

places, with the exception of one meeting, Acts 20: 4, (and that was a night meeting, corresponding to our Saturday night), is some proof of the perpetuity of the Sabbath. But there are many other facts that prove that the Sabbath is still binding. The seventh day was made a Sabbath in the garden of Eden. Gen. 2: 1-3. Jesus says that it was made for man. Mark 2: 27. It is a memorial of creation. Ex. 20: 11; 31: 17. It is not a Jewish institution. It was made twenty three hundred years before there was a Jew. The Lord instructed his apostles that the Sabbath should be prayerfully regarded forty years after his resurrection. Matt. 24: 20. God has promised a blessing on all the Gentiles who will keep it. Isa. 56: 6, 7; and this is that prophecy that refers wholly to the Christian dispensation. See Isa. 56. The Sabbath is a sign of the true God, by which we are to know him from false gods. Eze. 20: 20. The HERALD says that the public ministry of the Savior was under the law of Moses, and then quotes a part of the Savior's words in Matt. 5: 17, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law but to fulfill;" hence he says it was proper to conform as far as possible to the custom of those under the law; yet he says he left no opportunity pass to point out the more perfect way, and that he never during all his ministry give the least evidence to the Jews that the Sabbath was to be continued. I now ask if the first day was to take the place of the Sabbath, and the Lord let no opportunity pass to teach the more perfect way, why did he not once tell them so where is the record of it, and why were they keeping the Sabbath 30 years after the resurrection? It was not necessary for the Savior to tell them that the Sabbath was to be continued. They were zealously keeping the Sabbath, the only day that was ever blessed, sanctified or set apart for a holy use; they knew no other day, and if another day had been mentioned there would have been bitter contention; but there was none. The HERALD quotes the Savior's words where he says he came not to destroy the law but to fulfill; then he says in Paul's time the law had been fulfilled and abolished at the death of Christ. I now ask if the law was abolished, would it not be destroyed? and if so, would it not be making the Savior out a

liar? or does the word fulfill mean to abolish or destroy? if so let us read it so. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to (abolish)." Matt. 5: 17. The Savior said that he came to magnify the law and make it honorable. Isa. 42: 21. Strange way to make a law honorable! Read again, "For thus it becometh us to fulfill (abolish) all righteousness." Matt. 3: 15. Again, "If ye fulfill (abolish) the royal law, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," &c. James 2: 8. Again, "Love is the fulfilling (abolishing) of the law." Rom. 13: 10. Singular love that will abolish or destroy a law! But there is a law that was abolished at the cross. Eph. 2: 15; but not the one that was established by faith, Rom. 3: 31; not the one that is spiritual, Rom. 7: 14; not the one that was engraven on stone, Deut. 4: 13; not the one that contains the whole duty of man, Ec. 12: 13; not the one by which the world will be judged, James 2: 12. Then again the HERALD quotes 1 Cor. 9: 19-23, to prove that the reason why the Apostle Paul went into the synagogues on the Sabbath was to gain some and to teach them the more perfect way, and to teach them, he says, as we would the Seventh Day Adventists, by going into their church on the seventh day, in order to gain some from the errors of their way; that we might teach them to observe the first day as did the apostles and primitive Christians, instead of the Jewish Sabbath. Now I admit that the HERALD tries hard to convince us that the first day should be observed instead of the seventh; but where is the record that the apostles ever did so. Why did the Gentiles, Acts 13: 43, call it (the seventh day) the Sabbath, if Paul had taught them to observe the first day, and why did not Paul preach on the first day, when he preached to them at the river side, and also at Corinth, where he left the synagogue, and went into the house of one Justus, where he preached every Sabbath for a year and six months. The book of Acts alone gives a record of eighty-four meetings on the Sabbath. (See Acts 13: 14-44; 16: 13; 17: 2; 18: 4-11.) against one on the first day, Acts 20: 5-12.

I will now give a few facts concerning the first day. God calls it a working day. Eze. 46: 1. God

never rested on it; he never blessed it; Christ never blessed it; it has never been sanctified; no law was ever given to enforce the keeping of it, and where no law is there is no transgression. Rom. 4: 15; 5: 13. No penalty is provided for its violation; no blessing is promised for its observance; it is never called a rest day; it is only mentioned eight times in the New Testament, while the Sabbath is mentioned fifty-nine times. In all of the New Testament we have a record of only one religious meeting held on it, and that was a night meeting. It was not their custom to meet on that day. The Bible nowhere says that the first day of the week commemorates the resurrection. Baptism commemorates the burial and resurrection of Jesus. Rom. 6: 3-5.

Dayton, W. T.

Woman's Rights—Reply to Mrs. Gillam.

Mrs. Gillam says, "If every Christian woman would take the Bible for her guide, and study it as she ought, she certainly could see that voting is not part of her duty." She thinks "we have enough to do without trying to take man's work away from him."

Now I believe I am a "Christian woman," I take the "Bible for my guide." I have studied it to some extent, but fail to find any reason there why I should not vote, and I do not wish to "take man's work away from him;" but cannot find any reason in the Bible why man should vote and woman should not. I know the Bible says something about subjection, but admitting that woman should obey her husband; suppose he gives her the privilege of voting, then I think she might vote, and I don't find that any man has any authority to forbid any woman but his own wife from voting. Some men are willing that their wives should vote, but still these wives are prevented from so doing by other men—men who have no authority over them. Then there are plenty of women who have no husbands to obey. Who has any authority over them in the matter.

In the beginning God made man and saw that it was not good for man to be alone, then he made a help-meet, or suitable for him, then he gave them, not him, dominion. The devil appeared upon the scene and tempted the woman, she yielded; then she tempted the man and

he yielded; they lost their blessed state, and ever since man has arrogated to himself the right of dominion. He prefers to manage affairs "alone" (God said it was not good for him to be alone) without the assistance of the "help" God provided for him. But this state of things was brought about by the devil, it was his work. Now we read in the Bible that "for this purpose was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." So we who believe in the Bible and in our right to vote, confidently expect that the men will yet see their mistake and rectify the error. There are many crooked things which will be made straight in the "good time coming," and that is one of them. I think Mrs. G. is in error in supposing that women think "they are more capable of managing or ruling than men are;" but they do think they are equally capable. If our "rulers" or nature's law-makers, &c., were Christian men, and took the "Bible for their guide," there would be less reason for woman's having a share in the "dominion;" but we all know that any low, vile debauchee who is 21 years of age can vote, and many of our "rulers" are men of notoriously bad characters, and yet Christian women must be governed by them.

There are other points in Mrs. G.'s argument equally untenable, but I will only mention one, and that is "if Christian women go to the polls they will be placed more on equality with the lower class and be treated more like men." Does she think that she would be contaminated by going to the polls and dropping in her ballot. She surely is not so weak as that, and if she is not, perhaps other women may not be, and as to being treated like men, I have always noticed that men who behave as gentlemen are treated as such by other gentlemen, and we know that gentlemen will neither mistreat a lady or allow any one else to, either at the polls or anywhere else. A man is very low indeed who will mistreat a lady; such men are hardly fit to have a voice in government.

Now, if Mrs. G. will inform herself as to the actual results of woman suffrage in those places where it already exists, she will not be at all frightened at what now seems such a fearful bugbear.

MRS. S. A. MCKUNE.

Amity, Or. March 17, 1884.