

THE HOPE OF ISRAEL.

"THY WORD IS A LAMP UNTO MY FEET, AND A LIGHT UNTO MY PATH."

Present Series.

Marion, Iowa, Third-day, Feb. 23, 1869.

Vol. III.—No. 19

THE HOPE OF ISRAEL

IS PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY BY
ASAHEL ALDRICH,
FOR

The Christian Publishing Association.

H. E. CARVER, PRESIDENT.
B. F. SNOOK, EDITOR.

Address HOPE OF ISRAEL, Marion, Iowa.

TERMS:—One dollar and a half per year in advance
FREE to those unable to pay.

The Hope is designed to advocate the great truths of eternal life, immortality and salvation through Christ: The perpetuity and immutability of the Law of God: Personal holiness. The second personal coming of Christ to judge the world: The restoration of Israel: The reign of Christ on his throne on the earth in the times of restoration, and other kindred Bible truths.

YOUR MISSION.

HARK, the voice of Jesus crying,
Who will go and work to-day?
Fields are white, and harvest waiting;
Who will bear the sheaves away?
Loud and long the Master calleth,
Rich reward he offers free;
Who will answer, gladly saying,
"Here am I, send me, send me?"

If you cannot cross the ocean,
And the heathen lands explore,
You can find the heathen nearer,
You can help them at your door.
If you cannot give your thousands,
You can give the widow's mite,
And the least you give for Jesus,
Will be precious in his sight.

If you cannot speak like angels,
If you cannot preach like Paul,
You can tell the love of Jesus,
You can say he died for all.
If you cannot rouse the wicked
With the judgment's dread alarms,
You can lead the little children
To the Savior's waiting arms.

Let none hear you idly saying,
"There is nothing I can do,"
While men all around are dying,
And the Master calls for you,
Take life task he gives you gladly,
Let his work your pleasure be;
Answer quickly, when he calleth;
"Here am I, send me, send me."

IS THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH?

This question would be answered in the affirmative by a very large proportion of the (so-called) christian world, amounting, indeed, almost to unanimity. The idea that this day is the Sabbath has been handed down from generation to generation so nearly unquestioned that it may seem presumptuous at this late day to demand the proof of its claims. If the day commonly called Sunday is the Sabbath, we should expect to see that fact clearly developed and its claims fully verified in the word of God. All will admit that during the Mosaic or typical dispensation, the

seventh day of the week was the divinely appointed Sabbath day. If, at the end of that era, there was to be a change of the sabbatic institution from the seventh to the first day of the week, we may reasonably expect to find that change just as clearly indicated in the Scriptures, as the injunction was to observe the seventh day in the previous age. We have been under the impression that the Bible does not furnish the least evidence for any such change.

It was our privilege recently to hear a learned Presbyterian minister preach a sermon in favor of the Sunday Sabbath, in which he assured us that the change was clearly and positively taught in the Bible, and endeavored to sustain that assumption. In common with all first-day observers he based his Sunday Sabbath on the supposed fact that the resurrection of Christ occurred on that day; and quoted Matt. xxviii. 1 to prove a change from the seventh to the first day. He had his Greek testament with him and favored us with a translation of that verse, which we will give in such a way as to express his ideas as nearly as we can. "In the end of the Sabbath," i. e., in the end of the old Jewish series of seventh-day Sabbaths, "as it began to dawn into the first of the Sabbaths," i. e., as it began to dawn into the new series of Christian Sabbaths, "came Mary Magdalene," &c.

Now as the supposed resurrection of our Lord on the first day of the week is the chief corner stone in the first-day Sabbath theory, it follows that if the Bible fails to establish the fact of the resurrection on that day, the theory itself is without any foundation, and hence is worthless. Matthew is the only one of the apostles who has recorded the narrative of the resurrection, and from his account we learn that it occurred either previous to, or at the moment of the arrival of the two Marys at the sepulcher. According to the marginal reading of the second verse, when they came to the sepulcher there had been a great earthquake. If the marginal reading is correct, then it is evident that the resurrection occurred previous to their arrival; and this is further confirmed by the incidents subsequently related.

The question now arises, When did the two Marys come to the sepulcher? Matthew says it was "in the end of the Sabbath," or, as the American Bible Union translation more clearly renders it, "Late in the Sabbath." Now, if the women came to the sepulcher late in the Sabbath, and found the stone rolled away from the door and an angel sitting upon it who affirmed of Jesus that "he is not here, for he is risen," then it follows as an inevitable consequence that Jesus could not have risen on the first day of the week that was then just approaching or drawing on, but must have risen on the Sabbath, which was then about to close.

We will now briefly examine the position of the minister alluded to, and show that upon his own rendering, the passage in Matthew does not sustain his Sunday Sabbath. He claimed that because the word *Sabbatone* in that text is in the plural form, therefore it should be rendered to mean the close of one series of Sabbaths, and the commencement of another. We will not pause here to dispute this point, but simply call attention to the fact that even if this position be the correct one, the text still declares that it was "late IN" the old series of Sabbaths when the women came to the sepulcher and found that Jesus had risen; and hence, if this text does teach the introduction of a new series of Christian Sabbaths, and the resurrection of Christ indicates the day of the week upon which it should be observed, that day is still the seventh. H. E. C.

THE NATURE OF MAN.

HIS CONDITION IN DEATH.

Objections examined. Having examined the teaching of the Bible on the subject, and demonstrated, by the words of inspiration, that the "dead know not anything," we might dismiss the subject, and leave the reader to believe or disbelieve, as he chooses. But we are aware that many difficulties beset the inquirer after unpopular truths. We will therefore endeavor to remove some of those difficulties. True, there are *seeming* objections in the Bible to the views we have presented; but ought these *seeming* objections to be received unexamined, as conclusive evidence of the falsity of our position? Surely not. One thing is certain: the Bible is not a mass of self-contradictory absurdities. If the doctrine of the unconscious state of the dead be true, then every passage of holy writ can be reconciled with that doctrine. If not, then the opposite is the legitimate result. God is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever; and his truth is harmonious now and forevermore.

The first passage that we shall examine, occurs in 1 Sam. xxviii. 3-20. Here we are informed that Samuel was dead and buried. And King Saul, being beset with the numerous hosts of the Philistines, "was afraid, and his heart greatly trembled. And when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not." What did Saul do in his extremity? He went to inquire of a woman who had a *familiar spirit*. And he came unto the woman by night: "and he said unto her, I pray thee, divine unto me by the familiar spirit, and bring me *him* up whom I shall name unto thee. . . . Then said the woman, whom shall I bring up unto thee? and he said, bring me up Samuel. And when the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice; and the woman spake to Saul, saying, Why hast thou deceived me? for thou art Saul. And the king said unto her, be not afraid; for what saw-

cast them down from their thrones, and assigned their subjects from the oath of allegiance to their sovereigns; that he who shook from century to century kings and kingdoms with the thunders of the Vatican, and feared not to name them in his anathemas; that he whose feet submissive emperors and kings did kiss, and to whom princes, traversing the Alps and Apennines, went to receive from him their imperial crown at Rome; that he whose secular sovereignty in his own dominions, for a thousand years, could put to mockery many an ephemeral dynasty; that he who, but as yesterday, could boast his three millions of subjects to support his throne, and two hundred millions of children to support their Father's chain, would need a confessed parvenu to sustain him, a wild-beast to carry him, which, as all the world knew, so soon before was not?

If the time be come when the question may be asked, What is the wild beast that carries the woman? who is the kingly head of a restored empire, that sustains the pope, as pope, in Rome—and sustains him there still, after his temporal kingdom has been all but ref from him? there is a living emperor who can answer, as no man before him could have done,

1. "I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the wild-beast that carrieth her."—On the opening of the French Legislature, March 1, 1860, Napoleon III. thus addressed the assembly: "The facts speak loudly for themselves. For the last eleven years I have sustained alone at Rome the power of the Holy Father, without having ceased a single day to revere in him the sacred character of the chief of our religion." The Emperor's Speech to the French Chambers, Feb. 4, 1861:—

"It is enough for the grandeur of the country that it should maintain its right where it is indispensable, to defend its honor where it is attacked, to lend its assistance where it may be invoked in favor of a just cause.

It is thus that, to avenge our honor in the extreme East, our flag, united with that of Great Britain, has floated victoriously from the walls of Peking; and that the Cross—emblem of Christian civilization—again surmounts in the capital of China the temples of our religion, closed for more than a century. . . . At Rome I have thought it necessary to augment the garrison, when the security of the Holy Father appeared to be menaced."

2. The wild-beast that carrieth the scarlet-clothed woman, who sitteth on the seven hills, and is identified with the city which, in the days of the apostles, reigned over the kings of the earth, is the beast that was, and is not; even he is the eighth. "The Legislative Body, Dec. 1, 1851, having terminated their operations, all the members, with their president at their head, and all the members of the Senate and all the Councilors of State, resorted to St. Cloud. The ceremony took place in the grand gallery of Apollo, in the palace of St. Cloud. The Emperor entered the gallery, and took his place before the throne. . . . "The new reign," he thus spoke, "which you inaugurate to-day, has not for its origin, like so many others in history, violence, conquest, or craft. It is, you come to declare, the legal result of the will of a whole people, which consolidates in the midst of calmness what had been founded in the bosom of agitations. I am penetrated with thankfulness toward the nation which three times in four years has sustained me by its suffrages, and each time has augmented the majority only to increase my power. . . . I take to-day, with the crown, the name of Napoleon III., because the logic of the people has already given it to me in their acclamations, because the Senate has alike proposed it, and because the entire nation has ratified it. Is it, however, to say that, in accepting the title, I fall into the reproachful error of a prince, who, returning from exile, declared null and of no effect all that had been done in his absence? Far from me be such frenzy. Not only do I recognize the governments which have preceded me, but I inherit in some sort what they have done of good or evil; for successive governments, in spite of their different origin, are responsible for their predecessors. But the more I accept all, after fifty years, that history has transmitted with its inflexible authority, the less am I permitted to pass in silence the glorious reign of the head of my family, and the regular, though ephemeral title of his son (king of Rome) . . . My reign does not date from the year 1815; it dates from the moment you come to make known to me the suffrages of the nation. The Napoleonic dynasty recommenced."

At a grand military fete, May 10, 1852, in the Champ

de Mars, Napoleon III. restored the eagles to the armies of France. He thus addressed the soldiers: "The Roman eagle, adopted by the Emperor Napoleon at the commencement of this century, was a brilliant signal of the grandeur of France. It disappeared among our calamities. It ought to return when France, raised up from her defeats, should no more repudiate her proper glory. Soldiers! take again the eagles which have so often led our fathers to glory." In the beginning of the year 1855, as recorded in the *Moniteur*, he thus addressed, before the palace of the Tuileries, a detachment of the Imperial Guard previous to its departure to join the army in the Crimea: "Soldiers! the French people, in the sovereignty of their will, have set up again many things deemed forever dead, and now the empire is reconstituted. . . . The Imperial Guard, the heroic representative of military glory and honor, is here before me, surrounding the Emperor as of yore, wearing the same uniform, carrying the same flags. . . . Receive, then, those eagles, which will lead you on to victory, as they led your fathers. . . . Soon will you have help to plant our eagles on the walls of Sebastopol."

Of this reconstituted empire, as of the wild-beast that ascendeth from the abyss, it can truly be said, as it is written, "IT WAS, AND IS NOT, AND YET IS." Deemed forever dead, the empire is reconstituted.

3. The beast that thou sawest was, and is not, and shall ascend out of the abyss.—"The Roman eagle," said Napoleon III., "disappeared among our calamities. Take again the eagles," &c. The nation, "three times in four years, has sustained me by its suffrages, and each time only to increase my power." "After thirty-three years of exile and five of captivity, the nephew of the emperor has been chosen, by the suffrage of five millions and a half of Frenchmen, President of the French Republic." "He was proclaimed Chief of the State, Dec. 20th, 1848." "In 1852 he was elected Emperor." "It is a thing worthy of remark, that the number of suffrages always increased during four years. In 1848 it was five millions and a half; in 1851, seven millions five hundred thousand; in 1852 it is nearly eight millions. The popularity of the prince ASCENDED, ascended, ascended always, and now seemed to attain a summit so elevated, that it was believed to be inaccessible to the ambition of one man, however great it was."

4. And they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, when they behold the wild-beast that was, and is not, and yet is (shall be present).—"On learning the number of affirmative suffrages, France was as it were DAZZLED. Seven millions eight hundred thousand suffrages! it seemed almost a miracle; like some of the victories of the hero of Austerlitz, it was fabulous success." In reading the journals which announced the fact, all the world believed that it read a fairy tale.

"And there are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is; and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh he must continue a short space. And the wild-beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition." (Rev. xvii. 11.) The other king was to be the head of the beast itself under which the Latin kingdoms were again to be united. For once, and once only, since the Cæsarean head of the empire fell, the Latin kingdoms were united from the extremity of Italy to the German Ocean. Napoleon I. was the head of an empire which comprehended kingdoms of its own creation,—Spain, Holland, Westphalia, Naples. The Confederation of the Rhine was subject to his sway. Switzerland, Savoy, Lombardy, Tuscany, the minor dukedoms of Italy, and the States of the Church, so long divided, were portions of his empire. He was King of Italy, and his son and presumptive heir was King of Rome, which itself was "the second city of his empire."

But, as they that dwell on the earth do know, "the first Napoleonic empire was, and is not. Of it, and of its head,—the head of my family, says Napoleon III.,—they also know, as assuredly as the angel told the apostle, that when he came, he continued but a short space; as now they see "the empire reconstituted," "the new reign begun;" that which seemed forever dead, alive again,—the same wild-beast that was, and is not, the same head, the Napoleonic, but not the same king; and the kingdom now given, which was won by fierce conflicts before.

The end is not yet. But so soon as the beginning of the end, as it respects the wild-beast that ascendeth

from the abyss, can be seen, there are facts respecting it which need no proof, for they are expressly and necessarily such, that men, however blinded else, must needs be cognizant of them, even facts so marvellous as to excite the wonder of the world.

"The wild-beast that thou sawest was, and is not; and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and shall go into perdition."—*Sings of our Times.*

BEAUTIES OF THE BIBLE.—Daniel Webster was a firm believer in Divine Revelation, and a close student of its sacred pages. On one occasion, a small company of select friends spent an evening at his house. Tea over, the Bible and the relative beauties of its several parts became the topic of conversation. Each one of the guests had preferences. When the turn came to Webster, he said: "The masterpiece of the New Testament, of course, is the Sermon on the Mount. That has no rival—no equal. As to the Old Testament writings, my favorite book is that of Habakkuk, and favorite verses, chapter iii. 17, 18—'Although the fig tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be in the vines: the labor of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meat: the flock shall be cut off from the fold, and there shall be no herd in the stalls: yet will I rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation.' This, continued Webster, I regard as one of the most sublime passages of inspired literature. And often have I wondered that some artist, equal to the task, has not selected the prophet and his scene of desolation as the subject of a painting.

"When in Paris, some years ago," continued Mr. Webster, "I received an account of a French infidel, who happened to find in a drawer of his library some stray leaves of an unknown volume; although in the constant habit of denouncing the Bible, like most infidel writers, he had never read any part of it. These fugitive leaves contained the above passage of Habakkuk. Being a man of fine literary taste, he was captivated with its poetic beauty, and hastened to the club house to announce the discovery to his associates. Of course, they were anxious to know the name of the gifted author, to which inquiries the infidel replied: 'A writer by the name of "Hab ba-kook," of course, a Frenchman.' Judge of the infidel's surprise, when informed that the passage he was so enthusiastically admiring was not produced by one of his own countrymen, nor even by one of his own class of so called Free Thinkers, but was penned by one of God's ancient prophets, and contained in that much despised book, the Bible.—*Ex.*

SUNDAY TRAINS.—Some time ago, the "New York Sabbath Committee" sent out a circular letter to the Presidents of all the railroad companies of the United States, requesting them to furnish statistical information in regard to the extent of Sunday work on their respective roads, the number of Sunday passenger and freight trains, the number of men employed, the profitableness or unprofitableness of such trains, &c. One hundred and twenty-four companies promptly replied, and the result of this official information is now laid before the public. It appears that of these 124 companies, 65 run no Sunday passenger or freight and cattle trains, 59 do run such trains—(177 passenger trains in all.) The question of the profitableness of Sunday trains is answered by 16 companies in the affirmative, and by 38 in the negative; the rest left it unnoticed.—*Ex.*

The Hope of Israel.

"The entrance of thy words giveth light."

MARION, IOWA, THIRD-DAY, FEB. 23, 1869.
B. F. SNOOK, EDITOR.

REVIEW OF J. M. STEPHENSON ON THE ORIGIN, UNITY, DURATION, AND UNI- VERSALITY OF THE LAW OF GOD.

No. 3.

III. *The people with whom the law was made.* Mr. Stephenson supposes that the law of God is exclusively Jewish, and was not obligatory on any save that people. He says:

"The circumstances under which the law was made demonstrate that it was not designed for any other people, except that of the literal Israelites, and that too in their national capacity."

We now have his position, and will hear and examine his proof.

1. He refers to Ex. xix. 3-9, and says "God has never made such an agreement with any other, nor such promises to any other people. They also agreed to keep all the commandments of God." Well, what does all this prove? that the moral law is Jewish and binding on them alone? Not at all. It proves that God made a national covenant with Israel, in which he promised to favor them with certain blessings, provided they would keep his law, the ten commandments, the great condition of the covenant. This they agreed to do. Does this fact however, involve the idea that the moral and righteous principles of the ten commandments were not then and previously binding on the rest of mankind? As well might it be said that because Iowa, in order to become a state in the Federal government, covenanted to keep the constitution of the United States, that therefore said constitution is not binding on any citizens of the general government but the citizens of Iowa. But facts declare to the contrary, and show that the constitution of the Federal government has been and is binding upon all others in its domain. Just so as we proved in No. 1; the Law of God has been obligatory upon man from the beginning down to the present time.

2. The Elder tries to make a point over the idea that Israel would not hear Jehovah proclaim but ten commandments, and hence, that if they had remained quiet, God would have proclaimed all of the ceremonial system to them in his own person; and hence concludes that the ten are just as much Jewish as the other commandments. (1) This is all a mere assumption with no proof. If it were true, God never would have called the ten commandments a law, but a part of the law. Ex. xxiv. 12. (2) He did not intend to proclaim in person any but the ten commandments. Deut. v. 22.—"These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice: and he added no more." And he wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me." (3) This is further proven by the fact that God wrote this and no other law on two tables of stone. This very circumstance shows that there was a preeminent regard for the moral law on the part of God himself.

THE HOPE OF ISRAEL

3. Again he says:

"The foregoing record (Ex. xx: 18, 21; xxiv. 5,) agrees with that rehearsal by Moses forty years subsequently; that is, as far as the children of Israel were concerned as the only people upon the face of the earth with whom God made this law."

"This statement (xxxvi. 13,) excludes the idea of the preexistence of the law, and fixes the point indubitably that the children of Israel were the only people with whom God made this law."

This testimony proves that God required Israel to keep his law, and when it is affirmed from this consideration that the law was not binding on the Gentiles, such affirmation is without reason and favor from the word of the Lord. Besides, if such were the case, the Bible would be against itself; for we have proven that the law was binding upon all, during the age of the patriarchs and onward. We prefer to believe that Stephenson is against the Bible.

4. His next argument is based upon the fact that the ten commandments are called the covenant. And refers to Deut. v. 1-3 as proof. Moses here says God made not the covenant with our fathers, but with us, who are here alive this day. No, says Stephenson: "The ten commandments are called the covenant of God. His covenant." Ex. xxxiv. 27, 28. Hence his conclusion: the ten commandments therefore were binding only on the Jews from the time the covenant was made. We will now give a brief examination of this position, expose the absurdity of it and thoroughly refute it. (1) If this argument proves that the law was binding only upon the Jews, then it follows unavoidably that as Gentiles were not under it, they were not sinners in worshipping other gods, in taking Jehovah's name in vain, in stealing, in adultery, in murder, and in bearing false witness. (2) As according to the above assumption the ten commandments are the covenant not made with the fathers, and as only those in a covenant are required to obey its terms, it thence follows that the fathers, Isaac, Jacob, and righteous Abraham, the father of the faithful, were under no obligation to refrain from idolatry, profanity, murder, Sabbath breaking, adultery, &c. (3) It also follows from the same premise, that Joseph was mistaken in supposing that he would sin by committing adultery. (4) This theory even says that God himself was mistaken, when, after he had restrained Abimelech from adultery, he said, "Therefore have I withheld thee from sinning against me." Gen. xxii. (5) Yea, it goes farther than this. It charges God with being an oppressive and cruel tyrant, because he destroyed the Canaanites for their great sins, amongst which was profanity, a violation of the third commandment. Can a theory so licentious in its results, and so repugnant to common sense, have any sanction in truth? It cannot. It can only be founded on the principle of calling good evil, and evil good.

We will now examine this covenant question.

1. The covenant referred to in Deut. v. 1-3 is the same that is recorded in Ex. xix. 5, 6. This covenant embraced a promise to Israel of a kingdom of priests, and that they should be a holy nation, with the agreement on their part that they would keep God's supreme covenant—the ten commandments. This covenant concerning the priesthood was not made with the fathers, but with their children, at Mt. Sinai.

2. We will now prove that the ten commandments are God's covenant, or constitution, for such is the meaning of the word covenant when applied to the Law of God. Deut. iv. 13.—"And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone." Josh. xxiii. 16.—"When ye have transgressed the covenant of the Lord your God, which he commanded you, and have gone and served other gods, and bowed yourselves to which he commanded you, and ye shall perish quickly from off the good land which he hath given unto you." These testimonies show beyond doubt that the moral law is the constitution of the moral government of Jehovah.

3. This covenant God commanded to the fathers. Ps. cv. 7-11.—"He is the Lord our God: his judgments are in all the earth. He hath remembered his covenant forever, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations. Which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac; and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant: saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan the lot of your inheritance."

4. This covenant the fathers kept. Judges ii. 19-22.—"And it came to pass, when the judge was dead, that they returned, and corrupted themselves more than their fathers, in following other gods to serve them, and to bow down unto them; they ceased not from their own doings, nor from their stubborn way. And the anger of the Lord was hot against Israel; and he said, Because that this people hath transgressed my covenant which I commanded their fathers, and have not hearkened unto my voice; also will not henceforth drive out any from before them of the nations which Joshua left when he died: that through them I may prove Israel, whether they will keep the way of the Lord to walk therein, as their fathers did keep it, or not." Here we learn, 1st, That the people transgressed God's covenant by going after other gods. 2nd, That the covenant which forbids idol worship is the one commanded to the fathers. 3rd, That though Israel disobeyed this covenant, the fathers obeyed it (v. 22); for God says, "Abraham obeyed my voice, kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws." Gen. xxvi. 5. 4th, This covenant is commanded as such to a thousand generations, or forever. Deut. vii. 9, 10.—"Know therefore that the Lord thy God, he is God, the faithful God, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love him and keep his commandments to a thousand generations; and repayeth them that hate him to their face, to destroy them: he will not be slack to him that hateth him, he will repay him to his face." Ps. cxi. 7-10.—"The works of his hands are verity and judgment; all his commandments are sure. They stand fast for ever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness. He sent redemption unto his people: he hath commanded his covenant forever: holy and reverend is his name. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom: a good understanding have all they that do his commandments: his praise endureth forever."

Having shown the falsity of the above assumption we will now prove that the law of

ten com
1. If it
that peo
required
requires
another,
he is not
al obliga
2. The
for sine
proves t
ties. I
3. The
King of
manime
tially bi
to that
4. God
struction
land of
upon th
God des
never w
was Nin
ten com
5. Pau
ing on t
Rom. ii
without
as many
ed by t
are just
shall be
have no
tained f
a law u
the law
also be
meanw
er;) in
of mea
Here w
ned wit
are abs
where
iv. 15);
of the l
the lav
were w
among
do by m
They st
Written
should
it was
to this.
6. Pa
for kee
ed for
ca mis
but if
cision
uncirc
law, sh
circum
which
thee, v
transg
say, if
of the
Gentil
shall n

ten commandments is of universal obligation.

1. If it is not universal in its obligation, then that people upon whom it is not binding, is not required to live a moral life. If, therefore, God requires morality of one class of men and not of another, he is partial in his requirements. But he is not a being of partiality, and hence the moral obligations of his law are the same upon all.

2. The fact that the Canaanites were destroyed for sins forbidden in the ten commandments, proves that they were binding upon the Gentiles. Lev. xviii. 21-30.

3. The fact that God prevented Abimelech, King of Gerar, from violating the seventh commandment proves that the moral law is impartially binding upon the Gentiles, for he belonged to that people.

4. God assigns as the great reason for the destruction of the Chaldeans that their land was a land of graven images, and that they were mad upon their idols. Jer. 1. 38-40. Why should God destroy that people for violating a law that never was binding upon them? In like manner was Ninevah destroyed for sins forbidden in the ten commandments. Nahum iii. 1.

5. Paul testifies that the same law that is binding on the Jews, is also binding on the Gentiles. Rom. ii. 12-16.—“For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; (for not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another;) in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.” Here we are assured, 1st, That the Gentiles sinned without law. How can that be? for if they are absolutely without law, they cannot sin, for where no law is, there is no transgression (Rom. iv. 15); and John says, “Sin is the transgression of the law.” 1 John, iii. 4. They did not have the law written on tables of stone, and hence were without the written law. 2nd, They had it among them orally, for Paul says the Gentiles do by nature the things contained in the law. 3rd, They showed the work or command of the law written in their hearts or minds, v. 15. Why should God write his law upon their minds unless it was binding upon them? What do you say to this, Bro. James?

6. Paul testifies that the Gentiles are blessed for keeping the same law that the Jews are cursed for not keeping. Rom. ii. 25-27.—“For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law; but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision. Therefore if the uncircumcision keepeth the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? and shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfill the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law?” Query: Why should Paul say, if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, if the law were not binding upon the Gentiles? Again: Why should he say, And shall not uncircumcision, which is by nature, if

it fulfill the law, judge thee who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law, if the law is not obligatory upon the Gentiles? From this testimony there is no escape.

7. The universality of the law is demonstrated by the positive statement of Paul, that there is no difference between Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin. Rom. iii. 9.—“What then? are we better then they? No, in nowise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin.” This demonstrates that they are all under the same moral government, and that they are all governed by the same law.

8. Again: He testifies that the whole world is under the law. Rom. iii. 19.—“Now we know that whatsoever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.” This is not the Jewish world, as friend S. says, but the world that Paul says that we have proved to be under sin, which he says embraces the Jews and GENTILES. And to put this question beyond dispute, he says, “All have sinned and come short of the glory of God”—v. 23, and thus shows us all have sinned, all are therefore under obligation to obey the law.

9. Paul testifies further that Christ was sent into the world to redeem them that were under the law. Gal. iv. 4.—“But when the fullness of time had come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law.” If, therefore, the Gentiles were never under the law, Christ did not come to redeem them, and hence they are left without salvation.

10. From the foregoing considerations we conclude, 1st, that if the Jews only are under the law, that they only are under sin. 2nd, That as the Gentiles were not under the law, and as where no law is, there is no sin, that they are not, and were not sinners. 3rd, That these scriptures which represent them as being sinners are untrue. 4th, That all the murderers, adulteries, thefts, robberies, and idolatries committed by them are but innocent amusements. 5th, That the gospel being for sinners, it is not for the benefit of the Gentiles, as they are not sinners; and hence, the apostles were out of place when they preached the salvation of Jesus to them. 6, That the duty of repentance is a Jewish duty, for no man can repent who is not a sinner, and no man can sin unless the law of God is binding upon him. 7th, That God is a Jewish God, for in his law he seems to know nobody but Jews.

These are legitimate conclusions from Eld. Stephenson's premises and theology. We prefer to go by the Bible which says, “Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter; fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man.”—Ecc. xii. 14. And that too whether Jew or Gentile. B. F. S.

REPORT FROM BRO. BEED.

DEAR BRO. SNOOK: I have been lecturing in the town of Cheshire for some time past. I preached 12 times. God has been pleased to bless our feeble efforts; a number in this place have determined to keep the whole law. We have organized a church of six members, and there are about a dozen more we think will unite with

us soon. May the Lord direct the work. Bro. Graham has long stood alone in this place, but the Lord has given him his nearest neighbors to go with him to the Kingdom. Bless the Lord for it! They have established a weekly prayer meeting on Wednesday evenings. May they be a “living epistle, known and read of all men.” We have much opposition in this place. One Bolton has been preaching in this neighborhood for some time; when he commenced he was a pretty good Advent, and he gathered up a church which they call the Church of God. By the course they took they got into their church four or five Sabbath-keepers; some have withdrawn from them and united with us, and we think the Lord will still carry on his own work. Jesus says, “My sheep hear my voice, and they follow me: but a stranger they will not follow, but will flee from him, for they know not the voice of a stranger.” This people will not investigate; they even warn their members not to listen to Adventists, and refuse to let Adventists read a text in the Bible. At their meetings when they give liberty to any one to speak, if an Adventist gets up with his Bible in his hand, he is ordered to sit down; they do not want to hear from him. Our prayer is that the Lord will open the eyes of this people, that they may repent and be saved when the Lord comes. —Pray for your unworthy brother, and for the little church at Cheshire.

Your brother waiting for the coming of Jesus,
ELD. JOHN REED.
Allegan, Mich., Feb. 8th, 1863.

We rejoice with Bro. Reed in the Lord's work he is doing. It does us good to hear that our fellow laborers are out in the wide field working for the Lord, and that their labors are blessed with success. May God bless the little band at Cheshire, and may he bless Bro. Reed, and all the rest of his ministers who work for him. B. F. S.

OUR TIME AT HOME.

We had the pleasure on the first Sunday after our arrival home, of hearing Bro M. N. Kramer preach a sermon on the Sabbath question, in review of Mr. Marshall, Presbyterian minister of this place. We were much pleased with the defence, and pronounce it an able effort and a thorough refutation of the positions of Mr. M. Bro. Kramer is a man of deep research, and lives out the truth well at home. We hope he will be an instrument of much good in the Lord's hands. He can do much good as a minister if he will only use his talents for the Lord. His labors are much needed in the field, and we hope the time will soon come when we shall have his help. We need every good man in the field who can preach. The Devil has his agents out doing evil; why should not the Lord's servants be out doing good? We have been holding meetings at home for the last week. The weather has been very bad, but nevertheless, we have had a very good meeting. The interest has been very good, and we hope that good may result. B. F. S.

Frederick II. of Prussia received a petition from one of his districts praying that a certain clergyman be suspended from preaching, because he held that the punishment of the wicked would come to an end. The king took his pen and wrote the following: “I have considered the above petition and do hereby give my royal permission to all my loyal subjects to be damned to all eternity if they choose it.” But I do positively forbid their quarreling with their neighbors who are not willing to keep them company so long.

WHY SHOULD THE WICKED HAVE A RESURRECTION.

In an article under this heading in HOPE of Dec. 29, the writer has undertaken to show why some have come to the conclusion that there is no resurrection of the wicked. He says: "The want of a proper understanding of God's object in resurrecting the wicked, has led some to the conclusion, that the wicked will not be resurrected at all." And after stating various positions, as he understands them, he comes to the conclusion that all die as a penalty for Adam's sin; and that justice demands the resurrection of the entire race to a physical life, the very same life they lost in Adam. And that justice demands all this through Christ, as the second Adam, that the sinner may get his reward,—that the sinner is "not rewarded in this life, neither at death, nor in the state of the dead." So I suppose the Bro. must believe in the old theory of endless punishment in conscious suffering, or as he chooses the term, rewarded; but I hardly think the wicked would claim such a reward, even if justice did demand it, and if death, nor the state of the dead, is not the Bible punishment due the wicked, then this conclusion is inevitable. For the Savior says of the wicked, "These shall go away into everlasting [aionion] punishment, but the righteous into life [aionion] eternal." You may say it is in dying again, but this does not obviate the difficulty, if the reward you speak of is not death.

But I come now to the Adamic penalty and its effect. And 1st, What is a penalty? I answer, penalty is the infliction, or suffering the infliction of that which is written or threatened against an offender or violator of law, commands, or authority. 2nd. What is the nature of a penalty? Answer: The nature of anything is only known by its result, or the effect it produces. For instance: Our law says, the murderer shall hang by the neck until he is dead. The hanging by the neck is not the penalty, but simply the mode to produce that dead and unconscious state, which is the threatening written, and when fully executed, produces, and forever ends the penalty, which in its nature holds the criminal forever in the dead state, for it has no other nature, it has no restoring quality. On whom is penalty inflicted? When justice is done and the law has its demands, the transgressor only can suffer the penalty; whatever others may suffer in consequence, is not the penalty, for against such as have not violated law there can be no law or penalty.

Now to "the Adamic penalty." What was it? "Dying thou shalt die." How was it inflicted? God cut Adam off from the tree of life, the only element to which he had access which could perpetuate his living existence; consequently, after 930 years of sweat, wasting, and dying, it reaches its climax, and Adam is dead, and the penalty has no restoring qualities. But if it has any nature, it is to hold forever its death grasp upon its victim, and upon no others, for none but Adam and Eve have violated that law to which the Adamic penalty was annexed. But you will ask, Why his posterity die? I answer: It is not for Adam's sin as a penalty; "The soul that sinneth it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father." But why die? Sim-

ply because Adam, not possessing, could not transmit to his posterity an undying nature, therefore, through corruption and physical impurity, they must die. Now as man goes to perfection, they must die. Now as man goes down to death through physical disability, I inquire whether he will be raised to the same physical life that he lost, as the Bro. says? and why are they raised to physical life? because justice demands it; and why does justice demand it? the answer is because the first death is not for what we have done, but for what Adam did. This reason then, it will be seen affects equally both classes of the dead, the wicked as well as the righteous. And this is precisely what my Bro. maintains.

Bearing this point in mind, let us consider the matter a little further. If the dead have a just claim to deliverance from death, their present condition is one by which, so long as it lasts, they are wronged. But if wronged, who wronged them? did Adam inflict the wrong? Then against him, and him alone, is the claim for redress. But from him no help can come; he is dead, and since his death was for his own sin, it will be for my Bro. to show on what principle his animal life is to be restored. Has the wrong under consideration been inflicted by the Devil? if it has been, then the claim for redress is good only against him. But he, too, is powerless to correct the alledged injustice. It only remains therefore for the Bro. to affirm that God himself inflicted the wrong, and that he for that reason is bound to make reparation. But such an imputation would be the rankest blasphemy. "Justice and judgment are the habitation of his throne." Ps. lxxxix. 14. "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" And hence I would ask, Where, in all the Bible, is there an intimation that God was under obligations, in justice to make provision for a resurrection from the dead by sending his Son into the world? But saying what has been said, and admitting for a moment that all the dead will be raised to animal life because justice demands it, then I ask, Does the resurrection come as a blessing, or as a curse? To all the dead it must come in one of these ways. Is it a curse? The idea is absurd. If the dead have been wronged, that which is a curse is no remedy for the injustice. All must see this. Well then, does the asserted resurrection of animal life come as a blessing? Then I ask, How are the wicked benefited by it? will the Bro. tell us? Again: I would ask how are the righteous benefited by it; and if not benefited, of what avail will it be that the demand of justice is met? if it can do no more for the Lord's children than it does for the impenitent, it must be worthless, if not worse than worthless to both. But the truth on this subject we shall find by investigation to be that a life in the future is not a debt which God owes to man, but is a provision of redemption, and comes through his boundless love and mercy to those who lay hold of Christ. It comes, moreover, not as a restoration of mortal life, but as the bestowment of immortality.

I close this article with a few texts which I should like my Bro. to harmonize with his mortal resurrection theory. "So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption." "It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory. It is sown a natu-

ral body, it is raised a spiritual body." 1 Cor. xv. 42-44. "Neither can they die any more: for they are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Luke xx. 36.

J. C. DAY.

South Ashburnham, Mass.

REPLY.

It seems that Bro. Day has taken exceptions to an article under the above title, which appeared in the HOPE of Dec. 29th, and has felt called upon to review it. If said article were placed side by side with the review, I would consider it sufficient without making further remarks; but as it is it may be considered necessary to call attention to his criticisms.

He seems to be a little unfortunate in apprehending my meaning; he labors under the impression that I said man's natural death was a penalty for Adam's sin, and spends much time in combating that idea. If the brother would in examining the article, he would discover that it is not responsible for that statement. My position was, that as in Adam all died, even so in Christ should all be made alive; (1 Cor. xv. 22) and in consequence of Adam's sin, death came upon the whole human race (for death came into the world by sin, and death passed upon all men, for that [in whom, *margin.*] all have sinned, Rom. v. 12), and that "death reigned from Adam to Moses over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression (Rom. v. 14); and children are the only class who have not sinned, yet death reigned upon them. If the child in no sense suffers for the sins of the parent, please tell me why death came upon them? It could not have been for their own sins, for they had none. I cited for proof texts also Rom. v. 17, 18, 19, in which it is said, "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners."

If man forfeits his present life on account of his own sins, and thus meets the penalty of the law, then the law can have no more claims upon him, because he has satisfied its claims. If he should be resurrected, he would be raised an immortal being; but we are taught in the Scriptures that man shall be raised to receive his rewards. Luke xiv. 14; John v. 29; Rev. xx. 12, 15, which prove clearly that he has not received them; and as justice demands that the wicked should be rewarded for their deeds, its demands cannot be met without their resurrection.

"The resurrection," he states, "must be either a blessing or a curse to the human race." I answer that it is both a blessing to the righteous and a curse to the wicked.

The brother confounds the idea of a physical resurrection with that of a mortal. Physical means external, material, perceptible; while mortal means more; not only material, but corruptible and dying. The same life that Adam lost will be restored in Christ. It was Adam's physical life that was lost by sin (Gen. ii. 17; v. 5.); for his physical organization then became dying, and the Scripture says, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." As all lost their physical life in Adam, all will have their physical life restored in Christ. The resurrection of itself is not a reward, but the reward follows. "They that have done good shall be raised unto life, and they that have done evil unto damnation."—John v. 29. See Rev. xx. 12-15.

THE HOPE OF ISRAEL.

MARION, IOWA, THIRD-DAY, FEB. 23, 1889.

The Editor of the *Hope* does not hold himself responsible for the sentiments contained in articles written for the paper. Each writer will be held responsible for his or her views of scripture. We hold ourselves responsible for editorials, selections and comments; but no farther.

THE LETTER DEPARTMENT.—Brethren and sisters, remember to write for the Letter Department. It is cheering to the scattered and lonely ones to read in the *HOPE* the testimonies of others of like precious faith. Very many of the readers of the *HOPE* have not the privilege of meeting with brethren and sisters, and to many of them the *HOPE* is their only preacher. We have on hand some Letters which should have been given this week, but were crowded out by other matter.

We are happy to hear good news from Bro. Benbow of Sulphur Springs, Ind. The cause of God is still onward to victory there. Our good brethren there are alive and working for the Lord. He writes very encouragingly of the Sabbath School. Its condition is better than ever before, and its attendance very good. We are cheered with such news as this. May God bless this congregation and Sabbath School abundantly. B. F. S.

BRO. CHARLES SEWARD writes from Howard Co. Ind.: A word to those of like precious faith, for we are still having our Sabbath meetings every week, and there have two or three more decided to keep the Sabbath with us; they are also trying to dispense with that worse than useless weed, tobacco. May the Lord help every one who attempts to keep the commandments and faith of Jesus to depart from this filthy thing. The cause is onward here; we are battling hard for these glorious truths. The people are very desirous for Bro. Snook, or some one else to come to this place and preach the word. May the Lord direct to his own praise.

Discussion on Universalism.

Mr. Manford, Editor of *Manford's Monthly Magazine* says that we have invited him to discuss the subject of annihilation with him. I invited him to discuss the final end of the sinner, in which I proposed to affirm the following proposition: "The Scriptures teach that the punishment of the finally impenitent is destruction, which will result in a total extinction of their beings." This proposition Mr. M. accepted at Centerville, Iowa, while we were together there last fall. I am ready to defend the proposition, and we will yet debate it unless he fails to meet us. We also insist that Mr. Manford affirm a proposition involving his faith on the same subject. I will submit the following: Do the Scriptures teach the final holiness and salvation of all mankind. I deny. Mr. M., will you affirm? I will also affirm that the Scriptures teach that the second coming of Christ is a future event. Will you deny? I will be happy to have the discussion published, provided it can be faithfully reported. Do not know whether the gentleman will accede to the above terms or not.

B. F. Snook.

THE CHRISTIAN. 60 Cents!

A large, live, 8-page monthly religious and family paper, containing incidents, records of providences, sketches, music, poetry, true stories, pictures, reading for young, old, saints, and sinners. No controversies, politics, puffing, pills, or patent medicines. 60 cts. a year; 10 copies \$5. For Sunday Schools, 10 copies \$4. Send 10 cts. for 3 specimens before you forget it. Vol. 4 begins Jan., '89. More than 1000 pages new, five tracts for \$1. Address, H. L. HASTINGS, *CHRISTIAN TRACT SOCIETY*, 19 Linnell St., Boston, Mass.

"THE CHRISTIAN"—We have just received the 1867 volume of the *Christian*, neatly bound in paper. We have had the monthly visits of this publication ever since it started on its mission of good. Of its worth as a family paper we cannot speak too highly. It is conducted in good style, and edited with great ability, and breathes a spirit of piety so holy and pure that it must be loved by all who love the Lord. It contains valuable instruction to Christians, and affords much encouragement to the pilgrim on his way to Mount Zion to trust in his God, and persevere to the end. There is also a department for the children that makes it still more useful. It is edited by H. L. Hastings, Boston, Mass. We would advise all who wish such a periodical to subscribe for the *Christian*. B. F. S.

To every Friend of the Cause.

DEAR BRETHREN: There is now a debt of six hundred dollars against our office. Our good Bro. Aldrich offers to pay one hundred and fifty dollars of this, provided you will pay the rest. We now make a call to the good brethren of Iowa, Mo., Ind., Wis., Mich., and elsewhere, to volunteer in this good work, and be one of forty-five to pay this debt which will be only ten dollars each. Our paper will then be free and independent, for it is now about self-sustaining, and is growing in interest, and our list of subscribers fast increasing. Come, then, to the help of God's cause, and remember that for every dollar thus spent you will receive in the end a big interest. We are all poor, still we must sacrifice for God and his cause. B. F. Snook.

Each one of this list pledges to pay ten dollars when the requisite number is made up.

1. B. F. Snook,	\$10 00
2. M. N. Krauer,	10 00
3. M. B. Smith,	10 00
4. V. M. Gray,	10 00
5. W. J. Wilson,	10 00
6. I. N. Kramer,	10 00
7. S. W. Mentzer,	10 00
8. A. Friend,	10 00
9. Wilson Aldrich,	10 00
10. John M. Robbins,	10 00
11. H. E. Carver,	10 00
12. T. L. Holloway,	10 00
13. J. Brinkerhoff,	10 00
14. Eld. Samuel Page,	10 00
15. E. S. Sheffield,	10 00
16. Jacob Spangler,	10 00
17. J. T. Callicott,	10 00
18. J. W. McGuire,	10 00
19. Jane Martin,	10 00
20. S. C. Hancock,	10 00
21. Isaac Zirkle,	10 00
22. E. P. Goff and wife,	10 00
23. Mary A. Ayhart,	10 00
24. Mary A. Logan,	10 00
25. Laura L. Olark,	10 00
26. Elisabeth Ditto,	10 00
27. Elisabeth Whitehall,	10 00
28. Sophia Clark,	10 00
29. O. P. Moseley,	10 00
30. John Ferguson,	10 00
31. O. G. Knowlton,	10 00
32. Elisabeth Russell,	10 00

Can any one tell how it is that a man who is too poor to pay five cents a week for a good weekly paper, is able to pay fifteen cents a day for tobacco and cigars, to say nothing of an occasional drink?

Appointments.

The Lord willing I will begin meetings, where Bro. Seward may appoint, in Howard Co. Ind. Feb. 26, at early candle light, and continue as long as the interest demands. Thence we will go to other points where there is an interest to hear. All wishing our labors will address B. F. Snook, Fisher's Grove, Howard Co., Ind., Cannot Brn. Shortridge and Kiser attend the above meeting? B. F. Snook.

BUSINESS DEPARTMENT.

BUSINESS NOTES.

ST. LOUISA BONFIELD: You will find your money which you sent last Dec., received in *HOPE* No. 16, of Jan. 12.

Communications Received for THE HOPE.

Thoughts on the Judgment; Christian Activity; The Nature of Man; Bro. Regd's Mistake; Fixed purpose; The Day of Christ's Resurrection and Day of Pentecost, on what day of the week did it occur?

RECEIPTS

For The Hope of Israel.

Annexed to each receipt in the following list is the Volume and Number of the *HOPE* of ISRAEL to which the money received pays. Immediate notices should be given if money sent for the paper is not in due time acknowledged.

\$1.50 EACH. Rachel Munn iii-21, Wm Jackson iv-1, John M. Robbins iv-11. M. G. Daugherty iv-19, N. F. Nelson iv-19, C. G. Knowlton iv-19, L. Topping iv-1 \$.75 EACH. W. Covert iv-7, E. Moseley for Mrs E. J. Stadborn iv-4, W Covert for Sarah E. Suite iv-4. MISCELLANEOUS. A. Locke \$3.00 v-5, Elisha Starbuck \$2.00 v-1, John Branner \$1.00 iv-12.

Books and Tracts

For Sale at this Office.

THE TWO-HORNED BEAST of Rev. xiii 11-18. THE symbol as applied to the United States government disproved, and identified as the Papacy, or Roman Catholic Hierarchy. By W. B. Brinkerhoff. 80 pages. Price 20 cents, Post-paid.

THE MINISTRATION OF CHRIST: WAS IT Changed in 1844? By D. W. Hull. Price, 50c.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM, ITS NATURE, SUBJECTS, and Design. By B. F. Snook. 90 pp. Price 10 cts. Postage 2 cts.

REVIEW OF W. G. SPRINGER, on the Sabbath and Law of God. By B. F. Snook. Price, Post-paid 15 cts. An excellent work, and should be extensively circulated.

THE LAW OF GOD. Its observance from Creation, its immutability and Perpetuity proved from the testimony of the Old and New Testaments. 10 cts. Postage 2 cts.

AN APPEAL FOR THE RESTORATION OF THE BIBLE SABBATH, in an address to the Baptists from the Seventh day Baptist General Conference. Price, 10 cents, postage 2 cents.

DEATH NOT LIFE, or the DESTRUCTION of the WICKED ESTABLISHED, and endless misery disproved by a collection and explanation of all passages on future punishment. To which is added a Review of Dr. E. Beecher's Conflict of Ages and John Foster's Letter, By Jacob Blain. Price, 25 cents.

MUSIC. Two beautiful pieces of music on one folio sheet entitled "Redemption," and "Baulah," by S. O. Hancock. Price, 13 cts. per sheet, post-paid.

Also Sheet Music from H. L. Hastings, Song Sheet No. 1 containing Sunshine, The Parting Hand, The Resurrection Hymn, Consumption, We shall walk through the valley in Peace, I shall know thee in the Morning, Saint's Coronation Day, and hymns—The Gospel Feast, All Night long, and shall we know each other—Song sheet No. 2 contains Calvary, 'Tis the very same Jesus, The Shining Land, Sing to the Lord, Say Brother, Shall we meet, Bright Angels open the Door, Over There, and The Little Grave. Price, 15 cents per sheet, Postage 2 cents. Also Calvary, O I must be a lover of the Lord, and Gathered in the Morning, on single sheets. Price 5 cents each.