

Published by the American Sabbath Tract Society, Alfred Centre, N. Y.

ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT. Transient advertisements will be inserted for 25 cents each...

CATALOGUE OF BOOKS AND TRACTS.

THE SABBATH AND THE SUNDAY. By Rev. A. H. Lewis, A. M. Part First. 16mo. 288 pp. Price, 50 cents.

THE SABBATH AND THE SUNDAY. By Rev. A. H. Lewis, A. M. Part Second. 16mo. 288 pp. Price, 50 cents.

THE SABBATH AND THE SUNDAY. By Rev. A. H. Lewis, A. M. Part Third. 16mo. 288 pp. Price, 50 cents.

THE SABBATH AND THE SUNDAY. By Rev. A. H. Lewis, A. M. Part Fourth. 16mo. 288 pp. Price, 50 cents.

THE SABBATH AND THE SUNDAY. By Rev. A. H. Lewis, A. M. Part Fifth. 16mo. 288 pp. Price, 50 cents.

THE SABBATH AND THE SUNDAY. By Rev. A. H. Lewis, A. M. Part Sixth. 16mo. 288 pp. Price, 50 cents.

THE SABBATH AND THE SUNDAY. By Rev. A. H. Lewis, A. M. Part Seventh. 16mo. 288 pp. Price, 50 cents.

THE SABBATH AND THE SUNDAY. By Rev. A. H. Lewis, A. M. Part Eighth. 16mo. 288 pp. Price, 50 cents.

THE SABBATH AND THE SUNDAY. By Rev. A. H. Lewis, A. M. Part Ninth. 16mo. 288 pp. Price, 50 cents.

THE SABBATH AND THE SUNDAY. By Rev. A. H. Lewis, A. M. Part Tenth. 16mo. 288 pp. Price, 50 cents.

THE SABBATH AND THE SUNDAY. By Rev. A. H. Lewis, A. M. Part Eleventh. 16mo. 288 pp. Price, 50 cents.

THE SABBATH AND THE SUNDAY. By Rev. A. H. Lewis, A. M. Part Twelfth. 16mo. 288 pp. Price, 50 cents.

THE SABBATH AND THE SUNDAY. By Rev. A. H. Lewis, A. M. Part Thirteenth. 16mo. 288 pp. Price, 50 cents.

THE SABBATH AND THE SUNDAY. By Rev. A. H. Lewis, A. M. Part Fourteenth. 16mo. 288 pp. Price, 50 cents.

THE SABBATH AND THE SUNDAY. By Rev. A. H. Lewis, A. M. Part Fifteenth. 16mo. 288 pp. Price, 50 cents.

change, which is so silly, and manifests so little respect for God or his commandment that, were it not that many consider it to be an unannounced reason, I would not name it. It is this, that it does not matter which day we observe if we observe one. But this statement I must characterize as being a base and infidel conclusion; for we are distinctly taught to keep the seventh day.

The Sabbath Recorder

Alfred Centre, N. Y., Fifth-day, April 15
N. V. HULL, EDITOR.

EVERY COMMUNICATION, whether business or for publication, should be addressed to the SABBATH RECORDER, Alfred Centre, N. Y.

FEET WASHING.

The history of fallen humanity reveals selfishness as the fountain whence our actions flow. From this fountain, bitter streams run in every direction, and from them every child of Adam drinks; and who can number the evils produced by these poisoned waters, or describe their turpitude! It was to purify these streams, that Christ came into this world. His mission was conceived by a sentiment exactly opposite to the one governing those who live after the flesh. The first expression of this sentiment is seen in this, that divinity clothed itself in human flesh and took up its abode on the earth; and from the return of the Son of God until his return to the heavens, in his every word and act, and in all the circumstances of his life, he lived according to the spirit and not according to the flesh. But all this was done in the interest of humanity. The Scriptures represent man as having fallen from that state of holiness in which he was created; and for his recovery Christ came into the world. To accomplish this recovery, every possible variety of influence was employed in harmony with the nature of man. Words were spoken almost endless in number and variety of sense, and all possible acts were performed that could awake thought or impress the mind, and lead the heart back to God and holiness. The life of Christ was a strange moral magnet, nor was there a point in the human heart that could be reached that he did not touch. One of the first and most common forms in which human selfishness shows itself, and the one which seems nearest incurable, is that of self-exaltation. The ego in man is immense. It shows itself even in the child as a ruling passion, and how varied and endless are the disagreements and quarrels among men occasioned by it. It is deafe to the calls of mercy, and blind to the claims of justice, nor does it fear to insult and even defy God himself! Neither can the fear of hell restrain it, nor the hope of heaven compel it. From this, almost wholly, come castes and class distinctions among men.

By the disciples, the real doctrines of Christ seem to have been but little understood during his ministry, nor were they exempt from the influence of this selfishness of which we have been speaking. From Matt. 18: 1, Mark 9: 34, Luke 9: 46, and 22: 24, we learn that not unfrequently disputes arose among the disciples as to which of them should be the greatest in Christ's kingdom, evidently supposing it was to be an earthly one. This sentiment Christ sought in various ways to eradicate from their minds, and to instill into them the idea that in his kingdom no such distinction existed, and that greatness was loved and the spirit of humility, so that he who was greatest "was servant of all." But the time comes when his last lessons are to be given, and his earth-work is coming to an end; for the last passover that Christ was to celebrate with his disciples, the one that brought the hour of his death, was

at hand, so before his departure out of the world and in connection with this solemn supper, he performs upon his disciples a service which could not for impressiveness be excelled; for while they were eating, he rises from supper and commences to wash their feet. This was the work of a servant and not of a lord. From early times, among the Asiatics, feet washing, whether as an act of hospitality or in the domestic circle, was faithfully performed. But he who performed it, whoever he might be, took upon himself the work of a servant. Upon Christ the disciples had always looked with awe, supposing him an incoming monarch of power, greater than the world had ever known. His way was to be universal, and around his person was to gather all the honors of royalty. That he, then, should have his seat at the head of the table and proceed to the performance of this menial service, was to do an act to them incomprehensible and contradictory. Coming to Peter perhaps first, the disciple which of them all needed most to learn this lesson, his service was at once objected to, with the question, "Lord, dost thou wash my feet?" Jesus expostulates with him, saying, "What I do thou knowest not, saying, 'But thou shalt know hereafter.'" These are important words, because they imply that the essence of this transaction is in its meaning something which Peter did not understand. That Peter knew Christ was about to wash his feet is clear, but the meaning of this act was what Christ wished him to learn, and in this centers the whole transaction. But the controversy between Christ and Peter continues until the latter is informed that to refuse submission in this instance was to forfeit his heirship, and set himself off from Christ; and then he makes a hearty and manly surrender, one characteristic of this noble and honored disciple. Jesus now proceeds and washes the feet of the twelve, and then graciously frees them from doubt, by giving an explanation of this singular transaction; and this he does in the following words: "Know ye what I have done unto you? Ye call me the Teacher, and the Master; and ye say well, for so I am. If I, then, the Master and the Teacher, washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that as I do to you, ye also should do. Verily, verily, I say to you, a servant is not greater than his lord, nor one that is sent greater than he who sent him. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them."

In this exposition, we have in epitome the whole gospel of Christ. In Christ teaches the grace of self-denial, and in effect the practice of every Christian virtue. That he does not teach feet washing as an ordinance seems certain, but a duty running through our whole life and affecting all our relations with each other. It teaches us to bear each other's burdens—to be fellow-sufferers, especially that the strong should aid the weak. But with what force does it bear upon the ministry and the leaders of the church in general, teaching the duty of living for each other as well as for the whole church. But let us look at the case as it appears in this record. Here are a number of men whom Christ is teaching the divine sentiment of love, which moved him to make his advent on the earth and to become to the fullest extent the servant of his enemies, even dying for them, that these might in return become the deliverers of their fellows in sin; and yet the spirit of carnality so reigns in them that at the end of three years they are found seeking how they might supplant each other, and how in the kingdom of Christ, who they supposed was to be an earthly one, they might excel each other in position and honors. Let now the reader ask himself, how Christ could so effectually crush out of his disciples this fleshly sentiment as to become himself a servant while he exalts them to the position of teachers and masters, not rhetorically, but practically, and this too when for the last time he partakes with them of the Passover supper, and thus connecting it with the closing scenes of his life and of his tragic death. See also how he sets before them the operations of selfishness in the person of Judas Iscariot, who, for thirty pieces of silver, became his betrayer. That Christ employed the washing of feet here for the purpose of illustrating a sentiment, as when he took little children to illustrate largely the same principle, who can doubt? It is to be seen, then, that he is to do as to seek after the lesson taught, and as to the method of teaching, we have it here before us for our daily practice. That this feet washing was not understood to be an ordinance of the gospel by the apostles, seems evident from the fact that only John records it, and also that it was never referred to by any of the sacred writers afterward. Can any one see why, if it was practiced by the New Testament churches, it was not on any occasion referred to, neither in the Acts of the apostles nor in the letters to the churches? We do not offer this as proof positive, but as strong presumptive evidence. But we now introduce a case which is evidence is stronger still. Paul is his first letter to Timothy, written perhaps in the year 65, (ch. 5: 9, 10), says, "Let not one be enrolled as a widower under three score years old, having been the wife of one husband, well reported of for good works; if

she brought up children, if she lodged strangers, if she washed the feet of the saints, if she relieved the afflicted, if she diligently followed every good work." In this case, Paul classes the washing of feet with good works, such as alms deeds and acts of mercy and kindness done to our fellows, which is just where Christ places it in the thirteenth chapter of John. That in after days the washing of feet was practiced in certain branches of the church we are aware. See Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church, Vol. 1, page 561, and Lange's Commentary on John, page 410. But in neither case is there any pretension set up by the authors mentioned that Christ appointed feet washing as an ordinance of his church. Our conclusion, then, is that it was not Christ's purpose in this case to appoint a church ordinance, but to employ this simple rite of hospitality, practiced by menials, or those who for the time being acted their part, upon guests or masters, for the sake of impressing the minds of his disciples with the true idea of self-abandonment, and the exaltation of another.

EXPLANATORY.

It may be that some of our readers at first thought will complain at seeing so much of our space occupied with Bro. Scott's tract, but we ask you to wait a little and hear our explanation. The interest on the Sabbath question on the other side of the Atlantic is daily increasing and demands special attention. It has come to be known that three Sabbath-keepers, each not knowing of the existence of the other, nor of any others of like faith anywhere, have written tracts on this subject. This is a strange thing, and seems not only a revelation but a prophecy. These persons came to their conclusion unassisted by outside influences, and their methods of reasoning may be well calculated to reach their fellow countrymen; and in view of this, we thought it best to print Bro. Scott's tract in the columns of the Recorder. The writers of these tracts were John Villiers of Belfast, Ireland, Donald McKenzee of Urray, Rosshire, and James Scott of Elgin, Scotland. These, with other Sabbath-keepers, have been brought to light and made known to us by the advertising expedient of Bro. Jones. But this strangely revived interest has greatly increased the demand for our Sabbath publications. Extra copies of fresh matter from the columns of the Recorder are frequently called for, and had we the means to pay for the matter, we could greatly increase this work.

We say, then, plainly, to our friends, that there is a demand that is pressing for us to immediately increase the funds of the Tract Society. Let not calls be made that we cannot respond to affirmatively. These persons referred to above and others, fellow laborers with them, are doing everything they can to spread the light, and the means necessary for this should be freely furnished. Money should be furnished for the Recorder Extras, which seem to be doing a good work. There also should be funds furnished for sending copies of the Recorder gratis to persons here and there. Instances occur wherein this is the very best thing we can do. Let us take heart and go forward.

EVIDENCE FROM PROPHECY AND FROM MIRACLES.

I am truly thankful for the privilege I enjoy of speaking occasionally through the Recorder, by the generous courtesy of the editor; and not willing to abuse this privilege, I will briefly reply in what I have to say. The person who presses the claims of the Word of God on the faith and obedience of the hearer, is always liable to be charged with exclusiveness; and I may seem to be desirous of condemning the reader as an unbeliever, when my only object is to induce faith in what I believe to be the truth by a presentation of the arguments which sustain it. God is judge. And I believe he will judge men according to their opportunities and the disposition and intentions of the heart. I am thankful that it is not for me to judge. Still I think it right to exercise a fear, both in regard to myself and others, lest we come short and be found wanting, when weighed in the balances. So let us warn all of their danger from unbelief and disobedience, though we may seem to some as assuming to be their judge.

I concede the vast advantage given the Jews in the marvellous works of the Saviour, added to the testimony of the prophets, to assist their faith. In prophetic light, and in that afforded by their example and God's dealing with them, we have a decided advantage over them. So we may presume to say that God's dealing with them and with us is equal. But though they had this advantage, still I believe the logic was good, that had they believed Moses, they would have believed Jesus, for he wrote of him; and I do not know that Moses foretold his miracles, unless it was in the promise that He should be a prophet like himself. I have no disposition to place our mission alongside that of Jesus Christ for a comparison. But John the Baptist, the greatest of the prophets, of whom it is expressly said that he "did no miracle," but whose authority for his mission rested solely upon the predictions of the prophets, may be taken as an example for us, depending as we do wholly upon the

light of prophecy and God's dealings with men in all past ages of the world. The Jews were condemned by the Saviour for not believing John. And I can but view it that the light and warning which God is now giving to the world, concerning the close of probation and the coming again of Jesus, is far more convincing than John's message could be standing alone. I wish to labor in harmony with God's plan, raising the voice of warning for the purpose of saving men, not condemning them.

R. F. COTTRELL.

COL. 2: 16.

HAMILTON, Feb. 18th, 1875. DEAR BRO. BERNICK: A letter post-marked Leonardsville or West Edmeston reached me yesterday. I presume that it is from you, or from some one known to you. The enclosed tracts I have read and carefully considered, as I have many others of a like kind, with many papers and books in favor of the same views. If they had been written in a bitter, contentious spirit, I should have passed them by in silence. I shall attempt no formal reply, but will notice a point or two.

Much indeed depends on a correct view of Col. 2: 16. I find the word rendered Sabbath here in no less than ten passages where it is plural in form but translated by the singular Sabbath-day. Examples, Matt. 12: 1; Mark 1: 21; 2: 24; Luke 13: 10, and Acts 13: 14. It seems to be rendered by a plural where the connection requires it; in other passages generally by a singular. It should be rendered by a singular noun Sabbath here to be in form like the other nouns of the sentence.

Now, does it refer to the seventh-day Sabbath? I take up the New Testament and find the word Sabbath or Sabbaths fifty-eight times. It seems in every case to relate to the seventh day. Could a candid, unbiased reader put a different meaning on the fifty-ninth and last use of it in the New Testament? I turn to the Old Testament. Here it has the same meaning about thirty times, and perhaps six times is used in a secondary and peculiar sense.

I refer to Josephus and find the Sabbath eight times, but not the seventh day. For six hundred years before the apostle wrote, the word is in common use for that day, and not one instance where it is used for an annual feast. Hence, if the word in Col. 2: 16 is used in the singular, it must refer to the most prominent Sabbath, and if it be plural it must certainly include the most prominent. The connection leads us to the same. He has spoken of the "annual Sabbaths" or annual feasts in the same sentence. He does not repeat himself. The conclusion is inevitable, if we follow the apostle. We have a *typha* fulfilled.

Much is made of Matt. 24: 20. In the connection Christ is not warning them against the moral wrong, but what will put them to inconvenience in their flight. In those days it will be unsafe to turn back for garments, not to give it is wrong. To be with child, to give suck, or to be in travel, or on the Sabbath, will not be wrong but inconvenient. Among Jews then and now no aid in fleeing would be rendered on the seventh day. Hence, this passage describes nothing about the day to observe. It has long been a wonder that it is quoted so often, as well as far as this passage goes, to quote it that we should keep the whole of winter. Mr. Kelley's course is natural, after starting from a wrong position I was troubled in the same way until I saw how the New Testament treated the Decalogue. It treats it just as it does all the rest of the law of Moses. You are at liberty to send this letter to the author of those tracts.

T. A. BAYSON. LEONARDVILLE, N. Y., March 12th, 1875.

Rev. T. A. BAYSON.

Dear Brother,—Your favor of Feb. 18th came to hand in due time. Demands upon my time, incident to a series of revival meetings, have prevented an earlier reply. As to the letter you have received, post-marked Leonardsville or West Edmeston, I know nothing and am therefore unprepared to say anything respecting its contents. Your discussion of Col. 2: 16 seems kindly in spirit, and is therefore to be treated with respect, though I may differ with you both as to the premises and conclusions. The fact that you find in the New Testament ten passages in which the plural form of the Greek word *Sabbaton* is translated by the singular form, *Sabbath-day*, proves nothing but the simple fact stated, and for the very obvious reason, that it does not therefore follow that it should be so rendered in the passage under consideration, since it is no less true that there are at least seven passages where the same form of the Greek noun is rendered *week*, and that too in those very passages where we find in the English version the phrase, *the first day of the week*. You will therefore be compelled to either abandon your theory that the plural form of the Greek noun, as found in Col. 2: 16, must be rendered *Sabbath-day*, or your argument in favor of observing the first day of the week as the Sabbath, upon the hypothesis that Christ rose from the dead on that day. Your statement to the effect that the nouns in a sentence should agree in number is without force, since it is a well-known fact that the nouns in a sentence may be both singular and plural where they refer to different things.

If it were possible to show beyond a doubt that the Greek noun in the given passage should be rendered by a singular form in the English, there would still remain very good reasons for rendering it *week* as involving the idea of Sab-

baths, but applied to the annual feasts of seven days, the Passover, Tabernacles and the First Fruits, the last and first days of which were Sabbaths or days of holy convocation, and with which were associated burnt offerings, meat offerings, drink offerings and sacrifices. These feasts, together with the feast of the atonement, are intended by the apostle to make very evident from the following considerations: 1. The plural form of the noun, as employed, by the apostle and the Greek and Hebrew versions of the Old Testament, to describe the great annual Sabbath of the feast of the atonement. See Lev. 23: 32, where it is rendered *Sabbath of rest*, but literally rendered would be *Sabbath of Sabbaths*, and is evidently intended to describe the greatest of the annual feasts.

2. The things enumerated by the apostle in Col. 2: 16 are previously described in the fourteenth verse as ordinances "against us," "contrary to us." As answering this description is said of the day of atonement, (Lev. 23: 27, 29.) "It shall be a holy convocation unto you; and ye shall afflict your souls, and ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord. For whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day shall be cut off from among his people." Both, as to the character and significance of this feast, it is contrary to us and declares against us, and because of its typical nature must have been taken out of the way, nailed to the cross, when Christ suffered on the cross for the sins of men. The things to which the apostle refers in the passage under consideration, lie, in the following view, declares to be the shadow of things to come, the body of which is Christ. This is certainly true of certain annual feasts, and especially so of the feast of the atonement, which is without any real value or significance, save as a type or shadow of Christ's agony and death on the cross, to make, once for all, an atonement for the sins of men.

3. That the apostle did not, in Col. 2: 16, refer to the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, is made evident from the fact that it was not given as a type or shadow, but as a memorial of the one only true God, who is to be remembered and honored as the Creator and sustainer of the world. Ex. 20: 11. It does not point forward to things consummated on earth, but exists to keep in memory the fact of men's relations and duties to God as their Creator, Sustainer, and Benefactor; hence the words of Christ: "The Sabbath was made for man." That the Sabbath of the Decalogue, to which Christ refers, is for us, not against us; is in our favor and designed to bless, not contrary to us, see Is. 58: 13, 14.

In view of the doctrine taught in the context, unless it can be conclusively shown that the Sabbath is necessary as a season for physical rest and religious worship, it must follow that the apostle does not refer to it in Col. 2: 16. In referring to the Greek noun *Sabbaton* in the above passage, you raise the question, "Does it refer to the seventh-day Sabbath?" Your question implies that there was another Sabbath not included in the apostle's statement, and you thereby betray the disposition to put away the Sabbath which God has honored and sanctified, in order to substitute in its place some other day. You certainly cannot fail to understand that the Bible in no single instance calls or recognizes any day as the Sabbath; but the seventh and last day of the week.

4. Your statement that the Sabbath was made for man, while your own efforts in common with many others to build up and find some semblance of authority for another Sabbath in the place of that enjoined by the Decalogue, is a virtual recognition of the fact that the Sabbath is still a moral necessity for man. I have not at present time nor space to discuss your enclosed tract, but shall be pleased to do so at some future time. With the sincere desire that the Word of God may really become the rule of faith and practice for all Christian believers, and that truth only may prevail, I am sincerely your brother in Christ.

STEPHEN BERNICK.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE, with the May Number, completes its Fiftieth anniversary, and its twenty-fifth year. This number is one of unusual interest. The Editor's Easy Chair in a few words' points, with just pride, to the past of the Magazine, especially its more occupied with the celebration of our national glory than of Harper's well deserved prosperity. It opens with a graphic and complete report of the Concord Fight, by Frederic Hudson, illustrated with twenty-eight engravings, including facsimiles of Emerson's poem and of Longfellow's "Ride of the Puritan." This article is particularly timely, being published on the eve of the celebration of the centennial anniversary of the event described, and is worthy of the twenty-eight pages which it occupies. In another and more important sense is Harper celebrating its anniversary timely, in its First Century Series, which is intended to be a complete exposition of progress in every department of our national life. James Parton contributes to this number an article entitled "Our Country in the Past Period," with fourteen illustrations. Professor Charles Rau contributes a second illustrated paper on the "Stone Age in Europe," this month treating of remains found in caves; while Hon. S. S. Cox continues his

illustrated papers on "American Humor," and Bro. McKee's contribution another installment of his series on the Republican Movement in Europe. This number contains three excellent short stories, "The Judge's Daughters," by Virginia W. Johnson; "Nobody but Jane Rossett," by Annie Hodgson Burnett; and "Katy," by Sarah L. Burton. The poetry is contributed by John May, Nelly M. Hutchinson, Kate Ellard, and Mary B. Dodge. The Editorial Departments are as usual, full of interesting and instructive matter.

MAIN AND GRISWOLD VS. THE NEW CONSTITUTION.

My former article was devoted to the historic unfolding of the General Conference as an Advisory Council, with the express purpose of noticing other and more specific objections of Main and Griswold. In the mean time, I see by the last Recorder that "Arthur E. Main" has come forward with a rejoinder on a point I had not yet reached, but held for consideration in future articles. This seems to me a needless and sad waste of dialectic power. I will hasten to its consideration, out of the order I had proposed, and a third and greater waste occur: And I note first, that in this last article "Arthur E. Main" says, "I do not expect the right of Conference to give advice to the churches." This is clear gain. We then agree upon the fundamental and essential point. Let us make a mark here that he go no more back on that. I note also that he, wittingly or unwittingly, quotes in favor of this some of the authorities quoted by me to sustain the same proposition. Another happy omen. We agree then upon the essential point and upon the quotations sustaining it. This is great progress.

Second, "Arthur E. Main" says, "but simply object to its possessing the exclusive right." So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again. But now comes the rub. He says, "The proposed new constitution is at variance with all this both in letter and in spirit, which, strange to say, 'Little Rhoda' does not appear to see." Yes, 'tis true as strange, I do not see it. I see very clearly "Arthur E. Main's" *ipse dixit* respecting the exclusive right. So do I. Here we agree again.

In this respect general state of religion, recommend such measures, give such advice, and render such assistance as shall be thought most conducive to the advancement, peace, and enlargement of the Redeemer's kingdom.

Deborah, the prophetess, was a woman of Ephraim, and the wife of Laphoth. She dwelt in a tent under a palm tree, distinguished as the palm tree of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in Mount Ephraim.

Each should know that there is a hand of prayerful sympathy stretched out to him and to her, while the earth is uplifted to God, that to each the Sabbath may really prove "a delight, the holy of the Lord and honorable."

Deborah, the prophetess, was a woman of Ephraim, and the wife of Laphoth. She dwelt in a tent under a palm tree, distinguished as the palm tree of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in Mount Ephraim.

May the blessed word still go on, until God's people are all one in him, without a note of discord. I want to tell you that I heartily sympathize with you in all your efforts to spread abroad God's truth.

Deborah, the prophetess, was a woman of Ephraim, and the wife of Laphoth. She dwelt in a tent under a palm tree, distinguished as the palm tree of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in Mount Ephraim.

push Elder Gardner faster. I often get nervous over these anxieties, but try to busy myself on account of my ignorance and awkwardness, knowing that the Seventh-day Baptists are fully able to attend to their own work in the vineyard of the Lord.

Deborah, the prophetess, was a woman of Ephraim, and the wife of Laphoth. She dwelt in a tent under a palm tree, distinguished as the palm tree of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in Mount Ephraim.

to mediums for doing tricks which magicians will do with less deception, in greater variety, and for smaller pay.

Deborah, the prophetess, was a woman of Ephraim, and the wife of Laphoth. She dwelt in a tent under a palm tree, distinguished as the palm tree of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in Mount Ephraim.

Mn. HUTCHINSON, the missionary who just missed assassination at Acapulco, sailed on Tuesday, March 30, for Vera Cruz, from whence he will proceed to the city of Mexico.

Deborah, the prophetess, was a woman of Ephraim, and the wife of Laphoth. She dwelt in a tent under a palm tree, distinguished as the palm tree of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in Mount Ephraim.

A letter from Quito, in the Cologne Gazette, reports that the Republic of Ecuador has passed wholly under the control of the United States.

Deborah, the prophetess, was a woman of Ephraim, and the wife of Laphoth. She dwelt in a tent under a palm tree, distinguished as the palm tree of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in Mount Ephraim.

Ministerial Conference.—Providence permitting, the next session of the Ministerial Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church will be held at the Portland, Ore., Convention, commencing Tuesday, April 20th, at 7 o'clock P. M.

Deborah, the prophetess, was a woman of Ephraim, and the wife of Laphoth. She dwelt in a tent under a palm tree, distinguished as the palm tree of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in Mount Ephraim.

WHOLESALE PRODUCE MARKET. Review of the New York markets for butter, cheese, etc., for the week ending April 11th, 1875.

Deborah, the prophetess, was a woman of Ephraim, and the wife of Laphoth. She dwelt in a tent under a palm tree, distinguished as the palm tree of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in Mount Ephraim.

Deborah, the prophetess, was a woman of Ephraim, and the wife of Laphoth. She dwelt in a tent under a palm tree, distinguished as the palm tree of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in Mount Ephraim.

