

# ADVENT REVIEW,

## AND SABBATH HERALD.

"Here is the Patience of the Saints; Here are they that keep the Commandments of God, and the Faith of Jesus."

VOL. XXIV.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, JULY 12, 1864.

No. 7.

### The Advent Review & Sabbath Herald

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY

The Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association.

ELD. JAMES WHITE, PRESIDENT.

TERMS.—Two Dollars a year in advance. One Dollar to the poor, and to those who subscribe one year on trial. Free to those unable to pay half price.

Address ELDER JAMES WHITE, Battle Creek, Michigan.

#### Watch.

WATCH, Christian, watch! for there's danger around thee,

Legions of spirits thy progress oppose;  
Then look unto Him who once went before thee,  
He is able and willing to conquer thy foes.

Watch, Christian, watch! for the Master is coming,  
And bids thee be ready to hail him with joy;  
Then those who've been faithful will share in his glory,  
While all of the wicked of earth he'll destroy.

Watch, Christian, watch! for the day-star has risen,  
Soon will the morning all glorious come,  
When thou shall rest, sweetly rest from thy labor,  
And the angels in Heaven will welcome thee home.

Then be of good cheer for thy home is preparing,  
And crowns of bright glory are waiting for thee.  
Soon the clear light of Heaven will burst on thy vision,  
And sin, death, and sorrow forevermore flee.

S. ELMER.

Ashfield, Mass.

#### NATURE AND DESTINY OF MAN.

DISCUSSION BETWEEN ELD. N. V. HULL, SEVENTH-DAY BAPTIST, AND ELD. R. F. COTTRELL, SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST.

(Continued from Review No. 24, Vol. xxxiii.)

##### Elder Hull's Second Article.

ELD. R. F. COTTRELL:

Dear Brother,—I have read with interest and care your reply to my first letter, and will, as I am able, examine it in its bearings on the "question" at issue, as explained in the propositions subjoined, of which, as you remember, there are five. I have no objections to discussing that part of the "question" relating to the nature of man first, as you suggest, and then attending to what may remain. The whole question is, "What is the nature and destiny of man, according to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures?" The "propositions" covering the first half of this question, are

1. "That man is composed of matter and spirit."
2. "That the body is mortal, but the spirit is incapable of physical corruption."
3. "That in the resurrection man's body becomes immortal."

On the first proposition you say, "The issue between us is not whether man has a spirit or not, but what the nature of the spirit is—whether it is capable of a separate conscious existence, and whether it is immortal." I am sure you would not have made this statement, had you well considered the "proposition," which simply is, "Has man a spirit?" there being no ground for argument as to whether he has a body. Nor is there any controversy as to whether the body is mortal. Nor still have I asserted that the spirit of man is immortal, or that it is so declared by any express statement of Scripture. Neither the terms mortal nor immortal are so applied, so far as I recollect, in the Sacred Oracles. Besides, I do not propose to define the nature of the substance of the spirit of man. As the Bible does not define it, why should I? I think this subject has already been sufficiently befogged by "foolish and unlearned questions." "This is to be a

Bible discussion." I deem it impossible for us, in this life, to know the exact nature of a spirit. Jesus, I am aware says, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones;" but this fails of telling what the nature of the substance of a spirit is. I do indeed, in this discussion, expect to prove the capability of the spirit to exist after the death of the body, and when I have so done, the question as to the nature of the spirit is settled, in so far as the interests of this discussion are concerned, unless you shall prove that after this the soul or spirit does really cease to exist.

I agree with you, that the Bible teaches, when the question is formally put, that man has a body, a soul, and a spirit. But as the terms soul and spirit are sometimes used interchangeably, I deem it proper to use them so myself, especially as thereby the public are not misled. I am also aware, that in many instances the term soul, as it occurs in the received version, does not mean what it does in popular phrase; and further, that it is often a bad translation of the original Greek word. But this need in no wise stumble us. It may be, however, that in certain instances, we may differ as to the precise meaning of the term in the passages we may quote. If so, we will compare views, stating the points of difference, with our reasons for the opinions affirmed.

I will now turn to the passages quoted in my former letter, teaching the duality of man's nature, and more at length bring out the doctrine they appear to me to contain.

Matt. x, 28—"And fear not those who will kill the body, but cannot kill the soul; but rather fear him who can destroy both soul and body in hell." The corresponding text, in Luke xii, 4, 5, reads, "And I say unto you, my friends, fear not those who kill the body, and after that can do no more; but I will warn you whom to fear. Fear him who, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say to you, fear him." Now, what is here stated, and what inferences may we legitimately draw from the texts?

1. That man has a soul and a body
2. That man can kill the body.
3. But he can do no more.
4. But God can destroy both soul and body in hell.
5. The soul does not necessarily cease to exist when the body dies, for then the act of killing the body would also kill the soul.
6. Except, then, God by his own special act kills the soul, when the body dies, the soul is unharmed.
7. But the only ground upon which, under any circumstances, it can by possibility be affirmed that God will kill the soul, is in the case of the wicked; and even this not until after the resurrection, because no one affirms that the body is cast into hell until after this; and in the text cited, it is said that both soul and body may be destroyed in hell.
8. It follows, then, that the souls of the righteous will never become unconscious, because man can not destroy them, and God will not.
9. But the power man has to kill the body arises from the nature of the body, rendering it capable of receiving physical harm.
10. Therefore, the soul so differs in its nature from the body, that it is not subject to physical injury from any force that man can expend upon it. Hence it is not matter.

11. But the text broadly asserts, that man cannot kill the soul—not some souls, as for instance the souls of the righteous—but the soul. As an illustration of this, I cite two familiar passages—Luke xxiii, 46, and Acts vii, 50. In the first, Jesus, when dying, committed his spirit to his Father. In the second, Stephen, the martyr, when yielding up his life to his murderers, committed his spirit to the Lord Jesus. Now, in both these cases, you have before you what man can do—he can kill the body; also, what he cannot do—he cannot kill the soul. That it was the human soul of Jesus that he committed to his Father, seems indisputable. It was not his divine nature that was "straitened," but his human. Nor could he, in his divine nature, commit himself to God. The thing was impossible.

Besides, in this case Jesus illustrates by example the statement made to his disciples, Matt. x, 28, and shows that the soul does not die with the body—yea, that man cannot kill the soul! How flatly opposed to all this is the statement, that the soul dies, or sleeps with the body. The two are perfect antagonisms, so that if the one be true, the other must be false. Again, in the record of Stephen's death, his faith in his Master's teaching on this subject, stands out in bold relief. Take out that brief statement, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," from the narrative, and the very point upon the idea of the saint's assurance in such a time of trial, is removed. How clearly does it show, that "man cannot kill the soul." What exultation, what triumph, in the hour of danger and death, to know, both by the teaching and example of Jesus, and by the example of his first, and therefore his most honored martyr, that man, when in his diabolical fury he does his utmost, destroying the body by a horrible death, has then done all, as a servant of the devil, that he can. He hath no more that he can do—he cannot kill the soul!

I now proceed to examine the other passages quoted by me to prove the double nature of man, and your criticisms upon them.

1 Thess. v, 23—"And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly, and may your whole spirit, and soul, and body, be preserved blameless at the coming of the Lord Jesus." On this I said, "I have not introduced this text, in this place, with reference to the doctrine of trichotomy, but only to show further, that there is both a physical and spiritual nature in man." Upon this you remark, "Now, the question is, whether each of these is of itself alone a conscious being so that one man is capable of being resolved into three men, or whether two of these parts are capable of such separate conscious existence, or only one. If only one is independent of the others in its conscious existence and immortality, tell us which it is, and we will mark the other two 'mortal,' and leave them out of this controversy. The body you have proved is mortal. Which is immortal—the soul or spirit?" You do not deny but that the passage is good for the purpose for which I introduced it, namely, "to show further, that there is both a physical and spiritual nature in man;" but you proceed to raise certain questions which you regard as pertinent to the matter in debate.

This text, I suppose, refers—1. To man's spiritual nature; 2. To his animal life or soul; 3. To his physical organization. But it does not follow that because Paul in this case is using exact language, and therefore employs the term soul to distinguish the mere animal life of man, and that this dies with the body, therefore it is to be marked "mortal," and "thrown out of this controversy," because it is sometimes used in the same sense as the term spirit in this text, and it is in this sense I use it in this controversy, except in those instances where I give it other and special definitions. Nor should we gain anything by dropping the word soul, and using the term spirit, because that too is used in different senses in the Scriptures. I conclude, then, that your criticism is rather hyper than exact and necessary, and has in it more show than substance.

What you say about the "osseous, the muscular, the venous, and the nervous systems," I dismiss as fully answered in the remarks above.

Your criticism upon my use of the text, Matt. x, 28, because the term "spirit" is not found in it is answered by my statement, (if my statement is true, and I think it is,) that the words soul and spirit are sometimes used as synonyms, while at other times they are used in different senses. In this text, man's higher or spirit nature is evidently meant, because it may survive the death of the body. But with the death of the body, the animal soul or life must evidently perish. I think, therefore, that in this instance also, your criticism is without force.

What you say of the different translations of the Greek words *pneuma* and *psuche*, I pass as matters too well understood by critics and Bible students, to need further attention in this connection.

My next proof was 2 Cor. iv, 16—"For which cause we faint not, but though our outward man perish, our inward man is renewed day by day." On this I said, "This text I think, is unmistakable in its import." You however doubt the correctness of my conclusion, and say, "that there is no proof that the 'inward man is the soul or spirit.'" It is figurative language, and doubtless refers to the new man, that is put on at conversion—Christ dwelling in our hearts by faith—the hope of glory; this does not wane, but is renewed day by day. See Col. iii, 9, 10; Eph. iv, 22-24; iii, 16, 17; Col. i, 27. These texts read as follows: Col. iii, 9, 10—"Lie not one to another, putting off the old man with his deeds, and putting on the new man that is renewed in knowledge after the image of him who made him." But this says nothing about the "outward man" and the "inward man," as in 2 Cor. iv, 16, but speaks of the "old man" and "new man," terms having no meaning whatever in common with each other. But let us proceed. Eph. iv, 22-24—"That ye should put off the old man of your former conduct, corrupted by its deceitful desires, and be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man, which in God is created in righteousness and true holiness." Eph. iii, 16-17—"That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his spirit in the inner man. That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith," etc., etc. But this is sufficient.

The quotation from Eph. iv, 22-24, is of the same character with the one from Col. iii, 9, 10, neither of which speak of the inward man and the outward man, but of the old man and the new man. The passage, however, found in Eph. iii, 16, 17, is in harmony with the one in 2 Cor. iv, 16, and speaks of the "inner man." I am surprised that you, after so many years of study and thought, should confound these different passages, as they certainly, I must think, differ widely in their meaning. For instance, if the "inner man," the "new man," and "Christ dwelling in you, the hope of glory," mean one and the same thing, how is Christ, by his Spirit, working mightily in men's hearts, to strengthen Christ in men's hearts! Do you not see brother, that this is badly mixed? That the inner man is the subject of regeneration, so that the image of God is restored in him, seems to me manifest. Your interpretation seems unnatural—forced. I see no occasion to abandon my former view of this matter.

You next except to my use of John iii, 6—"That which is born of the spirit is spirit"—because I say it is the spirit of man which is the subject of regeneration. You seem to mistake me, when you ask, "Does this prove that flesh only, and not flesh and spirit, is the man that is born of woman?" Of the question of the origin of souls or spirits, I have said nothing, because it is not included in the question proposed for discussion. I had no thought of asserting that man has no spirit until regenerated. What I say is, that it is the spirit of man that is regenerated, and that this text positively asserts that. Your reference of this text to the resurrection, of the body, seems to me wholly without warrant. That the resurrection body will be spiritual, is a doctrine of Scripture, but not taught in this text. Jesus says nothing of the resurrection—it is not the theme of discussion. To discuss the resurrection, when the discourse of Nicodemus was concerning the new birth, would be evasive, and tending to mislead on a subject of infinite interest, not only to the interrogator, but also to the whole world. I dismiss this question for the present, feeling confident, that after further reflection, you will not urge an interpretation which makes Jesus thus to trifle with an earnest inquirer.

What you say upon my quotation from 1 Cor. ii, 11, I will pass, seeing the matter is so fully treated in another place, with no other remark, than that I did not cite the passage with reference to whether the spirit of man is conscious when separated from the body, but simply to show that man has a spirit, and that intelligence is one of its attributes.

You commence your concluding paragraph by saying, "In your next, it will be well for you to define the term spirit." I believe my engagement does not bind me to this; and I freely confess, that touching the nature of spirits, I have no very satisfactory knowledge.

Again you say, "If you think the texts you have quoted prove that the spirit of man has a conscious existence after the body is dead, (which I utterly fail to see,) please quote the texts showing that they cannot cease to live." Until my argument on Matt. x, 28, advanced in this article, is met and fairly overthrown, I think I may consider the question settled as to the existence of the spirit after the death of the body. Not that there are not other texts teaching, as I suppose, the same sentiment, but this is sufficient.

Your suggestion, that I prove that spirits can not die, when separated from their bodies, is, I think, extraordinary. By what rule do you require of me to prove a negative? When I prove that the soul lives, although the body dies, no more can be required. What you have now to do, as I understand it, is to show the unsoundness of my argument on Matt. x, 28. If you fail in this, I see not but you are required, by every principle of candor, to accept the doctrine.

I think I have now noticed the main points in your argument, and await your second reply.  
Very truly yours.

N. V. HULL.

#### Eld. Cottrell's Second Reply.

ELD. N. V. HULL:

Dear Brother,—The question under discussion, namely, "What is the nature and destiny of man, according to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures?" is a plain, fair question; and the Scriptures doubtless furnish us with all necessary information upon the subject, as is implied in the question itself. But your first proposition—"that man is composed of matter and spirit"—I do not deem a Scriptural proposition. It is a philosophical or a metaphysical proposition; neither the matter nor the spirit of it is found in the Bible. Both these words, it is true, are frequently found in the Bible, but never in the sense in which they are evidently used in your proposition. Matter is never contrasted with spirit, nor spirit with matter, in the Bible. And herein consists the fallacy of your argument. You frame a proposition with terms used in the technical sense of that which calls itself philosophy, and then go to the Bible, and, lo! the same terms, *in form*, are there, and the proposition is considered as positively proved! In this way you can prove that feathers are directly the opposite of darkness, because they are *light*.

You seem surprised that I should understand you as having undertaken to prove the immortality of the soul, and you are sure that I have not "well considered the proposition." You further say, "Nor still have I asserted that the spirit of man is immortal, or that it is so declared by any express statement of Scripture. Neither the terms mortal nor immortal are so applied, so far as I can recollect, in the Sacred Oracles." I am glad to have you make this admission. You will not, of course, attempt to prove the soul or spirit immortal, since the Scriptures—the only umpire in this controversy—do not assert it. And it is not only remarkable, but truly astonishing, that, while the terms soul and spirit are found many hundreds of times in the Bible, the terms immortal, never dying, deathless, or anything of the kind, is never applied to either of them, if, indeed, either is immortal.

But let us consider your second proposition, "That the body is mortal, but"—but what? what is the opposite of mortal, but immortal?—"the spirit is incapable of physical corruption." You seem to be aware that, respecting the use of the terms immortal and immortality in the Scriptures, we have the advantage, and so you put, "incapable of physical corruption" over against "mortal." This is ingenious; but what will it avail? What text in the Bible speaks of *physical corruption*? And if the Bible says nothing about it, how will you prove this proposition by the Scriptures? This, like your terms matter and spirit, is a philosophic term, and, like them, utterly unknown to the Bible. To prove this proposition, therefore, it will be necessary to resort to philosophical, instead of Bible arguments; and still it will remain unproved; for you do not profess to know "what the nature of the substance of the spirit is," and consequently you are wholly unprepared to say whether it is capable of physical corruption or not.

I admit, with you, that the terms soul and spirit are sometimes used in the same sense; but I know nothing of either of them ever being used to denote "man's higher or spirit nature." You say, "I am also aware, that in many instances, the term soul, as it occurs in the received version, does not mean what it does in popular phrase; and further, that it is often a bad translation of the original Greek word." Of the corresponding Hebrew word, Parkhurst says, "As a noun, *nehphesh* hath been supposed to signify the spiritual part of man, or what we commonly call his soul. I must for myself confess that I can find no passage where it hath undoubtedly this meaning." And I am fully persuaded that neither *nehphesh* nor *psuche* ever mean in the Scriptures, what is called the soul or spirit in popular phrase. You modestly decline defining this soul or spirit, for the reason that "touching the nature of spirits," you "have no very satisfactory knowledge." I accept of this as a valid reason. Yet you venture to tell me that "it is not matter." Being unacquainted with the substance, how could you tell so much without an express revelation? To my mind, as to some others,

"immateriality is but another name for nonentity. It is the negative of things and beings—of all existence. There is not one particle of proof to be advanced to establish its existence. It possesses no property or power by which to make itself manifest to any intelligent being in the universe. Reason and analogy never show it, or even conceive of it. Revelation never reveals it, nor do any of our senses witness its existence. In short, it can exert no influence whatever—it can neither act, nor be acted upon. And even if it does exist, it can be of no possible use." If you can give any better definition of it, you are requested to do so. If not, please excuse me if I am forced to believe that immateriality is nothing.

I do not presume to attempt to explain the substance of which spirits are composed. But this I have learned from revelation; that they are in the form of men; that they have faces, hands, and feet; that they can talk, look, walk, lie down, rise up, hold a staff in their hand, lay hold of men, and pull them with force from the violence of a mob, or hasten them from a doomed city. Gen. xviii, 1-16; xix, 1-16; Judges, vi, 11-21; xiii, 6-21. Angels are "all ministering spirits." Heb. i. But of disembodied human spirits, that are capable of making any "manifestations," physical or mental, I know nothing, having never read of them in the word of God.

On Matt. x, 28, you make a fair show of argument. I was aware that you could do so; and to those whose prepossessions and prejudices give them a choice that your view should prove true, it will doubtless be satisfactory. But those who can bring their minds to a thorough and impartial investigation of the whole tenor of Bible teaching on this subject, will find that your exposition of this text is out of harmony with the Scriptures. Why should *soul*, in this verse, mean an immaterial man, that lives after the body is dead, and in the same chapter, and speaking of the very same subject, namely the risking of our lives for the cause of Christ, mean simply life, as it is translated? "He that findeth his soul shall lose it; and he that loseth his soul for my sake, shall find it."—Verse 39. No one will claim that soul here means "man's higher or spirit nature," and that he must lose his immortal soul in hell in order to find it in heaven. But if we lose our life in this world, for the cause of Christ, we shall find it in the world to come, by coming forth from the grave to the "resurrection of life." And this perfectly agrees with what I before quoted from John, xii, 25. "He that loveth his life (soul) shall lose it; but he that hateth his (soul) life in this world, shall keep it unto life eternal."

On Matt. xvi, 26, "For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" Dr. Clarke says, "On what authority many have translated the word *psuche*, in the 25th verse, *life*, and in this verse, *soul*, I know not, but am certain it means life in both places."

I conclude, then, that in Matt. x, 28, the words are not used in their strictly literal sense; that to kill the body means to take away the present life, but to destroy both soul and body in hell, is to deprive one of life and being in the world to come. The former wicked men can do; but they cannot touch that life that is hid with Christ in God, which is to be given "when Christ who is our life shall appear." And with this agrees the parallel passage in Luke. Persecutors, after they have killed men, "have no more that they can do." Death puts the objects of their hatred out of their reach. Not so with the Lord; after he has killed his enemies, he can raise them from the dead, and cast them into hell. All believe that they are "cast alive" into hell; not that they are killed and then cast dead there.

I must here remind you, that if you succeed in proving from Matt. x, 28, the separate conscious existence of the soul, you will at the same time prove its mortality; for God can kill it, and he threatens nothing which he does not intend to perform. The wicked he will destroy, both soul and body. And that the souls thus destroyed will be unconscious is implied in your own words: "The souls of the righteous will never become unconscious, because man *cannot* destroy them, and God *will not*."

The necessity of brevity forbids that I should re-examine at length the other texts you have again spo-

ken of. I notice only a few thoughts. You think I have things "badly mixed," having "Christ, by his Spirit, working mightily in men's hearts, to strengthen Christ in men's hearts." The difficulty will vanish, when we consider, that "Christ within" is defined to be "the hope of glory." This hope may be strengthened by the Spirit and "renewed day by day," though the outward man is in a state of decay.

I do not see how it makes Jesus "trifle with an earnest inquirer," to represent that he told Nicodemus that he was mistaken in thinking "that the kingdom of God should immediately appear; (Luke, xix, 11,) that the present state of "flesh and blood" cannot inherit it; and that therefore he must not expect it till the birth from the dead, and the change to immortality, prefigured by baptism, should take place. He, as a "master in Israel," should have known this, having the 37th of Ezekiel and other like prophecies to read.

I now proceed to speak briefly to the question in debate—the question of man's nature as revealed in the Scriptures. Your first proposition speaks of man's composition, affirming that he is composed of matter and spirit. By the side of this I will lay my first proposition, viz: Man was formed of the dust of the ground. In proof of this I quote Gen, ii, 7, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Man was not a *living soul* until he received the breath of life; but he is called *man* before that was given; nothing having entered into his composition but the dust of which he was made. In accordance with this, Bible phraseology always represents the *man* to be where his body is, whether alive or dead. When the breath of life was given, *man became a living soul*. The man that was formed of the dust *became* a living soul. The man, then, was the soul, and the soul was the man. Hence one of the primary meanings of soul is the whole person or body. This is the inspired account of man's creation, and there is not one word or intimation in it of the immaterial, immortal soul of popular theology. How strange that the "clay tenement" should be so particularly described, and its immortal occupant not be considered worth naming!

Your second proposition is, "That the body is mortal, but the spirit is incapable of physical corruption." The second part of this proposition is foreign to all Scripture teaching, and, whether it is true or not it cannot be proved by the Bible. The first part of it—"that the body is mortal"—I have admitted as positively proved. By the side of this I place my second proposition, viz: Man is mortal. I admit that you proved the body to be mortal, because you found the texts of Scripture which expressly call it so. All I ask is, that you admit my proposition proved, when I produce the like testimony. Will you do so? I proceed then to the proof.

Job, iv, 17—"Shall mortal man be more just than God?" Here man as a whole, is called mortal. This could not be true if a part of him were immortal. All those texts that assert, in the broadest sense, that "man dieth," prove that he is mortal; for that which is immortal is exempt from death.

Rom, i, 23,—"And changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man." *Man*, in the broadest sense, is here called *corruptible* or *perishable*. (Grove's Greek Lexicon.) Then no part of him is incorruptible or imperishable. Man is corruptible; God is incorruptible. One of the definitions of the word here rendered incorruptible is immortal; and it is so translated in 1, Tim, i, 17, where also it is applied to God. This text, then, asserts the mortality of man.

My third proposition is, that man in death has no knowledge. "For the living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything."—Ecc, ix, 5. If that part of man which knows, while in life, retained its knowledge after death, this text would not be true. The two conditions of man—living and dead—are here contrasted. The living know, the dead know not, is the declaration. That which had knowledge in life, has none in death.

Psa, vi, 5,—"For in death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave, who shall give thee thanks?" There is a state of death, or there is not. If not, we may throw away our Bible, and say with Spiritualists,

"There is no death." What is death? Is it a state of separation of soul and body? Well, in that state "THERE IS NO REMEMBRANCE" of God. This text being true, the good man does not so much as know that there is a God when he is dead.

As ever, yours,

R. F. COTTRELL.

### Interesting Extracts. No. 3.

BY ELD. M. E. CORNELL.

"THE SUN SHALL BE DARKENED."

John Kennedy, in a sermon preached in Danvers, Mass., A. D. 1780, says:

"The late wonderful and unusual darkness, on the 19th day of May last, struck the inhabitants of this State with horror and amazement, and at the same time filled them with alarming apprehensions. Yea, the very brutes seemed greatly agitated. If so, could a thinking being sit unmoved while he beheld the sun veiled in darkness at noon-day; \* \* \* the husbandmen returning from their fields in great surprize; the beasts gazing in wild consternation; every countenance seemed to gather blackness; yea, a dismal gloom, which filled the beholder with fear and astonishment, waiting with much anxiety for some event. In fine, *the darkness was as we nor our fathers never saw.*"

The Boston Gazette says: "They were obliged to dine by the light of the candle. Such a phenomenon was never before seen here by the oldest person living."

A correspondent from Newport, May 20, 1780, remarked that "It is not recollected from history, that a darkness of equal intenseness and duration has ever happened in any part of the world, except the miraculous eclipse at the crucifixion of our blessed Saviour."

In a manuscript sermon by Rev. Elam Potter, M. A., on the dark day of May 19, 1780, delivered on the 28th of the same month, he says:

"But especially I mention that *wonderful darkness*, on the 19th of May, inst. Then, as in our text, the sun was darkened; such a darkness as probably was never known before, since the crucifixion of our Lord. People left their work in the house and in the field. Travelers stopped: schools broke up at eleven o'clock; people lit up candles at noon-day; and the fire shone as at night. Some people, I have been told, were in dismay, and thought whether the day of judgment was not drawing on. A great part of the following night, also, was singularly dark. The moon, though in the full, gave no light, as in our text."

THE FALLING STARS OF 1833.

The Christian Advocate and Journal, Dec. 13, 1833, says:

"It seemed as if the whole starry heavens had congregated at one point, near the zenith, and were simultaneously shooting forth with the velocity of lightning, to every part of the horizon; and yet they were not exhausted—thousands swiftly followed in the tracks of thousands, *as if created for the occasion.*"

A converted Papist writes: "It was, indeed, owing to this very doctrine (praying for souls in purgatory), that I saw the beautiful meteoric shower which occurred Nov. 13, 1833. I had been taught to make the sign of the cross once for every shooting star I saw, in behalf of departed souls; and being awake when the meteoric shower lighted up the heavens, the work of crossing myself began; but very soon the use of both hands could not suffice, for the stars apparently moved so rapidly that it became impossible to keep up. The consequence was, that the whole family was called up to see a wonder which excited no little fear in us all."—*The Conversion of a Papist*, pp. 39, 40.

A writer in the New York Ledger says: "They fell each one from its own starting point, in lines conformed to the arching sky, as if they followed the outline of one vast umbrella, overshadowing the beholder. Yet the meteoric stars fell unlike the ripe fruit, which drops from the tree directly to the ground. They *flew*, they were *cast*, they were *hurled* from their place like unripe fruit, which refuses to let go its hold, until the tree is powerfully shaken, when at length it breaks loose, bursts away, and darts madly toward the ground."

### The Hard Problem.

"THERE never was since the world began a problem for our faith to solve so hard as that which tries American believers at this time." So says one who clings with blinded zeal to the so-called millennium theory. The ideas which had been advanced were no new sentiments. I had been familiar with the stereotyped phrases from my childhood. Though they had always jarred somewhat discordantly, it was only by the help of present truth that I had been enabled to see how utterly futile and unscriptural they were. But now it struck me with new force; and as I drank in the import of the words above quoted, I fell to musing: At last one was ready to admit that it was a "hard problem." And no wonder! for he was forced to see and confess, "That Edomitic envy, aristocracy and greed characterize our people; that hostile camps of brothers of one land frown defiance at each other with such bitter hate that scarce a sentinel can live between them; or mingling in the closer conflict, our land is deluged with brothers' blood. No wonder it tries the faith of "American believers," at least that portion of them who are trusting in the American churches, dignified as the vicegerent of the gospel of Christ, to renovate this fallen, sinful world. No wonder it is a problem, hard for such a faith to solve; for well it may be, in the face of all the scriptures that disprove it, aside from the stubborn facts and proofs of man's degeneracy. Then why not open your eyes and see that the faith itself is the harder problem?"

It must needs be, "that the Scriptures be fulfilled," is the only way one can account for this persistent clinging to an unfounded dogma, by persons possessing clear, practical good sense in understanding other things. Why need a veil rest over the understanding in reading the word of God, except it be that so few read it with sufficient discrimination to break the spell of a hackneyed early training. Alas! that mankind will so impregably intrench themselves behind the ramparts of prejudice, that, resisting alike argument and the sterner logic of passing events, they will reiterate and endorse the sentiment, as not long since I heard one, in an outburst of pulpit eloquence, "I will never! no, never! till the latest hour of my breath, give up the idea that this sinful earth is to be renovated, and lifted to millennial purity by the *gospel* of Christ!" I sighed mentally then, and repeat it now: If you never will, you never will! But may not Jesus now be saying of such, as he said while upon earth of the scribes and Pharisees, "Let them alone; they be blind leaders of the blind;" even though they would doubtless ask as arrogantly as did those Pharisees: "Are we blind also?" Let Jesus' answer come with solemn weight to all, till in earnestness we pray, "Open thou the blind eyes."

M. W. HOWARD.

Malone, N. Y., June, 1864.

THE MOTHER'S INFLUENCE.—The solid rock which turns the edge of the chisel, bears forever the impress of the leaf and the acorn, received long, long since, ere it had become hardened by time and the elements. If we track back to its fountain the mighty torrent which fertilizes the land with its copious streams, or sweeps over it with a devastating flood, we shall find it dripped in crystal drops from some mossy crevice among the distant hills. So, too, the gentle feelings and affections that enrich and adorn the heart, and the mighty passions that sweep away all the barriers of the soul and desolate society, they have sprung up in the infant bosom in the sheltered retirement of home. "I should have been an atheist," said John Randolph "if it had not been for one recollection, and that was the memory of the time when my departed mother used to take my hands in hers, and cause me on my knees to say, "Our Father which art in Heaven."

WAY OF LIFE.—Many people labor to make the narrow way wider. They may dig a path into the broad way, but the way of life will remain a narrow way to the end.—*Cecil*.

SUBLIMITY.—One of the sublimest things in the world is plain truth.—*Bulwer*.

## The Review and Herald.

"Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth."

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, JULY 12, 1884.

URIAH SMITH, EDITOR.

### BOTH SIDES OF THE SABBATH QUESTION.

Review of T. M. Preble.

(Concluded.)

Preble.—"TWO OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.—The first is founded on Matt. xxiv, 20: 'But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day.' The Sabbatarian contends that by this passage the Saviour recognized the sacredness of the seventh-day Sabbath up to this time, surely. But we shall see. Two distinct things Jesus told the disciples to pray for. This is plain. All, I presume, understand that Christ had told the disciples that Jerusalem was to be destroyed by the Roman army; and when they, the disciples, should 'see Jerusalem compassed with armies,' then they must 'flee to the mountains.' But, in doing so, they were liable to meet with two obstacles, and only two. Therefore they must pray. Pray for what? Pray that your 'flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day.' If their flight should happen in the winter, it would be difficult for the disciples, with their families, to live in the mountains. If their flight should happen on the Sabbath day, they would find it extremely difficult to 'flee' out of Jerusalem, as the gates would be closed, according to Jewish law and custom. (See Ex. xvi, 29; Neh. xiii, 13-22). This being the case, Jesus knew well that those who were so tenacious of their traditions of the Sabbath as to lead them to condemn him as a Sabbath-breaker for restoring the withered hand, so that it was made 'whole, like as the other,' and for making a woman straight whom Satan had bound and bent over, or bowed together, so that she could in no wise lift up herself for eighteen years, and all this just because Jesus had done these acts of mercy on the Sabbath. I say, Jesus knew well that such hypocrites would be a great hindrance to the disciples if their flight should take place on the Sabbath. Now consider, Christ had told the disciples to leave Jerusalem when they should see it compassed with armies. Was Christ Lord also of the Sabbath? So he had once said. Why, then, should he direct his disciples to pray that their flight might not occur on the Sabbath day? The just inference is this: Christ really being 'Lord of the Sabbath,' the disciples would have a perfect right to leave Jerusalem at any time when Christ told them to. And, therefore, if the Jews would not let them leave when Christ had ordered it, it proves that those old hypocrites had so monopolized all the privileges of that day by their traditions, that even the disciples could not obey the Lord Jesus without praying to God to prevent them from falling into the hands of such wicked men, who were so outrageously bigoted in regard to the Sabbath that they would neither let Christ or his followers do that which was right on that day. Hence, the Sabbatarian finds nothing here to prove a sacred regard for the seventh-day Sabbath, but a wicked perversion of all its rights, by a class of men who were enemies to God, and violent opposers of his people."

REPLY.—This labored attempt to prove that Christ, in Matt. xxiv, 20, did not recognize the existence of the Sabbath at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, shows that it rests with some weight upon the mind of Eld. P., and must in some way be disposed of. He avails himself of the usual and only method of attempting to evade its force. Now, if his explanation should turn out to be not in any wise valid, it follows that the testimony must stand as an express recognition on the part of the Saviour of the existence of the Sabbath, and a declaration to his disciples of his tender regard for that sacred institution. Had Eld. P. made himself acquainted with a few facts connected with the siege and fall of Jerusalem, we think he never would have offered the explanation of this language that he has here given us. The subject is so well and briefly set forth in the History of the Sabbath, that we can do no better than to quote from that work, pp. 184-188:

"But it is replied that this last petition has reference only to the fact that the Jews would then be keeping the Sabbath strictly, and, as a consequence, the city gates would be closed that day, and those be punished with death who should attempt to flee; and, hence, this petition indicates nothing in proof of Christ's regard for the Sabbath. An assertion so often and so confidently uttered should be well founded in truth; yet a brief examination will show that such is

not the case. 1. The Saviour's language has reference to the whole land of Judea, and not to Jerusalem only: "Let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains." The closing of the city gates could not therefore affect the flight of but a part of the disciples. 2. Josephus states the remarkable fact that when Cestius was marching upon Jerusalem, in fulfillment of the Saviour's token, and had reached Lydda, not many miles from Jerusalem, 'he found the city empty of its men, for the whole multitude were gone up to Jerusalem to the feast of tabernacles.' (Jewish War, book ii, chap. xix.) The law of Moses required the presence of every male in Israel at this feast, in Jerusalem (Deut. xvi, 16); and thus, in the providence of God, the disciples had no Jewish enemies left in the country to hinder their flight. 3. The Jewish nation being thus assembled at Jerusalem, did most openly violate the Sabbath a few days prior to the flight of the disciples; a singular commentary on their supposed strictness in keeping it at that time. Thus Josephus says of the march of Cestius upon Jerusalem, that

"He pitched his camp at a certain place called Gabao, fifty furlongs distant from Jerusalem. But as for the Jews, when they saw the war approaching to their metropolis, they left the feast, and betook themselves to their arms; and taking courage greatly from their multitude, went in a sudden and disorderly manner to the fight, with a great noise, and without any consideration had of the rest of the seventh day, although the Sabbath was the day to which they had the greatest regard; but that rage which made them forget the religious observation [of the Sabbath] made them too hard for their enemies in the fight.' Jewish War, book ii, chap. xix.

"Thus, it is seen that on the eve of the disciples' flight the rage of the Jews toward their enemies made them utterly disregard the Sabbath! 4. But after Cestius encompassed the city with his army, thus giving the Saviour's signal, he suddenly withdrew it, as Josephus says, 'without any reason in the world.' This was the moment of flight for the disciples, and mark how the providence of God opened the way for those in Jerusalem:

"But when the robbers perceived this unexpected retreat of his, they resumed their courage, and ran after the hinder parts of his army, and destroyed a considerable number of both their horsemen and footmen: and now Cestius lay all night at the camp at Scopos, and as he went off farther next day, he thereby invited the enemy to follow him, who still fell upon the hindermost and destroyed them.' Jewish War, book ii, chap. xix.

"This sally of the excited multitude in pursuit of the Romans was at the very moment when the disciples were commanded to flee, and could not but afford them the needed facility of escape. Had the flight of Cestius happened upon the Sabbath, undoubtedly the Jews would have pursued him upon that day, as under less exciting circumstances they had, a few days before, gone out several miles to attack him upon the Sabbath. It is seen, therefore, that whether in city or country, the disciples were not in danger of being attacked by their enemies, even had their flight been upon the Sabbath day.

"There is, therefore, but one view that can be taken relative to the meaning of these words of our Lord, and that is, that he thus spake out of sacred regard for the Sabbath. For, in his tender care for his people, he had given them a precept that would require them to violate the Sabbath, should the moment for flight happen upon that day. For the command to flee was imperative the instant the promised signal should be seen, and the distance to Pella, where they found a place of refuge, was at least sixty miles. This prayer which the Saviour left with the disciples would cause them to remember the Sabbath whenever they should come before God. It was, therefore, impossible that the apostolic church should forget the day of sacred rest. Such a prayer that they might not at a future time be compelled to violate the Sabbath was a sure and certain means of perpetuating its sacred observance for the coming forty years, until the final destruction of Jerusalem, and was never forgotten by that early church, as we shall hereafter see. The Saviour, who had taken unwearied pains during his whole min-

istry to show that the Sabbath was a merciful institution, and to set aside those traditions by which it had been perverted from its true design, did, in this, his last discourse, most tenderly commend the Sabbath to his people, uniting in the same petition their own safety and the sacredness of the rest-day of the Lord."

Preble.—"The second objection is, 'THE THIRD ANGEL'S MESSAGE.' What is this third angel's message? Why, a late theory has been started, which claims that Rev. xiv, 12, has special reference to a particular class of persons who believe in keeping 'the commandments of God,' as mentioned in this verse; and that these commandments have special reference to the 'Seventh-day-Sabbath.' The passage reads:—'Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus.' It will be seen by the passage itself that it refers to the 'commandments of God—all of them—and not to any particular one. How, then, shall we determine what commandments are referred to? Please notice the last clause in the verse, 'and the faith of Jesus.' This proves that the commandments referred to are those of the New Testament; for there was no 'faith of Jesus' before Christ came the first time. Be not alarmed, kind reader, this will be proved by the word of truth, an unerring guide. Hear:—'But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterward be revealed. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.' Gal. iii, 23-25."

REPLY. Eld. P. has scarcely succeeded in concealing the latent feeling of contempt with which he speaks of the "third angel's message." Says he, "What is this third angel's message? Why, a late theory has been started," &c. But one thing is certain. There is an angel brought to view in Rev. xiv, the third of a series, who has the most terrific warning to utter that can anywhere be found in the word of God. It signifies something, and the nature of the warning renders it of the utmost importance that we should understand it. Sneers will not set it aside nor destroy its significance. It would be better for Eld. P. to have told us what it does mean, if our exposition of it is not correct, than to have treated it as he has. One singular misstatement needs correcting on the start. This "late theory," he asserts claims that "these commandments have special reference to the seventh-day Sabbath." Where did he learn this? He certainly did not get it from any Seventh-day Adventist writings. It would be agreeable if our opponents would not manufacture so many positions for us. We believe it has no more special reference to the Sabbath than to the other nine commandments. But we do believe that the commandments there referred to, mean specifically the ten commandments of God, all of them, Sabbath with the rest. We have more to say, of course, about the Sabbath commandment than about the others; because that is the one which the world has been taught to violate, and on which consequently, light needs to be given.

In connection with this misstatement in fact we must mention a misstatement in logic, which Eld. P. has made in putting forth his effort to prove that the commandments referred to are the commandments of the New Testament. The clause "and the faith of Jesus," he says, "proves that the commandments referred to, are those of the New Testament; for there was no faith of Jesus before Christ came the first time." We would fain believe that from some cause Eld. P. overlooked the little word "and;" for certainly no one who gets a clear idea of the construction of the language, can draw from it the conclusion presented by Eld. P. It does not read, Here are they that keep the commandments of God—the faith of Jesus; but the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. The commandments of God are one thing, the faith of Jesus another. Now what is this faith of Jesus? We affirm that it embraces all the precepts and teachings of Christ given us in the New Testament; and if this be so, the commandments of God spoken of in connection, are not the same thing, but commandments brought over from the Old Testament. Let any one apply it to any other than the ten commandments if he can.

Preble.—"No one need be surprised to see men, and women too, run into error when they will keep themselves 'shut up unto the faith,' but never come to it. Why will men be so blinded as to have faith in the visions of women instead of the visions of John? Why

follow the teachings of the *old dead 'schoolmaster'* instead of following the LIVING JESUS? They thus give countenance to the system for taking away sins on the head of a live goat! I would exhort all such to—'BEHOLD THE LAMB OF GOD, WHICH TAKETH AWAY THE SIN OF THE WORLD.' John i, 29.

REPLY.—When Eld. P. commenced his articles against the Sabbath of the Lord, we had hoped he would be able to go through with them without descending to the contemptible practice so common with a certain class of our opponents, of appealing to the prejudice of narrow minds, by heaping slurs upon the visions. But it seems he has not succeeded. The intense desire to give the "visions of women" at least one thrust, before closing his argument against the Sabbath, overcame him, and hence this exhibition of himself. It only confirms our opinion that it is scarcely possible for the opponents of the law of God, to write to any length against the Sabbath, without betraying the spirit spoken of in Rev. xii, 17. At least we have yet to see such an article where this spirit did not in one part or another unmistakably crop out: The text referred to says that the dragon was wroth, and went to make war with the remnant of the church "which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." And the testimony of Jesus Christ is defined in chap. xix, 10, to be the "spirit of prophecy."

There are those who are constantly watching for just such things as Eld. P. has here thrown out, and great is their glee when they can find a morsel over which to gloat. Accordingly no sooner had the above remark appeared in the Crisis from the pen of Eld. P. than the Millennial Harbinger announced in a most jubilant strain that Eld. Preble had written through the World's Crisis, a series of articles against the Sabbath, and the *visions of E. G. White*. So soon did this one remark against the visions become expanded into a series of articles! We hope Eld. P. will not feel flattered at this appreciation of his efforts. We would that it might open his eyes to the nature of the work in which he is engaged.

But again the "old dead schoolmaster" is brought on to the stage and a new application made of his mortal remains. This time he is set forth to represent "the visions of women!"

Preble.—"THE CONTRAST. The objector may ask, why there is such a contrast between my present views and those advocated by me when I observed the seventh day? as strong grounds are taken in both instances; and both arguments are drawn from the Bible. The answer is obvious. In my former argument, in favor of the seventh day, I had for my basis the *Old Testament*. And as my premises were *false* my conclusions were *wrong*! But in my present position my basis is the *New Testament*; consequently, as my premises are now true, my conclusions are therefore *right*."

REPLY.—Eld. P. should not be quite so fast here. It is true that false premises lead to wrong conclusions; but it is by no means as certain that, if a person's premises are correct, his conclusions will be right, for conclusions are often drawn as wide of the premises as the east is from the west, and the reader has had sufficient evidence that Eld. P. sometimes draws conclusions with quite a rapid hand. But what does he mean about his basis being the Old Testament, and consequently his premises false? Is the Old Testament false? Is it opposed to the New? We had supposed that the Bible was one harmonious whole, not two parts arrayed in antagonism to each other. Then we repeat a question or two which we have already asked: Where, except in the Old Testament, do we find any law prohibiting the worship of images; or where else any regulations prohibiting consanguinity in marriage?

But in looking at Eld. P.'s former argument, we fail to see that his basis was the Old Testament. We have his tract before us. The first part of the tract is an extract from the writings of Wm. Miller, in which there are eight references to the Old Testament and four to the New. In what Eld. P. himself wrote we find twenty-two references to the New Testament, and only two to the Old. One of these was to the fourth commandment, which he quoted on his title-page, and the other was to Dan. vii, 25, to show that the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the

week, by the papal power, was in fulfillment of that prophecy.

What his basis was, will still further appear from a couple of extracts from the tract referred to, which the reader will be pleased to see in this connection. In a prefatory note to the reader he says:

"A FEW QUESTIONS FOR THE READER TO ANSWER, BEFORE READING THE FOLLOWING PAGES.—What authority have you in the Old or New Testament to keep any day as a Sabbath, or day of rest? Do you find any command in the New Testament? If not, why do you not observe the day that is appointed in the fourth commandment? Has the day ever been changed? If so, when and where? Please point to the chapter and verse."

Yes, we would like the chapter and verse. We will let the reader decide whether Preble of 1864 is able to answer the questions of Preble of 1845. Again, he says, p. 7:

"In relation to the practice of the apostles, there is but one meeting of the disciples on the first day of the week mentioned in the New Testament, and that is in Acts xx, 7. But there are many meetings recorded which they held on the Sabbath. I know 1 Cor. xvi, 2, is considered proof respecting the first day; but when examined, I think it proves the contrary. It says, 'Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him,' &c. The expression, 'lay by him in store,' I think plainly implies that they were at home, rather than at meeting. Rev. i, 10, is the only other place that can be construed to favor the first day. John says, 'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.' Now, who knows whether he meant the first or the seventh day? I think the latter, because it is called 'the Sabbath of the Lord thy God,' but the first is nowhere called so!! In regard to the Sabbath, Christ says, 'The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.' Not a Sabbath, but the Sabbath. He says also, 'The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.' Mark ii, 27, 28. He does not say, the Sabbath was made for the Jews, and a Sabbath for the Gentiles, but 'THE Sabbath was made for man'—all mankind."

It will be seen from the above that Eld. P. once occupied a position for which he could give a valid reason. He has exchanged it, alas! for one for which no just ground can be found, either in nature, reason, history or revelation.

Preble.—"In conclusion. I now propose to all Sabatarians, as I have spoken once more upon the subject of the Sabbath, that if they think my present position is unscriptural, and can be shown to be such, I will just say, without bigotry or vanity, that if they desire, and will present a man well qualified to defend their side of the question, I will, by the Lord's permission, meet him at any proper time and place, and we will have this matter tested."

REPLY.—With this closing paragraph, a reviewer, of course, has not much to do. Sincerely believing his present position to be unscriptural, we have endeavored to present a few reasons for so regarding it. If Eld. P. is not satisfied, men will not be wanting, at any proper time and place, to further test this matter with him.

We are thus brought to the conclusion of Eld. P.'s effort against the Sabbath. The reader now has before him, from the pen of a representative man, arguments which have been set forth with all confidence as sufficient to overthrow the seventh-day Sabbath. Let us, in a brief retrospect, look at some of their main features in connection.

1. In the first place, the Sabbath is set forth as a type. But to make this position even appear plausible, the question of its origin must be kept out of sight; for the Bible distinctly places the origin of the Sabbath in Eden; but it is impossible that any type should originate before the fall. And further, the Sabbath as a type is said to foreshadow the future thousand years of millennial rest and glory. But the idea must be maintained that the Sabbath was abolished at the cross; hence, we have a break, a great gulf of over eighteen hundred years, between the shadow and the substance!

2. The Sabbath is incorporated into the very bosom of the decalogue, one of those precepts which God distinguished above all others by speaking them with his

voice, and writing them with his finger, thus showing that, one and inseparable, they were in their nature moral, immutable, and perpetual. But the Sabbath must be abolished, hence the whole decalogue must be abolished; for it is impossible to show any action in regard to one commandment which does not equally affect them all. This is the reason we hear so much about the ten commandments being abolished. It is simply and exclusively to get rid of the Sabbath, which is such a trouble to the lawless and disobedient. And having abolished the decalogue, mark the dilemma they are in, and the work they make in trying to extricate themselves from it. The law must be re-enacted, or a new one given. When? Some say by Christ, during his public ministry; but this was before the crucifixion, where only the abolition of the old can be placed; hence, we have a re-enactment some years before the old was abolished. Others, therefore, contend that the apostles gave the new law; but this was many years this side the crucifixion, leaving a large space in which God had no law for the government of his creatures! And the thought also occurs that for the former age, an age, as they hold it, of comparative darkness, God gave his law himself; but for this age of further light and glory, he retires upon the background, and leaves the giving of his law to men!—positions, all of them, too absurd for sane and sensible men to give them a moment's adherence.

3. Christ is also, in reality, set forth as dying to abolish his Father's law, which, if it could by any means have been abolished, he need not have died.

4. The original decalogue is denounced as a yoke of bondage, the letter that killeth, a curse, the old law of works, the "old dead school-master," &c.; but their law of the New Testament, which they must contend is exactly identical with it, only the obligation of the Sabbath is transferred to another day,—that is the law of faith, the law of liberty, the Spirit that giveth life, more glorious! &c. Such is the consistency of their theory.

5. The arguments they use destroy each other. Being compelled to admit that the Sabbath is a moral law, that nullifies the argument that it is a type; for moral laws have nothing typical in their nature. Then Paul's language is applied to the Sabbath, "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind," to show that the observance of days is a matter of entire indifference; which, interpreted in accordance with their theory, must mean that we must observe Sunday, but need not keep the seventh day. We shortly find that if we observe the seventh day, we fall from grace, and will surely be accursed; and, finally, that by so doing we tread under foot the Son of God, and count the blood of the covenant wherewith we were sanctified an unholy thing, and do despite unto the spirit of grace! Thus it becomes the most heinous crime against God, to keep a command under this dispensation, which under the former was the delight of both God and man, and for a violation of which, God visited his ancient people with frequent and severest wrath! And more than this, while we must not keep the seventh day, the divine law for which never has been repealed, we must keep Sunday, for which no divine law or command ever has been given!

Such are a few of the crooks and contradictions which attach to any theory devised to overthrow the Sabbath. They are inherent in the system, if it may be called a system, and no man, however able and sound in other respects, who undertakes to defend such views, can run clear of them. And if the reader, in following the arguments of Eld. P., has often been surprised at the inconsistency and weakness of his positions, attribute it not to the man, but the unfortunate side of the question upon which he labors. For no man of his age and ability, of his fairness and candor in every other respect, of his experience in the things of God, and especially in connection with the great truth of the second coming of the Saviour,—no such man, we say, with truth on his side, would advance the incongruous positions, and the lame and halting arguments which he has presented. But error disarms the strongest, and renders him who would be a host, if battling for the right, weak and impotent in its unworthy defense. For this reason, we are sorry to see Eld. P. where he is, and for his own sake, and

he good he would be able to do, we would that he might return to his first love, and again take up his position in the stronghold of truth.

Says the apostle, "Rebuke not an elder, but intreat him as a father." In the spirit of this injunction, Eld. P. will suffer us to address a few words to him.

We fear, Eld. P., that you do not realize the nature of the work in which you are engaged. It is a negative work, akin to that of the skeptic and infidel. It is tearing down, not building up. And you well understand that it is vastly easier to hurl an objection here and there against any system than it is to present another harmonious system to take its place. And such is the opposition to the seventh-day Sabbath, whether it take the form of no-Sabbath, or of a first-day Sabbath. It consists principally in throwing out objections, one text here and another there, which is supposed to bear against the great system which sustains the seventh day from Genesis to Revelation. And it matters not if these objections contradict and devour each other; as there is no harmonious system on that side to build up; but if they work confusion in the mind of the reader or hearer, and shake his confidence in the Sabbath, the object is gained. And who are the persons, Eld. P., who especially delight in your effort against the Sabbath? Answer. Those who believe in no-Sabbath. What care they for a poor apology for Sunday? They know that if the seventh day is not the Sabbath, there is none. Hence, they seize upon every objection that you raise against the Sabbath as sustaining them in their position. Thus are you confirming men in this species of infidelity; bolstering them up in the idea that the holy and beneficent institution of a day of rest has ceased to exist. And while this negative work is so easily accomplished, it is not so easily counteracted; as it is well known that an objection may be stated in one line, which it would require pages to answer. To illustrate: One man can tear up more railroad track than ten men can lay down; one incendiary can burn more buildings than a hundred men can build; and it requires only a few hours' work of the club and torch of the Goth and Vandal, to deface or ruin the stately edifice, which it has cost years of toil, and the mightiest efforts of art, to rear. Such, Eld. P., and we say it with all kindness, is the nature of your opposition against the Sabbath. But amid all the controversy and excitement which this subject is producing with various classes, we are happy to be able to say that

Like some fair monument of towering form,  
The Sabbath stands unmoved amid the storm;  
While round it fierce the noisy rabble crowd  
With tumult wild, and imprecations loud;  
Their missiles at it hurl with venom'd spite,  
To mar its beauty and obscure its light;  
And "More Confusion," is their proper label,  
"Than ever babbled 'round the tower of Babel."

You must not, therefore, be surprised if in some portions of our reply to your remarks, we have manifested more than wonted earnestness, and if our words may have seemed sharp and severe. Be assured that nothing has been set down in unkindness or malice. While we have endeavored to expose faithfully wrong premises and wrong conclusions, it has been with no hard or bitter feelings against their author. We have spoken only as the occasion seemed to demand. For when we saw you yielding to a class of ideas which led you to apply to Seventh-day Adventists, those who are endeavoring to regulate their lives by the highest moral code yet known on earth,—to apply to this class the language of Paul to the Philippians, "Beware of dogs, beware of evil-workers, beware of the concision," &c., it seemed to us time that the inherent falsity and unsoundness of such positions should with an unsparing hand be laid open to public view.

With no less sincere feelings of regard for your position, age and experience, have we reviewed your arguments, than we felt when, at the home of the writer, in West Wilton, N. H., twenty years ago, you made known in clearness and power the doctrine of the Lord's soon coming; or when you laid your hand upon his head, and said, "Bub, do you love the Lord Jesus?" We can now answer that question. We do love him. We take him for our Saviour. And while endeavoring to keep the law of God, we rely upon the merits of Christ's atoning blood for the forgiveness of our sins.

And the more we love him, the less consistent can we make it appear that by obeying the law of the Father, we thereby ignore or trample under foot the atoning work of the Son.

In contrast with the lack of harmony involved in the opposition to the Sabbath, look at the few following harmonious facts connected with the view we hold of this sacred institution.

1. The Sabbath was given to man in Eden, ere yet he had fallen from his innocence.

2. A law for its observance was given to Adam, and through him, as he then stood in Eden, of course for all his posterity.

3. When the moral law was given to the world in tangible form, we behold the Sabbath, in its very bosom, the golden clasp to bind together the two tables of the decalogue.

4. God declared to Israel that he would take the Sabbath commandment above all others to be the badge or sign of his loyal people.

5. We see the Sabbath, with the other nine commandments, everywhere kept distinct from the ceremonial law, which regulated, not obedience to God, but the way to approach unto him for pardon.

6. And when Christ came and introduced a new and better way of approach to God, he was careful to hold up the law of his Father, unchanged in the slightest particular, as still the great rule of rectitude, and the condition of everlasting life. If thou wilt enter into life, said he to the young man, keep the commandments. And he then pointed him to the decalogue to show him to what commandments he referred.

And 7. When the prophet Isaiah looks beyond this present evil world, beyond the reign of corruption and error, beyond the dominion of sin and sinners, when he looks forward to a new earth reposing in untold loveliness and beauty beneath a new heaven, he gives us a final view of the Sabbath in that glorious and eternal state: "For as the new heavens and the new earth which I will make shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." Isa. lxvi, 22, 23.

Thus while the Sabbath was placed like a bright coronet upon the brow of the first creation, ere Paradise was lost, while it has been, and still is, "the song of the church in the house of her pilgrimage," in Paradise restored it again appears, prominent among the blessings of the great restitution, and the prophet points to it as a season of hallowed repose and worship for the saints of God forever and ever.

We trust you still adhere to the noble sentiment expressed in your tract of 1845: "Truth is what I am after; and if I had but one day on this earth to spend, I would give up error for truth as soon as I could see it." We therefore pray you to review carefully your present position, and, as you then prayed, "May the Lord give you wisdom and help you to keep all his commandments, that you may have right to the tree of life." Rev. xxii, 14.

And when the faithful servants of God shall have finally entered into rest, as they look back upon their journey through this revolted world where disloyalty to the government of Heaven was the prevailing sin, and where opposition to God's law was the malignant principle which the enemy labored hardest to instil into the hearts of men, and as they think that then they tried to show their loyalty to God by loving his law and reverencing his Sabbath, that thought will be to them an exceeding joy.

CHILDREN STARVING.—A correspondent speaking of the sufferings of the poor in the counties of Spottsylvania, Stafford and Caroline, says: I stopped near a village to feed my horse and refresh myself, and here I discovered for the first time the state of the poor in the vicinity. Where my horse had eaten his corn from a blanket, several grains lay scattered on the ground. Three little half-clad children came and gathered them up and ate them. I was interested in one of them, a little girl, and called her to me, and upon questioning her, she said they had not eaten a piece of bread for three days, their only food having been wild greens gathered from the

fields. She said her father was killed in the first battle of Fredericksburg, and there was now no one in the neighborhood to whom they could apply for help. I gave them what I had in my haversack, and left them enjoying themselves.

#### Report of the Committee for the Month of June.

ONE hundred and seventy-four new subscribers have been added to our list during the month of June. The following statement shows the result of the labors of the committee, giving the names of the members reporting and the number of subscribers sent in by each, viz:

*One each.* W K Loughborough, J W Marsh, Mrs J S Woodward, A S King, J L Powell, B G Allen, J H Waggoner, R Rundall, Mrs A A Carter, J Minisee, A Van Syoc, G P Bailey, A M Gravel, J Byington, B Gardner, S J Wakeling, A Hunt, O Mears, H W Kellogg, H A Pierce, F Howe, Jos Bates, C D Bixby, J Frank, S Treat, O D Washburn, J Hare, C H Rogers, J L Richmond, Mrs C Manly, T M Morris, W H Wild, A Amburn, W McPheer, C Woodman, E Kellogg, A Stone, F A Dayton, J C Gregory, V Weed, J Loudon, G Hodges, L Kettle, A Pierce, S Pierce, L Drake, A C Hudson, M E Cornell, R Griggs, J O Thompson, B A Smith, S Kennedy, Mrs J Eckert, J L Wilson, E M Davis, A C Bourdeau, T Bryant, C Stratton, M B Ferree, E B Gaskill, Mrs W G Watson, S A Rowland, Mrs L B Webber, J Taber, T Lane, M C Butler, Mrs I F Long, Lydia Lane, R A Worden, P Miller jr., W Bryant, V V Wheeler, P H Cady, J Q Foy, J F Carman, L M Sheldon, Mary E Haskell, W E Newcomb, B Armitage, B Simonton.

*Two each.* W L Saxby, C S Fox, J P Flemming, B McCormick, I J Howell, S O Winslow, C W Olds, Ben Auten, G F Richmond, C C Collins, P C Rodman, Rebecca Whities, F A Dayton, W P Ballard, A A Dodge, H S Lay, H Gardner, Mrs E D C Green, D W Johnson, S M Holly, B B Francisco, G L Holiday, H C Miller, S O Winslow, J D Hough, S B Whitney.

*Three each.* S A McPherson, I D Van Horn, Louisa Mann, A Dalgrien, A A Fairfield, L G Bostwick.

*Four each.* W H Slown, M W Neal, H Bingham, N Fuller.

*Eight.* Isaac Sanborn.

Although the number of accessions in the present report falls a little below that of our last, yet we are not discouraged, as we are having a gradual increase, which if kept until the close of the volume, will bring our list up to five thousand.

Now is the time to work. There never was a better time to obtain subscribers than the present—currency plenty, and worth but about forty cents on the dollar in gold. We still offer the Review at \$1 a year to those who take it for investigation, and to those who subscribe for it to send to their friends. In all probability this offer will not continue long, for if gold continues to go up, and as a consequence everything else with it, we shall be compelled to advance our subscription rates.

We trust our committee will profit by these suggestions, and send along their subscriptions. Remember that now is the only time that you have the promise of the Review at "old prices."

E. S. W.

#### Happy Children.

How mistaken are some parents who toil to make their children happy, by gratifying every childish wish; whether it be in food, or in dress, or in innocent play-things? The very effort to please them, if improperly manifested, is an injury to them. The first lesson to teach a child, is, that the will of the parent is not law only, but that is best for it. The young mind hates law, rebels against restraint. Hence the will of the parent must not be held up before the child as a rod, but as a benefit—a blessing. It is astonishing how easily a parent may convince and persuade a child that it is not best for it to have its stomach loaded with sweet, pernicious things. When you succeed, a piece of wholesome bread is sweeter than sugar. It is so in matters of dress. What child does not feel as happy and as good, in neat, clean, plain clothes,

as in costly apparel? It is so in toys and play-things. Give your children plain food, plain dress, and a few play-things, and they will be far happier—if they are taught that Pa and Ma think it best—than if thousands were spent on them.—*Mrs. M. E. Gorman.*

## Letters.

"Then they that feared the Lord, spake often one to another."

This department of the paper is designed for the brethren and sisters to freely and fully communicate with each other respecting their hopes and determinations, conflicts and victories, attainments and desires, in the heavenly journey. Seek first a living experience and then record it, carefully and prayerfully, for the comfort and encouragement of the other members of the household of faith.

### From Bro. Taylor.

**BRO. WHITE:** The second Sabbath in the month (June) I was with the church at Kirkville. Although few in number, they are not discouraged. They love the truth, and are trying to live it. They feel its weight and importance, sustain their Sabbath meetings, and are keeping pace with the work. I think I can safely say that the few that are left are doing as well as when the numbers were more.

Last Sabbath and first day I was with the church in this place. Their numbers here are not large, yet they would be whole-hearted in the glorious work of the last message. They are not yet organized. They carry out the s. b. system, and with one exception their testimonies were good and to the point. They will soon be out of his sight, if they keep on walking in the light of the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus, which I trust they will do, for it is the sure and only way to mount Zion.

C. O. TAYLOR.

Verona, N. Y., June 28, 1864.

### From Bro. Luke.

**BRO. WHITE:** I have been distributing some of our publications, and trying to show my friends that the coming of the Saviour is near at hand. Some are interested; others scoff and say, "Where is the promise of his coming?" The most prominent and best educated member of the Disciple church here, took the ground that the Royal Law was repealed at the crucifixion; and in the same conversation declared that the kingdom was set up on the day of Pentecost, and that there was no law of Christ binding until the kingdom was established, and consequently there was neither law nor gospel for fifty days. When asked by what the people were governed, he said, the "law of the laud!" This man is a practicing physician, and a thorough graduate of two colleges. Truly, thought I, has God chosen the weak things of this world to confound the mighty and the wise. I start for Portland, Ind., on Tuesday. I humbly ask an interest in the prayers of the dear brethren:

J. A. LUKE.

Plainfield, Ind.

## Extracts from Letters.

Sister J. E. Green writes from Wis.: I am often filled with wonder to think I should ever offend so good a being as God; but the blessed words, "If any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous," and, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness," come to my heart with cheering power, and I am encouraged to plead for pardon, and strengthened to try hard to be more watchful and prayerful, that I may be among those who shall be cleansed from all unrighteousness. Oh, blessed thought! that the time will surely come when we shall sin no more. I have, of late, passed through some (to me) severe trials; for it is foreign to our nature to be despised and sneered at by friends and relatives on account of our opinions. But in the midst of it, I could not help rejoicing that I was counted worthy to suffer even a little for his sake, who suffered so much for me. Oh, how little and insignificant do such trials appear, in view of the great reward at the end of the race. All I ask is, that they may have a humbling and sanctifying effect upon me, that I may be an overcomer

through the blood of the dear Saviour. My daily prayer is,

"O, for a closer walk with God."

When I see those around me shrinking from a view of short crops, caused by the drouth now prevailing, and borrowing trouble about the future, the beautiful words of David, in the 91st Psalm, come to my heart like oil upon the troubled waters, "Because thou hast made the Lord, which is my refuge, even the Most High, thy habitation, there shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come upon thy dwelling." How many precious promises there seem to be written on purpose for those living just before Christ's second coming. I am truly thankful that we have the word of God to lighten us in these last days, and I desire to be among those who shall take it as the man of their counsel, that it may indeed be a lamp to my feet and a light to my path, and I may be guided aright, and at last worship with the overcomers around the throne of God in Heaven.

Sister E. F. Rood writes from Alamo, Mich.: When Bro. Cornell was lecturing at Otsego, one year ago, I listened to two discourses by him, and afterward attended the tent meeting one day, at the same place, and heard Bro. and Sr. White exhort and encourage the people in this glorious truth. This encouraged and led me to a careful investigation of the Scriptures, where I have not found the seventh-day Sabbath abolished, nor any other truth that I have heard preached or seen advocated in the Review. The paper is all the preaching I have, and I hail it with delight. I do not feel disheartened at the lonely path, but will try to press my way onward and upward, relying upon the strong arm of my Redeemer, who will in nowise cast out any who sincerely call upon his holy name.

Sister L. Risiuger writes from Euterprise, Minn.: I have just returned from the quarterly meeting, held at Pleasant Grove by Bro. Sanborn, thirty-five miles from my home. I there heard things that have brought my life up to the test. I cannot be neutral. I must take my stand upon this glorious platform of love, purity, and truth. I must consecrate myself to God, and make my body a fit temple for the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. "I will make haste, and delay not, to obey thy righteous commandments, O, my God," lest the tempter come and snatch away the precious influence made upon my heart. I love the people that live up to this beautiful standard of truth. Like Ruth of old, I feel like saying, "Treat me not to leave thee; for thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God."

Sister E. Wood writes from Bellaire, Iowa: One year ago last February I commenced keeping the Sabbath. I feel to thank the Lord that I was ever led to hear his precious truth, and had a willing heart to obey it. I am trying to heed the warning voice of the last message of mercy, by keeping all God's commandments and the faith of Jesus, that I may have a right to the tree of life, and enter through the gates into the city. I feel very unworthy to be numbered among God's servants, but Jesus is worthy, and it is through him I expect to be saved.

Bro. J. Hebner writes from Pottersburg, Mich.: Had it not been for the Bible, and the Review that advocates the doctrines of that book, I should probably have made shipwreck of my faith; but I can truly say to-day that my heart beats in unison with all the dear saints. Brethren and sisters, I rejoice with you that ever my ear was saluted with the third angel's message, the last message of mercy that will ever go to the world to warn the inhabitants thereof of the coming of the Saviour.

Bro. F. C. Castle writes from Buck's Bridge, N. Y.: Our quarterly meeting, at this place, has just closed. It was quite well attended. Bro. H. W. Lawrence was with us, related some of his experience, and exhorted us to arise and gird on the whole armor, and be awake to our responsibility. There was good freedom during the entire meeting. Bro. Whitney gave two discourses on first-day, after which one was baptized by Bro. Lawrence. The brethren then parted for their homes, encouraged to be more faithful.

Bro. H. Harlow, who appears to be going forward in the good work, writes from Decatur, Nebraska: I would like to say to my dear brethren and sisters scattered abroad that I am in full sympathy with the Seventh-day Adventists. I embraced the third angel's message nine years ago this month. Five years ago I bid good-by to tobacco. The 6th day of the present month I bid good-by to tea and coffee. I would like to say to my friends that it is my determination to keep all the commands of God and the faith of Jesus.

Sister F. Wiichel writes from Cooleyville, Minn.: I know that Jesus lives, and I also know something of what it is to suffer for the testimony of Jesus, and for keeping the seventh day. But I found it all in the Bible some years since. I love to hear of the near coming of our Saviour. And when I read the comforting letters in the Review, I have often felt that I would be glad to be a witness for God.

Sister M. L. Sutherland writes from Newtou, Mich.: The Lord has bestowed great blessings on me in answer to prayer, and I would acknowledge it to all of like precious faith, to incite them to prayer and faithfulness; for unto us is the promise given, "And whatsoever we ask we receive of him, because we keep his commandments and do those things that are pleasing in his sight."

Sister E. Carmichael writes from Springville, Iowa: I have cause to rejoice and praise the Lord for being so merciful to me. I esteem the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord; and I rejoice that he has left on record so many precious promises to those who are trying to keep his commandments.

Sister L. J. Shaw writes from Strykersville N. Y., June 5, 1864: I never before in my life felt the sacredness of the Sabbath as I do and have of late, and the beauty there is in the commandments of God, and the great and precious promises to those that obey his will. Praise the Lord!

Sister C. Ruiter writes from Duham, Vt.: My companion and children are keeping the Sabbath. We commenced soon after the tent-meeting in North Sutton, last summer. It is not a yoke of bondage to us, but a delight.

Bro. E. Jous writes from Dryden, Mich.: May it be mine to have that fellowship of which the apostle speaks, with both the Father and the Son, by keeping his commandments and the faith of Jesus.

## God's Strength.

"LORD, what a change within, one short hour  
Spent in thy presence, will prevail to make—  
What heavy burdens from our bosoms take!  
What parched grounds refresh, as with a shower!  
We kneel, and all around us seem to lower;  
We rise, and all the distant and the near  
Stands forth in sunny outline brave and clear:  
We kneel, how weak—we rise, how full of power.  
Why therefore should we do ourselves the wrong,  
Or others, that we are not always strong,  
That we are ever overborne with care,  
That we should ever weak or heartless be,  
Anxious or troubled, when, with us in prayer,  
All joy and strength and courage are with Thee?"

## Obituary Notices.

DIED in Orange, Ionia Co., Mich., March 1, 1864, Benjamin Howe, father of Bro. Franklin Howe, aged seventy-seven years, after a distressing illness of six months, occasioned by a fall from his door.

JOSEPH BATES.

DIED of spotted fever, after an illness of less than five days, May 10, 1864, Sarah Minerva, daughter of Asher S. and Lorana King, aged 34 years.

ASHER S. KING.

Hoosac Tunnel, Mass.

Blessed is he that hath part in the first resurrection.

## The Review and Herald.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, JULY 12, 1864.

### Explanation.

SINCE the publication of that portion of "Both Sides of the Sabbath Question," contained in No. 3, present volume, in which we stated that Eld. P. appeared to have drawn out his articles to a great length in consequence of our decision to publish them entire, we have received from him a letter stating some facts in the case, which entirely exculpate him from any such design; which facts we are happy to lay before the readers of the Review. They are these:

1. The delay of several weeks in his articles, after we commenced our review, was made at the Office of the Crisis, not by Eld. P.

2. His entire article was written and sent to the Crisis Office before our reply was commenced.

3. It was sometime after this before he received the Review which contained the commencement of our reply.

4. The division of his "number four" into three articles was not made by Eld. P., but at the Crisis Office.

We are happy to present facts which so effectually clear Eld. P. from all questionable motives in the matter; for while no other conclusion could apparently be drawn from the knowledge of the facts which we then possessed, than what was intimated in the number referred to, we should be sorry to have any one stand before the public in a wrong light from any remark of ours.

S. B. OVERTON. You have read the History of the Sabbath with very little care, if you still think that no command existed for the observance of the Sabbath for twenty-five hundred years from creation, or that we cannot keep the Sabbath because the world is round, or that only an indefinite seventh part of our time is required of us. Read it again.

### Note from Bro. Van Horn.

BRO. WHITE; We have spent three Sabbaths in this place, a little more than two weeks, and have given twenty-two lectures. The people are interested in what we have been telling them, and some are inclined to believe it is the truth.

We have had freedom in presenting the truth to them, and feel to praise the Lord for all his goodness to us.

Yesterday (Sunday) we called upon all who were convinced that the seventh-day Sabbath was binding upon Christians in this dispensation, to manifest it by rising to their feet. Twenty arose. When the question was reversed, four arose. We took this expression of the people in order to decide whether to stay with them longer, or to remove to some other place. We have decided to stay another week. We trust the Lord has a people here, and we pray that we may be strengthened to discharge our duty, and present the truths of the message to them in their purity. Remember us before the Lord in your prayers, that success may attend our labors this season.

I. D. VAN HORN.

Ihaca, Mich.

### Note from Bro. Bates.

BRO. WHITE: Since my last report, I have visited the church in Chesaning, Shi. Co., Mich. June 14 & 15, and held two meetings with them. A goodly number of the church from St Charles met with us and received a blessing from the Lord.

June 16-20 held six meetings with the church in Orange, Ionia Co. Brethren from Portland and Ionia came to the meeting and were much strengthened. Especially sweet and cheering was the season in attending to the ordinances of the Lord's house. As I stated in my last, so also in the above named places I am happy to learn that the interest is increasing with unbelievers to hear and learn more about our position.

JOSEPH BATES.

Monterey, Mich., June 27, 1864.

### Downfall of Hoops.

OUR lady readers will receive with surprise the news that the day of hoops is past. The Empress Eugenie inaugurated the movement, and of course all the female world follow suit. Already the most distinguished and fashionable ladies of New York have appeared upon the street without hoops, and have everywhere elicited admiration at the grace and beauty of their attire, and wonderment how such ungainly articles could ever have been tolerated. We state the above on the authority of the N. Y. Ledger in an editorial. We suppose however, we must 'wait for the wagon' a year or two longer, before the fashion reaches this part of the country.—*Sel.*

SOME professors pass for very meek, good-natured people till you displease them. They resemble a pool or a pond: while you let it alone, it looks clear and limpid; but if you stir toward the bottom, the rising sediments soon discover the impurities that lurk beneath.—*Toplady.*

## Appointments.

### Meetings in Ohio.

BRETHREN at Lovett's Grove being very busy building a house of worship, it is thought best not to hold Quarterly Meeting there on the 16th and 17th of July.

Also the meetings which were to have been held at Portage July 9 and 10, have been deferred till the 6th and 7th of August. OHIO CON. COM.

J. CLARKE, SEC.

THE next quarterly meeting of the Oakland Wisconsin church will be held the third Sabbath in July. On this occasion we wish the dedication of our meeting house in Oakland. Can not Bro. Steward be there? We invite the neighboring churches to attend.

S. A. BRAGG.

Cambridge, Wis., June 28, 1864.

The next quarterly meeting of the Seventh-day Adventist church of Mackford, Wis., will be held July 23. It is hoped that the scattered brethren and sisters of this church will either be present on this occasion, or represent themselves by letter. RUFUS BAKER.

PROVIDENCE permitting, I will meet with the church in Convis, Mich., Sabbath, July 16, and with the church at Parkville, Sabbath, July 23.

JNO. BYINGTON.

The next quarterly meeting of the church at Hundred Mile Grove, Wis., will be held August 6 and 7, 1864. Bro. L. G. Bostwick, of Port Andrew, Wis., is expected to meet with us. N. M. JORDON.

## Business Department.

### Business Notes.

D. W. Johnson. The Volumes of the Instructor commence with the year.

H. Keeney. Where do you want your Review changed to?

### RECEIPTS.

#### For Review and Herald.

Annexed to each receipt in the following list, is the Volume and Number of the REVIEW & HERALD to which the money received pays. If money for the paper is not in due time acknowledged, immediate notice of the omission should then be given.

H Harlow 2,00,xxv,14. L Hadden 2,00,xxv,22. E D Wilch 1,00,xxv,1. G Felshaw 2,00,xxv,13. W Martin 2,00,xxiii,19. S Jones 1,00,xxv,18. Mrs A C Hanaford 1,00,xxvi,1. N G Spencer 0,50,xxv,1. P R Smith 0,25,xxiv,14. Mary Alexander 1,00,xxv,3. G L Holiday for G Kelley 1,00,xxvi,1. J M Daigneau 1,00,xxiv,1. B Simonton for W J Simonton 1,00,xxvi,1. J W Landes for Mrs E Landes and Mrs O Hastings each 1,00,xxvi,1. J W Landes 2,00,xxvi,1. D W Johnson for R Robinson 1,00,xxvi,1. G Graham 2,00,xxvi,1. J M Deen 1,00,xxv,1. T F Cottrell 2,00,xxvi,1. C A Osgood for S Emmet 1,00,xxvi,1. J B Taber 1,00,xxv,1. Mary R Taber for L B Mc Euen and R S Case each 1,00,xxvi,1. M Kittle 1,00,xxiv,14. T F Emans 1,00,xxv,1. O Mears 4,00,xxix,1. P S Thurston for J

Woodard 1,00,xxvi,1. P S Thurston 3,32,xxiv,1. L F Lamb 2,00,xxvi,1. Eli Sherman 2,00,xxvi,1. A Sherman 1,00,xxiv,1. L Dickinson 1,00,xxvi,1. J Thomas 1,00,xxv,1. H Keeney 4,75,xxvii,14. G L Reddington 3,00,xxv,1. S N Smith 1,00,xxv,1. L Bean 2,00,xxvi,8. S E Ewing 0,50,xxv,1. R Garrett 4,00,xxvi,11. W Lookard 1,00,xxvi,1. S N Littlefield 2nd. 2,00,xxv,13. E Smith 5,00,xxvii,13. V Jenks 1,00,xxvi,1. S Blodget 2,00,xxv,20. Mrs Park 0,50,xxv,1. Lucy Seymour for Mrs E A Wartrons and Mrs M Hood each 1,00,xxvi,1. D Depew 2,00,xxiii,1. A Ballard 0,75,xxv,14. A Thompson 0,75,xxiv,20. J W Raymond 1,10,xxv,1. S Hills 2,00,xxvi,14. E Odell 3,00,xxvi,16. C Evens 1,00,xxvi,1. W A Hicks 1,00,xxiii,16. A Wattles 0,83,xxv,5. J Burbridge 2,00,xxv,1. J C Brown for G Baricklow 1,00,xxvi,1. M H Irish 4,00,xxvii,1. D Upson 2,00,xxiv,1. H H Blodget 1,00,xxvi,1. A G Long 1,00,xxvi,1. R H Peck 2,00,xxvi,1. I P Ulrich 2,00,xxvi,8. C M Smith 1,00,xxvi,1. H Miller 2,00,xxvii,16. C Colson 2,00,xxiv,1. H M Smith 1,00,xxv,1. R Unthank 0,50,xxv,1. H M Wilson 1,00,xxvi,1. A Buel 2,00,xxvi,1. B R Davis 1,00,xxvi,1. J Frost 1,00,xxvi,1. J J Blaisdell 0,50,xxv,1. C W Leighton 1,00,xxvi,1. J Barker 0,50,xxv,1. F J Goodrich 2,00,xxvi,9. H Nye 1,00,xxvi,2. H J Francisco 2,00,xxiv,1. Mrs K Bressler 1,00,xxvi,1. J Ralston 1,00,xxv,1. L S Gregory 2,00,xxvi,1. J B Gregory 1,00,xxvi,1. J Clarke 2,00,xxv,21. A Thomas 2,00,xxv,8. H Gregory 2,00,xxvi,1. S A Williams 2,00,xxvi,1. L L Byington 2,00,xxvi,1. A C Gilbert 5,00,xxvii,18. A A Marks 2,00,xxiv,1. C Z June 2,00,xxv,1. A A Marks for L Marks 1,00,xxvi,1. A T Phillips 1,00,xxvi,1. R Williams 2,00,xxiv,1. D Pass 2,46,xxvi,1. J Bartlett 2,00,xxiii,1. W E Caviness 0,75,xxv,1. T H Moffet 1,00,xxv,1. E J Bane 1,00,xxvi,1. J Piper 1,00,xxvi,1. P Miller 1,00,xxvi,1. E Miner 1,00,xxvi,1. M Cook 1,00,xxvi,1. D H Lamson 2,00,xxvi,1. J Deuman 1,00,xxvi,1. D Curtis 2,25,xxv,20. N Keezer 2,00,xxv,17. J B Webster 1,08,xxv,7. E Pratt 2,50,xxvi,14. F Frauenfelder 1,00,xxiv,12. E R Kelsey 3,00,xxvii,1. S A Bragg 2,10,xxvi,3. Mrs E Coleman 0,25,xxvi,7. M A Winters 1,00,xxvi,1. D Smith 1,00,xxvi,1. W H Lemon 1,00,xxvi,1. E V Ward 1,00,xxv,1. W Treadwell 1,00,xxv,1. A Caldwell 0,50,xxiv,1. E Davis 1,00,xxvi,1. E P Giles 1,00,xxv,1. L Schellhous 2,00,xxvii,13. E Griffith 2,00,xxv,1. J G Wood 2,00,xxvi,1. W McNitt 2,25,xxv,20. R Waters 1,00,xxvi,1. D W Whaley 1,00,xxvi,1. W F Crous 1,11,xxiv,17. D W Hull 5,00,xxv,1. R F Robinson 2,00,xx,12. W T Hinton 2,00,xxv,14. M B Greeman 2,00,xxvi,1. W T Hinton for T Henton 1,00,xxvi,1. S Shirkey 1,00,xxvi,9. L Pinkerton for J A Frimwood 1,00,xxvi,1. J Snyder 1,00,xxiv,23. H P Wakefield 2 copies 3,00,xxv,1. J Hurd 2,00,xxvi,9. T Nelson 3,50,xxv,1. S S Jones 1,00,xxvi,1. E Johnson 0,50,xxv,8. L J Shaw 1,25,xxv,1. J Park for R M Horn 1,00,xxvi,1. D Bickford 2,00,xxvi,5. S B Gowell 2,00,xxv,21. L Haskell 1,00,xxv,1. M Dow 1,00,xxiv,1. G H Mathews 1,00,xxv,1. J Kemp 1,00,xxiv,1. E L Bason for S A Rowland 1,00,xxvi,1. J P Flemming for Eld. P Small 1,00,xxvi,1. T Townsend 0,50,xxv,1. G W Ohaver 0,50,xxv,1. E Tucker 1,00,xxv,1. A Burrows 1,00,xxvi,1. J Carter 1,00,xxv,1. From a friend . . . 1,00,xxvi,1. Mrs S M Swan 2,50,xxvii,1. A C Morton 3,00,xxiv,14. J H Rogers 1,00,xxv,8. J J Owen 1,00,xxvi,1. F Douglass 1,00,xxiii,1. C G Campbell 1,00,xxiv,13. I Gleason 1,00,xxvi,1. H D Ford 1,00,xxvi,1.

### Books Sent By Mail.

E A Claffin \$1,45. M Whisler \$1. C McNeil \$2. Mrs M Tours 7c. Geo P Lampard 7c. S W Ford 7c. R Lampard 7c. C N Ford 24c. O E Merrifield 25c. Mary Alexander 50c. L Seymour 83c. P S Thurston 68c. A C Bourdeau 25c. A Wattles 17c. A Harmon \$1. D Poss \$3,39. Wm E Caviness 20c. L L Loomis 44c. Wm F Crous 89c. T Bradbury 12c. H Clough \$2. W H Lemon 12c. F Kotman 22c. F M Bragg 90c. L Lathrop 30c. Amelia Curtis 30c. Mrs C Curtis 15c. J S Webster 92c. Mrs R C Baker 18c. J Dubois 50c. G F Richmond 29c.

### Books Sent By Express.

B G Allen, Middletown, R I, \$4,40. M A Dudley, Washington, Washington Co, Iowa, \$17. E M L Corey, Lansing, Mich, \$1.

### Books Sent by Rail Road as Freight.

L G Bostwick, Blue River, Grant Co, Wis, \$76,12. Wm Merry, St Charles, Minn, \$63,66.

### Cash Received on Account.

T T Brown \$5. O Mears \$5. L G Bostwick for I Sanborn \$5. A S Hutches \$22. J B Frisbie \$1. J W Raymond \$1. J Bostwick \$1,25. J Clarke \$11. J H Waggoner \$7.

### General Conference Missionary Fund.

D. A. Owen \$7,00.

### Review to Poor.

J. B. Merritt \$1,00.