroyed. This text certainly confirms what I affirm in my proposition, viz., that there will be two classes when the Lord comes—one class faithfully teaching the people with regard to the signs of the times and the coming of the Lord; the other class opposing this work, and arguing that the Lord is not coming.

5. *This warning message will last through one generation—then the Lord will come.* God does not give his warnings to those who do not need them; hence, when a warning is given, it is always to that generation which will live to see the event of which they are warned. It was so in the days of Noah, and in other cases.

God does not give his warning to one generation and let them pass off from the stage of action, and then bring his judgments on another generation. But the very men who hear the warning will live to see the consummation of it. The signs will be given, then will come the proclamation based upon those signs. In Matt. 24, after giving the signs which should mark his second coming, Christ says, "Now learn a parable of the fig tree; when his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh." Verse 32. Yes; when we see the leaves putting forth we all know that summer is at hand. "So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors." Verse 33. When are we to learn this parable of the fig tree? Answer. When ye shall see all these things. This locates the time of which he is speaking, viz., when these signs have appeared. Luke gives it thus: "And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh." Chap. 21:28. When are they to look up and know their redemption is nigh? When these things begin to come to pass. Nothing could be plainer than that. See verse 31. "So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand." Now of what time is he speaking? It seems as though the blindest might see that it is the time when these signs shall appear. He says that when these signs do appear, then we may know that his coming is near, even at the door. The next verse tells how near. "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." Matt. 24:34.

What generation? Not the generation he was talking to, as some have foolishly argued; but the generation he was speaking of, viz., that generation which shall see these signs come to pass. Because he says "this" generation, it does not necessarily follow that he meant the generation then living. Ps. 95:10, furnishes a similar use of the phrase, *this generation*, "Forty years long was I grieved with this generation, and said, It is a people that do err in their heart, and they have not known my ways." The psalmist says, "This generation," and yet he was speaking of the generation which came out of Egypt five hundred years before. See Ps. 2:7: "I will declare the decree; the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." "This day have I begotten thee," says the psalmist. Was Christ begotten upon the day that the psalmist penned that? Certainly not. This language is quoted by Paul, and is applied to Christ's resurrection a thousand years afterward. Yet the psalmist says, "This day." How could he properly say, This

day? Because his mind was carried forward to the time that that event should occur, and, speaking of that time, says, "This day," that is, the time under consideration. So Christ, when he says, "This generation," means the generation of which he was speaking, the one that should see the signs.

Now we inquire for a moment, What has come to pass in our days? This thing has not been done in a corner. Everybody knows that for the last thirty-five years or more, there have been a class of people preaching that the Lord is coming in this generation. They have met with bitter opposition, with scoffing and ridicule, with persecution and slander, yet they have steadily gone forward and faithfully warned the world of the coming events. During the last thirty-five years, books and tracts upon these subjects have been scattered by the million, like the leaves of the forest, in every part of the world, till there is scarcely a school-district where they have not reached, nor a school-boy who has not heard the proclamation; and there are, to-day, scattered all through the land, not less than one hundred thousand souls who are expecting the immediate advent of Christ.

I appeal to the reader, whether this proclamation has not been extensive enough and long enough to fulfill the prophecies and condemn the world? Paul says that Noah, by his preaching, condemned the world. Heb. 11:7. But compare that a moment with this. He had no one to aid him in that work, but here are thousands engaged in this. He had no printing presses to publish his message; now, we have a score of them constantly aiding in this. He had not a tract; here, we have them by the thousands. He had not even a Bible; here, there is one in every house. He had no railroads or steamboats to facilitate his traveling; now, we can go to the ends of the world in a few days' time. If, then, one man, without a single colporteur, without a paper, without a tract, without a Bible, by his single voice alone, condemned the millions of that generation, even the whole world, how much more will the proclamation here given condemn this generation. Suppose for a moment that the Lord should come in this generation, would they not be without excuse? Could they say that they had not been warned? They might say that they did not believe that the warning which they heard was from God, and that would be all that they could say. The antediluvians might have said the same, and all others who have been warned, and rejected the warning.

Dear reader, we pray you to lay these things to heart and not pass them by lightly. It may be that God is in this work, after all. If you have not seen signs and evidences of the near coming of the Lord, is it because none such have appeared, or is it because you have not been watching for them? If not, give your attention to them. Do you know what are the signs of the last days? The Bible has given scores of them. Could you name a dozen? Might not many of them take place right before your eyes and you not know that they were signs of the last days, simply because you have not studied your Bible sufficiently on this point? May the Lord help you to wake up, before it is too late to embrace present truth.

Look at it from our stand point a moment. The Lord is coming; signs are everywhere appearing; the warning is sounding through the world; a people is being gathered out, waiting for his coming; the awful events of the Judgment and the plagues of the last days are about to burst upon us; the mass of the world are asleep; a worldly church and ministry are telling them of the golden age soon to come. If these things are so, what is your duty? Is it not to regard the signs, heed the warning, and join the little band who are trying to arouse the world concerning their impending doom? That this may be your decision is my humble prayer.

D. M. CANRIGHT.

Ezra the Scribe

WAS a remarkable man. He had a peculiar trait, which was truly singular. "For Ezra had prepared his heart to seek the law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments." Ez. 7:10. Few are the persons that seek the law of the Lord, in order that they may do and teach it. If men sought to know what God requires, they could find the way. But they seek to excuse themselves from doing what God commands by willing ignorance of his law, or by persuading themselves that it has been abolished. One pleads ignorance of its claims that he may be excused from doing it; another cannot plead ignorance, and therefore claims that it has been abolished, so that he need not do it; and some make both these pleas, so that if one fails to excuse them from doing the will of God, they can fall back on the other; if the law remains unabolished and unchanged, they still fail to understand its requirements. It would be better, like Ezra, to seek the law of the Lord with a heart willing to do it. "Seek, and ye shall find." The will of God is plainly revealed. The absence of a heart of willing obedience is the great cause of ignorance and error.

R. F. COTTRELL.

BEWARE lest earthly comforts prove spiritual temptations.

"AND HAVING DONE ALL, TO STAND."

Ephesians 6:13.

CAN you stand for God, though you stand alone,
With your heart at rest and your soul secure;
With your feet on the rock and your eye on the throne,
Can you stand and toil, and stand and endure?

Can you stand for God 'mid the storm's wild wail,
Can you stand when the tempests ride the air;
Can you stand when earthly hopes shall fail—
Can you stand for God and never despair?

Can you stand for God when your heart grows faint,
When your sad soul looks through the blinding
tears;

Can you stand without murmuring or complaint,
Through the tedious days and the toilsome years?

Can you stand for God while the witching smile,
And the siren song and the world's caress
Unite their charms with the serpent's guile—
Can you stand with only God to bless?

Can you stand in the faith, though the time be long,
Though the night be dark and the day-star dim;
Can you stand, and in his own strength be strong,
Till at last you are found in peace of him?

Can you stand?—Then stand in the strength of God,
Through the waning years of this world of woe:—
When the golden streets are by pilgrims trod,
You shall stand within and his glory know.

—The Christian.

Progress of the Cause.

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

The Kansas and Missouri Camp-Meeting.

THIS meeting has just closed, and we trust the interests of the cause in the State have been greatly advanced by it. We judge full twice as many Sabbath-keepers attended it, as have ever attended any meeting held within the bounds of this Conference before. This good attendance was not because circumstances were more favorable for getting there than in the past; on the contrary, they were never worse. Heavy rains fell the Sunday previous to meeting, when many desired to start, and the streams were up very high, so that a large number had to leave their teams on the way, and take the cars some distance, and then look for other conveyance to the meeting from the railroad; while others, by going long distances out of their way, found bridges where they could cross the swollen streams, and got through. We were much encouraged to see the spirit of sacrifice among the people, which prompted them to make the efforts they did. A good delegation came from Doniphan County, upward of one hundred and fifty miles; and nearly the whole of the little church which I organized in Howard County, last winter, came about the same distance.

During the first part of the meeting, there was a great scarcity of ministerial help. Many were much disappointed that Bro. and sister White were not present; and as Bro. Blanchard remained away to labor where there was an interest which had recently been started, and Bro. T. J. Butler was detained away till Sabbath, on account of sickness in his family, there was no one to take the burdens of the meeting but myself, and those who had recently received license from the Conference. But the Lord met with us by his Spirit. The preaching was designed to be close and practical, calculated to call the attention of the people to the real object for which they came together, and to show them what kind of a character they must form to stand the test of the Judgment.

Sabbath was a good day. The melting Spirit of the Lord was present with power. Feeling testimonies were given by scores. Some twenty or thirty came forward for prayers, and all felt greatly cheered by the evident tokens of the Lord's readiness to bless.

Sunday, the crowd came, many hundreds in number, and as it was quite rainy, our meetings were not all that we should have been glad to have them; still, we got through the day as pleasantly as could be expected, considering the unfavorable weather.

Monday, the day of closing, was profitable. Ten were baptized. Bro. T. J. Butler was ordained to the ministry by the laying on of hands, and our parting meeting was one of great interest. Many testified, with tears, of their determination to be more in earnest in the service of God than they had been in the past. Nearly all spoke of their being more than paid for their labors in coming to the meeting, and all seemed greatly cheered at the brightening prospects before the cause in this section.

In the business proceedings of the Conference, there were also omens of good. The brethren seemed to realize more than ever before that they must carry their own burdens, if they would prosper in the Lord. There was more of a coming up, by far, than I have ever seen before, to grasp these burdens, and try to bear them. Our sessions were harmonious and pleasant. There seems to be no good reason, so far as I can see, why this Conference should not prosper if all will be faithful in bearing the burdens which fall to them. Two new churches were admitted to the Conference—Palermo, Doniphan Co., Kan., and Elk Falls, Howard Co., Kan. Others should have made application, either by letter or delegate. The Conference has two new tents ready to run, and men enough within her

own limits to man them, from whom we hope to hear good reports the coming season. A great and good field of labor is open before them, which has not been spoiled by bad labor, and from which many invitations come pouring in for help. Why should we not look for good results? We shall expect to see good results, because we have great faith in the future of this cause where the people begin to realize its importance.

GEO. I. BUTLER.

Burlington, Iowa, June 4, 1873.

Report of Meetings.

APRIL 17, I left Battle Creek for Iowa, where I spent three weeks. From there, I went to Illinois, and remained two weeks; then, to Minnesota, where I also spent two weeks. The tract and missionary interest has been considered at each meeting, and a good degree of interest has been manifested on the part of the brethren and sisters in each State, in not only attending the meetings, but also in taking hold of this branch of the work.

In Iowa, we held meetings with the friends at Richland, Knoxville, Sigourney, also in Eld. Morrison's neighborhood, and Osceola. Our Richland meeting was small, as the roads were almost impassable. At Knoxville and Osceola there was a good representation of the brethren and sisters, in their respective localities; especially at Knoxville, they manifested their interest in the missionary work by remaining together from 9 A. M. until 2 P. M. on first-day, with an increasing interest, and at the close pledging for a fund in the tract and missionary work, also, to settle the indebtedness on our periodicals, about \$475.00, a portion of which was paid. A large portion of the time at Osceola on Sabbath and first-day was spent together at their meeting-house, and I trust it was not an unprofitable time. At this place, also, they donated freely; and, from reports since received from Bro. Nicola, the same lively interest is taken in other parts where he has visited, so that they now have a capital of nearly five hundred dollars, enough to settle their indebtedness at the Office on the delinquency of those whose periodicals have been stopped. This is as it should be. A sufficient fund should be kept on hand in every State for the T. and M. Society not only to have a supply of tracts and pamphlets with every company of brethren and sisters, where they are members of the society (and all should become members), but so that a good supply of the various kinds may be kept in reserve, and the society be in a condition to do a cash business with the Association, as this is the only proper basis on which the Tract Society can do business. Then, the friends of the cause will always be in a condition to take hold and carry forward every enterprise that may come up in connection with present truth. I formed a very pleasant acquaintance with Bro. Nicola and Bro. Harvey Morrison, and when I left the State it seemed like parting with friends.

At Aledo and Serena, Ill., the meetings were not large, but of some interest. The brethren in this State did nobly in relieving the Publishing Association from their share of indebtedness, as a Conference, on the delinquent subscribers, and at these two meetings, they donated some three hundred dollars more than enough to settle this matter with the Office, which will be used as a T. and M. fund in this Conference. The brethren in this State need help, and I have reason to believe they would appreciate it. The brethren are very much scattered, and could there be held, sometime in September or October, three tent-meetings, with the proper help, especially to help the church in those things where they need especial instruction, of about a week's duration each, I think it would be of a great benefit to the cause in this State. At the last one of the tent-meetings, there could be a session of their Conference, and some time might be devoted to the tract and missionary work, as that would be their annual meeting.

May 22, I arrived at Stewartsville, Minn. Knowing something of the condition of things in this State, and the struggles of the brethren to meet their Conference expenses in the past, we did not expect that much could be accomplished here except to organize a T. and M. Society, and to receive, perhaps, the initiation fees from those who wished to become members. The traveling was then very bad. Teams, with empty wagons, would get stuck in the traveled road. This was the case in the vicinity of Jo Daviess; yet the brethren turned out better than we could reasonably expect. Although our meetings were not large, they manifested the same liberal heart and lively interest as in other places, and in some respects went farther. They appreciated the assistance the General Conference had rendered them in the past, and raised money enough to settle all the claims of the Association on the delinquent matter against this Conference, and donated for a Tract Fund sufficient to meet present expenses, and have pledged, besides, about \$425.00. Let the same interest and conse-

cration be retained and manifested in every enterprise—the School Fund and Health Institute—and they will find in the day of Judgment that they have laid up a good foundation against the time to come.

The plan adopted by each of these Conferences on the matter of delinquency has been as follows: First, To pay the S. D. A. Publishing Association its claims against them on the various periodicals which have been stopped. Second, Place in the hands of each director the names of those whose papers have been stopped and the sums due, and he visits or corresponds with each person who is thus indebted in his district, and collects what he can, which is reserved as a fund to send the periodicals to the worthy poor and such as the board of directors, at each general meeting, may decide would be benefited by reading them. Third, To make it a special point to learn who are the worthy poor, whether their names have been dropped or not, and to see that they are not deprived of any of the periodicals which they may be interested in, or any reading matter which they should have and are unable to purchase, especially such works as the Testimonies, How to Live, and Appeal to Mothers. Minnesota not only raised money to pay the past indebtedness in this matter, but has relieved the Association of a number of names of this class, and paid six months in advance, at three-fourths the usual price.

We are fully satisfied that the friends of the cause, everywhere, only need to understand its wants and the relation they sustain to it, and a system whereby they can act efficiently, and they will consider it a privilege to sacrifice to carry forward this work. The cause of God is the best of all causes, and if we would save our means, our reputation, and our life, it will be by sacrificing or investing in the cause of our divine Lord. Let no one think that what is done in this direction, prompted by a pure motive to glorify God, is lost. It is a sure way to save it. It transfers it from mortal life to the immortal shore. Those who have sacrificed their health and even life for Christ's sake and the gospel have sent a poor mortal life in advance, which will be exchanged for immortal health in the kingdom of glory. Houses, lands, earthly friends, and everything this world calls dear and precious can be thus safely placed beyond the reach of the fiery element of this world, and thus secure to themselves a treasure in the Heavens. See Luke 12.

S. N. HASKELL.

Washington Territory.

THE REVIEW is a weekly visitor at our humble home; and as it is so highly prized by us and our hearts are so often made to rejoice in reading reports from different churches and testimonies from brethren and sisters as to their Christian experience, I thought it might not be amiss for me to give you my Christian experience since living in this far-off, lonely land. With my family, I emigrated to this country in the autumn of '59—the only family in this Valley that were trying to keep the commandments of God. And being raised a Seventh-day Baptist, and taking the *Sabbath Recorder*, I requested, through that paper, my brethren to send us a minister, that we might build up a Sabbath-keeping church; but this did not accomplish anything.

After a few years, there was a great revival of religion here. Under the preaching of a United Brethren minister, our children embraced religion, and were zealous in the cause of Christ. I joined them and was elected their class leader, with the understanding that I would keep the Sabbath. After a while, one of their ministers, S. S. Costin, embraced the Sabbath; and sister Morehouse, a worthy Adventist lady, moving here, threw the REVIEW into our hands; and, the Sabbath question being agitated somewhat, I found I could not get along in the Brethren church, hence withdrew. Then J. F. Wood, my son-in-law, took his family and went to California, hoping, as he afterward expressed himself, to get where he would hear no more about the Sabbath. After traveling over a good portion of the State, he settled down near Healdsburg, where Elders Bourdeau and Loughborough were preaching, and embraced the Sabbath, and commenced a correspondence with me, advocating the doctrines as held forth by the Adventists. He soon returned to this Valley and went through with a course of lectures, creating quite an excitement among the people.

While these things were going on, the Lord was preparing me to receive Bible truth. I had become an inveterate tobacco-smoker, from the advice of physicians, but becoming disgusted with the practice, I laid my case before the Lord, promising him, if he would assist me to leave off the vile practice, I would for some benevolent object give fifteen dollars a year—the lowest estimate of the cost of my tobacco—and from that day to this, I have never hankered after tobacco. So I entered, myself, into an s. s. plan, without knowing much about the plan as now carried out by S. D. Adventists. After Mr. Wood returned

here, wanting tracts to distribute, I gave him eighteen dollars of the Lord's money to procure them. They came, and fell into the hands of Mr. Rasmussen. Himself and wife embraced the Sabbath; and now one son has experienced religion. A year or two since, a Bro. Bunch moved here with quite a numerous family.

Now I would say that, although we are considerably scattered, we have been holding meetings at three different points, once in four weeks; and have been praying the Lord to send us a preacher. We sent money once to Bro. Cornell, and he returned it; and again, last fall, we received letters from two or three sources that he was coming here. He did not come; and the Lord has been impressing upon our minds the necessity of laboring in his vineyard, and has crowned our labors with the conversion of six young persons; one Mr. Tilton, his wife, two young men, and two young ladies; and after visiting a week or two and consulting with the brethren and sisters, it was thought best to organize a church. Consequently, last Sabbath and first-day, May 17, 18, we had a two-days' meeting. Eld. Coston preached two feeling sermons on Sabbath, with a conference meeting. The Lord was in our midst, and that to bless. He also preached two sermons on first-day.

After the first sermon, we organized a church of nineteen members. Elected S. S. Coston for our minister; S. Maxson was chosen and ordained for deacon; J. F. Wood, church clerk; also extended to him a cordial invitation to improve upon his gift in lecturing on the Advent faith; J. C. Bunch, treasurer for s. s. Society. Then we retired to the river, and with singing and prayers and tears witnessed the baptism of six young converts. Returned to the house; heard a sermon on the near coming of Christ; after which, a social meeting, in which all the members participated, or nearly so, leaving the meeting with an increased interest. Our church is called the first S. D. Adventist church of Walla Walla. This little company of Christians is a unit in the Adventist faith, keeping the commandments of God and living in the faith of Jesus.

In behalf of my brethren and sisters, I would say that we still pray for, and ask of you an experienced minister in the the Advent faith. We shall also ask of the S. D. Adventist Conference, to be admitted as a sister church, with all the privileges of other churches of your faith and order, holding ourselves ready to conform to the rules of the same. Pray for us, that this little church may be as a city set on a hill that cannot be hid; a bright and shining light in the world. God grant that we may be among those whom Christ's sentence shall establish unblamable in holiness, and who shall go with him to Heaven. "Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my redeemer. Ps. 19:14." S. MAXSON.

Walla Walla Co., W. T.

Ohio.

FROM April 8 to May 31, I held a series of meetings in the eastern part of Morrow Co. The first seven meetings of the series were held in an old Presbyterian church called Harmony. The society having gone down, the house was seldom used. Although they choose to call the church Harmony, it was soon very evident that the harmony of some of the society belonging elsewhere, was much disturbed by the truth which they would not hear, and we were notified to close our meeting. By earnest invitation, we went to a small school-house about a quarter of a mile distant, where we finished our meetings without further interruption.

I never experienced a worse time for meetings than during this series. The roads were muddy, the nights very dark and generally rainy. This had much to do in making our congregations very small most of the time. Several times there were but five present. But having a few interested hearers, we were encouraged to hold on till we felt sure that the work was done. Eight souls publicly accepted the truth. Six of these were members of the Methodist church. Five were baptized. They unite with the Waterford church, and hereafter, for a time, the regular meetings and Sabbath-school of this society will be held in "Yankee Street" school-house.

To my brethren in Ohio, I would say that I do not think it duty to pitch the tent at present. When the tent is pitched, it should be well supplied with laborers. Ohio has not the laborers. Oh! my dear brethren, should we not seek God earnestly for his blessing upon ourselves and our Conference? Should we not fervently pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers, imbued with the Spirit of God and the last message, that we may behold the work of God prospering among us? If the General Conference Committee can use our tent in any part of the wide harvest field, may they not take it? Better be in use than lying still.

I am now in the eastern part of Knox Co. Have commenced a course of lectures in a

good-sized country school-house. Have had my first meeting, with a very fair congregation. I earnestly desire to be remembered. I want the glory of God and the salvation of souls to be paramount to everything else.

My address, for the present, is Fredericktown, Knox Co., Ohio.

H. A. ST. JOHN.

June 2, 1873.

Napoleon, Mich.

We have our tent pitched on the public square, in this beautiful little village, and have been carrying on the work for ten days.

We have held fourteen meetings, with an average attendance of two hundred. Last evening, full three hundred and fifty were present.

We have brought the people down by the lines of prophecy to the present day, have introduced them to the three messages of Rev. 14, and in the last two discourses we have presented for their consideration the Sabbath in the New Testament, and the claims of first-day observance.

The interest to hear is as good, for the short time we have been here, as in any place I ever pitched the tent. Our meetings, and what is heard at the tent, is the chief topic of conversation. Books go off quite freely. Our work is calling the attention of some noble minds. The truth is certainly taking hold of some good people. What is best of all, the Lord grants his rich blessing, and we have good freedom in speaking.

Bro. Charles Russell is now with us, and we hope to accomplish much good in the name of the Lord. We hope to be remembered at a throne of grace by all who love the cause. Our address is Napoleon, Jackson Co., Mich.

In hope of life,

I. D. VAN HORN.

Waushara Co., Wis.

The quarterly meeting of Dist. No. 7, Wis., was held in Plainfield, May 10 and 11, 1873, in connection with the quarterly meeting of the Fish Lake church. The Spirit of the Lord was present, we believe, to encourage and strengthen his people and convict sinners of their sins. There is an increasing interest in the work of the Lord.

The T. and M. Society in this Dist. reported for two quarters:

No. of families visited, 37.	
Received for membership,	\$15.00
By donation,	1.00

Total amount of money rec'd, \$16.00

Number of new subscribers for REVIEW, 1; Instructor, 1; Reformer, 3.

Tracts given away,	pages, 8089
Pamphlets,	" 1001

Total, 9090

Books loaned,	pages, 700
---------------	------------

No. of members in this district, 25.

The quarterly meeting of Dist. No. 11, Wis., was held in the Cady school-house, Poy Sippi, May 31 and June 1, 1873, in connection with the quarterly meeting of the Poy Sippi church. Held seven meetings, which were profitable.

T. and M. Society in this district reported as follows:

No. of families visited, 31.	
Received for membership,	\$10.00
By donation,	.25
From book sales,	2.39

Total, \$12.64

No. of new subscribers for REVIEW on trial, 12; for Danish Monthly, 2.

Tracts given away,	pages, 3618
Pamphlets,	" 1225

Total, 4843

Books loaned,	pages, 1615
---------------	-------------

P. S. THURSTON, Pres. T. & M. Society.

Tract Society Meeting.

The first meeting of the Missionary and Tract Society of Dist. No. 4., Wisconsin, was held in connection with our quarterly meeting, the last Sabbath in May and first day of June. Bro. Decker was with us and gave us some instruction how to proceed with our society. The reports show \$14.00 for membership; donation, \$1.00; subscribers for REVIEW, 1; Instructor 2.

Tracts and pamphlets given away, pages, 3249.

Books loaned,	" 3045.
---------------	---------

C. K. ACKLEY, Director.

New Hampshire.

I RETURNED to New Hampshire May 15. Have given thirteen lectures. We have a fair attendance evenings and Sundays. Sabbath day, I meet with friends in Campton Village; have good meetings and Bible-class, but have not been able to meet them all at any one meeting yet, for the reason, some are sick and others not able to walk to where our meetings are held. But the most of those

keeping the Sabbath are advancing; we still hope all will hold fast and go forward. Pray for us.

P. C. RODMAN.

June 4.

Discussion on the Sabbath Question.

(Continued from page 2.)

brew as well as in English, the coming on of darkness after a period of light; in other words, the close of day by the coming on of night. There could be no evening, without a previous period of light. Day began, therefore, with light and not with darkness, and one day continued till the returning light marked the commencement of another. The later custom of the Hebrews (Lev. 23:32), of reckoning the day from evening to evening, was made necessary by the use of the lunar calendar, in the observance of their feasts, and other commemorative seasons, which depended on the return of the new moon. Where the natural day is meant, as in Lev. 7:15, it closes with the morning of the following day." And so that old nation, the Babylonians, also, reckoned their days. Here, I must add a word from J. P. Lange, the famous German commentator. He renders Matt. 28:1, "About the end of the Sabbath," and says: "The peculiar expression is explained by the context. It was the time of the dawn, or of breaking day (*hemera* to be supplied in connection with *epiphoskouse*), on the first day of the week, Sunday. Similar are the statements of Luke and John; while Mark says, about sunrise. . . . It is not the accurate Jewish division of time, according to which the Sabbath ended at six on Saturday evening, but the ordinary reckoning of the day, which extends from sunrise to sunrise, and adds the night to the preceding day. . . . Matthew makes the day of the week begin here with sunrise." Meyer, Alford, Conant, and many others, equally learned, treat this passage in a similar way. Others, as P. Schaff, Lange's translator, while favoring a different rendering, not only admit this to be the more natural translation, but, what is just to my purpose, concede that "the natural division of the day" was "from sunrise to sunrise."

The discussion of the third style, and the application of the whole to Acts 20, I must reserve for my next affirmative.

ELD. WAGGONER'S SECOND NEGATIVE.

ELD. VOGEL has turned his insinuation into a direct statement that some of my brethren have argued that the first covenant was not abolished. *This I deny*, and call upon him to point to a single accredited writer or speaker among us who has so taught. Were his statement true, it would have no bearing against my argument, but he knows the "effect" it will have on some minds. To add that he will believe on my "mere word" that I never held that view, may not have been designed to insult, but could never emanate, in such a connection, from a regard to the courtesies due to an opponent. I have not yet considered it due to anybody to offer even my "mere word" on that point.

A man more reckless of his statements on the Bible, I have never met. He says Ps. 69, is "not a prediction"—does not apply to Jesus more than to "any one else of the present day." (!) See verses 9, 21: "For the zeal of thine house hath eaten me up; and the reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me." "They gave me also gall for my meat, and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink." Comp. John 2:17, and Rom. 15:3, &c. And so unreliable are his statements on Isa. 56.

He says when the Lord's supper was instituted they "did not commune, but merely ate bread and drank wine"! And that is all they do now, according to the true faith. I was aware that Eld. V. was raised in the "mother church," but supposed he had got farther from her than he has. Jesus then said, "This is my body—this is my blood," i. e., they represented his body and blood, and so they do now. His reference to Lev. 23, for the times of instituting and of observing their feasts, do not serve him, for there was a specific statement of the time of their observance—but not so of the Lord's supper.

It is amusing to see how strenuously he pleads for inferences in behalf of positive institutions. Campbell is not misconstrued by me. He does inveigh against that which (to use his own words) "is supposed to be logically inferred" in favor of a positive institution. I ask the reader to look again at my quotation from Campbell. He describes and condemns the very course Eld. V. pursues, to wit., taking a part here and a part there and connecting inferences, without direct statement or precept. The only real service Mr. Campbell did for theology, was to strip the veil of tradition and inference from positive institutions. Eld. V. complains that I said "he knows better." I used the words justly. But if he does not yet know A. Campbell's position, I will try to enlighten him. We will read again:—

"A positive institution requires positive precept—a positive and express authority. No positive institution has ever been established upon mere inference. To attempt to found a positive Christian ordinance upon an inference, or upon a series of inferences, is, in effect, to stultify and make void its pretensions. . . . We have called upon its advocates times without number for such a precept—for such a positive injunction, but hitherto we have asked in vain."—*Baptism*, p. 218.

A man hung on circumstantial evidence is unjustly hung, if the evidence is not based on a series of undisputed facts. But Eld. Vogel not only violates every just principle, by trying to build up a positive institution by mere deduction, but even his supposed facts from which his deductions are drawn, are fallacies!

1. Rev. 1:10, does not hint of a new institution, nor point out the first day of the week.

2. Acts 20:7, does not speak of the Lord's day, nor of the observance of any day, nor of any duty in that respect.

3. 1 Cor. 16:2, does not speak of the Lord's day, nor of the observance of a day, nor of any assembling for any purpose on any day. Inference is all that he presents.

On Rev. 1:10, he has done a needless work. No one denies that it is a day "of," or "pertaining to," the Lord; "the Lord's day" expresses all that. He quotes Barnes; I accept it, and will quote it again. "So far as the word is concerned, it might mean a day pertaining to the Lord, in any sense, or for any reason—either because he claimed it as his own, and set it apart for his service, or because it was assigned to commemorate some important event." Now all these particulars apply to the seventh day as the Lord's day. (1.) He claimed it as his own. (2.) He set it apart for his service. (3.) He designated it to commemorate an important event, even the creation of the heavens and the earth. But neither of them applies to the first day. (1.) He never claimed it

as his own. (2.) He never set it apart for his service. (3.) He never designated it to commemorate any event. If this is disputed, we call for the precept—the "positive injunction!" They who love the pure word of God more than traditional fallacies, will be at no loss to determine which is the Lord's day.

He revives the question, and re-affirms his position that "Lord," in the text, refers only to Christ. I should have exposed this before, only that he declared its "proper place" was in this proposition. We will examine the ground.

(1.) He said, "Under this dispensation, the term, Lord, refers exclusively to Christ." I proved the falsity of that by quoting such texts as Rev. 11:15, "Our Lord and his Christ." To this, he replied:—

(2.) "I do not mean that the Father has ceased in his nature to be Lord; i. e., Jehovah, the self-existent One, but in the official sense of head over all things to the church, Jesus is the only head, the one Lord, without a rival, with all authority."

He has reiterated this, but I quote this, in preference to his later statements, because it is more brief and explicit. The second (marked 2) is an evasion of the most marked kind. The question is not as to whether the Father has changed in his nature, which would indeed be a rare question for discussion! but whether his assertion is true that "the term, Lord, belongs exclusively to Christ in this dispensation." This is too plain a point to dodge, and his first inference in his present argument is based on this assumption. What a ground for positive duty! When he undertakes to prove that the term Lord is used in Rev. 1:10, in a sense in which it is not used in Rev. 11:15, we shall note how it is done.

But, were his first assumption conceded, it would not serve his purpose, unless he could establish the other, which is based on the nature of the authority of Christ in this dispensation. The relevancy of the following quotation will be seen as I progress. Thus, he said:—

"Christ in his word-state was indeed present at creation, but only as agent, not as proprietor. . . . Hence, if the Sabbath had even originated there, Jesus would no more be the Lord of it, than a carpenter is owner of the house which he builds for another."

Now I affirm that both Father and Son are "proprietor" of the Sabbath by virtue of creation; it, and it only, is "the Lord's day," whether the term refers to Father or Son, or to both. And such an indignity as Eld. Vogel casts upon the glorious Son of God, I dislike to repeat, even to expose it. Let the reader turn to those scriptures which speak of the work of creation, and see if the above is not an insult to the Maker. See Col. 1:16, 17. "For by him were all things created, that are in Heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, AND FOR HIM." No; not "for him," says Eld. Vogel; he was only like the carpenter who builds a house "for another!" And such a monstrous perversion of Scripture as this is to show that Jesus is not the Lord of the Sabbath day—that it is not the Lord's day.

He continues to assert that Jesus is the only "Lord" in this dispensation, but evades the full result of his statement by adding—"in an official sense." Did he carry this limitation through his argument, there would be no dispute between us. But he does not; he makes him not an agent, but proprietor, in the New Testament, in a sense that he was not in the work of creation. Thus he quotes that he is "head over all things to the church," but only that part of the text which does not say that the Father gave him to be that head. He is Lord and Christ; but the Father "made him" such. Has he more independence or proprietorship in this than in creation? When he shows that his present "authority" was not conferred by the Father, and is not of a special kind for a special purpose, and that he is not yet "expecting till his foes be made his footstool," which will be done by the Father (Ps. 110:1); that God was not in Christ reconciling the world unto himself; that eternal life is not the gift of God through Christ; that Christ is not "mediator between God and man;" that he does not act as "advocate," and that the Father did not send the Spirit in answer to the prayer of Christ; that his doctrines were his own, and not his Father's; and that Christ came to do his own will, and not the will of the Father; when such and a score of other Scripture truths are reversed, then will be shown that Jesus has an independent proprietorship in the gospel, which he had not in creation!

I said (first negative) that "the Sunday is no part of the spiritual (moral) law written in the heart in the new covenant." This he denies; and as it is closely related to the question of "proprietorship," I notice it here. And first, I raise the question, Who made the new covenant? Who is the covenant maker "with Judah and Israel?" Is it the Father or the Son? I say it is the Father—the same that made the first covenant. Hear his words: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers." But if Eld. Vogel is right—if the "proprietorship" of the new covenant is in Jesus, then, I ask, Who is the mediator? The Catholics would answer, the virgin, or the pope; but what should we say?

And this forever settles the question as to whose law is put in the hearts of the "Israel of God" in the new covenant. Jehovah, the covenant maker says, "I will put my laws in their hearts." "The commandments of God" are distinguished from "the faith of Jesus;" and all the positive institutions of the gospel are a part of the faith of Jesus, not of the moral law of the Father. And as the Son does the will, or law, of the Father, nothing in the faith of Jesus can conflict with the law of God. But the Sunday tradition "makes void the commandment of God," and is, therefore, inadmissible. Christ never proclaimed it, and the law of the Father does not permit it. Thus much for the ground of his first inference.

But he says: "With reference to the binding force of a sacred day in this dispensation I have something clearer than inference." That is not a point of dispute between us. I have argued the same thing for the Sabbath institution. But that this sacred day is a new institution, or is the first day, he has only inference in his favor. Thus on all the ground of difference he stands on inference only.

1 Cor. 16:2, does not speak of the Lord's day, nor refer to it, nor to any observance of any day. Remember that an inference, when admissible, must rest upon facts beyond dispute; otherwise, it is utterly worthless. Fortunately for my argument, the ground of his inference is denied by his own partisans. The testimony of an opponent, in my favor, is the strongest evidence; therefore, I first give the testimony of authors who were strongly traditionized to Sunday-keeping:—

"Let him lay up at home, treasuring as he has been prospered. The Greek phrase, 'by himself,' means, probably, the same as at home. Let him set

it apart; let him designate a certain portion; let him do this by himself when he is at home, when he can calmly look at the evidence of his prosperity."—*Barnes*.

"Some are of the opinion that the sums thus set apart were brought to the treasury of the church at the time; but the words do not seem to admit of that interpretation; and if each separately laid by the sum which he proposed to give, the whole would be brought together at once when necessary, without any trouble in soliciting contributions."—*Comp. Com.*

"Every one was to lay by in store, have a treasury or fund with himself for this purpose. . . . Some of the Greek fathers rightly observe here that this advice was given for the sake of the poorer among them. They were to lay by, from week to week, and not bring into the common treasury, that by this means their contributions might be easy to themselves, and yet grow into a fund for the relief of their brethren."—*Matthew Henry, Com.*

"The apostle only meant that there should be no private and petty gatherings, then first to be made, when he came, but only one *sunesisphora* [joint contribution] formed, containing all the sums which had been gradually laid up in private."—*Bloomfield. Notes on Greek Text.* And of the "gatherings," he says: "The word *logia* is nowhere else found in the scriptural, and very rarely in the classical, writers; and seems to have been confined to the language of common life. It properly signifies a *gleaning*, and then, as here, a *slight gathering*."

"Certainly it may not be inferred from this passage that collections took place among the congregations on the Sabbath, for it was Paul's intention that each should make a suitable contribution at home."—*Olshausen, Com.*

"Lay by him in store; at home."—*Justin Edwards' Notes.*

"Par' heauto, by or with oneself; in one's house; at home, Fr. *chez soi*. 1 Cor. 16:2. So Xen. *Mem.* 1.13.3."—*Robinson's Lexicon.*

"Par' heauto, at one's home or house. Lat. *apud se*, Hdt. 1.105, cf. 1.86."—*Liddell & Scott's Lexicon.*

These were Sunday men; some of them of the most rabid kind. What but the most evident facts could lead them thus to remove the foundation for a popular Sunday inference? I copy also a few translations:—

"Let every one off you put asyde at home, and laye vpye whatever he thinketh mete."—*Tyndale.*

"Let each one of you lay by himself in store."—*Sawyer's.*

"Let each of you lay by him and treasure up."—*Anderson (Disciple).*

"Let every one of you lay aside and preserve at home."—*Syriac.*

To the above, I add a summary given by J. W. Morton, in his address to the Synod of the Ref. Pres. church:—

"I marvel greatly how you can imagine that it means in the collection box of the congregation! Greenfield, in his *Lexicon*, translates the Greek term, *par heauto*, 'by one's self, i. e., at home.' Two Latin versions, the Vulgate and that of Castellio, render it '*apud se*,' with one's self, at home. Three French translations, those of Martin, Osterwald, and De Sacy, '*chez soi*,' at his own house, at home. The German of Luther, '*bei sich selbst*,' by himself, at home. The Dutch, '*by hemself*,' same as the German. The Italian of Diodati, '*appresso di se*,' in his own presence, at home. The Spanish of Felipe Scio, '*en su casa*,' in his own house. The Portuguese of Ferreira, '*para iso*,' with himself. The Swedish, '*naer sig self*,' near himself. I know not how much this list of authorities might be swelled, for I have not examined one translation that differs from those quoted above. Now if your premise is false, your inference is not only unnecessary, but wholly inadmissible."

Had not so much stress been laid upon this inference I would ask pardon for spending so much time in exposing it. If inferences were admissible on the subject, what could the inference be worth based on a supposition so extensively denied by the most able of Sunday-keepers? And such is the whole foundation of the Sunday argument; the basis of a proposed positive institution of the gospel!

Eld. Vogel further infers that Sunday was a sacred day because they were to give on that day, and giving is an act of worship! Good, perhaps, for those whose worship is necessarily confined to Sunday—Sunday Christians! But my brethren all follow this injunction of 1 Cor. 16:2, yet not one of them regards it as the Lord's day. This shows to what a strait he is reduced to make inferences for Sunday.

His position on Acts 20 is not fully developed, but I will offer a few proofs to show that here, also, he has no foundation for his inference. Prof. Bush, an eminent scholar, said:

"The evening is probably mentioned first because the darkness preceded the light. On the ground of this recorded order of things in the sacred narrative, the Jews commenced their day of twenty-four hours from the evening."—*Notes on Gen. 1:5.*

Lange, on the same text, says:

"Evening and morning denote rather the interval of a creative day, and this is evidently after the Hebrew mode of reckoning; the day is from sunset, the morning that follows stands for the second half of the day proper. In the same manner was the day reckoned among the Athenians, the Germans, and the Gauls. It is against the text for Delitzsch to put as the ground here the Babylonish reckoning of the day, namely, from the dawning of the morning."

And so Kittó, *Cyclopedia*, Art. Day:—

"The earliest measure of time on record is the day. 'The evening and the morning were the first day.' (Gen. 1:5) Here the word 'day' denotes the civil or calendar day of twenty-four hours, including the 'evening,' or natural night, and the 'morning,' or natural day."

The reader will bear in mind that in exposing these inferences, I do not admit that an inference is any just reason for a positive institution. I protest against the whole course of Eld. Vogel, and am glad to put myself on the record as fully committed against inference and tradition. With Alexander Campbell, I demand "positive precept"—"express authority" for a positive institution. Eld. Vogel said a "formal proclamation" was necessary to make a positive institution binding. But that was only meant to apply against the Sabbath: with Sunday, the case is immensely different!

His remark that I wish to dictate as to the kind of evidence to be received, and that a pope could do no more, is deserving only of contempt. He did not think it popery in him to ask for the "formal proclamation" of the Sabbath: nor did he ever think it was popery for A. Campbell to demand a "precept" or "positive injunction" for positive institutions. I will yet show him that I stand upon the ground clearly marked out by the great body of writers, of all denominations, on the nature of and evidence for positive institutions.

The Review and Herald.

Battle Creek, Mich., Third-day, June 17, 1873.

Western Camp-Meeting.

Medford, Minn., June 26-30, 1873.
GEN. CONF. COM.

This Week's Review.

We hoped that a report from the Iowa Camp-meeting might be given in this paper, but it has not arrived.

Bro. Littlejohn's articles on the Amendment question are concluded this week; also Bro. Canright's articles on Present Truth.

A number of questions have been gathering for some time; these have been mostly disposed of; some are answered, and a goodly number have gone into the waste box. Practical questions, or those relating to our times and our duty, will receive attention. But, "Where did Cain get his wife?" and "How did Judas die?" might as well have a resting spell. All that can be learned on such questions may be found in Commentaries, and books of Notes. Let us be careful that we do not get our minds so fixed on Cain and Judas as to lose sight of worthier subjects of consideration.

Several interesting reports have arrived since this paper was made up. A good variety may be expected next week.

BRO. HASKELL wishes to have his letters sent to Battle Creek, as he frequently holds meetings where there is no post-office, as Joe Daviss, Minn., and letters sent to such places of appointment are lost.

Minnesota Camp-Meeting.

We expect this will be the most important meeting we have ever held in the State. Many things of deep interest to the cause must come up to be acted upon. We specially request that every S. B. treasurer and church clerk come, and bring their books and records with them. Do not fail to do this. If you cannot possibly come, send your books by some one else. We are determined to have a general straightening up of these matters in Minnesota. We ask and expect these officers to help us. Now is the time to do this.

The Tract and Missionary Society has just been organized in this State. Only a few have been able to attend these meetings. Something further must be done at the camp-meeting. There we shall have books to be distributed to the members so that the work can immediately begin.

Then we hope to have stirring, spiritual meetings, just such as we all need, and the labors of the leaders in the cause. Scattered ones should make special efforts to attend. The trouble is, those who need these meetings most, generally feel the least interest in them, and the greatest interest in home affairs. They can't think of leaving their work. The cares of this world are choking them. Come, friends, let us see you at the annual feast. Provisions for men and teams can be had on the grounds at cost.

D. M. CANRIGHT.

Answers to Correspondents.

A BROTHER writes:—

"I have recently had an opponent who denies that the word *day* is found in the original Hebrew in the first chapter of Genesis. If you think it worth while, I would be glad to have you give a true statement of the matter in REVIEW; especially the two words *day*, in Gen 1:5."

It is surprising that people will so misrepresent the word of God in order to maintain their own unscriptural views. Our common translation of Gen. 1:5, is as accurate as can be. The word *day* is as plainly there as it is in the English.

QUESTION. Do you, as a people, deem it proper and right for an individual who is a professed Sabbath-keeper to wish an individual who does not keep the seventh day to plow upon his premises, and he still remain in the house as a Sabbath-keeper?

Ans. No.

The person sending queries on Acts 7:59, and Col. 3:3, is referred to the book published at this Office entitled, "The Nature of Man."

QUESTION. Did Jephthah carry out his vow, and sacrifice his daughter? Judges 11:39. W. S. E.

Ans. We do not think that Jephthah vowed to sacrifice his daughter. The vow, as given in verse 31, includes two things, to wit, "It shall be the Lord's," and "I will offer it up as a burnt offering." In our version, these are connected by the conjunction, *and*, but the Hebrew letter thus translated is also used as a disjunctive, and translated, *or*, as in the margin. By reference to the law concerning sacrifices, it will be seen that certain "clean beasts" only were accepted for sacrifice; the first-born of mankind and the first-born of unclean beasts were to be redeemed because they could not be sacrificed. If a "singular vow" were made by a man, and it concerned one of his household, it was to be redeemed according to the estimation of the priest. Lev. 27. As Jephthah did not redeem his daughter according to this law, it appears that his vow did not devote her any further than that she should "be the Lord's," which doomed her to perpetual virginity. See verses 37, 38. And his vow was this: "It shall be the Lord's [devoted to his service], or I will offer it a burnt offering," that is, provided it is something which the

law permits to be so offered. Further reasons may be given for this view, but this seems sufficient.

QUESTION. Is it right to be baptized by a Sunday-keeper? D. P.

Ans. Doubtful: we could not be at all satisfied with baptism administered by one who did not keep all of God's commandments.

J. H. W.

QUESTION. Why is Christ represented as a reaper in Rev. 14:14, 15, when it is said in Matt. 13:39, that the reapers are the angels? L. M. A.

Ans. Jesus Christ is the commander of the angels. They perform the work spoken of under the figure of reaping the harvest of the earth, under his direction, and by his command. Therefore, it is proper, that in the symbol of the Son of man on the white cloud, coming to gather his saints—the wheat of the earth—he should be represented as a reaper.

We speak of Solomon building the temple. It was built by his command, and under his direction.

A. H. HALE.

News and Miscellany.

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

A FARMER near Eddyville, Iowa, has lost several cattle by mad itch. The animals actually scratched themselves to death.

THE German Parliament has passed the law advocated by Bismarck to regulate and control the clergy. This is another victory over the Jesuits.

IN addition to her political troubles, unhappy Spain is bothered by strikes among her workmen, some of them accompanied by riotous demonstrations.

A REMARKABLE phenomenon was witnessed recently in the town of San Ignacio, Mexico. There was quite a shower of quicksilver, fine drops of mercury falling everywhere and covering the plants.

THERE is an old bachelor in Brownfield, Me., 102 years old on the 31st day of January. He remembers the dark day of 1780. He makes his own bed, and does many other things.

Appointments.

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

* * Services in Chicago, every Sabbath (seventh day), at 209 West Erie St. All Sabbath-keepers spending a Sabbath in Chicago, are invited to attend.

TRACT and Missionary Society meetings will be held:—

Jay, Saginaw Co.,	June 21, 22.
Watrousville,	" 24, 25.
Lapeer,	" 28, 29.
Pottsville,	July 5, 6.

Will Brn. Corliss, and Weeks, meet us at Jay? Each of the directors is expected to attend some one of these meetings.

S. N. HASKELL,

E. H. ROOT.

I now design to attend the general quarterly meeting at Clyde, Ohio, according to appointment in this week's REVIEW; also the one at Bordoville, Vermont, July 19, 20. We expect a general attendance at both of these meetings. The above meetings, also those in Michigan, are expected to commence Friday evening, and there will be a social meeting Sabbath morning at 9 A. M.

S. N. HASKELL.

THE general quarterly meeting for the Ohio Tract and Missionary Society will be held at Clyde, July 12 and 13. Eld. S. N. Haskell is expected. A general attendance is desired. Provision will be made to care for all that may come.

O. F. GUILFORD, Pres.

A GENERAL State quarterly meeting will be held at Bordoville, Vt., July 19, 20. A general attendance of the brethren and sisters is requested, as important matters in reference to missionary work will be attended to at this meeting, which will commence Friday evening. Eld. Haskell appoints to be at this meeting.

A. C. BOURDEAU, Pres.

THE next quarterly meeting for the churches of Greenville, Orleans, Vergennes, Orange, and Bushnell, will be held at Orange, July 5 and 6. A general attendance of all is requested.

F. HOWE.

THE next monthly meeting for Western New York will be held at Lancaster, Erie Co., the fourth Sabbath in June, the 28th, the Lord willing.

W. H. EGGLESTON.

THE next quarterly Tract and Missionary Society meeting of each district will be held as follows:—

Dist. No. 4, West Bolton,	June 28, 29, 1873.
" " 5, Jamaica,	July 5, 6, "

A. C. BOURDEAU, Pres.

Hillsdale, Mich.,	June 28, 1873.
Ransom, "	July 5, "

C. STODDARD.

No providence preventing, there will be held a quarterly meeting with the church at Hundred Mile Grove, Wisconsin, July 5 and 6.

N. M. JORDON.

QUARTERLY meeting in Locke, Mich., July 5 and 6. Sister churches and scattered brethren are invited to attend. Come, brethren, and bring your children with you. It is expected to be a good meeting.

T. T. BROWN, Clerk.

LEIGHTON, Sabbath and first-day, June 21 and 22. Let all the friends in this section meet with us.

A. S. HUTCHINS,

CHARLES JONES.

THERE will be a two days' basket meeting at the Gregory school-house, June 28 and 29, at eleven and two o'clock of each day. Will Bro. B. F. Meritt try to attend? Also a meeting of the M. and T. Society, June 29. Let all come prepared to stay through all the meetings, if possible.

WM. H. SLOW.

QUARTERLY meeting for the Ulysses church of S. D. Adventists will be held at Kibbeville school-house, June 28, 29. All the members of the Ulysses church are earnestly requested to be present. Sister churches are invited.

A. D. GALUTIA, Clerk.

MONTHLY meeting for the Soldier Valley, Iowa, church of S. D. Adventists will be held at the grove of Bro. D. M. McWilliams, July 5. The brethren from Onawa and vicinity of Crabb school-house, Monona Co., are invited to attend.

J. W. McWILLIAMS.

Business Department.

Not aloof in Business. Rom. 12:11.

Business Notes.

QUITE a number have taken stock in the Publishing Association to whom we have not sent certificates because the P. O. address was not given. If such will report, we will forward their certificates.

Who is it? Some one writes from Rochester, Minn.: "Enclosed you will find \$1.50, which please apply \$1.00 on the REVIEW, and 50c on the Instructor." No name signed.

RECEIPTS

For Review and Herald.

Annexed to each receipt in the following list, is the Volume and Number of the REVIEW & HERALD TO which the money received pays—which should correspond with the Numbers on the Pastors. If money to the paper is not in due time acknowledged, immediate notice of the omission should then be given.

\$2.00 EACH. Robert Schram 44-1, M E Goodwin 44-1, Clara Bryant 44-1, Ruth Morrill 44-4, C Bradley 44-1, John Snow 44-1, Levi Newcomb 44-10, N B Morton 44-1, Mrs A Wortbury 44-1, J G Satterlee 44-1, Daniel Fuller 43-1, James H Keller 43-6, Albert Wike 44-1, Mrs M A Morrison 43-1, M H Brown 44-7, M P Stiles 44-1, Arba Smith 44-1, Eld W W Putnam 44-1, S Salisbury 44-1, Wm H Terrel 44-1, J C Tucker 44-1, J S Day 44-1, M Phillips 44-1, J S Smith 44-1, Mrs W Daniels 44-1, George Koon 44-1, W H Winters 42-1, A M Cornell 42-20, J Vaneman 44-1, G W Newman 44-1, Harmon Allen 44-1, Wm H Place 44-1, S Babcock 44-1, I Stanhope 43-14, Olive A Twist 44-1, J P Rathbun 43-14, Louisa Mann 46-1, S Vincent 44-1, Wm Coats 44-1, L B Wilbur 44-1, D Richmond 44-1, Mary E Green 45-1, Mary Frost 44-1, Richard Godsmark 44-1, J B Edwards 44-1.

\$1.00 EACH. Lucy A Rima 43-1, Charlotte Gregory 44-1, W Hale 43-1, Emma Heligass 43-1, Edward Pratt 43-1, J D Burroughs 43-1, M J Chapman 43-1, C A Bates 43-1, J H Bates 43-1, Dr J H Gineley 43-1, C Weed 43-1, Wm Bowen 43-1, Walter E Higley 43-1, Mrs J Shearer 43-1, C Houser 43-14, Mrs Mary Haskell 43-1, Hugh Lisk 43-1, C West 43-1, Mary Shell 43-1, John Andrews 43-1, P Chaffee 43-1, L R Chapel 43-1, W W Lockwood 43-1, G W Sheldon 43-1, Anson W Sanborn 43-1, M S Merriam 43-1, Moses Martin 43-1, A J Richmond 43-1, A B Castle, 43-2, Thomas James 43-14, A Carter 43-1, Herman Lyscom 44-1, S P Clark 43-1, Wm F Noyes 43-1, Daniel Oviatt 43-1, G G Green 42-15, T Smith 44-1, C M Ritchie 43-14, Mrs I H Archer 43-1, Dr W J Mills 43-1, Jane Dingman 43-6, Sarah Towle 43-1, M A Holt 43-1, J Byington 43-1.

MISCELLANEOUS. John Kraushaar \$1.10 43-1, Eld L Jorgensen 62c 43-1, L J Calkins 1.50 43-1, C P Hovey 62c 43-1, Cornelia Mack 1.37 43-1, S Risinger 1.10 43-1, M B Brownson 1.75 43-1, W Bailey 75c 43-1, M H Brown 67c 43-1, Maria Campbell 1.50 43-1, H A Harris 3.25 43-1, J R Winchell 1.50 43-1, G Castle 1.25 43-6, C Belden 50c 43-1, Amos Prescott 1.10 43-3, Hattie Barrett 75c 44-14, John Nelson 50c 42-1, Albert Kellogg 68c 43-1, Mrs C Freeman 75c 43-1, Mrs E D York 1.50 43-14, Mrs E Cooper 1.50 43-14, Lidia E Stratton 1.50 43-14, Peter Tubbs 1.50 43-14, Sarah Wallace 1.50, 43-14, John Douglass 1.50 43-14, Mary A Snow 50c 42-14, G T Smith 7.50 44-1.

50 Cents Each, Paying to Vol. 43, 1. G W Caldwell, G Rounds, George Stoddard, Mrs L Passmore, Mrs Ruth Pine, H L C Gilstrap.

Cash Received on Account.

Wm F Crous \$8.00, Mich T & M Society at Lapeer 7.90, Nahum Orcutt 19.75, Minnesota T & M Society 21.78, Mich Delinquent Fund, Dist No 6, 233.81, Minn Delinquent Fund 63 34, A Gleason 13.00.

Books Sent by Mail.

Wm Johnson \$1.00, Emma Heligass 1.00, Mrs Fannie Miller 1.00, Mrs P J Thompson 1.00, Mrs L A Marsh 1.00, James R Follett 1.00, John Snow 1.00, G Castle 1.00, Wm Potter 25c, Mrs M Densmore 1.00, C M Sweet 1.00, J A Munger 1.00, M Wood 1.00, Andrew Damon 1.00, Vita Morrow 1.00, Wm A Robinson M D 1.00, Noah Farrar 7.50, Mary E Green 1.00, C L Davis 1.00, J Iden 10c, C Jensen 25c, J D Hough 50c, E O Clark 25c, John R Israel 1.00, Thomas B Ellis 3.00, J H Bates 15c, A C Long 1.00, Robert Schram 60c, N M Humphrey 20c, A J Deedon 20c, Mary E Guilford 2.00, J W Mc Williams 25c, Charles Kysor 50c, M H Brown 70c, Eliza B Decker 50c, S Martin 50c, Wm Hills 1.50, H W Decker 3.00, H F Phelps 2.50, P C Rodman 6 15, Asa T Robinson 1.00, Harmon Allen 5c, Mrs A Jaycox 10c, W W Locke 50c, G C Starkey 1.25, Wm F Crous 1.00, D Azro P Raleigh 30c, L W Guiss 10c, Thomas Elliot 3.00, A M Cornwell 2.00, H I Farnum 25c, Melvia Bunce 35c, F J Payen 50c, Lewis Martin 25c, Alfred L Hussey 1.00, Anna Stroud 2.00.

Books Sent by Freight.

H Grant, Medford, Steele Co., Minn., \$49.15, D M Canright, Medford, Steele Co., Minn., 37.69.

General Conference Fund.

E O Edson, s B, 30c.

Michigan Conference Fund.

Received from the church at Orange, \$30.00, Oceana, 50.00.

Donations to S. D. A. P. Association.

Friend of the truth in N H, \$1.00.

Review to the Poor.

Harriet Evans \$85c.

Watches Sent by Express.

J L Hartford, Jamaica Plain, Mass., Dennis & Wilmarth's store, \$25.00.

The Review and Herald.

TERMS:

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

Books, Pamphlets, Tracts, &c.,

ISSUED BY THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION, AND FOR SALE AT THIS OFFICE.

Hymn Book. This is a book of 320 pp. of Hymns, and 96 pp. of Music. In plain morocco, \$1.00.

Thoughts, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Daniel. By U. Smith. 384 pp. \$1.00. Condensed paper edition, 35 cts.

Thoughts on the Revelation, critical and practical. By Uriah Smith. 328 pp. \$1.00.

The Nature and Destiny of Man. By U. Smith. 384 pp. \$1.00. Paper 40 cts.

History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week. By J. N. Andrews. 342 pp., \$1.00.

Life Incidents, in connection with the great Advent Movement. By Eld. James White. 373 pp., \$1.00.

The Spirit of Prophecy, Vol. I. By Ellen G. White; 416 pp. Vol. II, will be ready soon. Each \$1.00.

Autobiography of Eld. Jos. Bates. 318 pp. \$1.00.

How to Live; articles on Health, and recipes for cooking. 400 pp. \$1.00.

Sabbath Readings; or Moral and Religious Reading for Youth and Children. 400 pp., 60 cts. The same in five pamphlets, 50 cts.

Appeal to Youth; Address at the Funeral of Henry N. White; also a brief narrative of his life, &c., 96 pp., muslin, 40 cts. Paper covers, 10 cts.

The Game of Life, with three illustrations, 5x6 inches each, representing Satan playing with man for his soul. In board, 50 cts.; in paper, 30 cts.

Hymns and Spiritual Songs for Camp-meetings and other Religious Gatherings. Compiled by Elder James White. 196 pp. Bound 50 cts., paper 25 cts.

An Appeal to the Working Men and Women in the Ranks of the Seventh-day Adventists. By Eld. Jas. White. 172 pp. Bound, 40 cts., paper, 25 cts.

The United States in Prophecy. By U. Smith. Bound, 40 cts., paper, 20 cts.

The Advent Keepsake; comprising a text of Scripture for each day of the year, on the Second Advent, the Resurrection, &c. Muslin, 25 cts; do., gilt, 40 cts.

A Solemn Appeal relative to Solitary Vice, and the Abuses and Excesses of the Marriage Relation. Edited by Eld. James White. Muslin, 50 cts.; paper, 30 cts.

Progressive Bible Lessons for Children; to be used in Sabbath Schools and Families. By G. H. Bell. 228 pp. Bound, 35 cts., paper covers, 25 cts.

Sermons on the Sabbath and Law; embracing an outline of the Biblical and Secular History of the Sabbath for 6000 years. By J. N. Andrews. 25 cts.

Discussion on the Sabbath Question, between Elds. Lane and Barnaby. 25 cts.

History of the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul. By D. M. Canright. 25 cts.

The State of the Dead. U. Smith. 224 pp. 25 cts.

Our Faith and Hope, No. 1. Sermons on the Millennium, Second Advent, the Kingdom, the Judgment, the Time, the Sanctuary, and Saving Faith. No. 2 will be ready soon. 20 cts. each.

Refutation of the Age to Come. By J. H. Waggoner. 20 cts.

The Atonement; an Examination of a Remedial System in the light of Nature and Revelation. By J. H. Waggoner. 20 cts.

The Nature and Tendency of Modern Spiritualism. By J. H. Waggoner. 20 cts.

The Bible from Heaven; or, a Dissertation on the Evidences of Christianity. 20 cts.

Review of Objections to the Visions. 20 cts.

Discussion on the Sabbath Question, between Elds. Grant and Cornell. 20 cts.

The Destiny of the Wicked. By U. Smith. 15 cts.

The Complete Testimony of the Fathers concerning the Sabbath and First Day. By J. N. Andrews. 15c.

The Ministration of Angels; and the Origin, History, and Destiny, of Satan. By D. M. Canright. 15 cts.

The Three Messages of Rev. 14, and the Two-Horned Beast. By J. N. Andrews. 15 cts.

The Resurrection of the Unjust; a Vindication of the Doctrine. By J. H. Waggoner. 15 cts.

The Saints' Inheritance, or, The Earth made New. By J. N. Loughborough. 10 cts.

The Sanctuary and Twenty-three Hundred Days. By J. N. Andrews. 10 cts.

Sunday Seventh-day. A Refutation of Mead, Jennings, Akers and Fuller. By J. N. Andrews. 10 cts.

The Seventh Part of Time; a Sermon on the Sabbath Question. By W. H. Littlejohn. 10 cts.

The Truth Found; The Sabbath. By J. H. Waggoner. 10 cts.

Review of Gilliland, and other authors, on the Sabbath. By T. B. Brown. 10 cts.

Vindication of the True Sabbath. By J. W. Morton. 10 cts.

The Date of the Seventy Weeks of Dan. 9 established. By J. N. Andrews. 10 cts.

The Seven Trumpets; an Exposition of Rev. 8 and 9. 10 cts.

Matthew Twenty-Four; a full Exposition of the chap. By James White. 10 cts.

Key to Prophetic Chart. The symbols of Daniel and John explained, and the periods determined. 10 cts.

The Position and Work of the True People of God under the Third Angel's Message. By W. H. Littlejohn. 10 cts.

An Appeal to the Baptists, from the Seventh-day Baptists, for the Restoration of the Bible Sabbath. 10 cts.

Milton on the State of the Dead. 5 cts.

Four-cent Tracts: The Two Covenants.—The Law and the Gospel.—The Seventh Part of Time.—Who Changed the Sabbath?—Celestial Railroad.—Samuel and the Witch of Endor.—The Ten Commandments not Abolished.—Address to the Baptists.

Three-Cent Tracts: The Kingdom.—The Lost-Time Question.—Spiritualism a Satanic Delusion.—Infidel Cavils Considered.—The End of the Wicked.—Much in Little.—Scripture References.

Two-Cent Tracts: The Sufferings of Christ.—Seven Reasons for Sunday-Keeping Examined.—Sabbath by Elibu.—The Rich Man and Lazarus.—Argument on Sabbaton.—Clerical Slander.—Departing and Being with Christ.—Fundamental Principles of S. D. Adventists.—The Millennium.—The Second Advent.—Definite Seventh Day.

CHARTS: The Prophetic and Law of God Charts, painted and mounted, such as are used by our preachers, each \$1.50.

The Way of Life. This is an Allegorical Picture, showing the Way of Life and Salvation through Jesus Christ from Paradise Lost to Paradise Restored. By Eld. M. G. Kellogg. The size of this instructive and beautiful Picture is 19x24 inches. Price, post-paid, \$1.00.

The two Charts, on cloth, unpainted, by mail, with Key, without rollers, \$2.50.