



The Sabbath Recorder

Alfred Centre, N. Y., Fifth-day, Feb. 10. N. V. HULL, EDITOR.

All communications, whether on business or for publication, should be addressed to THE SABBATH RECORDER, Alfred Centre, Albany Co., N. Y.

THE SABBATH IN DEUT. 5: 12-16.

We write upon the passage heading this article by special request, because it is claimed that it proves the Sabbath was only intended for the Jews, and that it of course was abolished with the other appointments of the Mosaic economy. We wish it distinctly understood that we also hold that if the Sabbath originated with the organization of the Jewish nationality, it was a Jewish institution, and was abolished at Christ's death. The passage to be considered in this article being taken to teach this doctrine will be carefully and fully considered, and we at the outset agree, if it teaches the doctrine claimed for it, we are wrong in the position we have taken on the Sabbath question. On the other hand, if it shall fail to prove the doctrine in favor of which it is quoted then that doctrine fails, because this text is a fundamental one in its support.

Before we proceed to quote the passage to be considered, it is important to state that the ten commandments were delivered to Israel some forty years before the transaction narrated in the farewell address of Moses, of which this fifth chapter of Deuteronomy forms a part. The fourth commandment as recited here reads thus: "Keep the Sabbath day to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God commanded thee. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy manservant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; that thy manservant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou. And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and by a stretched-out arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." The point made here is, "that the Sabbath was given exclusively to the children of Israel" on account of what is said in the fifteenth verse, which is the last one quoted above. But it seems to us that the objector proceeds hastily, not considering the whole case as presented in the Scriptures, nor even fairly interpreting the one quoted. As the commandment stands in Exodus, its object is defined to be to commemorate the work of creation, a very different thing from the reason for giving it to the Jews. The reason given for appointing the Sabbath is the one that describes its nature and object, and therefore determines the question of its continuance or discontinuance. If the Sabbath was appointed as a memorial or creation, then it follows that it was ordained at creation, and must continue while time endures.

In the fifth of Deuteronomy, no reason is given for the appointment of the Sabbath, but a reason is given why God gave it to the Jews, and why their servants, whether animals or men, should be permitted to enjoy it rest. The reason why God gave the Sabbath to the Israelites was that he had constituted them his people. All other nations were organized in the interest of false gods, and obeyed their behests. Every religious rite of theirs expressed their disbelief in Jehovah, and their belief in false gods. How, then, could God make covenant with these idolaters, and give to them his Sabbath, which, in its very nature, was a contradiction of every doctrine they held, and rite they performed? The object of God in calling out the Israelites was to constitute them his witnesses, and hence he gave them that memorial which declared him the maker and rightful Lord of this world. This is a fundamental doctrine of all true religion, nor is there another appointment than this in Scripture set forth for this purpose. All other appointments than this refer in some way to redemption, and therefore according to their character are peculiar to some one of the dispensations this side the fall. One of the provisions of the Sabbath in its accommodations to humanity in its present state was in the interest of servants, and the passage under consideration is very emphatic on this point; and to secure the benefits it proposed to them, Jehovah makes an appeal to their masters, that of all others would make them take heed to the commandment, which was that they were once servants in Egypt, and that from that bondage he had delivered them, and in the place of it he had not only given them freedom, but also the rest of the Sabbath. Now we ask, what appeal other than this could have so bound them to the Sabbath, and also moved them in compassion toward their servants? But this form of appeal in the interest of the dependent classes was common upon the part of Jehovah, and in proof of this see Deut. 15: 15, where, after reciting the duties owed to certain class of poor persons, God enforces them in these words: "And thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondsman in the land of Egypt, and the Lord thy God redeemed thee: therefore, I command thee this thing to-day." Also chap. 15: 19, after reciting certain duties,

inclusive of those in respect to servants, God says, "And thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondsman in Egypt; and thou shalt observe and do these statutes." In chap. 24: 18, 22, God comes an address to his people concerning their duties to the poor in the words following: "But thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondsman in Egypt, and the Lord thy God redeemed thee thence: therefore I command thee to do this thing. When thou cuttest down thine harvest in thy field, and hast forgotten a sheaf in the field, thou shalt not go again to fetch it: it shall be for the stranger, for the fatherless, and the widow: that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all the work of thy hands. When thou beatest thine olive tree, thou shalt not go over the boughs again: it shall be for the stranger, the fatherless, and for the widow. When thou gatherest the grapes of thy vineyard, thou shalt not glean it afterward: it shall be for the stranger, for the fatherless, and for the widow. And thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondsman in the land of Egypt; therefore I command thee to do this thing."

Many other passages might be quoted in support of the position here taken, but these are sufficient. Every person familiar with the sacred record knows that everywhere the claims of God upon his people are enforced upon the ground of what he had done for them, and that when he would enforce upon them the claims of the helpless, their deliverance out of the hands of their Egyptian taskmasters was constantly referred to, and no more pertinent motive could be employed. But to show that we do not depart from sound principles of interpretation on Deut. 5: 15, we will introduce two or three witnesses from observers of the first day. In a new Commentary by Jameson, Fausset and Brown on this passage, we find the following note: "14. 'That thy manservant and thy maid-servant may rest, as well as thou.' This is a different reason for the observance of the Sabbath from what is assigned in Exodus 20, where that day is stated to be an appointed memorial of the creation. But the addition of another motive for the observance does not necessarily imply any necessary contrariety to the other, and it has been thought probable that the commemorative design of the institution being well known, the other reason was specially mentioned in this repetition of the law, to secure the privilege of sabbatic rest to servants, of which, in some Hebrew families, they had been deprived. In this view, the allusion to the period of Egyptian bondage (v. 15), when themselves were not permitted to observe the Sabbath, either as a day of rest or of public devotion, was peculiarly reasonable and significant, well fitted to come home to their business and besoms." Dr. Adam Clark says: "Verse 16. And remember that thou wast a servant. In this, and the latter clause of the preceding verse, Moses adds another reason why one day in seven should be sanctified, viz, that the servants might rest; and this is urged upon them on the consideration of their having been servants in the land of Egypt. We see, therefore, that God had three grand ends in view by appointing a Sabbath. 1. To commemorate the creation. 2. To give a due proportion of rest to man and beast. When in Egypt they had no rest: their cruel taskmasters caused them to labor without intermission; now God had given rest, and as he had showed them mercy, he teaches them to show mercy to their servants: remember thou wast a servant. 3. To afford peculiar spiritual advantages to the soul, that it might be kept in remembrance of the rest which remains at the right hand of God." Boothroyd, in the Baptist edition of the Comprehensive Commentary, says: "Moses does not here assign this as a reason why this day should be sanctified, but why servants should enjoy rest as well as their masters."

We think that thoughtful interpreters of Scripture are likely to agree in these three points: 1. That in Deut. 5: 12-16, no reason is given why the seventh day was sanctified, but that other passages abundantly show it was done in memory of creation. 2. That a reason is here given why the Sabbath already instituted was at this time specially given to the Israelites, which was that God had chosen them to witness for the true God as against all false gods. This involved the giving to them his laws and religious institutions, and hence the Sabbath that declared him the creator of the world was given to them. 3. Special mention is here made of the provision in the sabbatic appointment for the wants of all doomed to labor, and faithfulness in regard to the duties of the Israelites to their servants is urged upon them by a consideration of the fact that they too were once servants in Egypt, and well knew the injustice and cruelty that class were liable to receive. The boastful inquiry whether the Sabbath was ever given to any other nation than to the Jews, does not seem to us well considered. It may be specious, but it is not solid. It may sparkle, but lacks depth. Let us see. God never gave a written code to but one nation. From the first to the last, a religion organized down to the coming of Christ, and long after, every one was established in the interest of heathenism. How, then, could God give to them or any one of them his

Sabbath? But the Sabbath was no more withheld from these nations than was every other precept of holy writ. That which they had directly from God was natural religion, and this they grievously perverted. The Sabbath, from its nature, and from its historic surroundings, seems, like the gospel, a provision for all nations, and its abrogation would be a blasting calamity. Those who contend for the abrogation of the Sabbath do not seem to well consider what they are doing. They all of the time proceed upon the principle that practically the Sunday is a substitute for the Sabbath. That though the Sabbath is abolished, there still remains a day of rest. But this is a mistake, as the Bible knows nothing of such an institution. The first day of the week, by whatever name called, is unknown as a sacred day in the Scriptures. There is not a man living who, by the Bible, can prove that the first day of the week has any religious title whatever. Destroy the Sabbath, and you have no divinely appointed day of weekly rest left. We pray those seeking the overthrow of the Sabbath to seriously consider these things. And we ask, what evil has the Sabbath done that you seek its overthrow? Let not a senseless zeal possess you, impelling you to destroy that which Jehovah has blessed and sanctified. Pray, cease to fight against God."

RELIGIOUS GROWTH. In the new birth, the principle of religious life from God is planted in the soul. It is a passing out of death into life. In the language of Scripture, the unregenerate person is dead, and in the new birth he comes to life, or more strictly comes into life. This life is an operative, spiritual principle, and is to work itself out in the life of the man. But it is a principle under law for its development or growth. In other words, it is a new method of development. In its growth, it may be dwarfed or it may come to the fullness of the stature of a man, according to the treatment it receives from its possessor. Religious growth is as much under our control as other religious matters. Living a religious life is an art, a thing we are to study and learn by constant practice, nor will there ever come a time during our probationary state when we shall not be learners. We may learn many lessons, may win many battles on the field of conflict, but the strife will still continue. Satan may be conquered, but he can not be killed. What we are to seek to do is to exercise the gracious temper of Christ in all things. If we cultivated in ourselves the temper of the Savior, it would not be so difficult for us to realize his life in our lives. Our feet are intricable in this case our hearts are unstrutted. We fail in our efforts to reform because we overlook the fountain whence actions spring. Only he who has Christ's disposition can copy his life. Our life is an outflow, and as it is the fountain such will be the stream.

One of the first steps to be taken in religious growth is the study of Christ's spiritual state. What were his feelings and principles? What was his daily life under all circumstances? When questions of duty arise with us, we should ask what would Christ do under like circumstances, and so we should proceed day by day. Proceeding in this way, we shall have more love for Christ and his religion. Their real work will more and more reveal themselves to us, and his principles will increasingly have power over us. We shall in this way renew our strength day by day. Duty will less and less seem a task, and victories over our selfishness will be won. In this way our flesh will be crucified, and our affections will more and more be weaned from the world and its pleasures. The false halo that surrounds it will disappear, as the fog is driven from the mountain top by the winds which are the breath of God. It should be the life-work of every Christian to increasingly develop the life of Christ which is in him. This is his glory and his safety, as it is also his joy. Let us seek to have Christ within us the hope of glory, and the light of his love shining forth from our hearts.

EXPOSITION. "Owe no man anything but to love one another."—Rom. 8: 13. I have read many interesting homilies, with the above as a text. There has, however, usually appeared a lack of unity in the line of exposition lessening the authority and force of the discourse. The usually logical and clear expositor, Barnes, commits the illogical fallacy of using the word owe in the second clause of the verse in a different sense from that in the first. See his notes on the passage. My opinion is, that King James's translators unfortunately used the wrong word of the verb, and expositors have followed without investigation. Scholars will recognize that the Greek verb has identically the same form in the second person plural of the indicative present, as the imperative. Had the translation been in the indicative, the harmony in the line of thought would have been complete. The Holy Ghost no more intended to enforce financial duty in this text, than social affinity, or reciprocal kindness in any other relation in life. Translated as intended by the Spirit, it would have borne the thought, "ye owe nothing to any one but the love of each other." Understood in the imperative, and a thousand instances will occur in life where it can not be

strictly obeyed without violating the law of reciprocal love. The necessary effect would be to weaken the impulses of conscience toward implicit obedience, and only a divided heart would play around the altar of consecration." J. R. I.

MILTON W. ST. JOHN. The death of this brother, which took place at Westery, R. L. Jan. 27th, demands more than usual notice. Eld. S. Bardick, his pastor, is expected to give, through an obituary, a suitable account of his life and character. His funeral was attended by the Executive Board of the Tract Society in a body as a recognition of his services in the relations of member and officer among them for many years. At a meeting subsequently held, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted: WHEREAS, our esteemed Christian brother and co-laborer, Milton W. St. John, has been removed by the sad providence of death, and WHEREAS, for a term of years we have sustained intimate and cordial relations with him as a fellow member of this Board; therefore, Resolved, That we hereby give expression to our feelings of sorrow and sense of loss in his removal from among us, and we join in a just appreciation of his life and character as an efficient fellow-laborer, a discreet and intelligent counsellor, an upright and public-spirited citizen, a true and devoted husband, father, son, and brother, and a faithful and loved member of the Christian church. Resolved, That we hereby extend a cordial invitation to the church of which he was a member, and to his bereaved companion, children and relatives, to unite with us in the Board, and we commend them to the gracious care of him, who alone, from the fullness of his love, can minister all needed consolation.

Resolved, That the Corresponding Secretary be instructed to forward a copy of these resolutions to the family of our deceased brother, and also to the Sabbath Recorder for publication, with a sketch of his services as an officer of the Tract Society. In 1863, the name of Bro. St. John first appeared in the list of the members of the Board, and from that time his connection with it has been almost uninterrupted. In 1870 he was appointed Treasurer, and for three successive years he carried the burdens of that responsible position, which were unusually heavy on account of the extensive enlargement during that period. He was re-elected for the fourth time, but after serving three months, he prevailed upon his brethren to accept his resignation, in view of his failing health and the demands of his personal business. At the time of his death he was first Vice President, having been kept in that station since his release from the duties of the Treasury.

From the association enjoyed with him in Christian work so long, he became endeared to us, and we can cheerfully bear testimony to his integrity and faithfulness in caring for the trusts committed to his hands. He has always acted the part of the Christian gentleman, and exhibited the spirit of the self-sacrificing friend of the cause of God. We make this record as a merited tribute to his memory; and while we deplore our loss, we earnestly pray that upon his surviving co-workers may rest a double portion of the divine Spirit. J. B. CLARKE, Cor. Sec.

which such government was to be based, must be republican. The object of the government being to protect the interests and secure the rights of the governed, so long as these remain unchanged, no change of government is demanded, hence no change in the organic law is required; and as long as the government answers the end for which it was instituted, there would be a manifest want of wisdom in destroying it.

These principles hold good when applied to the moral government of God. It is based upon organic moral law. That organic law originated in the nature of the relations existing between God the Creator, and all created intelligences. It existed in the form of law, in the mind of God, from the beginning of creation. It became operative as soon as there were created intelligences to come under its control. What is this organic law? We find it consistently stated by Christ, (Matt. 22: 37-40): "Then one of them, a lawyer, asked, tempting him, saying, Master, which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law, and the prophets."

But, says the objector, these are Christ's words, in the gospel; this is gospel, and not law. Not too fast, my good friend. These commandments were not given by him as a lawmaker, but were quoted by him as a law expounder. Turn to Deut. 6: 5, and you will find the first one, and to Lev. 19: 18, and you will find the second. As an expounder of the law, (and none will dispute his qualifications for this office,) he declares that "on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." Then we have the authority of the Son of God, who was with the Father "before the world was," (John. 17: 5), for saying that these two commandments, covering as they do, the whole ground of moral obligation, constitute the organic law of God's moral government. They are God's constitution, applicable alike to the government of angels and of men, and all the law needed by either while in a state of purity. As soon as an intelligent being was created, it was his duty, by virtue of his relation, as a creature to the Creator, to love that Creator as the commandment requires; and so soon as another intelligence was created, it became his duty, as a fellow creature, to love the other one as himself. But when man fell from his original state, God saw that, in consequence of the change produced in his character, he needed a more definite and specific form of law, adapted to his fallen condition; and he gave him the same law drawn out in the form of the ten precepts of the Decalogue. In this form it is adapted to, and covers all the relations of men to God, and to each other, in all places and for all time. In this form it was demanded by these relations. If, then, man's relations demanded this form of organic law, in a fallen state, so long as he remains in a fallen state, there is no demand for a change in the law; for in moral, as in civil government, a change in the organic law will produce a corresponding change in the government. And so long as these relations exist the same as when the government was founded, the organic law of that government, based upon those relations, can not by any possibility be invalidated or abolished. With reason, then, did Christ say, and of moral necessity must say, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am come to satisfy, to do, to fulfill. For verily, I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Mat. 5: 17, 18.

And with equal reason and necessity could Paul write, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; ye, establish the law." Rom. 4: 13. Instead, then, of the law of the Father being invalidated by the gospel of the Son, it is the more firmly established by it. And how is it established by it? Here the question arises, What is the relation of the gospel to the law? We answer, It is simply a remedy for violated law. As such, it has stood before man ever since he was driven out of Eden. It is a mistaken idea, though widely entertained, that the gospel was first introduced by Christ at his advent. It had run parallel with the law, as a remedy for man's transgression thereof, for nearly six thousand years, having been introduced immediately upon the entrance of sin. "Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3: 4. Whenever a person is convicted of sin, it is the law that convicts him. "For by the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. 3: 20. When he repents of sin, turns from it, believes the gospel, and accepts of Christ as his Savior, he acknowledges the binding obligation of the law. "For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died." Rom. 7: 8, 9. It is the law that condemns him, and his only way of deliverance from that condemnation is by "being justified freely by his (God's) grace, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propiti-

ation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; . . . that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Rom. 3: 24-26. So far from the law being invalidated or abrogated by the gospel, we hear Paul exclaiming, "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." Rom. 7: 12. And this harmonizes with the declaration of the Psalmist, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever; the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb." Ps. 19: 7-10. And the closing benediction of the Son of God, "Blessed are they that do his (the Father's) commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates unto the city." Rev. 22: 14. May the Lord have mercy on those who do them not. D. P. CURTIS. MONTICELLO, Minn., Jan. 28th, 1876.

HISTORY OF SUNDAY LEGISLATION. In the Christian Church. BY A. B. LEWIS. CHAPTER V. PURITANISM AND THE SUNDAY IN ENGLAND. Continued from last week. After thus surveying the field, it is difficult to understand how Mr. Bowdye could be so blinded to the legitimate deductions from his own arguments, as to talk of a change of day. But so strong were his prejudices against what he calls Judaism that he clings to the Sunday, supporting his claim with the following broken reed: "But now concerning this very special seventh day which we now keep in the time of the gospel, that it is well known, that it is not the same it was from the beginning, which God himself did sanctify; and whereof he speaketh in this commandment, for it was the day given before ours, which in Latin retaineth its ancient name, and is called the Sabbath, which we also grant, but so that we confess it must always remain, never to be changed any more, and that all men must keep holy this seventh day, which was unto them not the seventh, but the first day of the week, as it is so called many times in the New Testament, and so it still standeth in force, that we are bound unto the seventh day, though not unto that very seventh. Concerning the time, and persons by whom, and when the day was changed, and was in the New Testament, that it was done in the time of the apostles, and that together with the day, the name was changed, and was in the beginning called the first day of the week, afterwards the Lord's day."

Mr. Bowdye quotes only two passages of Scripture in support of the above claim, Acts 20: 7, and 2 Cor. 16: 2. In direct opposition to his previous proposition, that the Word of God alone is authority, he devotes several pages to quotations and remarks concerning the "Doctors and Fathers" in the church, seeking to show that the early Christians changed the observance from the Sabbath to the Sunday. These quotations are made from those who gave most prominence to the resurrection theory as a reason for the change, and so, by a sort of implication, a degree of divine authority is hinted at. The greater part of the book is occupied in discussing the manner of observing the Sunday, as regards rest from labor, and forms of public worship. Great strictness in the one, and extreme simplicity in the other are everywhere inculcated. The appearance of this book caused no little commotion. It was at once adopted by the Puritan party. By the church party it was strongly opposed, as an encroachment upon Christian liberty, and as putting an undesired lustre and importance upon Sunday over the other festivals. Rogers, author of the Commentary upon the thirty-nine Articles, in his preface, boasts that it had been, and would be his dying day, "the comfort of his soul," that he had been instrumental in bringing this Sabbatarian heresy to light. Archbishop Whitgift, and Lord-Chief Justice Popham, called in this work, and forbade its reprinting. It was much read privately, however, and after the death of Whitgift, reprinted with additions in 1606.

Such were the theories of the Puritans concerning the Sunday. It now remains to trace its history in civil legislation, and in practical life. The visible separation between these radical reformers and the Established church began about 1600, when they were derisively called Puritans. During the remainder of the reign of Elizabeth, and the reign of her successor, James I., they had but little direct political influence. But as all reforms find their first welcome among the common people, puritan ideas and practices gained steadily among the masses. The spirit of liberty was demanding release from the civil and ecclesiastical usurpations and oppressions which marked the beginning of the reign of Charles I. His Queen was an open friend of the Papists, while he claimed to be the supporter of the orthodox church, as founded by Elizabeth. Laud and his co-workers were the King's advisers, and were at the head of the church party. Against these were arrayed the whole Puritan party, and many others who

could not fellowship the papistic tendency of the Court. In the Parliament, this included the body of the "House of Commons," and a party in the "House of Lords." But the "Bench of Bishops," who were ex officio members of the House of Lords, for a long time thwarted all efforts for change or reform. About 1640, the open struggle commenced by the passage of a reformatory bill in the House of Commons, one provision of which was for a stricter observance of Sunday. It was defeated in the House of Lords; but the discussion and agitation did much to arouse the people, and to disturb the security of the throne and the church party. This would probably have ended for the time in discussion except that, upon the heel of the failure of the bill, there came the insurrection of the Papists, and the massacre of the Protestants in Ireland, on the 23rd of October, 1642. Strong suspicions were entertained that the Court, especially the Queen, was a party to the plot, and fears were aroused that a similar fate awaited the English non-conformists. The failure of the efforts of Parliament, and of the Irish Protestants, to obtain relief for the sufferers, and punishment for the offenders, at the hands of the Court, only widened the breach between the two parties in the government, and showed the complexity of the Court with the barbarous butchery of the Irish. This led to a rapid separation. The bishops were soon driven from the House of Lords. The King fled to York, followed by his party. The Parliament having tried in vain to obtain his co-operation to avert the dangers to the kingdom, took the power into its own hands. The Queen fled to Holland, from whence, with her son-in-law, the Duke of Orange, she forwarded supplies to the King. Each party possessed itself of as much territory and military strength as possible, and the King, marching against London, was met at "Edgehill near Kinton in Warwickshire," by the Parliament forces under the Earl of Essex, and the first battle took place on the 23rd of October, 1643, just one year from the breaking out of the Irish insurrection.

Two causes now set to work to bring about a more religious observance of Sunday: (a) The Parliament was bound, by the turn matters had taken, to press the reforms for which it had been contending, among which was the stricter observance of Sunday. (b) The calamity of civil war with all its horrors was upon the nation, and like all great calamities, it tended to make the people more religious. Of the influence of the war, in its early stages, on the religious habits of the people, Neal (History of the Puritans, vol. I, p. 424) speaks as follows: "Though the discipline of the church was at an end, there was nevertheless an uncommon spirit of devotion among the people in the Parliament quarters. The Lord's day was observed with remarkable strictness, the churches were crowded with numerous and attentive hearers three or four times a day. The officers of the peace patrolled the streets, and shut up all public houses. There was no traveling on the road or walking in the fields, except in cases of absolute necessity. Religious exercises with and without private families; as reading the Scriptures, family prayer, repeating sermons, and singing of Psalms, which was so universal, that you might walk through the city of London on the evening of the Lord's day, without seeing but the voice of prayer and praise from churches and private houses.

"As is usual in times of public calamity, so at the breaking out of the civil war, all public diversions and recreations were laid aside. By an ordinance of September 2d, 1642, it was declared that, whereas public sports and plays were held in the streets, and other such spectacles of pleasure too commonly expressing lascivious and lewd notions, it is therefore ordained that, while these sad causes and set times of humiliation continue, public stagings shall cease, and be forbidden; and that any person who shall be seen to perform any such stage, or to be a part of the company, shall be liable to the penalties of the laws in that behalf made, and that any person who shall be seen to perform any such stage, or to be a part of the company, shall be liable to the penalties of the laws in that behalf made, and that any person who shall be seen to perform any such stage, or to be a part of the company, shall be liable to the penalties of the laws in that behalf made."

CORRECTION.—The New England Journal of Education calls attention to the following as a correction of the statement which was copied into the Recorder of Jan. 27th, as from the Missouri Republican under the caption, "How it Works." "We have the facts from the chairman of the committee on rules and regulations of the Boston School Board, to whom the matter was referred. In answer to our inquiries, he says: "The girl was kept out of school six or eight weeks. The father called it expulsion, I suppose; because the chairman of the School Committee insisted that if she attended school she must comply with the rules of the school. The father preferred that she should not attend."

LAW-LIKE, BUT DANGEROUS. A "Debate on the Religious Amendment" of the Constitution of the United States occurred at Cline, Ohio, on the 29th of December, 1875. In the course of the discussion, the advocates of the amendment presented the following sample of the thing designed for practical points: "The Jew and many Papists have conscientious convictions the seventh day of the week is the true Sabbath; but so many more of other persuasions, be the first day of the week to be Sabbath. In this conflict, the Jew has not hesitated to decide. His decision—the only one that has been made—is based upon his recognition as the great public science. In other words, the scientific belief common to the majority is given the preference, and the minority, instead of being compelled to profess, or believe the majority, are left to their own views and promote them, without incurring any penalty, provided they are guilty of any overt act in violation of the law."

Read carefully, the above you will find harmless; examined closely, it has the true ring of coin which says, "Might makes right." The darkest period in the history of Romanism, when hands were full of blood, were in which the "Great Public Science" was "given the preference" and became the standard of the law. Even then, the minority allowed to hold and promulgate their views, providing they were not guilty of any overt act in violation of the law." But on practical questions it is not possible for dissenters to obey conscience while committing an "overt act in violation of the law." Violation of the Sunday Law—weak as it is—was permitted only by suffering and because many believe the law to be unconstitutional and void. Increase the power of this "Great Public Science," and make the tool in the hands of partisans, and sufferance will speedily disappear. Note the words of the above: "This conflict, the State has not hesitated to decide. And that decision—the only one that can be made"—based" &c. Exactly, "The only one that can be made" will put that in plain. It is a true statement from the standpoint of those who press such amendments. Majorities must govern matters of religion, and the nation's government must so govern. The law of God is the test of a corrupt state-church which is the world. It was egged on by even in the later years of the tenth century, when "Rome's Pope," Alexander VI., his son, Cesar Borgia, made black pages of history blush at their crimes.

We may deem this "Religious Amendment" scheme an idle one. It may prove to be nothing more. But earnest men are beholding. They think they do God's service in pressing it. They are not aware in their opposition to the minority at least the Protestant ministers. They are only orthodox; inferior orthodox. So the Romish preachers who slew thousands of Sabbath-keeping Waldenses during later years of the dark ages, were only orthodox. They only put "Great Public Science" in civil law. The road between these two orthodoxes is short. Truth needs fear, but it is well not to be frightened or espoused. JAN. 30th, 1876.

HOME NEWS. Hartford, Conn., Feb. 4th, 1876. Our hearts are full of gratitude and awake to the blessings of God for the aid, instruction, and encouragement given us, during the Sabbath-School Institute, which closed last night, after its fourth session. Surely, the Board made a wise man in this provision was made, and encourage the teaching of the word of God. No matter how small a school as a first-class superintendent, the best of teachers, and the best, faithful scholars, it is stronger and wiser by these outside aids. While we can not accomplish much without earnest heart-work and faithful, deep-searching labor, we need these outside influences to give us fresh inspiration. They are like a fall of rain in the drought, giving new impetus to unfinished work. The earnest work by the members of the committee present, Rev. L. R. Swinney and O. D. Sherman, was a good influence. They endeavor, and advice to keep the Bible, and that great help, prayer, leads one to feel that it is for renew, and for every selfish give, that they are at work, but the love of God, enlightens the world, and salvation of the May God in his goodness bless them in all their Christian efforts is the prayer of A SABBATH-SCHOOL SCHOOL. Toledo, Iowa, Jan. 29th, 1876. I wish to say that Eld. E. L. has been laboring with the Lord to bless his laborers. The herish has been strengthened, and sliders have been made to feel the Lord was near, and have almost persuaded to forsake wanderings, repent and do first work, and sinners have converted. We expect to visit

moderately-drawn plans, which to carry forward need means for the most part from our transatlantic brethren. Funds are now urgently needed for the Memorial and other necessary expenses. Friends, remember us as best you can. W. M. JONES.

HARD TIMES. Ever since my earliest recollection, it has been the universal practice of some to complain of hard times. Having had the experience of fifty years in business, (though limited) in different parts of our commonwealth, the cry has been with a certain class, "Hard times." We are led to inquire, Are they honest in their complaints, or are they deceived? With a certain class, the times are, in their estimation, always hard. Another class find it necessary on certain occasions to curtail their expenses, apply themselves more attentively to their business than at other times in order to meet all their engagements punctually, and possess life's comforts. I remember a man of steady and industrious habits who, on the death of his father, had what may be called in the country, a competency left him, enough to buy him a good farm, with necessary improvements. He married a wife who was the possessor of more than he had. They commenced the world apparently with a determination to succeed. They hired money to begin the business of farming, as they needed teams, wagons, plows, cows, hogs, sheep, household goods, and many things innumerable, for which he must pay annual interest. They worked hard year after year, and yet the debt increased; instead of being paid, was constantly accumulating, and every few years (he would sell off a piece of land, or some timber, in order to make necessary payments. He wondered why he did not prosper as well as his neighbors; and his family worked hard and lived prudently. Knowing his difficulty, I had some curiosity to know why it was. I watched his movements for a season, being neighbor to him, and I ascertained to my satisfaction that there was a leak that would finally sink the ship. He began with a debt, interest accumulating. At the end of the year, instead of paying the interest, he would add it to the principal, and give a new note. At auctions, he would buy liberally, where there was a long credit, articles that he did not need, because they were cheap, and when the pay day came, he would give his note with interest, not heeding the counsel of Poor Richard, who said, "That what a man did not need was dear at any price." As soon as a crop was gathered, it was taken to market and sold, for it was pressed for money, and always with an empty pocket. Then for his family, his horses, hogs and cattle, he must depend upon the retail market. He would sell for cash, and buy on credit; thus he was a slave to his creditors. He had a neighbor who began life poor, worked by the month until he married, when he took a farm on shares. After a few years, he bought a farm adjoining the man spoken of, paid what he had saved, and gave a mortgage for the remaining sum. He raised and educated his family, lived comfortably and respectably, paid his interest annually and punctually, and some on the principle; always had an abundance from his farm for the support of his family, and some to spare; liberal in his donations to benevolent objects, and punctual in their payment, always having money in his pocket for necessary purposes, and not being under the necessity of going in debt. In a few years, his farm was paid for, and now he is buying his neighbor's farm, in small parcels, as he has occasion to sell. Mr. T. always has hard times, always works hard, is not an idler, neither are the members of his family. They are all industrious and prudent in their living expenses, enjoying but few of life's luxuries, and yet always on the drag, wondering why the times are so hard, while Mr. B. seems to be in readiness for the hard times. Having something laid up in store against a day of need, he smiles all the storm.

In my travels as a minister of the gospel, I find many who complain of hard times. The most of them are the makers of their own misfortune. When I go to a farmer's house in this comparatively new country, and find a father with sons grown up, sitting around the kitchen stove trying to warm it with a few sticks of green, black wood dug from under the snow, and they smoking some old clay pipes, and talking about hard times, and charging it upon the government, I say to myself, "You will always scratch a poor man's head." When I see a lot of men calling themselves farmers, spending day after day at the groceries and stores in the village, smoking and chewing, and complaining of the hard times, and their families at home with no wood, though an abundance in the woods near by, I am inclined to say, "O, ye grambles, go home; go to work at any business in which you can earn an honest penny, and soon you and your families will be relieved from the hard times, and will know the good of enjoying the peaceful comforts of life."

AN OBSERVER. The Unitarian church at Brookfield, Mass., has substituted water for wine at the administration of the Lord's Supper.



