



The Sabbath Recorder.

Alfred Centre, N. Y., Fifth-day, Oct. 31.

REV. N. V. HULL, D. D., - EDITOR.

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

THE CHRISTIAN UNION ON THE SABBATH.

We find the following in the Christian Union of October 9th. On every hand almost we are witnessing evidences of an increased interest on the Sabbath question, for which we thank God:

1. By what authority was the Sabbath changed from the seventh to the first day of the week? 2. Why was it changed? 3. When was it changed? 4. What passages in the Bible illustrate the change?

The ten commandments did not create laws; they interpreted and declared laws already existing. Cain was guilty of a crime, though he murdered his brother; he was five hundred years before God said on Mount Sinai, Thou shalt not kill. The Sabbath obligation rests, not on a law engraven on tables of stone that have long since crumbled to dust, but on a law written by God in the constitution of man, body, mind and spirit, and as lasting as the earthly human race. That law is written in man's need of certain stated periods of time for rest, bodily and mental, and for spiritual elevation, meditation and instruction. This is all the obligation that Luther, Calvin and the early reformers recognized. We are inclined to go further and to think that the proportion of time required for average humanity for rest, and for spiritual refreshment is one to seven. In the liberty of Christ's kingdom, each disciple is left to determine for himself, under the guidance of his ever present Lord, how he will secure this proportion of time and rest, and most profitably employ it for himself and for others. There is no direct Biblical authority for any change of day. The early Jewish Christians observed the seventh day as a Jewish Sabbath and the first day in celebration of their Lord's resurrection. The Gentile Christians coming into the church cared nothing about the Jewish day, but the resurrection day was sacred to them as to the others. Gradually, as the Gentile Christians outnumbered the Jewish Christians, the old day dropped out of use and the new day took its place. Even if, however, with a superficial philosophy we base the Sabbath obligation on the words of the fourth commandment, the day to be observed, whether the Jewish or the first, would be immaterial. The fourth commandment simply calls on us to work six days and rest on the seventh; and we do that now.

The answer of the Christian Union to the questions put to it concedes the binding nature of the ten commandments, and that the seventh day is the Sabbath of that instrument. In the Union's philosophy, we take little interest. It adds nothing to the teachings of the Scriptures. Perhaps the Union is correct as to the manner of Sabbath observance. It is certainly correct when it says, "There is no direct Biblical authority for any change of the day," and we go farther and say there is no indirect Biblical authority for the change of the day. That the early Christians of Jewish descent kept the Sabbath, seems clear enough, but there is no evidence whatever that they celebrated the resurrection of their Lord on the first day. There is nothing said in the Scriptures about celebrating the Lord's resurrection on any day of the week. Nor is there anything said about the Gentile Christians did concerning Christ's resurrection day. In after days, when the church began to make her own religion, patterning it after the heathen and Jewish systems, a "resurrection day" came into repute, and the days of Christ's arrest and crucifixion. Of these, however, the Scriptures know nothing.

The truth of the following sentence, however, can not be denied: "Gradually, as the Gentile Christians outnumbered the Jewish Christians, the old day dropped out of use and the new day took its place." No doctrine is here stated, only a historic fact, and we believe it to be true. To the following, however, we decidedly object: "Even if, however, with a superficial philosophy we base the Sabbath obligation on the words of the fourth commandment, the day to be observed, whether the seventh or first, would be immaterial. The fourth commandment simply calls on us to work six days and rest on the seventh; and we do that now."

Let us then begin immediately the work of enlargement. Let every one see what he can do himself, and what he can encourage others to do. If we will go to work earnestly, we can easily double the work of the last year.

1. Let our Recorder accounts be as promptly paid as possible. This will give new heart to all those interested in its prosperity and in the prosperity of our denominational work.

2. Increase its subscription list by adding to it some hundreds of paying subscribers.

3. Greatly increase your subscriptions or contributions, as the case may be, to the funds of the Tract Society.

4. And also equally increase your contributions to the funds of the Missionary Society. These are things vital to our well-being as a people.

The Seventh-day Baptists. A peculiarity has made this very small body of Christians more prominent than their numbers or activity warrant. The denomination, which has never been a large one, has now only a few thousand members, and differs from the large body of regular Baptists chiefly in the observance of the seventh day as Sabbath, instead of Sunday. It is not of recent origin, but claims that the early Christians down to the time of Constantine religiously observed the seventh day, and that there have been

various times in various parts of Europe were preachers and churches keeping the seventh day. They mention the names of several preachers in England who in the seventeenth century suffered for their Sabbatarian opinions. About the same time, the seventh-day principle began to appear in some of the Baptist churches here. In 1817, there was a division in the Baptist Church in Newport, R. I., resulting in the organization, ten years later, of the first Seventh-day Baptist Church in America. Subsequently, churches of like views sprang up in other parts of New England, and in the Middle States, where the strength of the denomination is yet to be found.

In 1814, a co-operative scheme was formed, the churches meeting together annually in conference to receive reports, and to discuss the different departments of church work, and to advise the churches, which follow the Congregational order, respecting any matters that may be presented to it. This year the Conference has been held at Plainfield, N. J. There were 250 delegates in attendance, of whom about forty were clergymen. Reports were presented from the South Eastern, the Eastern, the Central, the Western, and the Northern States, and the Middle and Western States, and in Virginia. Besides these, there were reports from the Sabbath school, the Tract, the Education, and the Missionary Societies. The Committee on the State of Religion reported that the churches in general are in a healthy and prosperous condition; but they regretted that many members seem to have no interest in the work and welfare of the church. The reports of the Missionary and Tract Societies contained nothing of special interest. The former supports a missionary in China, besides what it does for home missions; and the latter circulates denominational literature, particularly tracts on the Sabbath question.

A matter of more interest to the general public than anything yet mentioned in the proceedings of the Conference is the points of difference between the Seventh-day and the Seventh-day Adventists. A few years ago there were negotiations for closer relations between the two denominations, which agree exactly in the New Testament where the word Sabbath occurs, write them down, then sort them, classify them, and deduce the teaching of the New Testament for yourself.

The Union here admits that "Christ and his disciples observed the seventh day," and that they did it as a matter "of course." It follows from this that they did not "engage in any secular work." They attend worship in the synagogues on this day, and to them it was not a fast day, but a feast day. And take notice, it was not a yoke of bondage; but "a day of liberty."

The Sabbath, it says, "was made for man," and belongs to the "human race," and not "merely to the Jews," a doctrine that we cordially and heartily accept. The Union even goes so far as to say, "It is a Christian, and not a Jewish institution." That is very good. We take it the answer to "Also, wherein you judge the Seventh-day Christian observers to be in error," to be this, "Take your concordance, look up every passage in the New Testament where the word Sabbath occurs, write them down, then sort them, classify them, and deduce the teaching of the New Testament for yourself." Nothing could be better than this, and we wish the questioner would follow the advice given.

A LOOKING-GLASS.

We take the following article from the New York Independent of Oct. 17th, and commend it to the thoughtful attention of our people. The fact that the writer seems a little unfriendly to us must not blind us to the truth that he has some ground for saying unpleasant things about us. That he has drawn the picture too darkly, we believe; but we must be careful not to let whatever truth he does utter be lost to us on that account. Nor again must we allow some of the mistakes alluded to offend us. They are of little consequence when compared with a certain damaging truth running through the whole article, which is, that as a people we lack the essential quality of religious force. By this writer we are accused before the world of religious inefficiency, and this would be a small matter if we could in truth deny the impeachment.

Since reading this statement, we have greatly desired that our people might be benefited by it. Perhaps we feel this matter more keenly than we should, but for the fact that we feel a growing interest on this question ourselves. Sometimes we fear that as a people we are to sink into oblivion, but we rally from this and again feed on hope. The conviction is strong with us that God has a work for us to do in his vineyard, and then we fear that we shall never awake to a realization of this fact. And now we ask our brethren to think of this. Are we doing what we ought as a people?

At our late General Conference we thought we saw the working of the spirit of enterprise to an unusual extent, and do confess our faith was strengthened in our people. That, however, this rising spirit may not die, it is essential that we go to work. It must take on form, clothing itself in action.

Let us then begin immediately the work of enlargement. Let every one see what he can do himself, and what he can encourage others to do. If we will go to work earnestly, we can easily double the work of the last year.

1. Let our Recorder accounts be as promptly paid as possible. This will give new heart to all those interested in its prosperity and in the prosperity of our denominational work.

2. Increase its subscription list by adding to it some hundreds of paying subscribers.

3. Greatly increase your subscriptions or contributions, as the case may be, to the funds of the Tract Society.

4. And also equally increase your contributions to the funds of the Missionary Society. These are things vital to our well-being as a people.

SEVENTH-DAY BAPTISTS AND SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS.

Under the above heading, Eld. J. N. Andrews has an article of excellent spirit in the Review and Herald of Oct. 24th. Our special reason for referring to it is to make one or two explanations, so that a proper understanding of the main differences between them and us may be more clearly seen.

1. The at least semi-materialism of our Seventh-day Adventist brethren is objectionable to Seventh-day Baptists. We hold that God is spirit, and that man has a spirit.

2. Our Advent brethren, as we understand them, hold that Sister White is a prophetess, in the Scriptural sense of that term. This sentiment, Seventh-day Baptists do not receive. They hold that the book of prophecy closed with the utterances of John the Revelator.

3. Seventh-day Baptists believe in the second coming of Christ, and are generally agreed as to the form in which he is to come. Concerning the time of his coming, they only have this opinion fixed, that it will be in the end of the world. They do not feel hostile to the opinion that the coming of Christ is at hand, but admit that possibly it may be; nevertheless, the evidences producing this conviction in the minds of our Advent friends do not make the same impression upon us.

4. While Seventh-day Baptists are decided in their convictions against what they hold to be essential errors in the doctrines taught by their Advent friends, there is not, to any great extent, any feeling of bitterness toward them, but rather a feeling of kindness and generosity.

5. In this connection, we think it would be proper to make a personal explanation. In the case of Dr. Lee, the editor of the Recorder, no knowledge of any special controversy between him and the Adventists, save what clustered around the question of spiritual gifts, and had therefore no thought of doing an unneighborly thing. We supposed that an open question, and was therefore innocent at least in our purposes.

The movement in the interest of an amendment to the Constitution of California, incorporating in that instrument, among other things, a clause declaring the Sunday the Christian Sabbath, and enforcing its observance by pains and penalties, is calling out considerable discussion. Even the ministry are divided on the question. Rev. W. E. Fjams has written a powerful letter, showing the necessity of a complete separation of Church and State in order to the welfare of each. In answer to him, however, an admission is made by Rev. N. K. Johnson on the Sabbath question, that means a good deal. It is in this sense: "That the moral law requires one day out of seven, whether the first or the seventh may be questioned, to be kept sacred to rest and worship." This shows that this question has been considered by this gentleman, and that he dare not decide in the interest of the first day; and how could he when paying any regard to the facts underlying the fourth commandment, or to the language of the commandment itself?

But with the thought that this movement has for one of its purposes the hampering of those who are keeping the seventh day, and are propagating this doctrine in that country, we are more and more impressed as the controversy proceeds. If those who are called to defend the Sunday as a religious institution can get it incorporated into the Constitution of their State, they can quote that, and this will free them the dilemma they are in when they attempt to quote Scripture.

POLITICAL-RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN PENNSYLVANIA.

[The letter below from Senator Jones will be read with interest by all our readers, and especially by those in Pennsylvania, and they will know to do about it. Whether the enemies of religious liberty defend the Colonel or not, nothing is true, which is, he can better afford to be defeated by bigotry and intolerance, than to succumb to them, and thereby win in the contest.]

To the Editor of the Sabbath Recorder: As a defender of religious liberty in Pennsylvania, and as an advocate of the rights of conscience, I deem it my duty to inform my brethren of the Seventh-day Baptist churches in Pennsylvania, that a direct attack has been made on Hon. Aaron K. Dunkel, in a circular purporting to come from a Methodist preacher, because Col. Dunkel, as a Senator, was among the most active in his opposition to the Sunday Bill, which was an act to prevent shops on the Lord's day, and was intended to shut up the Zoological Garden and International Exhibition. Col. D., and others, contended that the present Sunday Law of 1794 was all sufficient for the purpose, if the members of "the Sabbath Alliance," as the organization is called, would only carry it out. But this law was too mild, and the fine was to be increased very much. The new act did not reach the Senate, but was defeated in the House. Had it come to the Senate, it would have met with fierce resistance not only from myself, but from Col. Dunkel. At that time, he was publisher of the Sunday Republic, and his paper took strong ground against the new bill. For doing this, the Methodists now attack him, as he is nominated for Secretary of Internal Affairs. His opponents say, "Mr. Dunkel will learn the number of the friends of the Sabbath more correctly when

the day of election comes. The Christian ministers and people of this Commonwealth are not prepared to entrust its affairs in the hands of men who have no regard for the sacred day which is the conservator of religious worship." In other words, because Col. Dunkel is opposed to enforcing the observance of Sunday by law, these people urge that he should be defeated. He has nobly and bravely stood by me on all occasions, and has always voted for my bills to relieve those who observe the seventh day as the Sabbath. Justice calls upon me to inform my brethren of the Seventh-day churches in Pennsylvania of these facts.

HORATIO GATES JONES, PHILADELPHIA, Oct. 25th, 1878.

REVIEW

Of articles in the Sabbath Recorder, recently published in the Free Methodist, at Syracuse, N. Y. No. VI.

Levi Wood, Dear Brother—What you have written in your articles on the Sabbath, respecting the Jewish feasts, which occurred at the time of the crucifixion, and soon after, has given me more light, concerning them, than I had previously for which I am very thankful. There is no doubt but that all these feasts, viz.: the Passover, the feast of first fruits, and the Pentecost, typified important events in the scheme of redemption. The paschal lamb was a type of Christ, and he was crucified on the very day on which this lamb was slain, so that here type and antitype came together on the same day. The offering of first fruits occurred on the very day of the resurrection of our blessed Lord; for I do not doubt that he arose on that very day; but, as I have already said, that is not the fact mentioned in connection with that day, for it merely happened to be the first day of the week, on the third day from his death; and it is the latter day, as to number, that is always named in connection with the resurrection.

And the very process of reasoning by which you locate and identify the first day of the week, positively fixes the place of "the seventh day" in the week; for it must be the day next preceding the first day; and that was then, and is now, ever shall be, the Sabbath of the Lord, "according to the commandment."

You then make the following assertion: "The first day of the week is, therefore, the day of days to the Christian. The seventh, on which our Lord was death's captive, has lost its hold on the Christian heart." Yes; and it is to be deplored that so many, even of those who claim to be far ahead of the mass of the Christian world in spiritual attainments, and have separated themselves from that mass in many respects, should yet cling to a practice originating in a paganized Christianity, having no higher authority than the traditions of men, who make void the command of God now, just as much as the Pharisees did the same thing. How can Christians remain guiltless while they thus set aside God's Sabbath, contrary to the example of Christ himself, and take another day to commemorate his resurrection, without any command from him to do so? and that day one which has the pollution of idolatry clinging to it! I tell you it is cause for sorrow, in stead of the joy and triumph which you throw around it.

You next say: "While Christ lay in the grave, on the seventh day, a terrible gloom was on his disciples. 'They mourned and wept;' sorrow had filled their hearts." But the next day they saw him alive. "Then were the disciples glad when they saw the Lord." Their joy knew no bounds." I think when you look at this a little closer, you will find yourself a little too fast here; for they did not see him, nor believe he was alive, till after the end of the first day—it was after sundown—consequently it was in the beginning of the second day of the week that he appeared to them, so they no doubt had as much "sorrow" all the first day as they had the seventh. I will now quote quite a lengthy paragraph, to give my readers a specimen of your reasoning:

"Now I ask which day is most dear to the Christian heart? It is said that the Sabbath commemorates creation. Follow Christian, which is most dear to you, creation or redemption? If the Sabbath commemorates creation only, what have we to commemorate redemption? Let us have a Sabbath which commemorates redemption and creation also. This the Christian Sabbath does. Shall we keep that day sacred in which wicked men and devils held a jubilee over the death of Christ, while his dead body was hidden from human view, and in which apostles and disciples were ready to expire with grief? Or shall we celebrate, keep sacred, and rejoice in that day of his glorious resurrection, which brought dishonor and shame to his enemies, and unspeakable joy to his friends? The reason of the thing is a sufficient proof that the day must have been changed."

It is a sufficient answer to the above, to say that if Divine wisdom did not see fit to make any such arrangement, why should human wisdom think it necessary? Verily it looks more like human folly to devise any such plan. God never leaves such important matters to be settled by the whims and caprices of finite beings.

You next enumerate all the remarkable incidents of this day on which Christ arose from the dead, from "the wonders of the morning to a climax in the evening," and end the paragraph with the following words, in italics: "Such was the first Christian Sabbath." Well, from your description of it, which is in harmony with the history of it, as given by the Evangelists, it did not have many characteristics of the Sabbath.—The distinctive feature of it, at least, was lacking—rest and quiet. For you say, "Jerusalem was all astir,"

and it is not at all probable that anybody, not even the disciples, thought it was the Sabbath; for they had kept the preceding day "according to the commandment." The crucified One himself had rested in the quiet and stillness of the sepulchre; but now, on this first day, he arises to life and goes forth to activity, and labor, in the great work of redemption which he came to do—not to rest from it, as you say in a preceding paragraph. And we find him, in the prosecution of this work, traveling a distance of at least fifteen miles, and two of his disciples did the same; and, for aught that we know, they might have done more; but even that would be a good day's work, especially for the Sabbath.

The eleven were not together until evening, and then it was in their own home, to remain for the night, instead of for religious worship; and Christ's appearance to them, on which so much stress is laid, by first day people, did not take place till this time of the day; and, very unfortunately for your side of this question, it was after the second day had begun. And not one of them believed that he was alive till they saw him. Then it is not very probable they would think anything about keeping a day in honor of an event which they did not believe had occurred. More anon.

J. T. HAMILTON.

OUR PARIS LETTER.

(From a Regular Correspondent.)

Paris on a rainy day.—The fumes and omnibuses—Anecdote about an American—Up in a balloon—What one sees and feels 600 metres up in the air—A paying investment in hot times—The electric light for streets and dwellings, etc.

HOTEL DU LOUVRE, PARIS, Oct. 25th, 1878.

Delightful as Paris is, without doubt, on a clear, bright day, when the sun is shining and the fountains on the Place de la Concorde seem to be charged with diamonds instead of water, yet I know of no city that looks so dull and dismal when it rains. London has its fogs; but one expects them there—would be disappointed, in fact, if it were not foggy, as if we had missed a part of the show—but, somehow or other, fogs and rain do not assimilate with the Paris atmosphere, and the gay and glittering butterflies which people its busy streets look dismal enough when the rain is pouring down on a dreary October afternoon, like to-day. The famous painting by Edward Detaille, "Le Regiment qui passe," which was exhibited at the Salon of '75, and is now owned by the Corcoran Gallery at Washington, I believe, is an excellent delineation of a rainy day in Paris, from the forlorn look of the poodle dog that trudges in front of the soldier, to the dreary aspect of Porte St. Martin in the foreground. The omnibuses loaded with umbrellas, the dripping peddlers, the yellow mud in the street, the clammy-looking hooves—all this makes up a perfect tout ensemble, which no one who has seen Paris on a rainy day, can fail to appreciate.

It is on such days as these that the fancies, or Paris backs, make their richest harvest. According to official reports, there are not less than twelve thousand of these vehicles in constant use in Paris; they can be readily known by the red waistcoat and shining hat of the driver, and by the little wooden sign on his seat, which indicates whether his vehicle is to let or not. If this sign is turned so as to show the word *loue*, then the fiacre is engaged; if not, it is open to engagement; if the very moderate rate of two francs (forty cents) an hour, or thirty cents for a trip or *course*, as the French call it, any place within the walls of the city. The omnibuses, of course, are still better patronized, and it is next to impossible to get a seat in one except at the terminal stations, every one showing the sign of *Complet*, which means, simply translated, no room. And that reminds me of an anecdote told here, yet doubtless new to most of your readers. An American who had just arrived from the mother country was started at finding all the street cars and omnibuses showing this sign. He wanted to go to a hotel, but found every omnibus crowded, and the passengers apparently all going in the same direction, viz., to a place called "Complet." "What a popular place that must be," he thought, "that even here in Paris, everybody crowds there; and, strange to say, the Guide Books say nothing about it!" It was some time before he found the meaning of this mystic word, and learned that every omnibus has seats, outside and inside, for only a certain number of people; and when these are all filled, the conductor shows the sign *Complet* forward and aft, and can not be induced to stop to pick up more passengers on any part of his route. All the whistling, hallooing, swearing, and shaking of umbrellas in Christendom would not induce him to do it!

The anchored balloon in the courtyard of the Tuilleries is still doing a fair business, although the price for a trip 600 metres up in the air has not been reduced. As the serial voyage lasts only about twenty minutes, the price charged (four dollars) seems rather high; one in fair weather, and the forenoon in the rain, and found the last trip the most interesting. After we had got up about two hundred and fifty yards, we could see nothing at all under us, except a dark gray cloud; Paris was completely hidden in the rain, with the exception of the Arc de

Triomphe, the outlines of which could be faintly traced through the underlying mist. Twice that height we had passed completely through the rain, and the sky looked bright and blue above us, although the sun was still hidden by higher clouds. The last hundred yards did not change the appearance of things, with the exception that one of our lady passengers got seasick, no rare occurrence when there is a little wind and the balloon sways to and fro like a ship in a heavy sea. The effect of this balloon ascension on a clear day, when all the objects below are distinctly visible, and Paris, with its immense network of streets and boulevards, lies spread out like a map, is very peculiar. As the balloon, which will carry sixty two passengers, gradually rises, the ground seems to sink below, and the balloon itself with its occupants to remain stationary in space; it is the same optical illusion, but in reverse order, as that to which one is subject when, while sitting in a railroad car, not in motion, another train passes by, and it seems as if you were moving and the other train at a standstill. The immense buildings of the Tuilleries and Louvre gradually diminish in size; in a little while, the triumphal arch on the Place du Carrousel looks no larger than a pea, and the pedestrians on the Place like ants crawling through it. At the extreme altitude of 600 metres all Paris seems to take a breath. "If the rope should break now!" one can not think without a shudder, especially if it blows and there is a heavy strain on it. Well, in that event, the balloon would go straight up like a kite, until the managing aeronaut could open the valve, and by letting the gas escape, cause the balloon to descend to terra firma. But, so far, no accident of that or any other kind has happened, and in fine weather the balloon almost invariably takes up its full complement of passengers, among which are always a large number of ladies. On an average the balloon makes fifteen ascensions a day, and counting thirty passengers for each trip, which is less than half its capacity, this makes 450, which, at twenty francs a head, is 9,000 francs, or eighteen hundred dollars per day, so that it will be seen that this balloon business is a paying investment, notwithstanding the expense of running it.

So far, the electric light has proved a grand success, which will cause its more general introduction here in December next. The electric lamps on the Avenue de l'Opera, Place de la Concorde, and in the Grand Hotel and Hotel du Louvre, burn without a flicker, and by the use of peculiarly constructed double globes with a violet tint, has been heretofore, in a measure, one of the chief obstacles to its general use in public and private dwellings, has been greatly subdued. Though many times as bright as gas, one may look at these globes without aching eyes. The common gas street lamps look like mean yellow tattling sables. In comparison with the subdued electric light, the effect of which, on the streets and places where it has been introduced is exactly like that of bright moonlight; Eudymion himself might be deceived by the beauty of this modern science. Consequently, stocks in the several companies which control this invention have gone up, and there is no lack of both English and American capitalists who are diligently investigating this subject with a view to the introduction of the electric light in their respective countries.

CHRISTIAN UNION.—No. 11.

Shall those persons be taken into the church who contend that we may take any day of the week we choose for a Sabbath, and on this ground refuse to keep the Sabbath of the Lord? The answer to this depends on what the Bible teaches. When it is said the seventh day is meant? The seventh day of the month, or the seventh day of the period of seven days? Certainly Moses and all the Israelites knew what seventh day it was. What was the use of mentioning a day, if they did not know what day it was? The Almighty does not deal with men in that loose way. When the man was condemned to die for gathering sticks on the Sabbath day, they seemed to know what seventh day was meant. Happily, there is no uncertainty about it. The first seven days had each a name, and the name given to each is mentioned in the first part of the book of Genesis. In the 18th of Exodus two of these are spoken of, and their proper title is given to them—the sixth and the seventh. In Ezek. 46: 1, we read, "The gate of the inner court . . . shall be shut the six working days; but on the Sabbath it shall be opened." And in Luke 13: 14, the ruler of the synagogue answered, "There are six days in which men ought to work; in them [there] come and be healed, and not on the Sabbath day." We read further that the women rested the Sabbath day, according to the commandment, and on the first day of the week, came out to the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, which shows that the first day of the week was the day that followed the Sabbath. These things taken together demonstrate that the seventh day of the fourth commandment was the seventh day of a period of seven days, commonly called a week; and that this weekly period was appointed by God himself at the beginning of the world. And the uniform practice of Christians, Jews, and Mohammedans shows that it was so understood. How ridiculous, then, is the opinion entertained by some modern divines that the seventh day is no particular day of the week, but that a person may keep any other day and obey God just as well as by keeping the seventh.

It is a remarkable fact that the class of persons who believe that the Sabbath is a perpetual institution, but reject the Sabbath of the Lord, are very generally falling back on the seventh part-of-time theory. They know very well that there is no commandment to keep the first day, and they know as well, if they honestly examine the Bible, that there is no reliable example of first day observance. To be at all consistent, they must resort to the idea that no particular day is enjoined, or consent to obey God by keeping holy the day he has blessed and sanctified. But certainly they adopt the sentiment of 40 day in particular without reflection. The argument for it is not as strong as a gossamer thread. There is not a single passage in any part of the Bible that gives the least countenance to it. On the other hand, every injunction to keep the Sabbath as a day of sacred rest, implies a particular, definite day. Take, as an illustration, the falling of the manna in the wilderness. In every week for about forty years there were four distinct acts of God which proved unmistakably what was his will in regard to the day to be kept as a holy day. The falling of the manna on six days only; the falling of a double portion on the sixth day; the preservation of what fell on the sixth through the entire seventh, and the withholding of the manna on the seventh or Sabbath. If any one undertook to keep any other than a certain, definite day, he would soon find out his mistake by having nothing to eat. And one man was doomed to die because he engaged in secular work on this definite Sabbath day. Evidently the advocates of the sentiment that all that is required is to keep one seventh part of time, have not well considered the consequences of reducing the theory to practice. They all observe the first day of the week (so far as they observe any day), not because there is any divine authority for it, but because the civil law requires it, and because it is customary. The theory itself is of comparatively recent date, and has never yet been tested by practice. If any considerable number of the people would adopt it in daily life, disorder, confusion, and perhaps revolution and anarchy would prevail. Suppose a family would undertake to carry it out—the husband refraining from all secular work on one day, the wife on another, the children also choosing some one day and others another; they would soon find that the Almighty in infinite wisdom appointed a definite day. Let the schools in a city adopt the theory of keeping no day in particular for a rest day, the superintendent preferring to rest the first day, according to the laws of the land; a part of the teachers in the exercise of their lawful rights, choose the second; while others say it will suit their convenience to keep holy the third day; also a portion of the scholars will be at home on the fourth day, and others on the fifth day. How long would it take to break up the school altogether? Let bankers, insurance agents, merchants, mechanics, manufacturers, and business men generally carry out this new theory, and every one can see at a glance what the end would be. And are we to believe that God who is a God of order, and not of confusion, himself so ordained it, and we must submit to it, with all the evils that flow from it? Further, let our courts of justice make the experiment of the seventh part-of-time theory. The judge having spent a day of rest, is about to commence business, when he finds other officers just ready to begin their rest day, while the jurors and witnesses disagreeing among themselves with regard to the holy day, can never set together in a single law case; the criminals in the meantime defying the law, so that the State is ruined by the prevailing lawlessness, and there is no hope of reformation till this unscripural dogma is renounced. These remarks will apply just as well to all legislative bodies, and it is manifest that no nation could prosper, if it could exist at all, by having a Sabbath movable at the will of the people. Now, since a Sabbath which is not fixed would be a curse, and not a blessing, then it is a theory, it should be rejected. Being would never give such a one.

We therefore arrive at this conclusion, that if an applicant for church membership has no better pretext for refusing to keep God's holy Sabbath than the seventh-part-of-time theory, he should be advised to examine the foundation of his faith and hope. He may possibly find that the secret of the difficulty is that he is not willing to obey God at all, and needs a new heart and a new spirit. O how much we should desire a deep work of the Holy Spirit in order that they may do what is right!

The next article will be the last, and will be on the No-Sabbath theory. JAMES McFARLAND, SPRINGFIELD, O.

ITALIAN OTTIER.

The Churches of Modern Rome. The churches of Rome, of which there are as many as the number of days in the year, are noted for architectural beauty and for choice works of art which they contain. In noticing a few of the celebrated of these churches, we will begin with St. Peter's. The center of the piazza or square in front is a magnificent Egyptian obelisk, which was brought to Rome by the Emperor Caligula, to adorn the circus of Nero. Near it are splendid fountains. On the sides of this square are semicircular niches of the Doric order. On the sides are one hundred and fifty columns in four rows, occupying a width of fifty-two feet. The trade of these columns is adorned with two hundred and thirty-six statues. The church of St. Peter is said to occupy the site of the dens and the circus of Nero, who the Christians underwent martyrdom, and where St. Peter was buried. The first church edifice which occupied this site was built by order of the Emperor Constantine A. D. 320. After having been several times restored, it became a ruin in the fifteenth century. In 1585, Nicholas V. ordered its reconstruction. Owing to the death of pope shortly afterwards, the work was suspended. A few years later, Julius II. employed the architect Bramante to construct a new design was a Greek cross mounted by a dome. Raphael, Leo X., substituted a Latin cross. Afterward, Sixtus V. returned to the Greek cross. The building then pushed forward with the rapidity, and was a marvel of architectural skill. The work was directed except the facade, when Sixtus directed the nave to be projected in the direction of the front, thus again altered the design. Its greatest length is sixty-six feet and thirty-six inches; the floor area marks showing length of five cathedrals which nearly approach it in length. St. Paul in London, the Cathedral of Florence, St. Sophia at Constantinople, the Milan Cathedral, and St. Paul outside of the walls of Rome, exceed it in more than one hundred feet, facades surmounted by a balcony with statues of Christ and the twelve, nineteen feet in height. The central entrance is the place where the new pope is crowned, and he imparts his benediction on to the crowd assembled on the in front of the church. Of the doors, the one on the right, the Porta Santa, is opened on the pope in the year of jubilee in twenty-five years. It has not been opened since 1825; since in 1870, it was opened in 1870, and in 1870, the government of Rome had returned to the possession of Victor Emmanuel. This cathedral is adorned with three hundred and ninety-six statues of popes and saints. A more noticeable is the famous statue of St. Peter, holding a key, which is the symbol of the great to the extent of St. Peter's day, a huge statue, sparkling with precious stones, is placed on its head; a heavy ring is put on one of its fingers; the bronze key is exchanged for a golden one. The interior dome is covered with pietistic mosaic. Around its summit is an inscription in Latin, "Thou shalt be upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." These letters, and a half feet high; to those on the pavement they are, perhaps, an inch high. The dome is a picture of an apostle grasping a key. This looks to be about length, is seven feet long, knowing the proportions can an idea of the vastness of St. Peter's. Underneath it is the high altar where only celebrates mass. Over the imposing bronze canopy, ed by four spiral columns made material. This altar, over what is purported to be the tomb of St. Peter and St. Paul, is said that half of the bodies of these apostles are here; the other half, in Lateran, while their cran are in St. Paul's outside of At the foot of the stairs the descent to these tomb is a statue, by Canova, of an attitude of prayer, the high altar at the up the principal nave, is it. Above the altar, four bronze statues support a canopy. This chair is said to be the seat of St. Peter, the Apostle Peter. Above a window of golden color glass, in the center of dome, with rays of light from it, that penetrate through it, surround it. The St. Peter's are, with two mosaics. Many of these are celebrated paintings, do they imitate oil paint takes a very close inspect the difference.

Next to St. Peter's is the church of St. Paul the walls of Rome. It occupies the site of the edifice was destroyed by the principal facade occupying more than 1 square feet. The mosaic is Scriptural from the lives of St. Peter. The interior is decorated with mar-

YELLOW FEVER.

is fast disappearing from New Orleans, Vicksburg, Memphis, and other places of any size. The frosts of the past few days have done the work.



