

S. D. A. GEN. CONF. LIBRARY  
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

THE  
REJECTED ORDINANCE:  
OR,  
THE PERPETUITY  
OF THE  
MEMORIAL OF OUR LORD'S HUMILITY.

—  
By W. H. LITTLEJOHN.  
—

REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING HOUSE:  
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.; CHICAGO, ILL.;  
TORONTO, ONTARIO.  
1889.

HERITAGE ROOM  
James White Library  
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY  
Barrien Springs, MI 49104

# CATALOGUE OF PUBLICATIONS

ISSUED BY THE REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING  
ASSOCIATION, BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

## PERIODICALS.

**The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald.** A 16-page Religious Family Newspaper, devoted to a discussion of the Prophecies, Signs of the Times, Second Coming of Christ, Harmony of the Law and the Gospel. What we must do to be Saved, and various Bible questions. \$2.00 a year.

**Good Health.** A monthly journal of hygiene, devoted to Physical, Mental, and Moral Culture. Ought to be in every household. \$1.25 a year.

**The Youth's Instructor.** An excellent 4-page illustrated weekly for the Sabbath-School and family. 60 cts. a year.

**The Home Missionary.** An 8-page monthly. 10 cts. a year.

**Sandhedens Tidende.** A 16-page Danish semi-monthly, devoted to expositions of Prophecy, the Signs of the Times, and Practical Religion. \$1.00 a year.

**Sanningens Harold.** A 16-page Swedish semi-monthly, magazine form, of the same character as SANDHEDENS TIDENDE. \$1.00 a year.

**Herold der Wahrheit.** An 8-page German semi-monthly devoted to prophetic expositions, the Signs of the Times, and Practical Religion. 75 cts. a year.

**De Bijbel Lezer.** A religious monthly in the Holland language, containing 16 large octavo pages, committed to Prophetic Exposition, Signs of the Times, Health and Temperance, Practical Religion, etc. etc. 75 cts. a year.

**Sundhedsvennen:** (The Friend of Health, in the Danish language) monthly. 80 cts. a year.

**Helsovannet:** (The Friend of Health, in Swedish) a monthly Health Journal. 80 cts. a year.

☐ The above are published at Battle Creek, Mich. Terms always in advance.

**The Signs of the Times.** A 16-page weekly Religious Paper, devoted to the dissemination of the light upon the same great themes treated in the Review. Published in Oakland, Cal. \$2.00 a year.

**The American Sentinel.** An 8-page weekly, devoted to the defense of American Institutions, opposed to a union of Church and State. Address *American Sentinel*, Oakland, Cal. \$1.00

**Sabbath-School Worker.** A 16-page quarterly. 25 cts. a year.  
Address, *Pacific Press*, Oakland, Cal.

**Pacific Health Journal and Temperance Advocate.** Devoted to Temperance Principles and the Art of Preserving Health. 32 pages monthly, published at Oakland, California. \$1.00 a year.

**Present Truth.** A 16-page semi-monthly, issued at London, England, at 75 cts. a year. This is a stirring periodical, largely used for ship work and other missionary purposes.

**The Bible Echo and Signs of the Times.** A 16-page monthly, published at Melbourne, Australia. A vigorous exponent of those Bible truths which are of especial importance at the present day. \$1.00 per year.

## BOUND BOOKS.

**Thoughts on the Books of Daniel and the Revelation.** (In one volume.) A judicious exposition of these two prophetic books in the light of history, ancient and modern. \$2.50

**Complete History of the Sabbath, and the First Day of the Week.** By the late Eld. J. N. Andrews. A mine of information on this all-important question. Treats the subject from a Biblical and Historical standpoint. New edition, revised. Now ready, 548 pp. \$2.00

**Thoughts on Daniel.** Critical and Practical. By Eld. U. Smith. An exposition of the book of Daniel, verse by verse. 416 pp. \$1.25

**Thoughts on the Revelation.** By Eld. U. Smith. This work presents every verse in the book of Revelation with such remarks as serve to illustrate or explain the meaning of the text. 429 pp. \$1.25

**The Sanctuary and the 2300 Days of Dan. 8:14.** By Eld. U. Smith. This work explains the great Advent movement, and makes plain the present position of those who wait for the Lord. 352 pp. \$1.00

**Synopsis of the Present Truth.** A work which gives an epitome of the faith of the S. D. Adventists. It treats upon every essential point of their faith. Uriah Smith, author. (Revised edition) 436 pp. \$1.00

**Bound Volumes of Testimonies to the Church.** 4 Vols. in music (each \$1.50). The set. \$6.00

**Bible Readings for the Home Circle.** Highly embellished. Contains 122 readings on various Bible subjects. Has 57 full-page cuts, 170 original headings, 5 colored plates, and 600 pages. \$2.00

Cheap, plain edition, \$1.00

**The Atonement:** An Examination of a Remedial System in the Light of Nature and Revelation. By Eld. J. H. Waggoner. 468 pp. \$1.00

**The Nature and Destiny of Man.** By Eld. U. Smith. This work treats on the great questions of the condition of man in death, and his destiny beyond the resurrection. 443 pp. \$1.50

**The Coming Conflict:** or, the United States to become an Oppressive Power. By Eld. W. H. Littlejohn. The Sabbath question fully discussed. 428 pp. \$1.00

**The Great Controversy between Christ and his angels, and Satan and his angels.** In four volumes. By Mrs. E. G. White. These volumes cover the time from the fall of Satan to the destruction of sin and sinners at the close of the war (thousand years of Rev. 20). Each, 400 pp.

Vol. I. Old Testament History, reaching to Christ. (Present edition exhausted.) \$1.00

Vol. II. Life and Ministry of Christ. 1.00

Vol. III. The Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of Christ, with the Lives of his Apostles. 1.00

Vol. IV. (Illustrated.) Treats of the Christian Church in its varied experiences during the gospel dispensation, but specially at the time of the end. 2.25

THE

# REJECTED ORDINANCE:

OR,

## THE PERPETUITY

OF THE

# MEMORIAL OF OUR LORD'S HUMILITY.

By W. H. LITTLEJOHN.

"Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you." CHRIST.

SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST  
PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,  
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

HERITAGE ROOM  
James White Library  
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY  
Berrien Springs, MI 49104

BV  
893  
.F7L5  
HER.



LIBRARY of  
**ANDREWS UNIVERSITY**

213209

## THE REJECTED ORDINANCE.

### CHAPTER I.

#### THE NATURE OF THE ORDINANCE.

WHEN our Lord was upon the earth, his heart was often saddened by the refusal of the people to accept his teachings, even when they were sustained by unanswerable logic. Though patient in the iteration and reiteration of truth, he at times turned away from those whose hearts were hard as steel, and whose spiritual eyes were as destitute of sight as were the seared and filmed orbs of Bartimeus the beggar, to mourn the blindness of an age where light seemed to have lost its power to illuminate the soul.

“Walk [said he] while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you.” “While ye have light, believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light.” This exhortation, however, was fruitless in moving his hearers to obedience, and the record which follows shows that, having exhausted the resources of his power in the vain effort to draw the people to himself as the light of the world, he withdrew and hid away from them. This he did, doubtless, not from any feeling of animosity because of the rejection of himself or his word, but because his continued presence would have resulted in harm rather than good, since—having developed an unwillingness to obey—an increase of evidence would

have simply served to enlarge their accountability.

On another occasion, as his eye rested on the city of cities, he uttered these mournful words: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not." Matt. 23:37. His heart was burdened almost to breaking with a sense of his inability to save those whose salvation had been the great desire of his life. He knew his mission full well. He knew that in him alone were the possibilities of pardon and life. He also knew that those men had refused to receive him, not because of any want of evidence of his divinity, but because they loved darkness rather than light, even where the latter was so clear that it equaled in its strength the full blaze of the midday sun. He was aware that they had cast him out deliberately, and under circumstances which made their condemnation certain.

He said to them, "Did ye never read in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner; this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes?" Matt. 21:42. From this it is manifest that he well understood the fact that the leaders of the people had set him at naught, but that God had made him, notwithstanding this fact, the foundation of every well-grounded hope of salvation. Eighteen hundred years have since passed, and how completely has the order of things been reversed. Where God is, there is always assured triumph.

The priesthood—those who ought to have been the God-directed builders of the spiritual temple—

failed to recognize the corner-stone which the Lord had provided for that most glorious edifice which has since become the stupendous structure of the Christian Church, and they were left to themselves, while the chosen instrument of God has filled the precise position which He designed he should fill in the only plan of salvation which has been offered to man.

From this we may learn two lessons. The first is, that it is a fatal thing to reject truth. The second is, that even when truth is rejected, the declaration of the apostle is verified; namely, that we can do nothing against it, and that its ultimate success is certain.

We read that God has sown the light for the righteous; this being the case, he who fails to gather its rays, in order that he may thereby illuminate the pathway of life which he is treading, is neglecting to avail himself of God's appointed means for his salvation. The consequences of such an action must uniformly be ruinous.

If we are ever saved, it will be because God will save us in the use of those instrumentalities which he has provided.

If we are ever lost, it will be because we have failed to carry out the instructions given in the sacred record.

As in the State it is vain for an individual to plead his ignorance of the statute law in extenuation of his offense, so in the Judgment of the great day it will be useless for us to urge, either that we were not acquainted with God's requirements or that we were unable to see light in his light.

Our opportunities for knowing what is the will of the Lord are ample, and if we do not avail ourselves of them, the fault will be our own. We

speak, of course, of the great fundamental principles of the gospel. Said Christ, "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." John 7:17.

Here, then, we learn that divine aid is promised to every honest-hearted individual who is really anxious to discover the path of light.

But divine aid means success.

The only thing, therefore, necessary to its realization, is a sincere desire to know the will of God.

But says one, "How shall we be able to understand our own hearts, so as to know whether we are actuated by motives which, in this matter, are every way right?" I answer, that the test, according to the scripture quoted, is very simple. The only thing to be determined is, whether we are really desirous of doing the will of the Lord; or whether our motive is, after all, simply that of an anxiety to be saved. In other words, are we doing the will of God because we love to do that will? or are we striving to do it merely to obtain the reward which we hope will follow?

In deciding this point, there is one test which can always be relied upon with confidence.

If we love to carry out the purposes of Him who has a right to our services, we shall ever seek to know just what he would have us do in all particulars.

Our eyes will never be closed to light, let it shine upon a duty however unpleasant; and we shall never hesitate to follow out a line of thought or listen to an array of argument, for fear that it may throw upon us a responsibility which we do not like to incur. Let it cost what it may, we shall not only be ready to receive instruction, but we

shall also pray for it in reference to everything which God has revealed in his word, however humiliating to our feelings and disastrous to our temporal interests that instruction may prove to be.

In the Saviour's prayer for the church we find these words, "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth." John 17:17. Here we are taught that sanctification comes through knowledge. As therefore, sanctification, or purification, is the very thing which God desires for us, and which we should desire for ourselves, we ought to reach out after it as the tendrils of the earth-plant reach out after the shrub or the tree as a means wherewith to lift itself toward heaven and light.

By looking through the history of the ages, we see that the providence of the Lord has been in harmony with the text quoted, and that whenever men have been "purified and made white," it has been in connection with their obedience to some important truth. The observance of this truth has usually brought with it the necessity of a sacrifice either of feeling or property, and that sacrifice has in turn brought the individual making it nearer to God.

Reader, are you ready for the ordeal?

Do you value the favor of Heaven above the treasures of earth?

Will you exchange the approbation of man for that of God?

Are you ready to search his word to see if there is not some light there which you have not yet received?

If so, you are very near, if not within, the kingdom of Heaven.

Before we part company, let us prove your sincerity or demonstrate your lack.

Is it probable, in view of the differences of opinion existing among different sects, that you have all the truth and no error?

We fear not.

It would be strange indeed if such should be the case; yea, more; it would be remarkable if your errors were not numerous, and your lack of light very considerable.

With your permission, therefore, we will select, from many which might be taken, a single unpopular truth, and call your attention to it through this tract. It shall be what we have alluded to in the heading of this tract as the rejected ordinance.

Do not suppose that it is baptism, and that, as immersionists, we shall claim that the churches generally have rejected the proper mode of baptism.

No; we allude to an ordinance more unpopular than that which Anabaptists love, and one which we believe they have set at naught more fully than Pedobaptists have the one which relates to the plunging of the body in water.

The one to which we have reference is the sacrament of feet-washing.

It is brought to view very fully in the thirteenth chapter of John. From the record we learn that on the memorable evening when the Lord instituted the supper which commemorates his death, "he riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself;" and that "after that, he poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded." John 13: 4, 5.

We also read that he said to them, "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet." John 13:

14. Here is a plain intimation that the rite there instituted was not to cease with its origination. But somehow—for what reason we cannot tell—there has disappeared from the church almost altogether everything which answers to the transaction which took place at the time in question.

It is true that in the Romish Church we have a trace of it in the practice of the pope in washing once in each year the feet of twelve beggars. The perversion of the ordinance, however, as here perpetuated, is so complete as to make it almost unrecognizable. The only lesson which we can draw from it is that the Church of Rome, as a whole, acknowledge that Christ's work was exemplary, and therefore to be followed in after ages. This concession is important in settling the general principle of the perpetuity, in some sense, of the ordinance, as by that means we have the testimony of the majority of the Christian world to the effect that the language of Christ implies the continued celebration of the event in which he is represented as having washed the apostles' feet.\*

As already remarked, the great mass of the Protestant world have nothing which in any way commemorates the wonderful humiliation of the Master which we are considering.

It is true that there are a few denominations that constitute exceptions to the rule; but they are so

---

\*The total number of Christians in the world is estimated to be about three hundred and sixty-nine millions nine hundred and forty-nine thousand. Of these, one hundred and eighty-five millions four hundred and twenty-two thousand belong to the Roman Catholic Church. By deducting one-half of the whole number of the Christian Church, therefore, from the membership of the Church of Rome, it will be seen that the latter body is in the majority by four hundred and forty-seven thousand five hundred.

few as to be regarded merely as exceptions. This fact, however, does not affect the settlement of the question at issue, since it was to the word of God, and not to the practice of men, that we were to go for light. Let us therefore approach the subject in a spirit of candor and of prayer.

To begin with, it will be well to inquire into the reasons which are assigned for the general discontinuance of the practice under consideration.

The only one with which we are acquainted is based upon the supposition that what Christ did was not designed to be regarded as the institution of a religious ordinance, but was simply an exercise of the rite of hospitality. In other words, that he only did that which it was common among the Jews for the host to do to his guest when visiting him at his own home.

Having stated the argument of those who object to the idea that Christ designed to originate by the transaction in question a new rite which was to be celebrated by his followers in succeeding ages, we now proceed to an examination of the reasons set forth from which such a conclusion has been reached.

The first suggestion which we offer is, that were we to concede that the premise taken is correct, *i. e.*, that what the Lord did, conformed in every particular to a custom then existing, such a concession would not preclude the possibility of his having had an ulterior design in the whole matter.

Were this true, it would not be the only time when he had availed himself of an existing practice for the purpose of building upon it an institution whose object was entirely different in its nature from that with which it had formerly been associated.

Take, for example, the ordinance of baptism: all must admit that its design in the Christian dispensation differs materially from that which John had in view when he administered it upon the banks of the Jordan; or, going still further back, from that of the immersion of proselytes to Judaism as it was practiced ages before either John or Christ made their appearance in the world.

So, too, in the matter of circumcision; it by no means invalidated the argument for the perpetuity and design of that rite as a religious institution, when it was conceded that it had been practiced by the heathen nations before the days of Abraham. God took the one and Christ the other, and for wise purposes transformed them into religious ceremonies which were to be perpetuated. They were well adapted to inculcate the moral which they were designed to teach when resorted to under the sanction of God, and it was therefore unimportant whether or not they ever had been used for another purpose.

If this be true, then it is merely begging the question to say that, because feet-washing was resorted to in the days of Christ by others than himself, therefore he must, in the case in hand, have employed it for no other purpose than that for which it was resorted to by others.

As in the case of baptism and circumcision, so in this case, it is possible that he might have seized upon it as being precisely adapted from the religious standpoint to inculcate just the grace which he was anxious to develop among those of his followers who should come after him.

In the second place, we repudiate, as utterly untenable, the view that Christ was simply carrying out in what he did a practice of his time which was

common on occasions such as the one in question, for the following conclusive reasons:—

a. Because it occurred at the wrong time.

The rite of hospitality was always attended to immediately after the guest had entered the house; since it was then that the circumstances of the case furnished the necessity for the ablution.\*

Feet-washing was purely utilitarian in its character, and owed its origin to the fact that the pedestrian in the dry and dusty East,—with his feet clad only with sandals, and his limbs below the knee frequently entirely bare,—as a matter of comfort to himself as well as respect to his host, universally resorted to the use of water almost immediately upon passing the threshold of the friend who was about to entertain him.

Had he delayed longer than this, not only would he have been unpresentable in his personal appearance, but he would also have been in danger of soiling the linen and the furniture with which his limbs might come in contact.

If, therefore, it can be shown that our Lord disregarded the important element of time in the transaction in which he figured so conspicuously on the evening of his betrayal, the inference will be legitimate, either that he was ignorant of the precise moment at which custom demanded that the rite should be administered, or else that what he did had no special reference to that usage of his time.

\* "As sandals were ineffectual against the dust and heat of an Eastern climate, washing the feet *on entering a house* was an act both of respect to the company and of refreshment to the traveler."—*Comp. Dic. of Bible*, by Smith and Barnum, art. "Washing the Hands and Feet."

All the italics in these notes are our own.

Turning now to the record we read: "And supper being ended, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him, Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God, and went to God, he riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments, and took a towel, and girded himself. After that, he poureth water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet, and to wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded." John 13: 2-5.

Here it is distinctly stated, first; that supper was ended, and, secondly; that he rose up from supper and commenced to wash the disciples' feet.

As a consequence of this declaration, it is settled, beyond dispute, that the bathing of the feet did not occur for some time—perhaps several hours—subsequently to the entering of the disciples into the upper chamber where the passover supper was eaten.\*

\* That there is comparative unanimity in the conviction that the Lord's Supper and the washing of feet were attended to after the commencement of the passover supper, the following brief citations will prove:—

"Our Saviour, *after his last supper*, gave his last lesson of humility by washing his disciples' feet."—*Enc. Relig. Knowledge*, art. "Washing of Feet."

"Our Saviour, *after his last supper*, gave a striking lesson of humility by washing his disciples' feet, John 13: 5, 6, though the eighth verse shows that he had also a deeper meaning."—*Dic. Holy Bible*, by Am. Tract Society, art. "Foot."

"For the same reason he may purposely have postponed the act of washing his disciples' feet till *after supper*, lest, while he was teaching a new lesson of humility, he might add a sanction to current and baneful errors."—*Kittó's Cyc. Bib. Lit.*, art. "Washing of Feet."

"Supper being over."—*Sawyer's Translation*.

"At supper."—*G. Campbell's Trans.*

"Supper being served."—*Bible Union Trans.*

This, however, as stated above, constituted a marked departure from a usage to which it is claimed he was seeking to conform.

Shall we conclude, therefore, that the variation occurred through ignorance on the part of our Lord as to what would have been proper under the circumstances?

We answer, No. This would impeach his intelligence respecting one of the commonest transactions of every-day life.

Not only so, it would show an utter disregard in point of time of the proprieties of the occasion.

If the washing of the feet needed to be attended to at all because of physical defilement, every consideration of taste, as well as of comfort, demanded that it should have been done long before a sufficient amount of time had elapsed for the preparation of supper, so that the individuals themselves might have been ready to enter upon that meal in a condition of absolute cleanliness; since if there ever was a time when the persons of Jewish guests should have been scrupulously free from defilement of every sort, that time was when they were gathered around the table for the purpose of eating a meal. This was true of their hands, because it was their practice to dip all of them into a common dish which was the receptacle of the food for the whole company. It was also true of the feet and limbs; because it was their habit to recline at meals on the same sofa or couch, so that the head of the one might rest on the breast of the other, the limbs of the two parties coming in direct contact with each other as well as with the material which covered the seat on which they reclined, and, therefore, in danger of soiling (unless scrupulously clean) both the garments of a friend at meat and the upholstery of the host.

With all of these facts and circumstances our Lord was well acquainted; and no doubt he was as desirous, to say the least, as the average man of his time that every consideration of neatness should be carried out.

What, then, we ask again, could have been his motive in delaying as he did the entering upon the work under consideration?

As we have seen, it could not have been through either ignorance or oversight.

Neither could it have been on account of indifference to physical uncleanness; for to suppose that this was the case up to the time of his rising from the table and taking the basin and towel, and that he was just at that moment seized with a sudden and inexplicable desire that all should be immediately purified by the use of water, would manifest an oversight or an unaccountable fickleness of purpose wholly incompatible with our ideas of his divine perception of the time when, and the place where, and the manner in which, everything in its due order should have been provided for.

What, then, we ask once more, was the purpose and object which he had in view while doing what he did? The answer is obvious.

It was something different from the mere desire to rid his disciples from bodily uncleanness through a resort to the rite of hospitality; since, had that been his purpose, he would have resorted to that rite in the earliest stage of the interview, instead of waiting until it was already too late to secure the principal objects for which it was employed on such occasions.

5. The language of Christ forbids the idea that this could be true. Said he to his disciples, "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know

hereafter." Now there is no rational interpretation which can harmonize these words with the view that the Saviour was at the time only administering the usual rite of hospitality. For, if this were the case, every one of the twelve apostles was perfectly familiar with the transaction which was taking place before them, having witnessed it scores and scores of times, since it was something which every dusty and foot-sore pedestrian had experienced, whenever, weary with his labors, he entered the house of a man of his time.

If our opponents, therefore, are correct, the Lord was wrong in inferring that the apostles did not comprehend his movements, and intimating that it would be necessary that they should be explained to them thereafter.

*c.* What Christ did furnishes so marked a departure from the course pursued ordinarily in his age by those who were entertaining guests, that it becomes apparent that he was acting independently of their example, and, therefore, that his motives were different from theirs.

He in person took the basin and the towel, and, with his own hands, washed and wiped the feet of the disciples. In doing this he varied from the custom of his generation in just so far as he did the work himself. All that they did was to furnish to the individual water and the needed appliances, leaving him thereafter to perform the work of washing his own feet. This is manifest from the language of the Saviour in his conversation with the Pharisee at whose house he was stopping at the time at which the conversation in question took place. He said to him, "Simon, I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no water for my feet; but she hath washed my feet with tears, and wiped

them with the hairs of her head." From this it appears that the Lord reproved the Pharisee, not for having failed to wash his feet, but for having neglected to furnish him the water with which to do it himself. It is clear, therefore, as to what the practice was. It is also clear that the Lord so far deviated from it at the time of the passover supper as to make his action incompatible with the notion that he was doing to the apostles only that which he expected the Pharisee to do to him. So radical was his departure from the customary practice, that it proves indubitably that he either designed to create an entirely new institution, or else to transform the old one so far as to make it subservient to the inculcation of entirely new ideas. It matters not which horn of this dilemma the objector may take; for either one of them will impale the theory that the Lord was simply acting the part of the host to his disciples, they, in the meantime, sustaining to him the relation of guests.

*d.* The deportment of Peter also furnishes conclusive evidence that the action of Christ was altogether unusual, and had never been witnessed in him before.

How could this have been true, however, if Christ was merely acting the customary part of a host? This was the fourth passover that Jesus had attended. Is it not probable that in each of them he had sustained the same relation to the twelve that he did on that occasion? If this be so (our opponents being right), then custom would have demanded that he should do on the three previous occasions just what he did at that time. But this could not have been the case; else Peter had witnessed the same occurrence before, and would not have been so perfectly overwhelmed by the extrav-

agance of the Lord's humiliation. Why, said he, "Thou shalt never wash my feet." This proves that he had never done so formerly, and that it was a sight to which the apostles were wholly unaccustomed. If this be the case, however, as it certainly must be to explain Peter's action, then it is evident that the Master there inaugurated something which they had never witnessed in him before, and for which their minds were wholly unprepared by anything in his life or the usage of their time. But concede this point, and we are again compelled to admit that the familiar rite of hospitality will not furnish a suitable explanation of the scene in that upper room where the Lord and his followers were assembled.

*e.* If the language of Peter is irreconcilable with the accepted view, the reply of Christ utterly demolishes it, once and forever.

Said he to the recusant apostle whose extreme modesty and veneration forbade the thought that the Maker of worlds should so far humble himself before him as to wash his feet, "If I wash thee not, thou has no part with me."

The scope of this declaration is simply overwhelming. According to the statement which it contains, the only alternative left to Peter was submission or separation from the household of Christ. Let him but have persisted in refusing to submit to the ordinance, and this refusal would have cost him the loss of eternal life. How prodigious, therefore, the consequences which hung upon the decision which he there made. But will any one say that for a trifling cause the Saviour would have cast off this tried disciple, who had been so long a faithful companion in his labors and sufferings?

Would a simple refusal to submit to a rite of

hospitality which had in it no religious element, have been sufficient to call forth from the Lord such a terrible denunciation of punishment in case of a failure to comply?

Such a hypothesis is simply preposterous.

The washing of feet, as it was then practiced, from the stand-point of hospitality, was never compulsory, but always a matter of free choice. The individual might indulge in it or not, according to his inclination or the necessities of his condition.

So far as Peter was concerned, also, the occasion of his hesitation was not an unwillingness to submit to the purifying process, but it was a deep sense of his own unworthiness and of the exalted character of the Son of God. There was in his motives nothing which was unworthy of the man, but rather everything which should have commended him to favor. He, therefore, who would argue that the Master, when there was nothing at stake but the mere matter of the ablution of a portion of the person in accordance with a usage of the times, would have insisted upon carrying his point, even at the cost of Peter's salvation, does a gross injustice to the heart of Christ.

Let it be admitted, however, that the occasion was one on which a new Christian ordinance was in process of erection, and the whole affair takes the complexion of a high religious duty, and justifies the action and the words of the Saviour. This is so, because Peter would have been found not simply setting at naught a conventional arrangement of little consequence, but absolutely and persistently refusing to perform a solemn and religious duty.

*f.* The theory that the affair was wholly secular in its character is very unsatisfactory in another particular; *i. e.*, it teaches that Christ sought to

enforce a thing for which there was no earthly necessity. In other words, that he required Peter to submit to the washing of his feet, when, according to his own statement, they needed no cleansing whatever.

His declaration was: "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit: and ye are clean, but not all. For he knew who should betray him; therefore said he, Ye are not all clean." Manifestly these words imply that in the case of Peter there was no physical necessity for the application of water. This being the case, there was no good reason why the customary rite of hospitality should be administered to him; since that was designed to be employed only by persons whose feet had become soiled by travel, or otherwise, and needed to be cleansed. Christ said to him distinctly, "Ye are clean." His statement was of course true. And, being true, it furnishes positive proof that his object was not the purifying of the body according to the manner of his time, but must have been something entirely different. He emphatically sets forth in words the fact that even though the whole person were perfectly free from everything like external pollution,—having been washed, so that he was clean every whit,—still it would be required that he should submit to the washing of the feet. It mattered not if—as was perhaps true in the case of Peter—the individual had not passed out of the house subsequently to the taking of the bath,\* it was still required that he, though "clean every whit," should submit to the

\* As to the custom of bathing in connection with the pass-over supper, the following is to the point:—

"*He that is washed*] That is, he who has been in the bath, as probably all the apostles had lately been, in order to prepare

ordinance in question. But this being so, there is no further need of debate. The subject is at once freed from all of its difficulties, and the evidence that Christ had in view a higher and nobler object than the mere carrying out of a social formula instituted solely for the purpose of physical cleanliness, is overwhelming to that extent that we cannot see how a candid person can longer doubt.

Pausing, therefore, for a moment in order to present in a brief summary the points made thus far, we will leave this branch of the subject. That summary will run as follows: The transaction which we have been contemplating was not identical with the ordinary custom of feet washing as administered to guests in the lifetime of our Lord, as proved by the following decisive considerations:—

1. It occurred after supper; whereas, in order to make it appear to be one and the same with the rite in question, it would be necessary to prove that it was administered immediately upon entering the house, and before the eating of the meal of which the disciples partook in company with the Lord.

2. It was something with which the disciples were not familiar, as shown by the language of Christ; whereas every one of them had been acquainted with the ordinary rite of hospitality from childhood, having witnessed it again and again, and, doubtless, having themselves been refreshed by it times without number.

3. Christ himself washed the feet of his disciples: whereas, had he followed the practice of his time,—and the one which it is claimed he sought

themselves the better for the paschal solemnity: for on that occasion, it was the custom of the Jews to bathe twice."—*A. Clarke's Notes on John 13: 10.*

to imitate,—he would simply have provided them with water, and allowed them to do the balance of the work for themselves.

4. It was something which the Lord had never done to his followers before, as proved by the language of Peter; whereas, if it had been the habitual bathing of the feet as practiced by the contemporaries of Christ, the latter must have administered it to the disciples on at least the three passovers which preceded the one which they were then celebrating, as in all of these passovers he doubtless sustained to them practically the same relation which he did on that night.

5. The refusal of Peter to allow the Lord to wash his feet would have cost him the loss of eternal life; whereas a refusal on his part to submit to the ordinary custom of feet-washing would have been followed by no punishment whatever, and would only have subjected him to the inconvenience attendant upon a condition of uncleanness as it regarded his lower limbs.

6. Christ emphatically declared that the washing which he administered was compulsory, even when the feet were entirely free from soil of any and every nature; whereas the sole and only object of furnishing the traveler with the appliances necessary for the washing of the feet was to enable him—from considerations of both health and comfort—to enjoy a condition of perfect freedom from bodily defilement, and, therefore, was never resorted to unless such defilement actually existed.

Passing now from the region of debate concerning the nature and object of the transaction described in the thirteenth chapter of John, where is introduced that most incomprehensible humiliation on the part of our Lord, as brought to view in the

washing by him of the disciples' feet, we proceed to consider the bearing of this transaction upon the matter of Christian duty subsequently to that time.

Evidently the persons in question appreciated but imperfectly the significance of the scene in which they were actors. Christ realized this, and therefore he said, "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter."

From this it is fairly deducible that what was done was of such a nature that its influence and effects would be felt subsequently. Everything connected with that extraordinary transaction was of a character to make the most profound impression, and to provoke reflection and study into its design.

Nor was this reflection and study to prove fruitless. Ye shall know hereafter, said the Saviour. We think that promise has already been fulfilled, and, as we have argued thus far in this tract, that the Lord made it too clear to admit of doubt that what he did was designed to create an institution for the use and benefit of those who should come after him. That this was so, as it regards the twelve, we have the authority of his own words for believing. "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet." These declarations are explicit. With what Christ had outwardly done, they were well acquainted. Now, he enjoined, go and do likewise to one another. No ingenuity in construction can evade the obvious and natural conclusion from these words that the ordinance originated was not to perish with its institution. The apostles were not to be satisfied with simply contemplating the nature of the work which Christ had done for them, but they were strictly commanded to *do* to each other the very thing which he had *done* to

them. No duty ever devolved upon them which was enforced by a clearer statement of obligation. "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet," said the Saviour. It was just as certain, therefore, that they were to imitate his example as it was that the work in question had been performed by him upon them. That this work, however, had been actually done, there was, with them, no room for doubt. They had both seen and experienced it. This being the case, there was no room left them for debate; what they had seen performed, they were as certain that it was their duty to repeat as they were that they had ever witnessed it at all.

The final declaration of Christ, also, emphasized that which his positive command had embodied. He did not say to them, Happy are ye because ye have witnessed these things; but his declaration was: "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them;" *i. e.*, *action*, and not *knowledge* simply, was the important thing. The blessing which was to be secured to them was not to come alone through the channel of acquaintance with what the Lord had accomplished upon their persons, but through that of *doing* to each other what he had done to them. With the lapse of time, the scene which they had witnessed in that upper chamber would gradually have faded from their memory. It needed to be commemorated in order that the benefits to be derived from it might be lasting in their character. By each one of the twelve, as he should participate personally in imitating and perpetuating the occurrences of that night, would all the advantages be realized and enjoyed in their fullness. At each recurrence of the solemn celebration, the individual actors would have most vividly portrayed anew

before their minds the great condescension of the Master, and thereby they would individually receive a blessing which might properly be represented as rendering them "happy indeed."

Thus much for the duty of the apostles. Further space need not be devoted to its consideration; for if the Lord failed to make it manifest, then language has lost its force, and can no longer be relied upon as a medium through which to enjoin obligation.

Passing, therefore, from the apostolic twelve, we inquire whether Christians generally are not in duty bound to obey the same injunction which the Saviour directed to those who were honored with a position nearest his person.

As it regards this question also, we think there is little room for doubt.

First, because, as all will admit, the Saviour selected the twelve as a sort of a miniature church, through which, for the purpose of convenience, he conveyed his will and his commands to those then living, outside of the apostles, and to those who should follow them in subsequent ages. Through them has come to us nearly all of the instruction which fell from his lips for our benefit. On one occasion he said to them, "What I say unto *you* I say unto *all*, Watch.

Again, on the very evening on which the ordinance of feet-washing was created, there sprang into existence another sacrament of equal importance, which is at the present time universally celebrated. We have reference to the Lord's supper. The circumstances attending the origin of both were nearly identical. They came into existence the same evening, in the same room, were administered to the same persons, and were enjoined by the same Lord.

If there be any difference as it regards the obligation of either, that difference is in favor of the more unpopular ordinance; for it was of this that the Lord said to Peter, that, unless he submitted to it, he should have no part with him. Also it was of this that he said, "Ye *ought* to wash one another's feet." Whereas, he simply remarked of the other, "As oft as ye do this, do it in remembrance of me." These facts being true, the same logic which would prove the perpetuity of the Lord's supper—which was at the outset celebrated by Christ and the apostles alone—would also perpetuate the ordinance of feet-washing; and, therefore, as Christians generally acknowledge that it is their duty to observe the former, they should either concede that they have been mistaken in that, or else admit that consistency demands that the latter be regarded as equally binding.

Secondly, we conclude that Christians in our time are as much in duty bound to participate in the ordinance of feet-washing as were the apostles; because, reasoning from a general stand-point, we are as much interested as they were in the principle which the ordinance was created to illustrate. That principle was the duty of humility as enforced by the example of Christ. Said he: "The servant is not greater than his lord, neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them;" *i. e.*, if I your Lord and Master; I by whom and for whom all things were made that are made; I who am the only begotten Son of the Father, have so far humiliated myself that I have been willing to kneel before you, and in the bathing of your feet have performed the service of a servant and a menial, surely you, who are in common but servants to me,

ought to be willing so far to humble yourselves as to do unto one another that which I have done unto you.

What a sublime lesson!

The King of glory so destitute of pride and exaltation that he could even wash the feet of sinful, erring man.

How important that this lesson should be learned by all.

With what overwhelming force is taught by it the brotherhood of mankind, the wickedness of pride, and the propriety that each should minister to the other.

In no other way could this lesson have been imparted so successfully.

But were the apostles the only ones who needed its instructions?

Were they less fraternal, more proud, or more unwilling to minister to one another than we are?

Beyond all question, at the time under consideration they were vastly more humble than the average Christian at the present hour.

This being true, however, the conclusion is unavoidable that if *they* needed the ordinance, *we* need it in a ratio greater by tenfold.

By parity of reasoning, therefore, it was designed for us, because Christ well understood what our situation would be, and the presumption is, that, having done what he did to meet the needs of one class, he perpetuated the duty of exemplifying the transactions of that hour, in order to meet the greater necessities of those of us who were to come after.

Were we to pass from the discussion of general principles in their bearing upon the issue before us to the question as to whether the New Testament

throws any further light upon the matter of the perpetuity of the ordinance save that which is found in the command of Christ, we should enter a field not wholly destitute of the confirmatory proof which we seek.

The apostle Paul, in addressing Timothy respecting the propriety of supporting certain widows by the charity of the church, commends one class as being worthy of maintenance at their hands. Guarding with jealous care the fruits of the liberality of his brethren, and being unwilling that they should be consumed by any except those of the most undoubted merit, he writes as follows: "Let not a widow be taken into the number under threescore years old, having been the wife of one man, well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work." 1 Tim. 5:9, 10.

In this passage the obvious allusion is to one who, possessing those other Christian graces necessary to the development of a symmetrical character, was also one whose humility and sincerity had been proved by the high test of a willingness to carry out the behest of the Saviour brought to view in the words, "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet."

Such was the nature of the obligation imposed by this precept, and such was the mind which its fulfillment betokened, that Paul felt that he would be perfectly safe in recommending the individual possessing it as worthy of material aid. He well knew that the dishonest, the insincere, and the hypocritical would be very slow to carry out an ordi-

nance which had in it so large a demand upon the graces of meekness and ingenuousness.

Reasoning from this stand-point, therefore, we reach two conclusions. In the first place, it becomes clear that the apostle placed a very high estimate on obedience to that institution which the Lord inaugurated on the eve of his departure from this world, in order to commemorate that lowliness of heart which enabled him to perform the most menial offices for the benefit of others. In the second place, it is evident in the side-light thus thrown upon the subject, that in the year of our Lord sixty-five,—thirty odd years this side of the passover supper,—Christians were still celebrating with great solemnity the event which took place in that chamber at Jerusalem in which the Lord, in the attitude of a servant, condescended to wash with his own hands, and to wipe with the towel with which he was girded, the feet of his attendant disciples.\*

But, if this be true, we have again reached, through the practice of the church, the same decision at which we had arrived by inductive argument. That is, we are brought once more to the conclusion that the sacrament of feet-washing is

\* The following from Kitto's *Cyclopedia* will serve to show the reader the facts in regard to the historic evidences respecting the continuance in the early church, for centuries, of the celebration of the action on the part of Christ which is passing in review before us:—

"Feet-washing (*pedilavium*) became, as might be expected, a part of the observances practiced in the early Christian Church. The real signification, however, was soon forgotten, or overloaded by superstitious feelings and mere outward practices. Traces of the practice abound in ecclesiastical history, and remnants of the abuse are still to be found in the Romish Church. The reader who wishes to see an outline of these may consult *Seigel, Handbuch der ch. Alterthümer*, ii. 156, seq."

still binding upon all, since we find it in use among the churches some thirty odd years this side of the boundary line of this dispensation; for since that period, all will admit our relation to that subject has been in nowise affected by any change of doctrine or duty. If we had found no trace of the practice in the meager record of current events which the New Testament brings to view, that would in nowise invalidate the necessity of performing an office which rests squarely on a positive command. But, having the command, and then finding a usage approved by the highest authority known to the church, which harmonizes perfectly with our interpretation of the law, the question of the necessity of our obedience to the same is not only emphasized, but also settled beyond dispute.

Thus, reader, we have canvassed this subject as fully as the circumstances of the case seem to require.

By the positive precept of Christ, by numerous inferential arguments so strong as to amount to actual demonstration, and by the practice of the first generation of Christians, there has been brought home to your door an obligation which, although heretofore not understood by you, has now become plain and unmistakable.

It only remains, therefore, to inquire, What disposition will you make of this matter?

Returning to the point whence we started, how does your heart appear to you, when upon it is thrown the flood of this new light?

Do you discover in it any disposition to evade the requirements of the situation, or to shrink from them?

Is the consecration as complete, after all, as you had hoped it was?

Or is God bringing you now to a point where you can discover your own lack, and where, if obedient to him, you will be able to attain to a deeper experience than you have ever reached before?

I beg of you to move cautiously over this ground, for here are quagmires and quicksands which have swallowed up many an unwary traveler.

Be not deceived. It is not a matter of indifference whether or not we walk in the light. As it was of old, so it is now. He that refuses to do this, sooner or later will grope his way in moral darkness. "While ye have light, believe in the light [said the Saviour], that ye may be the children of light." In these words is brought to view, as existing within the individual himself, the power to believe or disbelieve the truth. If we are honest in heart, we may "know of the doctrine." The danger is that where knowledge brings with it unpleasant duty, we may deceive ourselves by requiring more testimony than the case demands. Where no additional responsibility is incurred, and where the matter is one of sentiment rather than of practice, we reach conclusions with comparative ease. The instance before us, however, is not of this sort. The thing required furnishes us with something to *do*, as well as something to *believe*. Experience has shown that the dangers of the situation lie in the direction of an unwillingness to perform the act required. For some reason, there is in the *minds* of many persons a repugnance to carrying out the practical features of the sacrament under discussion which is exceedingly strong. That this should be so with the natural heart, it is not difficult to comprehend. Not so, however, with professing Christians, who claim to have mortified the flesh. The former, being unregenerate, have never

learned to humble themselves; but the latter are but poor scholars in the school of Christ unless they have learned the absolute necessity of self-abasement.

So far as the action of washing the feet of a brother is concerned, it is true that when performed in the manner in question it is a work which is humiliating in its nature; but does this really render it objectionable? It seems to us that this is very far from being the case. If in any way the humiliation involved dishonor, the situation would be different. This cannot be, however, since Christ himself gave us the example, and he never would have done anything that was wrong in the abstract. Where, then, does the cross enter? Manifestly in the tacit confession involved in the action which we put forth. In washing the feet of another, we virtually say to him, "My brother, I am willing, for Christ's sake, not only to regard you as fully my equal, but also to sustain to you the relation of an abject servant to his superior." If there be pride in the heart, this will be an unpleasant task. If you be a rich man, and that brother a poor man, again the deed will greatly mortify the flesh. If you be learned, and he be unlearned, the situation will be trying. Nevertheless, if the true spirit of the gospel be in our hearts, these difficulties will vanish like the dew before the rising sun. Paul declared that there was a saying that was worthy of all acceptance; *i. e.*, "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom *I am chief.*" Again it is said, Let the rich rejoice that he is made low. James 1:10. And once more: "Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate. Be not wise in your own conceits." Rom. 12:16.

In fine, the Scriptures abound everywhere in declarations to the effect that we ought to be willing to humble ourselves at all times, regarding others as better than ourselves.

By one who understands his own heart, this will not be looked upon as a difficult and unreasonable requirement; since, being acquainted with his own sins and ignorant of those of his neighbor, and feeling that there is no defense for his past course, he will naturally come to view those around him as really more deserving of the divine clemency than himself. To him it will be rather a pleasure than a burden to perform any action which shall in any way develop in himself a spirit of contrition, and furnish to others proof of his lowliness of mind. But convince him that Christ has gone before and set an example which he is expected to follow, and he will not stop to debate the question whether in any way he may be doing those things which by the more haughty in spirit may be regarded as a violation of the proprieties of cultured life. With him sentimentalism is past, and the struggle for life has become so real and all-absorbing that mere conventionalisms have lost their power to separate him from Christ. With him, the popular whim which attaches a taint of degradation to the person who is religiously employed in the washing of feet, will have little or no weight. Discriminating between solid argument and mere sophistry, he will discover that the washing in question is not for the removal of the filth of the flesh, but as a type which has a reflex influence by calling attention to what the Saviour has done in his own person; thereby developing in the disciple that grace which would make him com-

pare in lowliness of heart with his great Exemplar. All the unpleasant associations in the minds of the prejudiced against the ordinance as being one to be employed merely for the purposes of physical cleanliness, will be removed when he learns that all who participate in it, following the example of Peter, have previously purified the person for the occasion by the employment of the requisite ablution.

Those objections, also, which arise in the mind of many because of the mistaken notion that the ordinance is entered upon by the sexes promiscuously, will be dispelled when he ascertains that everything is done decently and in order, the males administering the ordinance to males, and females to females, under circumstances calculated to secure the strictest propriety in all particulars.

In fine, he will instantly perceive that all of the arguments which are brought to bear upon the subject by those who object to the suitable commemoration of one of the most striking events in the life of Christ, fall so far short of accomplishing the end desired, and are so radically defective in their nature and construction, that they serve to establish, rather than to undermine, his new convictions. They will appear to him like the most tenuous cobwebs stretched across the pathway of truth, hardly tangible enough to be felt, and destined to be swept away by the advancing foot of the first passer-by. All of them will be found to have their origin in a mistaken conception of the facts, or in a disposition to evade a duty by an unwitting appeal to prejudices altogether unworthy of a Christian man. To all of them he will make but the one answer:

The command and the example of the Son of God are with me authority of too high a nature to be set at naught by a logic sadly defective in its character, or by a caprice, which, if it would reflect on the ordinance at all, would also reflect on Him by whom it was created.

The more he shall consider the matter of the sacrament, and the important lesson which it teaches, the more profound will be his assurance that it meets us in our fallen natures right where we are, and where we most need help.

Should it ever be his fortune to enter the room where the humble followers of Jesus, acting upon the instructions of the Master, are practically illustrating the value of the institution which originated with him, he will appreciate, as never before, the power of the dramatic in religion. As with streaming eyes, and hearts that are bowed down with a solemn sense of the work in which they are engaged, one after another girds himself with the towel, and, in imitation of the Lord, kneels to administer the ordinance to a brother, he will be overwhelmed as never before with a sense of the condescension of Him whose glory filled the heavens, and yet who, laying it all aside, clothed himself with a form of flesh and actually performed the office of a servant to servants. While his eye runs over the emblems now upon the table, of the Lord's broken body and shed blood, as well as the visible appliances connected with the ordinance of condescension, the scene enacted in that upper room at Jerusalem eighteen hundred years ago will be revived before his fancy with a vividness and power which mere words could never impart. With a grateful heart, and an almost crushing

sense of his own unworthiness, he will thank God for the perpetuity of an emblematical scene which overwhelms him with a deeper sense of the self-abnegation of the Master than ever had taken possession of his mind before.

May God grant, candid reader, that your experience may prove to be of the kind spoken of above, and that—putting aside as unworthy of a moment's thought, all suggestions which are dictated by the fear of man or the love of applause—you may walk in the light which now shines upon your pathway, content to know that this light comes from Heaven, and that the path which it illuminates will lead you to a deeper experience in the things of God, and to a more profound sense of your own unworthiness and of his goodness.

Suffer no false issue to be presented before your mind. Remember that the question resolves itself simply into this: When the Lord said, "*Ye ought to wash one another's feet,*" did he mean to be understood as saying *ye ought not to wash one another's feet*? Or did his words accurately express the thought that was in his mind?

If you shall decide that the first position would dishonor the Master by reflecting upon his ability to employ language that was calculated to convey correctly the lesson which he designed to teach, then your duty will be plain. Then those other words, so searching and so just,—"*If ye love me, keep my commandments*" (John 14:15),—will furnish you with a key to duty which will unlock every problem relating to the course you ought to pursue in the future.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE ORDER TO BE PURSUED IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE ORDINANCES.

As some difference of opinion seems to exist among those who accept the ordinance of feet-washing as one which rests on Scripture authority, respecting the question of precedence in administration between it and the Lord's supper, I have thought that it might not be unprofitable to discuss the matter in a brief chapter.

The record from which it will be necessary to draw our data is exceedingly meager, and in order to attain to the desired end it will be required that we proceed with care, comparing at every step the statements bearing upon the subject, which are made by the different evangelists.

It is not a little remarkable that those who mention the Lord's supper make no allusion to the ordinance of feet-washing, while the one who makes mention of feet-washing does not refer in any way to the administration of the eucharist.

This latter fact is accounted for on the hypothesis that John's Gospel was supplementary in its nature, and designed principally to supply facts which the other evangelists had omitted in their productions, and, therefore, as they neglected to mention the ordinance of the Lord's humiliation, he supplied the omission without repeating the account of the Lord's supper, the details of which they had given so fully. Should it be objected to this supposition that John also speaks of a "supper," we reply: The one to which he adverts was that of the passover, which preceded

the partaking of the emblems of the Lord's death, and must not be confounded therewith. The term "Lord's supper" is applied to the eucharist but once in the New Testament. This use of the term is found in 1 Cor. 11:20, and did not occur until A. D. 59; *i. e.*, about twenty-seven years after the death of Christ.

The expression usually employed when referring to the matter seems to have been that of "breaking of bread."

That the supper to which John alludes is that of the passover, is manifest both from the accounts given by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and from the fact that there was on the table a dish into which the Lord dipped the sop which he gave to Judas. Had it been merely the "Lord's supper," no such dish would have been necessary, since the bread and wine required nothing of the kind when used as a sacrament.\*

Having premised thus much, we come now to the real work in hand, *i. e.*, that of deciding which of the two ordinances was first participated in.

For the purpose of reaching our conclusion with ease and certainty, we will make the account, as given in the thirteenth chapter of John, of the events which transpired on the evening of

\*In addition to what has been said of the supper, it might be well to call attention to the fact that in Luke 22:17 mention is made of a cup, while in the twentieth verse of the same chapter another cup is spoken of, and that some, by confounding these two cups, have adopted wrong conclusions. The cup alluded to in verse 17 was one of the four ordinarily partaken of in connection with the passover supper; while the one mentioned in verse 20 is the one which the Lord appointed to be used in connection with his supper. See Bible Dictionary published by the American Tract Society, art. Passover.

the passover, the basis upon which to construct a table which, we think, will enable any person to reach a safe conclusion in the matter under consideration.

If the reader will now turn to the narrative by the beloved apostle in the thirteenth chapter of his Gospel, he will find that the events transpired on that evening as given below:—

1. Passover supper (John 13:1, 2);
2. Jesus arose from the table and washed the disciples' feet (John 13:3-11);
3. Sat down again to the table and conversed (John 13:12-17);
4. Designated the one who should betray him (John 13:18-26);
5. Said to Judas, "That thou doest, do quickly" (John 13:27-29);
6. Judas went out to betray him (John 13:30);
7. Jesus discoursed to the disciples (John 13:31 to 14:31);
8. He goes out to the Mount of Olives (John 14:31).

As remarked above, the table is based on the account of John, because it is more full than that of any other evangelist.

The reader will observe that he mentions eight transactions in consecutive order, and that we have given to each one of them its proper number. He will please turn in his Bible and carefully read all the verses which we have quoted in order to verify the citations which we have made. Having done this, he will be ready to enter with us upon an examination of what Matthew, Mark, and Luke have recorded in their gospels as having transpired on the same evening to which John makes reference. When this shall be accomplished, he will readily perceive that as each one of them understood in his own mind the order of events as they occurred, and

gave them without confusion of statement, it will be possible for us to harmonize their accounts when we get the proper clue.

That is, when Matthew, Mark, and Luke speak of the breaking of bread, they all have reference to the same event, and that event must have stood related in their minds to the other transactions of the evening in the same way that it did in the mind of John; since all were present on the occasion of which they write.

In other words, if in tracing their accounts we shall find that both they and John speak of what Christ said about the betrayal of himself by Judas; they on the one hand locating the breaking of bread in immediate connection with such saying of Christ, and John, on the other hand, speaking of "feet-washing" as having been attended to *before* the saying of Christ to Judas, then we must understand that the "washing of feet" did precede the breaking of bread, although the three evangelists fail to mention the same, and although John neglected to allude to the Lord's supper at all.

The first evangelist whose account will be examined is Luke. As it is brief, we shall give it nearly in full, as follows:—

"And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer; for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves; for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come. And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the

new testament in my blood, which is shed for you. But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table. And truly the Son of man goeth, as it was determined; but woe unto that man by whom he is betrayed." Luke 22:14-22.

A glance will reveal the fact that Luke's testimony is of the highest importance in our investigation. He, unlike John, makes mention of the breaking of bread. This transaction he connects with our Lord's designation of Judas as the betrayer. His words are: "This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you." "But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table."

By this declaration two points are settled. The first is, as stated above, that the breaking of bread and the passing of the cup took place in immediate connection with what Christ said to Judas about his betrayal of him; and the second is, that they preceded that event; transpiring in *immediate* connection therewith.

Do you ask how this will assist us in deciding which preceded in the order of events, feet-washing or the Lord's supper?

I answer, that, as Luke has linked these two things *together*, we ascertain that the feet-washing could not have transpired *between* them, and therefore, it must either have *preceded* both of them, or *followed* both of them, and consequently, that we have found a clue which will lead us to a settlement of the whole question; since John, though he does not speak of the breaking of bread, does—as seen in the above table of the order of events, Nos. 2 and 4—locate the conversation between Christ and Judas *after* the washing of feet. But as we have seen that Luke con-

nects the breaking of bread and the designation of Judas as the betrayer, as having taken place at the same moment, and as John places the feet-washing *before* the time that Christ pointed out Judas as the betrayer, he also proves that the feet-washing must have *preceded* the breaking of bread.

To restate the proposition that all may understand it: John's account shows that Christ washed the feet of the disciples, then sat down to the table again and told Judas that he would betray him; while Luke's account shows that Christ made this declaration about Judas *while* passing the emblems of his broken body and spilled blood, and, therefore, after the washing of feet; else it could not have taken place in *connection* with what Christ said to Judas; since John shows that the declaration of Christ to Judas was made *after* the washing of feet.

Should it be objected that Luke's account is not *necessarily* consecutive in the order of its presentation, we should reply that it *must* be, so far as it relates to the Lord's supper and the pointing out of Judas as the traitor; since Luke gives, not his own words, but those of Christ, just as the Lord spoke them. That is, he represents Christ as saying, "This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you. *But*, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table." Now the use of the conjunction "but" as thrown in by Christ between what he said about the cup and about Judas, would not be admissible in such a connection, unless it was found in a connected conversation. This however, would not be true of the conversation under consideration if the view which we

are combating be correct; since as John shows beyond all controversy that Judas was not identified by Christ as the betrayer until after the washing of feet, then (the position of our opponents being true) Luke must have taken words which Christ spoke about the bread and wine before the washing of feet and the long discussion which accompanied it, and related them, in the use of the conjunction "but," as though they were in the same discourse; whereas, at least half an hour intervened between the two declarations.\* But such a supposition would be absurd in the extreme, and consequently, cannot be entertained for a moment so long as the other view offers no difficulties whatever, and is consistent both with the laws of language and the probability that Luke's representation of what Christ said is just what it appears to be,—a connected conversation.

Let us advance now to an examination of what Matthew has said concerning the matter which is passing in review. It will be found in the twenty-sixth chapter of his Gospel, and reads as follows:—

"Now when the even was come, he sat down with the twelve. And as they did eat, he said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every one of them to say

\* That we are right in supposing that half an hour would be consumed in washing the feet of the twelve apostles, will become apparent to any person who will pause and consider the matter for one moment. The least possible amount of time which could have been devoted, in this process, to each individual, without its being characterized by indecent haste, would be two minutes; allowing, therefore, two minutes to each of the twelve apostles, and six minutes for the extended remarks which accompanied the ordinance, you have half an hour as the least amount of time requisite for its administration.

unto him, Lord, is it I? And he answered and said, He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. The Son of man goeth as it is written of him, but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! it had been good for that man if he had not been born. Then Judas which betrayed him, answered and said, Master, is it I? He said unto him, Thou hast said. And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom. And when they had sung a hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives." Matt. 26 : 20-30.

The reader will observe that Matthew makes mention of four of the events spoken of by John, and one in addition, of which John does not take notice, *i. e.*, the Lord's supper.

He will also discover the fact that there is nothing that Matthew says which will enable us to locate the "breaking of bread" definitely with reference to the relation which it sustains in point of time to the "washing of feet." Matthew simply remarks that the bread and the wine of the eucharist were partaken of while they were eating, without particularizing further. His statement must be taken as one that was not designed to be given in chronological order; else his account would disagree with that of Luke; since, if it is given in chronological order, Matthew places the "breaking of bread" *after* the identification of Judas as the traitor; whereas Luke locates it *before* that event in the most unqualified manner. Matthew evidently carries his history forward through the passover supper, the washing of feet, the sitting down again of Christ

at the table, and the pointing out of Judas as the traitor, and then—in accordance with a custom often followed by the sacred writers—he falls back in his narrative once more in order to bring up the matter of breaking of bread (which he had previously omitted), in the use of the words, "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread," etc. We are now ready for the parallel passages in Mark, which we give verbatim herewith:—

"And in the evening he cometh with the twelve. And as they sat and did eat, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, One of you which eateth with me shall betray me. And they began to be sorrowful, and to say unto him one by one, Is it I? and another said, Is it I? And he answered and said unto them, It is one of the twelve, that dippeth with me in the dish. The Son of man indeed goeth as it is written of him; but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! good were it for that man if he had never been born. And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them; and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God. And when they had sung a hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives." Mark 14 : 17-26.

What has been remarked of Matthew is equally true of Mark.

He also omits the Lord's supper in his general account, and then falls back in order to mention it in the use of a similar expression to that which Matthew employs; *i. e.*, "And as they did eat, Jesus took bread," etc.

As already remarked, any other interpretation would inevitably lead to inextricable confusion; for, as suggested above, it would leave Matthew and Mark in conflict with Luke; since Luke cer-

tainly represents the breaking of bread as having transpired before Christ pointed out Judas as the betrayer.

The only objection which could with any show of reason be raised to the interpretation which we have offered, will be found in the suggestion that Matthew and Mark speak of the breaking of bread as having occurred "as they sat and did eat." This objection, however, we do not regard as valid. It may be met in one of two ways.

1. It is not impossible that the idea which the evangelists meant to convey was simply that the breaking of bread took place while yet they were at the table of the passover supper. 2. It is not incredible, or even improbable, that after the Lord arose and washed the feet of the apostles and sat down a second time to the table, they might have resumed their eating which had been prematurely broken off by the mysterious action of Christ in the washing of their feet.

Either of these hypotheses is preferable to a view which would make Matthew and Mark flatly contradict Luke, and at the same time put them out of harmony with John.

Should any person still insist that we have erred in reasoning that the accounts of Matthew and Mark do not give in consecutive order the events to which they make reference, then we reply: Should we grant the objector's desire and concede that they speak of the transactions just as they occurred, and that their account should be taken instead of that of Luke, such a concession would not alter the conclusion reached materially; for by reading what they say with the understanding that it is connected history, they will be made to teach that the Lord's supper

followed what the Lord said to Judas about betraying him; this being so, then it must also have followed the *feet-washing*; since John shows that the washing of feet occurred before they sat down to the table the second time, that event being numbered two in his table, while the declaration of Christ to Judas, in the same table is numbered four.

Thus it has been made to appear that—take whichever horn of the dilemma may please him—the objector will be compelled to admit that *feet-washing* must have preceded the breaking of bread on the memorable evening on which our Lord partook of his last passover supper.

Reconstructing, now, our table of the order of events based upon the account of John, and inserting therein in its proper place—as determined by the record of Luke—the celebration of the Lord's supper, the reader will be enabled to obtain a consecutive view of the principal occurrences of the evening: 1. Passover supper; 2. *feet-washing*; 3. Sat down the second time to the table; 4. Lord's supper (Luke 22:19-21); designating the one who should betray him; 5. Said to Judas, "That thou doest, do quickly;" 6. Judas went out to betray him; 7. Discourse to his disciples; 8. Went out to the Mount of Olives.

A brief summary of some of the principal points which have been made in the present article would run as follows:—

1. The supper mentioned in the thirteenth chapter of John was the passover supper.

2. The account given in the thirteenth chapter of John, being the fullest of any furnished by the evangelists, and giving, as it evidently does, the

events which it enumerates in consecutive order as it regards each other, furnishes a basis for a table with which to compare the statements found in the other gospels.

3. In such a table it is manifest that the "washing of feet" preceded the pointing out of the traitor.

4. Luke mentions the Lord's supper, while John omits that supper, and connects it with the pointing out of the traitor; which event is numbered four in the table of John.

5. Matthew's account is not given in consecutive order, and therefore does not affect the question.

6. Mark's account, also, is not given in consecutive order; and, therefore, *it* does not affect the question.

7. We are left, consequently, to the accounts of John and Luke for the settlement of the whole matter; and as Luke connects the Lord's supper with the designation of Judas as the traitor, it must be joined with that event *i. e.*, the one numbered four in the table of John.

8. Uniting the Lord's supper with No. 4 as found in John's table, we ascertain that the Lord's supper must have followed the feet-washing; since "feet-washing" is, in the same table, numbered two.

Having now, as we believe, removed all the difficulties which lie in the way of our theory that the feet-washing preceded the Lord's supper, and having established that theory by a line of argument which is both natural and easy, and which cannot be successfully controverted, we leave the subject with the reader, trusting that what has been said will commend itself to his judgment.

### CHAPTER III.

#### THE PROPER TIME FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE ORDINANCES.

HAVING considered in a previous chapter "The Order to be Pursued in the Administration of the Ordinances," I propose in the present one to discuss the question of the proper time for their celebration.

The difficulties that attend the discussion of this branch of the subject are neither so great nor so numerous as were those with which we were confronted in the consideration of the points presented in the former chapter. Probably there are fifty who have been troubled as to which should take the precedence in administration, the washing of feet or the breaking of bread, where there has been one who has borrowed any trouble concerning the precise time when the ordinances should be administered. Should there be but one, however, it would be our duty—provided he were sincere in his questioning—to assist him in the solution of what might, to his mind, appear to be a difficult problem.

So far as we are aware, those who hold to a specific time for the "breaking of bread" and the "washing of feet" are of the opinion that it is indispensable that they should be attended to in the evening.

It is difficult to say whence they get this opinion, unless it be either from the fact that Christ broke the bread and washed the feet of the disciples in the evening when he instituted the ordinances, or because it is supposed by these in-

dividuals that the ordinances take the place fully of the passover, and are to perpetuate it under a different set of types, but subject to the same limitations and regulations.

So far as the first position is concerned, it may be properly remarked that more importance is attached to the fact that the "Lord's supper" and the "washing of feet" were attended to in the evening than the circumstances itself will warrant. The element of time is never to be regarded as essential unless it is made so by the very nature of the duty prescribed, or by explicit declarations found in the command imposing the same.

To illustrate: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," is an injunction which has imposed an obligation on every minister since the days of Christ, the exact moment, however, at which the preaching and the baptizing shall be performed is not thought to be a matter worthy of discussion, since there is no limitation, as to the time when these things should be done, found in the original command. This being true, the preacher has felt free to present his message whenever and wherever he could get the ears of the people, and to baptize either by night or day, in the morning or at noon, or in the twilight, all candidates who have met the implied requisition by believing on the Lord Jesus Christ.

Again, in the sixth chapter of Matthew and the ninth verse, the Lord's prayer is introduced by the words, "After this manner therefore pray ye;" but who does not understand that the individual is left free to select the time and place for the repetition of that prayer in accordance

with the opportunities or necessities which may surround him? The reason why he uses this liberty is apparent. It is because the precept was given without specification as to time and place, and he naturally and correctly concludes that he is left to select these for himself.

But without multiplying illustrations further for the purpose of proving a general principle of interpretation which is too obvious to demand further exemplification, we turn to apply it to the question before us.

Did the Lord, in the memorable evening of the institution of his supper, enjoin upon his disciples that they should commemorate the same thereafter in the evening, and in the evening only?

In order to discuss the question intelligently, we have transcribed all the passages which bear directly upon the subject. They are as follows:—

"But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." Matt. 26 : 29.

"And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat: this is my body. And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them; and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God." Mark 14 : 22-25.

"And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you. But, behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table." Luke 22 : 19-21.

"What! have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or

despise ye the church of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not. For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." 1 Cor. 11: 22-28.

"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" 1 Cor. 10: 16.

"And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers. And fear came upon every soul; and many wonders and signs were done by the apostles. And all that believed were together, and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favor with all the people. And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved." Acts 2: 42-47.

"And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight." "When he therefore was come up again, and had broken bread, and eaten, and talked a long while, even till break of day, so he departed." Acts 20: 7, 11.

In examining the foregoing scriptures, the reader has discovered that in all which Christ said there is not one declaration from which it

may reasonably be inferred that he designed to convey the impression that the evening furnished the only period of time in which the breaking of bread was to be attended to thereafter.

The scope of this injunction comprehends three things: First, it is fairly deducible from his remarks that they were expected to imitate his example; second, that when they did so, it was to be done in remembrance of him; third, that they should continue to commemorate his death in that way until he should come again.

The expression "as oft as ye do it" is general in its character, and, in the absence of any qualifying clauses, cannot be claimed to place any restriction whatever upon the free choice of the individual as to the time and the place when and where he shall commemorate the humility and death of his Lord.

Turning to Luke 11: 2, we read, "When ye pray, say, Our Father," etc. In this language we have a case nearly parallel to the one before us; for the expression "when ye pray" is nearly tantamount to the words "as oft" as ye pray. But will any one insist that the former expression furnishes any limitation as to the time when we may offer the Lord's prayer? But the case is a parallel one; for our Lord himself had just been praying at the time he used the expression, "When ye pray, say, Our Father," etc. Therefore, as this was doubtless done in the daytime, it would, according to the view which we are opposing, be equivalent to a restriction upon the disciples to pray only in the daytime. Such a restriction, however, is not acknowledged by those with whom we differ upon the subject before us, and we cannot therefore see how they

can fail to comprehend that in this, as in many other cases, they have acknowledged a law of interpretation which, when properly applied, will remove all their objections to the administration of the ordinances in the daytime, which are simply based on the fact that Christ attended to them in the evening.

Thus much for the example of Christ.

The next point to be considered relates to the proposition that the passover was always partaken of in the evening, and therefore that the ordinances should be celebrated in the evening also.

A serious objection to this line of argument lies in the fact that it would prove altogether too much. If it is valid in one point, it is valid in all; *i. e.*, if the Lord's supper takes the place of the passover, and must consequently be attended to in the evening because the passover was attended to at that time, then, by parity of reasoning, it must, like the passover, also be partaken of on the evening of the 15th day of Abib. This being true, then it is necessarily an institution which can be attended to only once in a year, instead of once a week, as is the practice of some, or once in a month as is the custom of others, or once in three months, as is the habit of others still. But if this be so, it would be necessary that we should give far more attention to the Jewish calendar as formerly made up than we have hitherto been in the habit of doing, and we fear that it might puzzle some of us exceedingly to determine just when the 15th day of Abib will be reached. Not only so, but it is also apparent that if the passover is the Lord's supper, both are subject to the same laws as it regards

the time at which they were to be administered, and it follows that the regulations which govern in the case of the former will apply equally to the latter, unless specifically repealed. As a consequence, all the specifications relating to posture, clothing, place, etc., which applied to the passover, should be observed by us in partaking of the eucharist. As we receive it, it should be with our loins girded, our shoes on our feet, and our staves in our hands; and it should be eaten in haste. (Ex. 12:11.) Since the passover was connected also with the feast of unleavened bread, who will say that all the regulations concerning that feast, all that was said concerning the cleansing of the house from leaven, and the abstinence from the use of leavened bread for one week, etc. is not still obligatory upon Christians for seven days in each year at the return of their annual passover ceremonies? Certain it is that it would be just as reasonable to suppose that these other ceremonial provisions which related to the old institution are grafted upon the new one, as it is to conclude that the peculiarity of the former, as to the fact that it was necessarily attended to in the night, should still apply to the latter.

Nay, more: it is to us more probable that our supper should resemble that of the passover in the particular that it should be celebrated once a year, than that it should be limited, like the latter to the evening. This is so, first, because Christ was crucified in the daytime; secondly, because he was crucified but once, and will not be again, and, consequently, since a full year was formerly taken in the tabernacle service to represent the whole work of Christ from his cruci-

fixion to his second coming, it would appear to be not altogether improbable—judging from the standpoint of the types—that the breaking of bread might be properly participated in but once a year, as were the passover solemnities formerly.

But this would be simply an induction of the human reason drawn from the probabilities of the case. Such induction, however, is not always safe. God's plans are higher than our plans. His methods vary from our methods. That which appears to us to be highly proper might seem to him to be highly improper. The best thing we can do, therefore, is to leave speculation out of the question, and confine ourselves to the record. In that record we learn that Christ is our pass-over. We also learn that the symbols to be employed by us in the celebration of our passover are entirely different from those which the Jews employed. They slew, roasted, and ate the lamb; we break and eat the bread, and drink the wine. They partook of the passover but once a year; we partake of it as often as circumstances render it desirable. Our justification for this deviation is made out in three ways. First, we understand that the original passover was the creature of the Mosaic law, and that, consequently, when that law with all its types and ceremonies passed away, the whole Jewish passover system was abrogated with it; and therefore we have nothing to do with its times and ceremonies. Secondly, the law of our eucharist was given by Christ himself, and in it there is not only no restriction as it regards the precise period when it is to be administered, but, also, that the language employed by the Saviour is of such a nature that it leaves us the prerogative of a free choice in that

particular. Thirdly, the examples which are left us prove most conclusively that, so far as the element of specific time is concerned, it is not perpetuated in our institution.

In Acts 2:42-47 we read that the disciples continued daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart.

In regard to the signification of this passage learned writers have differed widely. Some have supposed that it related simply to a common meal, while others have thought that the allusion was to the "breaking of bread" in the "Lord's supper," which they claim at that time took place in connection with such meals.

We confess frankly that it is not clear to our own mind where the exact truth lies in this controversy. We feel assured, however, that the reference in verse 42 is to the sacrament, as any other view of the matter would affect the dignity of the record by making Luke appear to confound the sacred with the profane by uniting in the same sentence the mention of such Christian duties as fellowship, doctrine, and prayers, with the eating of an ordinary repast. This would seem highly improper, both from the standpoint of its connection, and the application of the word "*steadfastly*" to the partaking of food in the ordinary way. But if the "breaking of bread" mentioned in verse 42 means the eucharist, then in order to avoid the conclusion that it means the same in verses 46 and 47, we must decide that there is an abrupt deviation within this brief space in the use of the term "breaking of bread," by which it is made in the first place to point to the sacrament, and in the second place to something wholly secular in its nature.

Such a version, to say the least, appears to be strained.

But if it be not correct, if the same word in both instances is to be understood as representing the same idea, then we have the disciples "breaking bread" and eating meat daily, either in their own houses, or in those of one another.

This being true, however, then—as the "eating of meat" is admitted by all to signify ordinary meals—it is undeniable that they were in the habit of partaking of the eucharist in the daytime, unless resort be had to the violent presumption that they never ate meat except in the night season.

Having considered those passages which favor the supposition that we are at liberty to consult our own interest or inclinations in deciding as to when this ordinance shall be participated in, it is proper that we should give our attention to several texts which are supposed to favor the opposite theory.

The first of these is quoted above, and found in the twentieth chapter and seventh verse of the book of Acts. That this verse records an instance of the celebration of the Lord's supper, is generally conceded. That it was partaken of, also, in the night season, is highly probable. This being the case, it has been cited as an illustration of the fact that the apostle Paul selected that time because he desired to conform in his practice to the example of Christ. The passage in question, however, is very far from proving that for which it is quoted.

In the first place, it is submitted that it is not safe to infer an exemplary intention from a single instance where there is not one word in the con-

text which even intimates that such an intention was entertained by the apostle. If there had been a long list of occurrences of this kind, all of which uniformly took place at the same time, there might be a bare presumption of design, unless other reasons should suggest themselves as furnishing a motive for the selection of such a time. But when the case is a single one, and when a sufficient reason may be found for the fact that the apostle attended to the matter in the night because it was his last meeting with the disciples at Troas,—since he designed to depart in the morning,—then that fact, in and of itself, fully explains his object in attending to the matter when he did. It was very natural that in his last meeting with those whom he loved so dearly, he should desire to commemorate an event which has brought salvation to all in common, and which furnished a pledge of future reunion which would never be broken up.

In the second place, we suggest that it was not the matter of the precise time at which the ordinance should be administered which actuated Paul in selecting the night season for that work, since if that had been the case, he would have chosen the first part instead of the latter portion of the night. That the apostle did, however, break bread in the morning, and not in the evening, is easily demonstrated by the context, wherein it is stated that he preached until midnight; the narrative showing that subsequently to that time, Eutychus, having fallen from the window, was restored by the apostle, and that after this last event, Paul returned to the chamber, broke bread, and continued to talk until break of day; but the events connected with

the restoration of Eutychus, the allaying of the consequent confusion, and the delay which would have been required before quiet, and order, and calmness of thought could have been sufficiently restored to allow the resumption of the apostle's discourse, must necessarily have thrown the supper forward into the morning, even though we allow no time for preaching after the coming up and before the breaking of bread. Such being the case, the text before us, instead of antagonizing with our theory, furnishes a marked confirmation of the same, by giving us the example of Paul and the church at Troas on the side of the practice which we defend; for if the element of time was essential in Paul's day, he would have been particular to administer the ordinances in the *forepart* of the night, as Christ did, instead of attending to them in the *morning hours*.

In the third place, it might be well to call attention to the fact here that the meeting at Troas—occurring as it did too early in the season for the annual passover feast—furnishes a confirmation of the hypothesis offered above, that the repeal of the Mosaic code resulted in the abolition of all the regulations respecting the annual celebration of the passover, and, consequently, of the Lord's supper also.

By this means we are enabled to see that the Christian ordinance, so far as its regulations were concerned, must necessarily have been governed by the sayings of Christ, instead of the provisions of the Pentateuch.

The last text we shall mention—as it is the only one remaining unanswered, so far as we are aware of—is found in the eleventh chapter of first Corinthians, and the twentieth verse. The

argument drawn from this passage is based upon the fact that the breaking of bread is there alluded to as the Lord's supper. From this it follows, say some, that the eucharist should be partaken of in the evening because it is styled a supper, which never could have been the case unless it was designed that it should be eaten in the evening exclusively.

This argument seems to us to be weak in the extreme. Mark you, the apostle does not say that we should partake of the sacrament at supper time; but he simply gives to the meal of which we are to partake the name of "Lord's supper."

Now it by no means follows from that fact that we are necessarily restricted in the partaking of that meal to the precise time at which our Lord instituted the same.

Were this the case, we should be unable to comply with the command, since—as already seen—the exact time at which the disciples partook of the emblems in the first instance cannot be ascertained. It is true, doubtless, that it was done in the forepart of the night; but it is not true that the Lord's supper, as such, could not be partaken of at any time except that at which the Lord partook of it at the first; for—as heretofore proved—the same apostle who wrote the passage quoted from Corinthians did, as shown from his own example at Troas, deem it admissible to partake of the same in the morning hours.

The term supper—unfortunately for those who attach so much importance to it in the decision of the subject before us—is one which is not by any means limited in its application to an evening meal. Originally the meals of the ancients

were two, the latter of which was called supper, and was eaten very frequently not only before the setting of the sun, but even as early as noon itself, or shortly thereafter. This being the case, so far as the signification of the name is concerned, any hour which should fall between noon and midnight might with perfect propriety be selected for the Lord's supper. And whenever the sacrament shall be partaken of at any hour between those points, it could with propriety be called, first, a supper, because of the time at which it was administered, and, secondly, the *Lord's supper*, because originally instituted by him.

But this being true, then we have both the afternoon and the first part of the night from which to select an hour for the administration of the ordinances, which shall suit either our convenience or taste, even though we should concede the argument of our friends to be true, as they draw it from the appellation of supper which was originally used to designate the sacred meal. Hence the only portion of the day wherein it might not be legitimate for us to offer the emblems of the broken body and spilled blood of Christ to any of his disciples, must be found between sunrise and noon.

The only reason, also, why any one could properly insist that such a period would not be suitable for the work in question, would be found in the fact that a meal partaken of during *its hours* could not properly be called a supper. In reply to such a view it will only be necessary to say that if Paul could administer the Lord's supper between midnight and daylight, then he might also have done it between

daylight and twelve o'clock noon; as it would be just as improper, when governed by the consideration of time, to call a meal eaten between twelve o'clock midnight and six o'clock in the morning a supper, as it would be to give that title to one entered upon between the latter hour and twelve o'clock noon.

The simple fact is that it utterly overturns all theories which rest upon the hypothesis that the title "supper," as applied to the eucharist, does in any way affect or determine the time when it shall be administered.

The truth, therefore, is by this time apparent to all that such an appellation was not used because of future limitation in point of time, and that the sole reason why it was selected is found in the fact that the sacred writer sought to discriminate between it and the passover supper, in immediate connection with which it originated. Such an hypothesis is every way logical and consistent, and it harmonizes also with the words employed by our Lord in enforcing the ordinance, and with the construction which the apostle placed thereupon, as interpreted in the light of his individual practice. Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, when alluding to the passover which was eaten by the Lord and his disciples on the evening of his betrayal, speak of it as the "supper." It was therefore needful, in order to prevent confusion, that some other title should be applied to the Christian sacrament. How natural that it should, for the purposes of distinction, take the name of *Lord's supper*.

Thus much by way of argument.

It only remains, now, that we present an epitome of the points made before leaving the subject. It would run as follows:—

1. The element of time is never to be regarded as essential unless it be made so by the very nature of the duty prescribed, or by explicit declarations found in the command imposing the same. Illustrations of this theory of interpretation which all have indorsed, are found in the fact that all persons pray, and that all ministers baptize, whenever occasion offers, simply because there is no limitation in the original injunctions on these subjects.

2. There is no restriction as to time in the command, as appears from the examination of the texts, since the words "as oft as ye do it" are not definitive in their character.

3. The passover regulations do not affect the question, since the passover was not the model of the Lord's supper.

4. If Acts 2:42-47 be treated as though the term "breaking bread," which is employed twice in those verses, has reference in both instances to the eucharist—as it certainly does in one—then the disciples assuredly did partake of the Lord's supper in the daytime.

5. The record found in the twentieth chapter of Acts, which is quoted to prove that the Lord's supper must be partaken of in the evening, does in fact disprove that proposition, since it is therein made to appear that—though they came together for that purpose in the evening—they did not in reality break bread until the morning hours.

6. The argument drawn from the fact that the eucharist was termed Lord's supper, really possesses no force whatever in the matter of limiting its celebration to the evening hours; since, at that time, it would have been proper to call any meal a supper which was eaten between twelve o'clock and midnight.

7. If Paul could have partaken of the Lord's supper in the morning hours between twelve and six o'clock, then he, as well as ourselves, might also do the same between six o'clock A. M. and twelve o'clock noon.

8. The appellation Lord's supper was given, not for the purpose of defining the time when that meal might be eaten thereafter, but simply to distinguish it from the passover supper, in immediate connection with which it was instituted in the outset.

**The Marvel of Nations; or, Our Country, Its Past, Present, and Future, and What the Scriptures Say of It.** By U. Smith. One hundred thousand issued. Elegantly bound in muslin. 288 pp. \$1.00

**A History of the Doctrine of the Soul.** A work of great value. Muslin binding. 75 cts.

**The Seventh-Day Adventist Hymn and Tune Book.** Large size, with music. Cloth binding. \$1.50  
Five other styles of binding ranging from \$1.75 to \$2.75.

**Hymns for Divine Worship.** Contains all the words in the above book, but no music.  
Pocket size, in Russia leather. \$1.00  
In Morocco, gilt, 1.50

**Life of Wm. Miller, with portrait.** This book gives interesting sketches of the Christian life and public labors of this pioneer in the Advent movement in this country. 416 pp. \$1.00

**Life of Elder Joseph Bates, relating his experience of twenty-five years on ship-board, with incidents of his rise from cabin-boy up to master.**  
Fine tint paper, 352 pp. \$1.00  
Plain white paper, 55 cts.

**The Bible from Heaven.** An argument to show that the Bible is not the work of men, but is in deed and truth the word of God. 300 pp. 80 cts.

**The Soul and the Resurrection, showing the Harmony of Science and the Bible on the Nature of the Soul and the Doctrine of the Resurrection.** By J. H. Kollong, M. D. 75 cts.

**Early Writings of Mrs. White.** 75 cts.

**Smith's Diagram of Parliamentary Rules.** Indispensable to Parliamentarians. 50 cts.

**Facts for the Times.** A volume of valuable Historical Extracts on the present truth. Excellent for Bible students. In muslin. 284 pp. 50 cts.

**Testimonies for the Church.** Nos. 31, 32, Each, 50 cts. No. 33, 60 cts.

**Temperance Song Book.** An unequalled book. Temperance people are lavish in its praise. 30 cts.

**Better than Pearls.** A superb collection of very choice music and words. 40 cts.  
In boards, 30 cts.

**Pearly Portals.** An excellent book. 35 cts.

**Songs for Class and School.** A truly meritorious book for teaching purposes. 144 pp. 15 cts.

**Joyful Greeting.** The latest, the richest, the cheapest, and altogether the best S. S. song-book in the market. In boards, 216 pp. 25 cts.  
In muslin covers, 50 cts.

**The United States in the Light of Prophecy; or, an exposition of Rev. 18:11-17.** By Eld. U. Smith. Dealing with our own land, and applying to our time. Of surpassing interest to every American reader. 186 pp. Paper covers, 25 cts.

**Sunshine at Home.** A bright, sparkling book for the family circle, brimful of good sense, and perfectly free from "trash." 128 quarto pages, highly embellished. (Revised edition, gilt, \$1.75.) \$1.50

**The Women of Mormonism.** A scathing arraignment of this vile system, which is every spreading our country like the frogs and locusts of Egypt. Should be circulated everywhere. Contains statements from government officials and prominent clergymen. Illustrated. 82 pp. 10 cts.

**Refutation of 44 so-called Objections to the ANCIENT SABBATH.** By D. T. Bourdau. 10 cts.

**Bible Sanctification.** By Mrs. R. G. White. 82 pp. 10 cts.

**The Seven Trumpets.** An exposition of the subject, as set forth in Revelation, chaps. 8 and 9. 86 pp. 10 cts.

**The Marvel of Nations; or, Our Country, Its Past, Present, and Future, and What the Scriptures Say of It.** By U. Smith. One hundred thousand issued. Elegantly bound in muslin. 288 pp. \$1.00

**A History of the Doctrine of the Soul.** A work of great value. Muslin binding. 75 cts.

**The Seventh-Day Adventist Hymn and Tune Book.** Large size, with music. Cloth binding. \$1.50  
Five other styles of binding ranging from \$1.75 to \$2.75.

**Hymns for Divine Worship.** Contains all the words in the above book, but no music.  
Pocket size, in Russia leather. \$1.00  
In Morocco, gilt, 1.50

**Life of Wm. Miller, with portrait.** This book gives interesting sketches of the Christian life and public labors of this pioneer in the Advent movement in this country. 416 pp. \$1.00

**Life of Elder Joseph Bates, relating his experience of twenty-five years on ship-board, with incidents of his rise from cabin-boy up to master.**  
Fine tint paper, 352 pp. \$1.00  
Plain white paper, 55 cts.

**The Bible from Heaven.** An argument to show that the Bible is not the work of men, but is in deed and truth the word of God. 300 pp. 80 cts.

**The Soul and the Resurrection, showing the Harmony of Science and the Bible on the Nature of the Soul and the Doctrine of the Resurrection.** By J. H. Kollong, M. D. 75 cts.

**Early Writings of Mrs. White.** 75 cts.

**Smith's Diagram of Parliamentary Rules.** Indispensable to Parliamentarians. 50 cts.

**Facts for the Times.** A volume of valuable Historical Extracts on the present truth. Excellent for Bible students. In muslin. 284 pp. 50 cts.

**Testimonies for the Church.** Nos. 31, 32, Each, 50 cts. No. 33, 60 cts.

**Temperance Song Book.** An unequalled book. Temperance people are lavish in its praise. 30 cts.

**Better than Pearls.** A superb collection of very choice music and words. 40 cts.  
In boards, 30 cts.

**Pearly Portals.** An excellent book. 35 cts.

**Songs for Class and School.** A truly meritorious book for teaching purposes. 144 pp. 15 cts.

**Joyful Greeting.** The latest, the richest, the cheapest, and altogether the best S. S. song-book in the market. In boards, 216 pp. 25 cts.  
In muslin covers, 50 cts.

**The United States in the Light of Prophecy; or, an exposition of Rev. 18:11-17.** By Eld. U. Smith. Dealing with our own land, and applying to our time. Of surpassing interest to every American reader. 186 pp. Paper covers, 25 cts.

**Sunshine at Home.** A bright, sparkling book for the family circle, brimful of good sense, and perfectly free from "trash." 128 quarto pages, highly embellished. (Revised edition, gilt, \$1.75.) \$1.50

**The Women of Mormonism.** A scathing arraignment of this vile system, which is every spreading our country like the frogs and locusts of Egypt. Should be circulated everywhere. Contains statements from government officials and prominent clergymen. Illustrated. 82 pp. 10 cts.

**Refutation of 44 so-called Objections to the ANCIENT SABBATH.** By D. T. Bourdau. 10 cts.

**Bible Sanctification.** By Mrs. R. G. White. 82 pp. 10 cts.

**The Seven Trumpets.** An exposition of the subject, as set forth in Revelation, chaps. 8 and 9. 86 pp. 10 cts.

**A Word for the Sabbath; or, False Theories Exposed.** A poem by Eld. U. Smith. 60 pp. 30 cts.  
Glazed paper covers, 15 cts.

## SABBATH-SCHOOL HELPS.

**Bible Lessons for Little Ones, No. 1.** Flexible cover. 15 cts.

**Bible Lessons for Little Ones, No. 2.** Flexible cover, with map. 20 cts.

**Bible Lessons for Children, No. 3.** 25 cts.

**Bible Lessons, No. 4.** With map. 25 cts.

**Bible Lessons, No. 5.** 25 cts.

**Bible Lessons, No. 6.** 25 cts.

**Bible Lessons, No. 7.** 20 cts.

**Bible Lessons, No. 8.** 20 cts.

## PAMPHLETS.

**Helps to Bible Study.** A series of Bible readings, with hints to Bible workers. 25 cts.

**Historical Sketches of S. D. A. Foreign Missions.** 90 cts.

**S. D. A. Year Book for the year 1889.** 15 cts.

**The Tabernacle Lectures.** A series of XXXII lectures, setting forth the doctrines of the S. D. A. people. Paper covers, 267 pp. 20 cts.

**The Ministration of Angels, and the Origin, History, and Destiny of Satan.** 144 pp. 20 cts.

**The Abiding Sabbath and Lord's Day.** A pointed review of the \$500 and the \$1000 price essays in support of the Christian Sabbath, so-called. 20 cts.

**The Nature and Tendency of Modern Spiritualism.** By Eld. J. H. Waggoner. 20 cts.

**Visions; Objections to Spiritual Gifts Answered.** 20 cts.

**Civil Government and Religion.** Shows the relation that should exist between Church and State. Scriptural and logical. 25 cts.

**The Holy Spirit, Its Gifts and Manifestations to the end of the Christian age.** By Eld. J. H. Waggoner. 144 pp. 15 cts.

**The Three Messages of Rev. 14:6-12.** Particularly the Third Angel's Message and the Two-horned Beast. By Eld. J. N. Andrews. 144 pp. 15 cts.

**The Morality of the Sabbath.** 86 pp. 15 cts.

**Miraculous Powers.** The Scripture testimony on the Repeatability of Spiritual Gifts. Contains many interesting historical extracts. 15 cts.

**Matthew Twenty-Four.** A clear and forcible exposition of our Lord's discourse upon the Mount of Olives. By Eld. James White. 64 pp. 10 cts.

**The Sanctuary and 2300 Days.** 30 cts.

**The Tithing System; Or, The Divine Plan for supporting laborers in the cause of God.** By Eld. G. I. Butler. An extended treatise. 117 pp. 10 cts.

**Matter and Spirit.** A philosophical argument on an interesting theme. 66 pp. 10 cts.

**Refutation of 44 so-called Objections to the ANCIENT SABBATH.** By D. T. Bourdau. 10 cts.

**Bible Sanctification.** By Mrs. R. G. White. 82 pp. 10 cts.

**The Seven Trumpets.** An exposition of the subject, as set forth in Revelation, chaps. 8 and 9. 86 pp. 10 cts.

**The Truth Found.** The Nature and Obligation of the Sabbath. By Eld. J. H. Waggoner. 64 pp. 10 cts.

**Hope of the Gospel.** By Eld. J. N. Loughborough. 80 pp. 10 cts.

**Christ and the Sabbath:** or, Christ in the Old Testament, and the Sabbath in the New. By Eld. James White. 56 pp. 10 cts.

**Redeemer and Redeemed.** By Eld. James White. This work sets forth the plan of Redemption in its three stages. 49 pp. 10 cts.

**Thoughts on Baptism;** Its Action, Subjects, and Relations. By Eld. J. H. Waggoner. 25 cts.

**The Rejected Ordinance.** A carefully prepared argument on our Saviour's Act of Humility recorded in John 13. 64 pp. 10 cts.

**The Honor Due to God.** Thoughts on Tithes and Offerings. By Eld. E. J. Waggoner. A plain Bible exposition of the tithing system. 10 cts.

**The Position and Work of the True People of God** under the Third Angel's Message. By Eld. W. H. Littlejohn. 10 cts.

**Life of Christ and his Apostles.** 8 books, paper covers. 90 cts.

**The Saints' Inheritance;** or, The Final Home of the Saved. 10 cts.

**The Sunday Seventh-Day Theory Examined.** A refutation of the discordant views on that subject. Paper covers. 10 cts.

**Key to the Prophetic Chart.** A valuable publication. 6 cts.

## TRACTS.

**National Reform Tracts.** This package contains thirteen tracts (112 pages in all) treating upon the various phases of the National Reform movement, as follows:—

1. Evils of Religious Legislation, 4 pp. 2. Religious Liberty, 8 pp. 3. National Reform and the Rights of Conscience, 8 pp. 4. The American Papacy, 8 pp. 5. Bold and Base Avoval, 8 pp. 6. National Reform in Church and State, 8 pp. 7. Parity of National Religion, 4 pp. 8. The Salem Witchcraft, 8 pp. 9. What Think ye of Christ? 4 pp. 10. National Reformed Constitution and the American Hierarchy, 16 pp. 11. The Republic of Israel, 4 pp. 12. National Reformed Presbyterianism, 24 pp. 13. The National Reform Movement an Absurdity, 8 pp. This package will be sent post-paid to any address for 10 cts.

**Origin and Progress of S. D. Adventists.** 32 pp. 6 cts.

**5 cents each.** Justification by Faith. An Explanation of the Prophetic Symbols of the Bible (Illustrated).

**4 cents each.** Samuel and the Witch of Endor. The Sufferings of Christ. The Present Truth. The poor Million on the State of the Dead. Ten Commandments not abolished. Address to the Baptists. The Two Thrones. Spiritualism a Satanic Delusion. The Second Advent. Scripture References. Seventh Part of Time. A Greek Falsehood. The Two Covenants.

**3 cents each.** End of the Wicked. Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists. Signs of the Times. Who Changed the Sabbath? The Millennium. Sabbath. Parable of the Ten Virgins.

**2 cents each.** Christ in the Old Testament. The Sabbath in the New Testament. The Old Moral Code not Revised. The Sanctuary of the Bible. The Judgment. Much in Little. The Two Laws. Seven Reasons. The Definite Seventh Day. Departing and Being with Christ. The Rich Man and Lazarus. Ethna on the Sabbath. The Law and the Gospel. God's Memorial. The Sabbath Made for Man. Bible Conversion, and Sanctification. The Lost-Time Question.

**1 cent each.** The Coming of the Lord. Perfection of the Ten Commandments. Without Excuse. Thoughts for the Candid. Which Day and Why? Can we Know; or, Can the Prophecies be Understood? Is the End Near? Is Man Immortal? The Sleep of the Dead. The Sinner's Fate. The Law of God. "The Christian Sabbath." Sunday-keeping not a Bible Doctrine. The Intermediate State.

**Candid Admissions** in reference to the Bible Sabbath, from Sunday observers. (On thin paper) Per hundred, 25 cts.

## HEALTH PUBLICATIONS.

**Manual of Health and Temperance.** A book brimful of information on a hundred useful topics, with department on cooking. 320 pp. 75 cts.

**Digestion and Dyspepsia.** By J. H. Kellogg, M. D. This work embodies the results of the author's experience in dealing with this form of disease, in all its stages, and is a thoroughly practical treatise on this prevalent malady. Paper covers, 25 cts. Cloth, 75 cts.

**Uses of Water in Health and Disease,** giving careful and thorough instruction respecting the uses of water as a preventive of disease, and as a valuable remedy. In cloth, 166 pp. 60 cts. Paper covers, 196 pp. 25 cts.

**Lectures on the Science of Human Life.** By Sylvester Graham. Three lectures of great value which should be in the hands of every individual. 174 pp. 80 cts.

**Diphtheria.** A concise account of the nature, causes, modes of prevention, and most successful mode of treatment of this now prevalent and fatal disease. With 4 colored plates, 64 pp. 25 cts.

**Alcoholic Poison;** or, the Physical, Moral, and Social Effects of Alcohol as a Beverage and as a Medicine. The best compendium of the temperance question published. Its statements are brief, concise, and to the point. 128 pp. 25 cts.

**Evils of Fashionable Dress,** and How to Dress Healthfully. Enamel covers, 40 pp. 10 cts.

**Proper Diet for Man.** A scientific discussion of the question of vegetable versus animal food. Ultra notions are avoided, and the subjects treated are handled with candor. 15 cts.

**Health and Diseases of American Women.** 69 pp. 15 cts.

**The Hygienic System.** Full of good things. 15 cts.

## TRACTS.

**3 cents each.** Wine and the Bible. Startling Facts about Tobacco.

**2 cents each.** The Drunkard's Arguments Answered. Alcoholic Medication. Twenty-five Arguments for Tobacco-Using Briefly Answered.

**1 cent each.** Causes and Cure of Intemperance. Moral and Social Effects of Alcohol. Tobacco-Using a Cause of Disease. Tobacco-Poisoning; Nicotiana Tabacum. Effects of Tea and Coffee. Ten Arguments on Tea and Coffee.

**1/2 cent each.** Alcoholic Poison. Tobacco-Using a Rôle of Barbarism. True Temperance. Alcohol—What is It? Our Nation's Curse.

Full Catalogues of all our publications, in English, and the various Foreign Languages, furnished free, on application.

For anything in this Catalogue address,

REVIEW & HERALD, Battle Creek, Mich.

Or, PACIFIC PRESS, Oakland, Cal.