

tion, I told the church how Mr. Adamson had written to Brother Wright (and we know not to how many others), citing I Cor. 5:16 without comment, as applicable to my husband. Mr. Adamson could not deny the fact, under the evidence, but protested that he had not intended any reflection upon Mr. Russell's moral character. Some of the brethren present remarked that such a charge *would have no weight with anyone who knew Mr. Russell or who had ever looked into his face.* In telling what inference he did wish to give by the citation named, Mr. Adamson replied that he meant to say that Mr. Russell is a "railer." But since railers are not mentioned at all in the citation, but five verses further down in the chapter, I showed that this is only one of the many cunning methods of misrepresentation resorted to by these wicked men—*because they do not know any real crimes to lay to his charge.* I mention these items here, because no doubt they have been similarly misstated orally or by letter to others; and to show that the same spirit that prompted the misrepresentations of their first attack still controls them, and that reconciliation with such people, under such conditions, would neither be possible, nor desirable, nor right, nor scriptural."

THE BAD SEED GERMINATED

The excitement connected with the conspiracy against me above referred to temporarily hindered the sprouting of the bad seed of so-called "woman's rights" and ambition, and temporarily Mrs. Russell became very enthusiastic in my support. It was she who first called attention to Matt. 24:45-47, applying it to me in a meeting at Allegheny and subsequently in another meeting with the New York church. I demurred that I had not thought of the passage thus, and declined to make any personal application of it, although I could not deny the force of the argument that it pointed out "that servant," and "fellow servants" and "the household," apparently clearly and designedly distinguishing between these terms. Some little objection was aroused by her interpretation and I urged great moderation in the making of any personal application, suggesting that the WATCH TOWER rather than its editor might be considered "that servant." As an evidence of Mrs. Russell's position on the question, I give a copy of a letter she wrote in defense of her statement of the matter before the New York church, as follows:—

Allegheny, Pa., Dec. 31, 1895.

Mr. Geo. D. Woolsey,

Dear Brother in Christ:—Husband has shown me your kind letter of Dec. 18, the spirit of which was much appreciated by both of us. I am glad to note your frankly stated opinion as to the interpretation of Matt. 24:45-51, and I have carefully examined the arguments and Scriptures you have set forth. Thinking you will be glad to know *how I view the Scriptures you mention*, I will proceed to tell you I fully agree with the interpretation of Isaiah 52:7, presented in the Tower of Oct., 1881, which you endorse, the one in that case being the Christ, Head and body, of which the living members constitute "the feet."

I also agree that Rev. 16:15 refers to any one of the church who complies with the conditions. The entire statement gives evidence to this effect. It could not be understood otherwise. I also agree that in the parables of the talents and pounds, as in all parables, the thing said is not the thing meant, and that each one here mentioned, as in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, represents a class.

But when we come to Matt. 24:45-51 it appears to me to be a totally different case. Here are brought to our attention—"that servant," "his fellow servants" and "the household." Now, if the Lord wished to indicate a chief servant of the truth, and fellow servants assisting in serving the meat in due season to the household of faith, he could not have chosen more precise language to convey such a thought. And, on the contrary, to ignore such an order and reasonableness in the account, to my mind throws the entire narrative into confusion, making the "servants" (plural) and "that servant" interchangeable terms.

If we should handle all Scriptures thus loosely, it seems to me we could either prove or disprove anything according to our preconceived ideas. It does not seem to me reasonable, nor a justifiable interpretation of our Lord's testimony, to say that the entire household fed itself, and that the Lord gave the meat in season to all together without using any of the number as his agents or servants in the distribution. And if it be conceded that there is a difference between "the household" and "the servants" who minister the meat in due season to the household, then it cannot be denied that our Lord's words also point out one

of those servants as specially intrusted with the meat in season and used in dispensing it to the fellow servants and the household in general.

I notice that you do not analyze the text as I do. If you see any way for making these three expressions viz., "that servant," "his fellow servants" and "the household," all mean the same thing without making nonsense out of the entire statement, I hope you will favor me by pointing out how it can be done.

It seems to me, further, that the interpretation which I suggest is the one, and the only one, which corresponds to the fulfillment. We agree in the belief that the Lord is now present, that he assumed his office of King in 1878, and that since that time his household has been richly fed with meat in due season. It seems to me that in dispensing the food to the household the Lord has not given it personally to each member, but from among them he has chosen and used a number of servants, and that all of these servants have been supplied with the meat in due season through one particular servant—"that servant." So, both from the construction of the Lord's language and from the facts before us which constitute their fulfillment at the time indicated, viz., in these days of his presence, I can, so far, reach no other conclusions than those I have stated.

However, my object in writing is not to urge my convictions upon you. I merely state them for your consideration, believing you will be interested in examining them, and that you will agree with me that whatever God has expressed in his Word is worthy of our most careful consideration, and is for our instruction and profiting.

With the greetings of the season, in which Bro. Russell joins,

Your Sister in Christ,

MARIA F. RUSSELL.

Letter from Mr. Joseph L. Russell (now deceased), father of the Editor, relating to the same trouble:—

My Dear Son:—It is with love and sympathy in my heart that I write you at this time, after having read the full account of your trials and troubles amongst those whom you accepted as brethren in Christ. It does seem almost incredible that those people could be guilty of such mean and despicable conduct toward you, from whom they had received so many marks of kindness. But, my dear son, these are some of the trials we all may expect—especially those engaged in the "harvest" work. I am proud of the noble defense you make in vindication of your conduct, and especially in the cause of the truth we all love so dearly. I feel confident that you will come out of this trial brighter and more appreciated in your character and works than you ever were before. The good Lord, who has been testing your works, will promote you to still higher honors in his kingdom. I pray that he may bless you always and sustain you in every good word and work; and to him we will ascribe all the praise forever. Amen.

But while confident that the outcome will be a final victory for the truth, it is very trying for one who has labored late and early for the last twenty years for the cause of truth, to have his supposed friends turn against him and brand him as a liar and a hypocrite. Oh! it is terrible! I often think of you and your many trials, which you seem to meet very courageously. But with an approving conscience a man can stand considerable, especially if the Lord is on his side to help and strengthen. Please extend to your dear wife my hearty congratulations on her noble defense of her husband and the cause of truth during this trying ordeal. With love and congratulations from us all, I remain, your loving father,

JOSEPH L. RUSSELL."

* * *

As matters began to settle down, the "woman's rights" ideas and personal ambition began again to come to the top, and I perceived that Mrs. Russell's active campaign in my defense, and the very cordial reception given her by the dear friends at that time throughout a journey (which she volunteered at that time to take, for the express purpose of defending and vindicating me amongst those friends who had been disturbed by the slanders circulated by those involved in the conspiracy), had done her injury by increasing her self-appreciation. Instead of considering the kind expressions of the friends as applying to her as a representative of the WATCH TOWER, a representative of the truths it promulgates, and a representative of her husband, as well as for her personal worth, the lady appeared to credit all the demonstrations to the latter—as acknowledgments of her personal abilities. Gradually she seemed to reach the conclusion that nothing was just proper for