

ADVENT REVIEW,

And Sabbath Herald.

VOL. XXVI. BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1865. No. 23.

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

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.

Address ELDER JAMES WHITE, Battle Creek, Michigan.

Dawn.

BONAR.

Light of the better morning,
Shine down on me!
Sun of the brighter Heaven,
Bid darkness flee!
Thy warmth impart
To this dull heart;
Pour in thy light,
And let this night
Be turned to day
By thy mild ray!
Lord Jesus, come;
Thou day-star shine;
Enlighten now
This soul of mine!

Streaks of the better dawning
Break on my sight,
Fringing with silver edges
These clouds of night.
Gems on morn's brow,
Glow, brightly glow,
Foretelling soon
The ascending noon,
Wakening this earth
To second birth,
When He shall come
To earth again,
Who comes to judge,
Who comes to reign.

From the Sabbath Recorder.

NATURE AND DESTINY OF MAN.

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

Elder Hull's Eighth Article.

ELD. R. F. COTTRELL:

Dear Brother,—I still argue, that when you say the soul puts on immortality at the resurrection of the just, you not only go beyond the record, but, further, that you employ sophistry in your argument. You confess that I have proved by direct Scripture testimony, that the body is mortal. Now, that the resurrection of this mortal body is the question under consideration in the argument of the Apostle, is, I think, put beyond the possibility of cavil. See the 44th verse—a verse thrown in expressly as a definition—"It is sown an animal body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is an animal body, and there is a spiritual body." Again, verse 50—"Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God; nor doth corruption inherit incorruption." Now do not "flesh and blood," in this verse, mean what "body" does in the 44th? And is it not this flesh and blood of which corruption is affirmed? If so, then *corruptible*, in the 54th verse, refers to flesh and blood as being decaya-

ble, and *incorruption* to the new or spiritual body given the saints at the resurrection. How plain and direct is all this!

But now look at your argument. 1. "Man is a soul." 2. "When he received the breath of life, he became a living soul." 3. "The Scriptures call him 'mortal man.'" 4. "Then the living soul is mortal." Let us now look at this, part by part. 1. Man is a soul. Here you use the word *soul* in one of its meanings, as if this were its only meaning. Besides, you use it not in the sense in which it is used in Matt. x. 28, nor as used in this discussion; for here it has the sense of *spirit*. But had you employed the word as in Ps. lxxxiv, 2, "My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth, for the courts of Jehovah," would it have suited your purpose? 2. "When he received the breath of life, he became a living soul." That is, he ceased to be a *thing*, and became a *person*—a creature of life. Here you use the word *soul*, as before, in the sense of *person*, which has nothing to do with our discussion. 3. "The Scriptures call him mortal man." That this term *mortal* refers to the body, I have proved by overwhelming testimony. 4. "Then the living soul is mortal." Yes, this living person, or being, is subject to death. "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."—Gen. iii, 19. Now, this discussion is not about this dust that was taken from the ground and returned to it again, but of that of which Stephen spoke in Acts vii, 59, when he said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Have I not, then, reason to charge you with sophistry? SOPHISM, says Webster, "is specious but fallacious argument—a subtlety in reasoning—an argument that is not supported by sound reasoning, or in which the inference is not justly deduced from the premises." Perhaps, however, this is the method by which you propose to keep me from "reasoning in a circle."

I call your attention to one or two more points in that paragraph. You say, "I have proved the entire man mortal." Show me the passage which says the *spirit* of man is mortal, and I will publicly retract all I have said in this discussion proving that man's spirit survives the death of the body.

Your assertion, that man's spirit puts on immortality at the resurrection of the just, I have attended to in my previous article, showing that it is the *body*, not the soul, that puts on immortality at that time.

You are particularly severe upon me for saying, "All I have attempted concerning the *idea* of the soul's immortality, is to prove that the soul does not necessarily die with the body." You say, "Indeed! That is attempting very little." I am relieved, however, by your covert concession, that this is easily done; and also by your admission, that I have done it, by saying that I would have attempted more "had the proof been at hand," and by your further confession, that I would not undertake anything for which there was not proof. It will greatly please me to have an opportunity to return the compliment.

You do not meet my argument upon Acts xxiii, 8, etc., proving the separate existence of human spirits. 1. I make this statement: The Pharisees did believe in this doctrine. 2. With reference to this, as well as the existence of angels and the resurrection of the dead, Paul announced himself a Pharisee. 3. Therefore this is a Scripture doctrine. That angels are not meant

by "*spirits*" in the text, is manifest. Olshausen says upon this verse, "In verse nine, *pneuma*, as used by the Pharisees, is plainly to be understood of a departed soul, because it is distinguished from *aggelos*. If hearing something from the Spirit of God were meant, the article could not be dispensed with before *pneuma*, nor could *elatese* be applied in this manner to the spirit." Josephus says, (Ant., book 18, sec. 3,) "They also," the Pharisees, "believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them, and that under the earth there will be rewards and punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life." The same author says, in the next section, "But the doctrine of the Sadducees is this: That souls die with the bodies." Is not that your faith also? If so, then, in respect to this article of their faith, you are a Sadducee! But Paul says that in this matter he was a Pharisee. So you and Paul differ there, do you not? You of course think you are right. I doubt it.

Now, when Jesus said, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have," he said it with reference to the doctrine believed by the Pharisees concerning the existence and nature of the spirits of departed men, i. e., dead men; otherwise his language would have been unintelligible. You attempt to free yourself from this text, by saying that "man's spirit is not a being, but an endowment." Had you reflected sufficiently, you would not, I am sure, have made such an assertion. If by *being* you mean *personality*, the Scriptures are certainly against you. Paul says, Rom, vii, 22, "I have pleasure in the law of God, as to the inward man." 2 Cor. iv, 16, "For this cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." To the same effect is Eph. iii, 16; Col. iii, 10; 2 Pet. iii, 4, and various other passages. Nothing can be plainer, than that personality is here affirmed of the spirit of man. Besides, the spirit of man is not, strictly speaking, an "endowment" of man; but the powers of the spirit, whatever they may be, are its endowments. You might as well say that the body is an endowment of man. The truth rather is, that the body has its endowments, as has also the spirit. Webster says, definition third, "Endowment is that which is bestowed on the person or mind by the Creator. . . . Natural activity of the limbs is an endowment of the body; natural vigor of intellect is an endowment of the mind." You see, then, that mind is one thing, and endowment is quite another. The passage in Acts xxiii, 8, is a complete answer to your statement, that the Scriptures do not teach the separate existence of the spirit from the body, which is what is meant by "*disembodied*" spirits. *If the existence of the spirit, in this sense, is not taught in the Scriptures, then nothing is!*

I still hold to my former statement as to the meaning of *phtharton*, and further affirm, that it is never used by any Lexicographer of the spirit of man. Besides, to say that Paul, in Rom i, 28, affirms this of the spirit of man, or of the "whole man," is to make the Apostle stultify himself; for in Rom. viii, 11, he expressly asserts this mortality to be of the body." So, vi, 12, "Let not sin reign in your mortal body." In 2 Cor. iv, 11, Paul says, "That the life also of Jesus may be made manifest in your mortal flesh." Ought not these quotations to settle this matter?

If you accept, as you say you do, my "lecture on

the philosophy of language and the diversified use of words," please apply the principle to your theory of interpretation, and we will have no further controversy.

To what you say of man's mortality, and his want of knowledge in death, etc., etc., I need add nothing further, as you have advanced no new thought.

I join with you in a hearty acceptance of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and rejoice in the light it sheds upon the question of the future of man. But your argument, as to what it proves concerning your theory of the nature of man, is so fully answered in another place in this discussion, that I will pass it without further notice.

What I have said on the matter of "seeking for immortality," I still stand to, and am the more, if possible, convinced of its correctness, from the fact that it remains perfectly unshaken after your assault. Your main point, that eternal life consists in our having incorruptible bodies in the future state, is too puerile to affect any well-instructed mind. That our spiritual bodies will endlessly exist, I doubt not; but that this is what is meant by "eternal life," as taught in the New Testament, is too absurd to be entertained for a moment. To reduce the whole gospel transaction, as wrapped in the mission and ministry of Jesus, to the work of securing man an eternal existence, is really too shocking. The means and the end bear no proper relation to each other.

Approaching the close of your letter, you say "And now, what progress can we report in this discussion on the nature of man? You have proved, by unquestionable authority, that the body is mortal. I have proved, by testimony equally clear and unquestionable, that the entire man is mortal." Dear brother, how can you make such a statement as this last? I have proved my statement, in just so many words. Have you done that? Is not yours an *inference*, while mine is the exact statement of Scripture? I despair, when I find a man so often charging others with preaching their philosophy in place of a "thus saith the Lord," who shall then coolly give utterance to such statements. Every reader, who has followed us in this discussion, knows that you have not produced one passage which says, "The whole man is mortal." That you have again and again asserted this, all know. Your method of proof is to select such passages as may in *phraseology* nearest approach your point, and place them in a circular form, and then complete the circle by a bold assertion, and call that "proof." Pray, brother, don't do so!

How much progress we may be making in this discussion, I can not say. It was with great reluctance that I engaged in it. I have little taste for controversy. My labors are important and abundant, in a direction much more congenial to my tastes. I entered the discussion from a sense of duty. I felt also my weakness, and naturally shrunk from such a responsibility. But I am glad I entered the field, as I trust I have both received and imparted knowledge. The readers of both the papers in which the discussion has thus far been published, have had an opportunity to read both sides, and are better informed of the sentiments in controversy. I sincerely hope the effect of the controversy may not be to alienation, but to a union in the truth. It may be best, as you delicately hint, to proceed to the second question, "the destiny of man;" but please do not claim a victory before we enter the arena!

I remain sincerely yours,

N. V. HULL.

Eld. R. F. Cottrell's Eighth Reply.

ELD. N. V. HULL:

Dear Brother:—When I said, in my fifth article, that "the Bible is silent concerning the immortality of the soul in its present state, or until it shall put on immortality at the resurrection of the just," I told the truth, as you know, and my meaning was not concealed, but obvious. I said, in the same article, speaking of the resurrection as taught by Paul in 1 Cor. xv, "then this mortal person or soul will put on immortality." To this you objected. You said with emphasis, "There is neither word nor hint in the Bible, of the soul's putting on immortality at the Resurrection." In reply to this, I made

the argument which you now complain of as sophistical. This argument was briefly this: 1. Man is a soul. 2. Man is mortal. 3. This "mortal man," or soul, if just, puts on immortality at the time of which it is said "This mortal must put on immortality." I submit it to the reader, that in this there is no deceptive use of terms, nothing ambiguous or equivocal—that there is neither *sophistry*, nor yet *unsoundness*, in it. If it had not been unanswerable, you would have shown its unsoundness, instead of quoting Webster's definition of *sophism*.

But you complain that the sense in which I use the term soul, is not the sense in which it is "used in this discussion." Now, I really thought that a Bible discussion of the nature of man would lead to the discovery of the Bible sense of the word soul. A leading definition of soul, as used in the Bible, is *person* or *creature*, though in its first use in the Bible it means *life—the life which God gave to the lower animals*. Gen. i, 20, "Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creatures that hath life"—Hebrew—*soul*. These two are the leading definitions of soul, as used in the Bible. Yet you say that *soul*, in the sense of *person*, "has nothing to do with our discussion."

Then, as the *gift* or *endowment* of life was communicated through the breath of the nostrils, the breath is sometimes called the soul. 1 Kings xvii, 17, 21. But breath and life are the leading definitions of spirit, breath or wind being its *literal* meaning. "Ruah signifies, originally, a breathing or blowing."—*Alger*. This author says of *nehphesh*, soul, "Its first meaning is breath, the breathing of a living being. Next it means the vital spirit, the indwelling life of the body." In these definitions he is in perfect harmony with Gesenius.

I did not mean to argue that *life*, which is the gift of God to every living creature, and to all men a mysterious endowment, which none but God can give—that this is the thing that puts on immortality at the resurrection. Nor yet that it was the soul in the sense of Matt. x, 28. Neither did I argue that an immaterial, immortal soul, is to put it on. And for you to assume this is the sense in which soul is used in this discussion, is begging the whole question. Such a soul or spirit is not revealed in the Bible. The words soul and spirit are used about *seventeen hundred times* in that Book, but they are never qualified by immortal, never-dying, deathless, or *any other term of like import*. If I am wrong in this, please bring out the testimony, and end this controversy. The Bible is as silent as Hades concerning the existence of such a soul in man. This stupendous fact is unaccountable upon your hypothesis, and irreconcilable with your theory.

I freely admit that Paul, in 1 Cor. xv, is speaking of the resurrection of the dead—of the fleshly, mortal body, if you choose; and I have no idea that he meant to teach that that which never died nor was subject to death puts on immortality. I admit that the body is mortal, as you have insisted. But when you try to make this fact prove that the soul is immortal, you must ever fail. Must I repeat and compare our arguments? Mine is this: 1. The Scriptures call man mortal, in a general, unlimited sense. 2. The Scriptures nowhere represent any part of man as being immortal. 3. Therefore man is wholly mortal. Now you know that both my premises are true, and every one can see that my conclusion is found in the premises. Otherwise our revelation is deficient. But we are to discuss the question by the Bible. Now what is your argument from these revealed truths? It is in substance this: 1. Man is mortal. 2. But the body is mortal. 3. Therefore a part of man is immortal. Your conclusion is not in the premises, and there is nothing in the Bible to supply the deficiency.

Let me illustrate this argument by another equally forcible. 1. "The Sabbath was made for man." 2. But the Lord said to the Jewish people, "I have given you the Sabbath." 3. Therefore the Sabbath was not intended for the Gentiles. You and I will not accept of such logic, but we claim that if the Gentiles are included in the general term man, the Sabbath was intended for them. So if the soul is included in the general term man, it is mortal; but if it is excluded, then it is no part of the man, and consequently is excluded from our discussion on the nature and destiny of man.

But you say, "Our discussion is not about this dust,

that was taken from the ground and returned to it again, but of that of which Stephen spoke in Acts vii, 59, when he said, 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.'" Then what the Bible calls man, formed from the dust of the ground, is excluded from a Bible discussion of man. But what was the spirit which Stephen commended to his Lord? It was simply his life—the "vital essence" which God communicated to man with his breath, and which made him a living soul or conscious being. We read the text:

"For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit; but the Pharisees confess both. And there arose a great cry; and the Scribes that were of the Pharisees' part arose, and strove, saying, We find no evil in this man; but if a spirit or an angel hath spoken to him, let us not fight against God."—Acts xxiii, 9, 10.

There is nothing said of human spirits in this text; and there is nothing to prove that they were *disembodied*, or "departed," if human spirits are meant. Therefore, if the human spirit is meant, the denial of its existence in such general terms, involves the denial of a human spirit in living men. Do you think the Sadducees went so far as that? I do not wonder that Olshausen, or yourself, or any one believing as you do, should infer that it "is plainly to be understood of a departed soul, because it is distinguished from *aggelos*." It is possible, however, that spirits are not distinguished from angels in the text, but are the same. When God said, "Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws," we are not to infer that commandments, statutes, and laws, are each distinguished from the others. Angels are spirits. Are they not all ministering spirits? But the view that distinguishes spirits from angels in the text, involves the absurdity that "the Pharisees confess *both*" of *three things*—the resurrection, angels, and spirits. I believe they confessed both of two things. 1. The resurrection. 2. Angels or spirits. I do not think it was the Spirit of God that the Pharisees supposed might have spoken to Paul, neither do I think it a human spirit; for, to oppose a human spirit disembodied, would no more be fighting against God, than to strive with such spirits while in the body. In the belief of the existence of superhuman spirits—the angels—Paul and the Pharisees agreed. But if the Pharisees did "believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them, and that under the earth there will be rewards and punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life," Paul did not endorse this Pagan notion, neither does Eld. Hull; for you hold that rewards and punishments are not awarded till after the judgment and resurrection. Then why quote such testimonies? When you quote, "The spirit shall return to God who gave it," do you mean that the soul goes into some mammoth cave of the earth to find God there, where immaterial souls are confined within the damp and dismal walls of a material prison? If not, why quote such nonsense? You might as well go right to the fountain head of all such marvelous and precious knowledge, namely, the mythology of the Pagans. If Josephus and the Pharisees got these ideas from their inspired Scriptures, we have those Scriptures, and can get them there. But if they got them from some other source, we have no more to do with them than we have with the teachings of the "Christian fathers" of the tenth century to establish Christian doctrine and prove a change of the Sabbath.

Where, then, is your authority for saying that "when Jesus said, 'A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have,' he said it with reference to the doctrine believed by the Pharisees concerning the existence and nature of the spirits of departed men, i. e. dead men; otherwise his language would have been unintelligible." The doctrine of spirits, good and bad, was taught in their Scriptures. See 1 Kings xxii, 19-23, Job iv, 15, and all those passages that speak of familiar spirits, and unclean spirits. Zech. xiii, 2. Such were the unclean spirits cast out by Jesus. Hence the Saviour's language is perfectly intelligible without the aid of the spirits of dead men.

Did Jesus and Paul endorse the doctrines of the Pharisees? They did in regard to the resurrection of the dead, and of the existence of angels or spirits. These were endorsed, because they were Scripture doctrines, not because the Pharisees believed them. But

what is the source of our information, outside of the Bible, of what the Pharisees *did* believe? and is it perfectly reliable? Let us see.

Speaking of Josephus, Alger says, "These are his words: 'The Pharisees believe that souls have an immortal strength in them, and that in the under-world they will experience rewards or punishments according as they have lived well or ill in this life. The righteous shall have power to live again, but sinners shall be detained in an everlasting prison.' Again he [Josephus] writes, 'The Pharisees say that all souls are incorruptible, but that only the souls of good men are removed into other bodies.' The fragment entitled 'Concerning Hades,' formerly attributed to Josephus, is now acknowledged on all sides to be a gross forgery. The Greek culture, and philosophical tincture with which he was imbued, led him to reject the doctrine of a bodily resurrection; and this is probably the reason why he makes no allusion to that doctrine in his account of the Pharisees."—*History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, p. 163.

Such is the corrupted, fabulous source of our information of what the Pharisees believed. Who knows then, what they believed, further than is revealed in the Bible, only that *some* of them were turned away from the truth unto fables, our most reliable witness being one of that number? If you make Jesus endorse one iota not revealed in the Scriptures, by the same rule you can make him endorse the whole—non-resurrection of the wicked, transmigration of the souls of the righteous, and no bodily resurrection at all. Let us return, then, and discuss our subject from the Bible, as we agreed to do.

I am satisfied with what I have already said of the inward man, hidden man of the heart, &c., figurative expressions so easily explained without the aid of an immortal soul.

You still hold that *phtharton* "is never used by any Lexicographer of the spirit of man." Very well. I have never used it so; but admit that the spirit leaves the body at death. But what is that spirit? It can mean no more than the life imparted to man, as well as other living creatures, with the breath. "His breath (Ruah, spirit) goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish."—Psa. cxlvi, 2-4. Is there no sophistry in assuming that that spirit is an immortal soul?

Of the literality of eternal life, promised to believers, I have spoken in my former letter. You think it "really too shocking" to reduce the whole gospel transaction to the work of securing man an eternal existence. If he were to exist in an eternal hell, I should think the same. But the gospel promises, not only an escape from death, and eternal life, but freedom from all the effects of sin and the curse. I see nothing shocking in "glory and honor and immortality."

To the sentiment you utter, near the close of your letter, that you "sincerely hope the effect of this controversy may not be to alienation, but to a union in the truth," I heartily respond, Amen and amen!

Sincerely yours,

R. F. COTTRELL.

Heaven a Location.

"And he shall send Jesus Christ which before was preached unto you; whom the Heaven must receive until the time of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began. For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. Acts iii, 20-22.

"And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven, as he went up behold two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." Acts i, 10, 11.

If it be established that the incarnation of Christ was local, that his crucifixion was local, and that his resurrected body was real, tangible, and local, as the bodies of other men, then it is also established that Heaven,—the Heaven of heavens, the home of ministering spirits, the mansions preparing for the just, has, and all have, a locality somewhere in the boundless creation of space.

Moses heralded the Messiah to the Jews; he was to be like himself, a man. Local, capable of being in but one place at a time; and a prophet whose sayings they should hear "in all things whatsoever." There can

be no spiritualizing here. The holy Bible here is very explicit.

"I go to prepare a place for you; and if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also." John xiv, 2, 3. If we are to hear him, we are to believe him also. How beautifully he associates location here with the promise.

Evasive minds find it convenient to assert, Christ has come; that far back in the remote past, was the judgment! But where is the historical proof? If the Second Advent was at the destruction of Jerusalem, where is the evidence of Josephus upon so striking and wonderful an event! Why should he, and all historians be silent upon a subject so far outstretching Christ's ministry, resurrection, and ascension? On this point, all like them should keep silent till they can find the proof.

Again, Christ comes at death, say some. That is the judgment-day to each and all. Answer. You have seen the lamp of life go out, have closed the sunken eye in death. Did you then see the bright celestial host? did you see Christ as he is? see the melting firmament? see this wicked world renewed, restored? see the glorification of Christ by his own? Literally these have not been. Literally they must be. Without them what is the Bible? What, and where is Christ! What, and where is Heaven?

ETTA BOOTH.

North Ridgeway, N. Y.

The One Talent.

HIDE not thy talent in the earth:—
However small it be,
Its faithful use, its utmost worth,
God will require of thee.

The humblest service rendered here,
He will as truly own,
As Paul's in his exalted sphere,
Or Gabriel's near the throne.

The cup of water kindly given,
The widow's cheerful mites,
Are worthier, in the eyes of Heaven,
Than pride's most costly rites.

His own, which he has lent on trust,
He asks of thee again;
Little or much, the claim is just,
And thine excuses vain.

Go, then, and strive to do thy part—
Though humble it may be,
The ready hand, the willing heart,
Are all Heaven asks of thee.

Take Care.

Do not wound the hearts of those you should shield. "Your anger may sting venomously. Your jealousy may do a mischief in one short hour that your whole life cannot repair. Your cruel pride may do a whole age's work in a day. You cannot take back the injuries you have done to those whose hearts lie throbbing next to yours. Ah! when Winter has frozen my heliotropes, it makes no difference that the next morning thaws them out. There lie the heliotropes, a black noisome heap. And it is possible for you to chill a tender nature so that no thawing can restore it. You may relent, but frost has been there, and you cannot bring back freshness and fragrance to the blossom. You cannot sweeten the embittered heart to which your words have been like scorpions. It is a terrible thing for a man to have the power of poisoning the hearts of others, and yet carry that power carelessly. He cannot find place for repentance, though he seeks it carefully with tears."

UNSANCTIFIED TALENT.—Knowledge and good parts, managed by grace, are like the rod in Moses' hand, wonder-workers, but turn to serpents when they are cast upon the ground, and employed in promoting earthly designs. Learning in religious hearts, like that gold in Israelites' ear-rings, is a most precious ornament; but if men pervert it to base, wicked ends, or begin to make an idol of it as they did a golden calf of their ear-rings, it then becomes an abomination.—*Arrowsmith*.

Don't Make a Fuss.

By all the motives which have weight with man or woman, be adjured, not in any case, to make a fuss. In the first place, it never does a bit of good. You can accomplish all you intend, and obtain all you desire, quite as well without it, if not a little better. Nay, sometimes, it actually prevents your succeeding, where you certainly might have done so, had you kept cool, and not forewarned and forearmed everybody by a cannonade.

In the second place, it is exceedingly annoying to others; there is neither peace nor comfort in the neighborhood of a fusser. He is always plaguing you to know if you think it will rain next week, when he is going to the white mountains; or dreading that the cars will run off the track, or the omnibuses break down, or the hotels be crowded, or some such imaginary trouble, ever so long beforehand. And, when fairly started on such an excursion, a fusser destroys all the comfort and enjoyment of his unfortunate companions, and makes his own fancied torments real ones to them. Therefore his company is sedulously avoided.

Thirdly, no one sympathizes with a fusser. Even other fusers have no fellow-feeling with it. The word (and a most expressive one it is,) means worrying over trifles; and who cares a straw if Mrs. Briggs did lose her handbox, which contained her French bonnet? or if Mr. Brown's bedroom was invaded by a shaggy dog that wouldn't go out, so that it quite worried him to death, and made him quite nervous, as he pathetically declares? Nobody cares whether you or I could not sleep because the rats run over our heads all night, or because we had such startled dreams, or such a bad pain in our shoulder, etc. People don't like to have their sympathies appealed to for such nonsense.

Fourthly, it is decidedly vulgar and incompatible with the dignity of a true lady or gentleman. It was an apt remark that a well-bred hostess will not move a muscle, even when John upsets the best china.

The Scoffer Silenced.

AN infidel from Louisiana saw, in a steamboat on the Mississippi, a minister whom he heard deliver a discourse on infidelity. Gathering his associates to the table, he began to tell hard things about religion and religious people, the Bible and its ministers. The minister said nothing.

At length the infidel came up, and suddenly slapping him on the shoulder, said—

"Old fellow, what do you think of these things?"

"Do you see that beautiful landscape?"

"Yes."

"If you were to send out a dove he would pass over it, see and delight in all that was beautiful and lovely; but if you were to send out a buzzard, he would see nothing to fix his attention, unless he could find some rotten carcass, loathsome to all other animals; on it he would light and gloat with exquisite pleasure."

"Do you mean to compare me to a buzzard?"

"I made no allusion to you."

The disciple of Tom Paine walked off in confusion, and was called buzzard the rest of the passage.—*Ex.*

A Walf.

God's children are never orphaned. He lives, they live. He calls them 'sons' and they learn to say 'Our Father which art in Heaven.' In-breathed the spirit of adoption, hence no 'creature' (Rom. viii, 39:) can dissolve the relationship. Why then should faith fail ever, why not always cry in joyful trust, my Father? God's love in Christ to us ward! Blessedest mystery, tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril, sword, death, life, angels, principalities, powers, present things or future, height, depth, nor anything else there be—shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord! Rom. viii, 35. Sure here is fullness! Certainly here is safety! God's love is hedged with triple covenants. Yea and amen are his seal, and he who trusts, receives. God's sons are fatherless never. Our Father from everlasting to everlasting; the same yesterday, to-day and forever! Believe and be happy.—H. L. T. in *Herald of Gospel Liberty*.

The Review and Herald.

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

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1865.

URIAH SMITH, EDITOR.

Theology a Little Confused.

An eastern paper lately contained the following item:

"I am young, but I must die;
In my grave I soon shall lie;
Am I ready now to go,
If the will of God be so?"

"Ah! that was the last Sabbath sweet little Nellie ever spent there. Two Sundays thereafter she was sleeping in Jesus, with the angels of Heaven singing the praises as her soul reposed in holiness."

To those who are well-informed on the teachings of the Bible in reference to the state of man in death, the above extract speaks for itself; to those who are not, we propose to speak for it. The poetry expresses what is to many a great and solemn truth, and is in sentiment correct. But how is it with the few lines of comment that follow? We think it would be difficult to get a greater number of inconsistencies, to use no stronger word, into so small a compass.

The writer first launches out upon the expression, "sleeping in Jesus," which is Bible, and so far all correct. But he goes on, "with the angels of Heaven." What! are the angels "sleeping in Jesus?" We have not been accustomed to contemplate Heaven as a place where such a state of things existed. We have supposed that the angelic inhabitants of Heaven were all alive with a conscious and joyful activity, not silent and still in inglorious sleep. But the writer continues, "singing the praises." Here he draws largely again on our astonishment; and we are compelled to ask in wonder, Do people sing praises while they are asleep? We believe it is not usual. We think there would be too much uncertain sound and incoherent sense. "Some people, we know, are accustomed to talk in their sleep, and such, now-a-days seems to be a great share of the popular talk concerning man in death; but singing in that state is still more rare; and we cannot believe it is the plan of Heaven to look for praise to beings in such a condition.

It may be said that it is the body only which sleeps in Jesus, the soul being conscious and singing the praises. But the writer stops up that crevice by his next declaration which is, "as her soul reposed in holiness." The poor body cannot be brought in to free the matter from difficulty here; for the soul is said to be reposing, and hence could not at the same time be singing praises. So whether it is the soul or the body to which the writer refers, it is either asleep in Jesus, or reposing in holiness, and at the same time singing praises with the angels of Heaven, whom we must infer from his manner of expression, are asleep in Jesus also.

We showed the above extract, a few days since, to a staunch believer in the popular, but unscriptural doctrine of consciousness in death, with the inquiry if there was not a little discrepancy between the ideas of sleeping in Jesus, and at the same time singing praises. He said it was difficult to express the whole idea upon this subject, in one sentence; and in this we agree with him exactly, that is, understanding by the whole idea the popular view. The idea is, he continued, that the body was sleeping in the grave, while the soul was praising God in Heaven. We suggested that then the poetry was a little out of joint: "In my grave I soon shall lie;" for the pronoun "I" must refer to whatever there was about the person that was intelligent or conscious. He said no more; but we hope he will examine this subject till he is led to embrace a view for which he can, in the language of Peter, give a reason with meekness and fear.

To carry out the full idea as generally entertained, which our friend thought so difficult to express in one sentence, the poetry should read something like this:

"I am young, but my body must die;
In the grave, my body, while
my soul is conscious and soars
away to sing praises with the angels
in Heaven, soon shall lie."

We confess that this does not materially help the poetry, nor indeed the truthfulness of the sentiment. Why will not people come to the Bible on this question? Why will they not believe what Solomon said, when contrasting the living and the dead, he declared that the living know that they shall die, but the dead know not anything. If Solomon has told us the truth, that which has knowledge when a person is living, knows not anything when the same person is dead. There is no evading this declaration; and what can men require more plain, simple or direct?

But we must be patient. The agitation is going forward; we will be thankful for this. We hold no views, but such as challenge examination. And while we urge the truth upon our friends, let us do it with gentleness, meekness, and a Christian spirit, and pray that it may be blessed to the enlightening of professors, and the conversion of sinners; for it is only through the truth, upon this as well as all other subjects, that a person can, after the light has come forth upon them, be sanctified and saved.

My Condition.

A TERRIBLE blow has fallen upon me, from the results of which I am still a great sufferer. On the 16th of August I was stricken with partial paralysis, which shocked my brain, and caused my right hand to fall by my side destitute of feeling and strength. And although this stroke did not take me from my feet, it terribly shocked my nerves.

At first I could command but one word in the English language, namely, *pray*. This I could speak to my wife and the Christian friends present. After a short season of prayer, I could raise my arm with ease, but could not move my fingers. In a few days, however, these began to return to their usual condition, and have been nearly as natural as those on the other hand.

For three weeks I was confined to my bed, nearly all the time a great sufferer from extreme nervousness, want of sleep, excessive sweating, and then chills. During this time I lost fifteen pounds of flesh. The care and attention I received day and night from Bro. U. Smith and wife, Bro. Amadon and wife, Bro. M. J. Cornell and wife, my own family, especially my dear wife, was most tender and kind. Other dear friends of the church manifested a most Christian and liberal interest for my welfare. May God bless all these dear friends, and if I am not able to compensate them here, may they find a reward in Heaven to be bestowed on them by the Lord for their care for his suffering servant.

Since I have been at "Our Home" I have taken rather heroic treatment. This, with loss of sleep, and my extreme nervous condition, has reduced me in weight and strength. This is said to be necessary to a permanent restoration. Since my sickness I have lost in all about twenty-five pounds.

I have enjoyed many free and happy seasons of prayer with those who have prayed with me and for me, and on the day appointed for fasting and prayer in my behalf, was very happy, hopeful, and free in the Lord. I enjoy with my faithful wife three seasons of prayer each day, that God in his own good time will raise me to health.

During my sickness I have been examining my life closely. I thank God that the best of my life has been spent in his service. But in the stormy trials of the past, since I have been connected with the cause of present truth, I see that I have not always trusted in God as I should have done, and drawn from him that rich grace which would have been sufficient to have filled me with consolation every hour. False-hearted men have grieved me, and I have too often cherished a feeling of murmuring against them. This has cast a gloom over my own spirit, when if I had endured the trials as I should have done I might have enjoyed the sunlight of Heaven.

In order to enter Heaven I must be an overcomer, and if my present afflictions are designed of the Lord to refine me as gold, and prepare me for greater usefulness here, and the rich reward of the overcomer hereafter, I should kiss the rod which has smitten me. From the very depths of my soul I can say, The Lord

doeth all things well. I expect that God will hear the prayers of his people and raise me up. Self and wife hopefully join with the thousands of dear friends who are praying for us.

I commenced to write this statement with my own hand that eleven weeks to-morrow morning fell paralyzed by my side, but my strength failed and Eld. Loughborough finishes as I in weakness dictate to him. I have no idea of entering any department of labor whatever sooner than six months from the present time. Rest is my due, and I must have it, and shall take it. For seventeen years I have labored excessively, generally seven days of each week. The number of hours that I have labored during most of my Office life, for each day, have been double what they should have been. My wife is worn as badly as myself, and with the exception of the shock I have received, is in no better condition than myself. We must have rest, and the benefit of all the means for the restoration of health available. In due time we hope to come forth with new vigor to work temperately for God. We ask all those who have faith in God, to pray in faith for our speedy restoration.

Let no one think for a moment that we shall turn aside from our purpose, even when we are raised in a degree to health, to answer their objections to what we have taught. We have done our duty in the fear of God, and leave the result with him fill he in his providence leads us to the work again. In his own good time the Lord will make all these matters plain to those who have a heart to believe. Skeptics and infidels see a thousand contradictions and errors in the Bible. God don't compel them to believe, but gives the doubter the privilege of doubting at pleasure, and we never expect to be able to make all things in our past teaching so plain as to compel every professed Sabbath-keeper to believe.

Satan no doubt will think that this is a fine time to hurry on certain ones to raise and talk their doubts and make distraction if possible; these will have a chance to fulfill all the desire of their hearts in the field of doubt. We would say to the numerous friends in Iowa, God sent us in your midst last June to check the wide-sweeping rebellion and fanaticism that was raging among you. You then had evidence of the right, for which you will have to give an account. That terrible conflict did very much to bring me where I now am. I from my heart forgive the erring, and would say to the true-hearted and good in that State, we need your prayers and sympathy.

God is doing a great work for me, every day discovers to me new imperfections in my Christian life, and brings me nearer to my Saviour. My dear wife is wonderfully sustained in strength, in hope, in faith, and in courage in the Lord.

JAMES WHITE.

"Our Home," Dansville, N. Y., Oct. 31, 1865.

Which Was Written Latest, the Book of Revelation, or Gospel of John?

It is generally supposed (probably from the order of the books,) that the Apocalypse closed the canon of inspiration. This is sometimes urged as an argument by those who oppose the perpetuity of spiritual gifts. Such quote Rev. xxii, 18: "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book." But however plausible this view may seem, it is quite apparent that it will not abide the test of a close investigation. Our attention was called to this interesting subject several years since, and since that time we have been surprised to witness the amount of evidence, which from time to time has been thrown in our way, against the book of Revelation being the last addition to the New Testament canon. We find by examination that the gospel of John, (perhaps also John's epistles) and not the book of Revelation, was the last product of the inspired penman.

There is another interesting thought connected with this subject, viewed in the light of the Sabbath question. It is said by our First-day friends, that Sunday, at the time the book of Revelation was written, had obtained the general title of "Lord's day." Rev. i, 10. If this was the general title of Sunday, doubtless

the same apostle would address it by the same name in all subsequent writings. But in the gospel of John, written after the Revelation, we find him speaking in historical language, and there he calls it "the first day of the week." John xx, 1. This would show the futility of attempting to erect a Sunday fabric on the term "Lord's day."

Having made these introductory remarks, we will now state our authorities for not believing that the Revelation was the last written book of the Bible. The reader can judge of their respectability and value for himself.

1. The Comprehensive Bible, published by Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia, with a lengthy introduction, tables, chronological index, philological and explanatory notes, in its preface to the gospel of John, says: "After the death of Mary, the mother of Christ, which is supposed to have taken place about fifteen years after the crucifixion, and probably after the council held in Jerusalem A. D. 49 or 50, at which John was present, he is said by ecclesiastical writers to have proceeded to Asia Minor, where he founded and presided over seven churches, in as many cities, but chiefly resided at Ephesus. Then he was banished by the emperor Domitian, in the fifteenth year of his reign, A. D. 95, to the Isle of Patmos, in the Ægean Sea, where he wrote the apocalypsc. Rev. i, 9. On the accession of Nerva the following year, he was recalled from exile, and returned to Ephesus, where he wrote his gospel and epistles, and died in the 100th year of his age, about A. D. 100, and in the third year of the emperor Trajan."

2. "The Annual," a neat and commodious edition of the Scriptures, published by Woodford & Co., New York, gives the same time for writing the Gospel of John as the Comprehensive Bible; namely, after the apostle returned from Patmos. This locates the Revelation in A. D. 96 or 97, and the Gospel 97 or 98.

3. Barnes' Notes, in the preface to John's Gospel, after stating the opinions of learned men on the time of its publication, says: "The common opinion is, that it was written at Ephesus, after his return from Patmos, and of course as late as the year 97 or 98."

4. An edition of the Bible published by Ivison & Phinney, New York, containing the apocrypha, with Cantine's notes and references, also various tables, and a chronological index, in the latter says: "A. D. 96, St. John is banished into the Isle of Patmos, by Domitian, and there receives and writes his revelation. After the death of Domitian, John returns to Ephesus and writes his Gospel."

5. Nevin's Biblical Antiquities, by John W. Nevin, D. D., in a chronological scheme giving the authorship, time, and place, of writing the various books of the New Testament, locates John's writings as follows: "Book of Revelation, Asia Minor, A. D. 96. Three epistles of John, 96 to 100. Gospel according to John, 96 to 100." Page 446.

6. The Domestic Bible, edited by Rev. Ingram Cobbin, with numerous illustrations and copious notes, in the preface to John's Gospel says: "John was the brother of James, whom Herod beheaded. Acts xii, 2. He wrote about A. D. 97, having chiefly in view to record such miracles and discourses as most clearly displayed the character, office, and divine nature of the Saviour. His gospel supplies what the other evangelists omitted."

7. The Cottage Bible, edited by Rev. Wm. Patton, and published by Case, Lockwood & Co., Hartford, Conn., with Practical Expositions and Explanatory Notes, adopts the idea that the Gospel of John was written subsequent to the Revelation. As the language is the same as that already quoted from the Comprehensive Bible, we need not repeat it.

8. The Mine Explored; or Help to the Reading of the Bible, published by the American Sunday School Union, p. 281, says: "John probably wrote his gospel after the year 97." And then again a little onward it states, "This gospel was probably written the last of all the books of the Bible, and more than fifty years after the gospel of Matthew."

9. The Biblical Reason Why, a general Hand-book for Bible students, p. 131, reads as follows: "John was bishop of Ephesus. Being called to Rome, he was condemned by the emperor Domitian to be cast alive into a cauldron of boiling oil; but being miraculously

preserved, and coming out more fresh and vigorous than he entered in, he was banished to the Isle of Patmos. Here he was favored with visions which form the subject of the book of Revelation. After Domitian's death, St. John returned to Ephesus, wrote his gospel about the year 98, and died A. D. 100."

10. Olshausen's Commentary. This much distinguished German critic, although in some respects he differs from most other commentators on this question, in Vol. ii, p. 296, says: "The contents, no less than the form of the Apocalypse, indicate that its composition was earlier than that of the Gospel." And again, "Between the composition of the Apocalypse and that of the Gospel, however, a period of some length seems to have elapsed."

11. Horne's Introduction. This voluminous writer, Vol. ii, p. 314, remarks: "John was banished to the Isle of Patmos towards the close of Domitian's reign, where he wrote his Revelation. On his liberation from exile, by the accession of Nerva to the imperial throne, he returned to Ephesus, where he wrote his Gospel and Epistles, and died in the hundredth year of his age." And again he says, "We have strong evidence from the contents and design of the gospel itself, that it was not written until the year 97."

12. The Paragraph Bible, issued by the London Religious Tract Society, in the preface to the gospel by John, says: "According to the general testimony of ancient writers, John wrote his gospel at Ephesus, about the year 97."

13, and last, Hale's Sacred Chronology. This celebrated chronologist puts down the gospel of John, in the year A. D. 97, after the apostle's return from Patmos, and argues with some warmth against those who contend for an earlier date. Dr. Hale's testimony on any point of chronology would be entitled to great weight, because chronology was his study. His remarks against the theory that the Gospel of John was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, are a complete upsetter to that scheme. (Vol. iii, p. 25.)

We have several other testimonies in our possession, which testify that John wrote the gospel after the Revelation, but it is not necessary to present them. Among the ancients who favor this position are Irenæus, Theodoret, Epiphanius, Jerome, St. Augustine, Eusebius, and Chrysostom; and among moderns, are Dr. Mill, Fabricius, LeClerc, Morer, Bertholdt, Bishop Tomline, and Mr. Jones, in addition to others previously mentioned. We might also refer to the "Bible Text Book," of the Am. Tract Society, the "Union Bible Dictionary," of the Am. Sunday School Union, the "Religious Encyclopedia," "Watson's Bible Dictionary," "Dictionary of the Holy Bible," by the Am. Tract Society, and various editions of the Bible, and New Testament, which we have examined, and all of which decidedly, in one way or another, sustain the view we have presented.

With such testimonies, is it any wonder, then, that the writer believes that the Gospel by John was written after the book of Revelation? G.

Hard Questions for Spiritualists.

The following tough questions for Spiritualists, are from a believer in the phenomena, but who is disgusted with the libidinous tendencies of that sect. The article is from a little tract just sown broadcast, by Wm. B. Potter, M. D., of Philadelphia, who hopes thereby to warn the world, and reform his "erring brethren." The extract speaks for itself. If what Dr. Potter says is correct, Spiritualism truly must be a vile thing. The italic is his. G.

"Why don't every one receive communications from friends or relatives in spirit life? We are told that our friends and relatives think more of us and are more anxious for our welfare than when with us in earth life. Why don't our friends control mediums and rap, tip or write out communications and order them sent to us? If our friends cannot control mediums, why don't they get those spirits that do control to communicate for them? Instead of all getting communications from friends in this way, why is it that not one person in ten thousand gets a communication unless

he goes or sends to the medium for it? In thousands of instances a few words from the mother would save the daughter from the snares of the seducer, or the son from ruin; in such cases why don't the parent seek some medium and give the warning? Why do our friends when communicating, so rarely give names? Cannot a spirit control a medium's hand to write a name as readily as a personal description that may apply to a score of persons? Why do spirits so often object to giving tests and so frequently fail when they attempt it? Why have they failed to convince ninetenths of those who have witnessed the manifestations? If Spiritualism is such a great blessing, and spirits are so anxious to convince mankind, why don't they give the foreign news in advance of the steamers, or give tests to our professors of science? Why have spirits when treating questions of science given so much that is fanciful, foolish and false? Why have so many of the mediums been persons of low characters? Why have Negroes, Indians, and inferior races had so much of spirit manifestations, while enlightened nations have had so little, until within the last sixteen years? Why was "seeking unto spirits that murmur and peep" forbidden under the Mosaic dispensation? Why are we told under the Christian dispensation to "try the spirits?" Why have so many of the mediums left husband or wife, or been guilty of gross immoralities? Why have all the spiritual papers that have exposed "Free-Lovers" failed to pay expenses? Why have notorious "Free-Lovers" and libertines been special and honored correspondents of spiritual papers? Why has spiritual literature been so full of "Free-Love," and "whatever is, is right" theories and teachings? Why did the Committee of the National Spiritual Convention at Chicago report a plan of National Organization, with a special provision that no charge should ever be entertained against any member, and that any Spiritualist without any regard to moral character might become a member? Why did the National Spiritual Convention at Philadelphia, which has just closed, accept notorious libertines as delegates? Why did its committee refuse to even read a proposition to disfellowship notorious, persistent, and habitual libertines? Why was a proposition by a speaker to welcome a delegate from perdition, or Satan himself, received with applause? Why do Spiritualists generally refuse to disfellowship "Free-Lovers?" Why has Spiritualism broken up hundreds of families and become noted for "Free-Love" and Affinity-Hunting? Why have the better class of communications always taught us not to trust spirit communications, but to rely on our own reason and conscience? Why has dealing with spirits in all ages and countries tended to immorality and licentiousness, unless counteracted by the purest virtue or the strongest religious principles? Why so much flattery, so many contradictions, so much about spheres and Psychology, and so much that is merely thought reading, in spirit communications?"

For the N. Y. Independent.

"A Very Materialistic Christianity."

MR. EDITOR:—In your paper of Aug. 10, I notice an article with the above heading, in which you attempt the portraiture of a certain people with whom you lately met in a "remote settlement of the West." From some of the features in your description, it seems quite possible the people alluded to may be the people with whom I have the honor of being connected; but, if so, your attempted portraiture is, in some respects, a mere caricature. I therefore ask the privilege of a brief reply, through your columns, that your readers may be better informed respecting us as a people. Your sense of justice cannot deny us the privilege of answering for ourselves, since your opportunities of gaining a knowledge of us have doubtless been quite limited, and the channels of your information may have been corrupted by prejudice. I am truly glad, however, that we have been noticed in the Independent, for the work in which we are engaged was not intended to be done in a corner.

You speak of our work, if indeed we are the people, as "a singular movement in the way of proselytism." Proselytism is no reproach, if men are proselyted from error to truth, and from disobedience to duty. This

was the work of the first apostles and has been the work of the true church in every succeeding age. And as for singularity, the preaching of the truth has always seemed more or less singular; and had John the Baptist lived and preached his message in our times, he would probably have acquired the appellation of a "back-woods orator."

You are mistaken in regard to the place of the publication of our periodical. Our paper is published at Battle Creek, Michigan, Eld. James White being the President of our publishing association, and not as you have it in Boston—"the source of so much light to our country."

We do not teach that "the soul sleeps with the body in the grave." We believe, that man is a unit—that soul and body are not separate beings; but that it takes the whole body soul and spirit, if you please, to constitute a living man or soul. The living man became subject to death on account of sin, no part being exempt, and there is no remedy but the resurrection. "If the dead rise not, then they that have fallen asleep in Christ are perished." See 1 Cor. xv, 16-18.

You represent us as teaching "that the final Heaven of the saints is to be a sort of Garden of Eden restored; with all its material and voluptuous delights." You must be aware that the Scriptures promise a restitution—a new Heavens and a new earth—and also the resurrection of the body. And where is the evidence that a resurrected, spiritual body is immaterial—that it has not "flesh and bones" as our Lord had after his resurrection? Why should material men sigh for immateriality? Can we not, while we are here in our fleshly bodies, worship God in spirit and in truth? Some such true worshipers were on the earth in the time of our Saviour; for he says, "But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth." We need not become immaterial in order to worship God aright.

You continue: "The wicked, they hold, in default of being raised from the dead, are annihilated, their bodies being literally burnt up in the fires of the final conflagration, and becoming ashes under the feet of the righteous; a sort of manure, we suppose, to increase the fertility of the paradisiacal soil, &c. Now since it is Bible language that the wicked shall be burned up root and branch, and be ashes under the feet of God's people, does not your jeering comment savor too much of scoffing at the Scriptures themselves? In all candor I ask you to reflect on this.

But if you are not mistaken concerning the people you describe—if they hold that the wicked will be burned up, "in default of being raised from the dead," I assure you we are not the people. We have no fellowship with the denial that "there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." We hold that the wicked will be raised from the dead, and will be punished for the deeds done here in the body, and none can more heartily condemn the opposing heresy than we.

Your second paragraph I quote entire, as follows: "Saturday as the only lawful Sabbath is a great practical item in their faith. It is the seventh day from creation, and the great crime of the Christian world is the observance of the first day of the week. This is the mark of the beast; this is the Babylon out of which the people are exhorted to escape. As this new religion is wholly materialistic, of course an outward or literal day is more to it than faith, repentance and holiness. Its advocates are too ignorant to entertain the question as to whether Saturday is really the seventh day from creation, or whether those seven days may not have been geological periods. They are innocent of all such investigations."

All the world—Jews, Christians and Mohammedans, are agreed in the numbering of the days of the week. The Saviour recognized the day the Jews were observing as the true Sabbath of the commandment which refers us for its origin to the creation; and there has been too much contention since that time concerning the respective claims of the seventh-day and the first, too many religiously observing, during the middle ages, each of these two days—for the true reckoning of the week to be lost. The commandment still says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Are we under no obligations to heed it? You

speak of it as "an outward or literal day." Is not the first day as much? in behalf of which so many so-called Sabbath conventions are being called in these days, to promote its better observance, if not to enforce it.

This literal day is more, you say, to our "wholly materialistic" religion than faith, repentance and holiness. What is faith, but believing the testimony of God's word? What is repentance, but turning away from sin which is the transgression of the law? And what is holiness, but obedience to the same divine law? We teach that men should repent of their Sabbath-breaking as well as every other sin. And it is in vain to claim holiness of heart, if we are unwilling outwardly to obey the ten commandments.

It is a cheap way to dispose of those who plead for reform, to affect to despise them on account of their ignorance. Did you imagine that your suggestion as to whether Saturday, is really the seventh day from creation, was something new to us? or that we knew nothing of the "oppositions of science, falsely so called?" We knew that open infidels array the pretended revelations of geology against the records of the Bible. But I would not like to see a Christian encourage infidelity, by engaging in a similar work. The several geological periods of the creation week consisted each of an "evening and a morning," the evening being darkness or night, and the morning, light or day; and upon the fourth day the sun was set to rule these geological periods, dividing the light from the darkness, and it has faithfully performed the task assigned ever since.

The preaching of truth, ever since the days of Him who "came not to send peace on earth, but a sword," has divided neighborhoods and families, as you say this Sabbath preaching is doing. But the fault is not in the truth, nor in the faithful preaching of it, but in those who reject and oppose it.

Concerning the report that "The noisiest work is generally reserved by these Sabbatarians for the first day of the week," I have heard it reiterated so often for the last forty years that it seems to me too stale for repetition. I have been conversant with Seventh-day Baptists for that length of time, and with Seventh-day Adventists some fifteen years, and have never known the report to be true in one instance. But I have frequently known noisy work postponed to another day, solely out of regard to the feelings of our first-day neighbors, and to avoid all occasion for the repetition of this slanderous report. This courtesy I have never known, on their part, an effort to reciprocate.

Be pleased candidly to review our position and yours, with a view to ascertain which are "the most fatal errors which ever corrupted the church and encouraged infidelity"—whether they are with those who contend for a strict adherence to the letter and spirit of the word of God, or with those who favor the prevailing customs and traditions, and contend that literal obedience is non-essential—claiming to worship God "in spirit," while his "truth" is ignored, if not repudiated.

Very respectfully yours,

R. F. COTRELL.

Olcott, N. Y., Sept. 1, 1865.

The Contrast.

God does, Satan undoes; God creates, Satan destroys; God builds, Satan tears down; God enlightens, Satan darkens the mind.

God gives strength, Satan weakens the body and mind; God is good, Satan is evil; God is righteous and holy, Satan is unrighteous and unholy; God is pure, Satan is vile; God is the Creator, Satan is a created being; God is independent, Satan is dependent.

God delights in conferring happiness, Satan delights in making others miserable; God restores the erring and the wanderer, Satan is in raptures at the success he has in bewildering the lost and straying. God dwells in unapproachable light, amid the hosts of angels, who are ever happy in his presence; Satan is ever in chains of darkness, reserved to his final doom, made more bitter by the hosts of demons that surround him, and all their misery enhanced by the thought that their own pride brought them down from Paradise.

God is happy in his own righteousness, without a stain of injustice upon him; happy in the thought of

the happiness and joy his hand confers upon his creatures, who not only in Heaven, but throughout the wide universe, attest to his goodness. Satan is miserable with his millions of sharp goads, which, like so many venomous stings, ply his conscience and render him desperate and raging in his hopeless career.

If Satan is as dependent for his existence as the merest worm, why did God permit him to prolong his rebellion for thousands of years, why permit him to soil the Garden of Eden with his filthy presence, and there make others as miserable as himself?

When Satan fell, he had not yet fully demeaned himself to the lowest scale of wickedness; evil had not yet been developed; angels had not yet witnessed the debasing consequences of sin; sin and disobedience were not yet fully appreciated, even by angels; the influence of sin upon the moral and physical constitution of men and angels had not been witnessed, Satan stood up as yet only as a fallen angel; yet noble and kingly, yet an angel, with strong desires for a restoration to his former home.

Time has fully developed the nature of pride and selfishness, and has manifested the true and unfailing results of sin.

Satan and his angels are no more the noble beings who fell from Heaven, and man is no more the beautiful angelic man as he came from the hands of his Creator.

Everywhere are spread out before us, evidences of his fall; the prison filled with felons too corrupt for innocence to gaze upon; the asylums for deaf, dumb, blind, idiotic, and insane; the general lack of benevolent qualities in mankind, and in many branches of the human race the utter ruin of mind and body, all tell the same tale of woe and sin.

With such a monument to the memory of pride and rebellion, the universe will ever be safe when its author and abettor, with his helpers, are all consigned to oblivion.

JOSEPH CLARKE.

The Bible Rule of Interpretation.

"Knowing this first, that no prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation." 2 Peter i, 20.

It has often been said that the Bible "is like a fiddle," many tunes can be played, and many changes and variations can be made upon it. So we are told that we can prove most any doctrine by the Bible to suit our own notion or convenience. But let us look at this in the light of reason and revelation. There is a discrepancy somewhere; it must be one of two things: either God has failed to give us a perfect rule, inspiration has failed to point out a direct and an unbroken chain of prophecy, and a code of laws, which leads to the promotion of man's highest interest, and which will enable the professed followers of our Lord Jesus Christ, to "come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God," or else the great mass of religionists have failed to come up to the great standard rule of Bible interpretation which God has given, and are trying to work their passage by bringing the Bible to their own standard of interpretation; thus causing discord, disunion, and isms among the professed followers of Jesus Christ. I am satisfied the latter position is correct.

We believe the Bible should be its own interpreter, and should be taken in its most plain and literal sense, when it can be done without destroying the harmony of its several parts. Bible truth is a unit, and in viewing it from all its various stand-points, we find that the ways leading from each of these stand-points, converge toward one common centre; and when united form a perfect whole.

All the inspired writers, from Moses down to the last sacred penman, are in unison in relation to the great plan of human redemption. Those writers were not dictated by human wisdom, but by the Holy Ghost. "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Pet. i, 21.

Again, let us hear Paul: "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me, is not after man: For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the Revelation of Jesus Christ." Gal. i, 11, 12. But let us here inquire into the reason

why men have lowered the standard of Christianity and Bible truth, and have departed from God, the fountain of living waters. We answer, it is the way which they have been educated, which has been upon false premises. The case of the apostle Paul will bear upon this important point. We understand that he was brought up at the feet of the learned Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect manner and law of the fathers, and with authority from the chief priests. He punished the saints, and compelled them to blaspheme, and persecuted them even unto strange cities, and he verily thought he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth; but after he was converted, and the scales fell from his eyes, his educational influence was turned, and he became a mighty and strong man in the truth of God.

It is a fact worthy of note, that from the earliest period of the gospel church down to the present time, the common people who have not had the advantages of an education, have more easily and readily embraced the gospel, from the fact that they have not been influenced by educational prejudices. The poet has well said,

"'Tis education forms the tender mind,
Just as the twig is bent, the tree's inclined."

Since the rise of the Advent doctrine, and especially since the proclamation of the third angel's message, there has been a class of individuals who have looked away from the great mass of corrupt teaching and false interpretation, and have learned to let the Bible stand as its own expositor. The Bible is no more to them a "sealed book;" its rich treasures are unlocked, and said the angel to Daniel, "But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end; many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. Many shall be purified, made white and tried: but the wicked shall do wickedly, and none of the wicked shall understand, but the wise shall understand." Dan. xii, 4, 10.

God will lead his people, when they take his unerring word for their guide.

F. GOULD.

Stowe, Vt.

Strong Faith and a Clear Sky.

THE Scriptures plainly teach us that it is our duty and privilege to pray for the things which we need, with the expectation of receiving them. This truth is taught in such texts as these: "He shall deliver the needy when he crieth; the poor, also, and him that hath no helper." Psa. lxxii, 12. "And it shall come to pass before they call, I will answer; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear." Isa. lxxv, 24. "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him." James i, 5. Doubts and spiritual darkness are the natural visitants of the prayerless heart; they abide in the gloom of moral night, uncheered and unhelmed by the bright beams of heavenly light. But prayer, effectual, fervent prayer, awakens and strengthens faith. Faith removes clouds and darkness, as well as mountains, and gives the soul a clear sky. The disciples of Jesus realized the benefits of prayer in strengthening their faith, when they so ardently and fervently prayed, "Lord increase our faith." And when that poor despairing medicant exclaimed, "Lord, I believe, help thou mine unbelief," he not only felt the need of prayer to strengthen his faith, but happily realized its benefits in bringing into exercise a patience of faith, which grappled with the mountain difficulty before him, and removed it. He that prays much, will have strong faith, will be little troubled with doubts, clouds, and darkness. And he that is delivered from clouds and darkness, must live in the bright sunshine of a clear sky.

A praying man will be a faithful man, a spiritual man, a happy man, a holy man, and one fruitful in all that is good. And by frequent converse with an all-intelligent and benevolently instructive God, he secures a thorough knowledge of what is most important for man to know. Who then, that would possess the valuable treasure of these graces, will fail to secure them, seeing they may be obtained upon such easy terms—simply asking. Let all remember that the ef-

fectual, fervent prayer of a sincere and upright heart, is a currency that always passes readily at the storehouse of Heaven, and will bring in exchange, the choicest and best of Heaven's blessings. And he that would be rich in blessings, full of faith, and walk in a clear sky, should pray always, with all prayer and supplication in the spirit, realizing that the Lord Jesus Christ is the all in all of his redeemed. In every want, He is their friend; in every danger, He is their defense; in weakness, He is their strength; in sorrow, their joy; in pain, their peace; in poverty, their provider; in sickness, their physician; in hunger, their bread; in trouble, their consolation; in perplexity, their counselor; in the furnace, their refiner; in the flood, their rock; in assaults, their refuge; in accusations, their advocate; in debt, their surety; in slavery, their ransom; in captivity, their deliverer; in the day, their sun; in the night, their keeper; in the desert, their Shepherd; in life, He is their hope; in death, their life; in the grave, their resurrection; in Heaven, their glory! Therefore let us draw nigh unto Him, who is all in all for time and for eternity, and he will shelter us in the day of his fierce anger.

LYDIA JANE SHAW.

Strykersville, N. Y.

"Come and See." John i, 46.

Jesus, dear name, how sweet it sounds
Replete with balm for all my wounds,
"His word declares His grace is free,
Come, needy sinner, come and see.

He left the shining courts on high,
Came to our world to bleed and die,
Jesus, our Saviour bled for thee;
Come, thoughtless sinner, come and see.

Your sins did pierce his bleeding heart,
"Till death had done its dreadful part,
Yet his dear love still burns to thee;
Come, trembling sinner, come and see.

His blood will cleanse the foulest stain,
And make the filthy leper clean,
His fountain open stands for thee;
Come, guilty sinner, come and see.

The garments of his shining grace,
His glorious robe of righteousness;
In this array thou bright shalt be;
Come, naked sinner, come and see.

No tongue can tell what glories shine,
In our Immanuel all divine;
Oh, that in sweetest melody
Each heart may sing, "He died for me."

Report from Bro. Taylor.

Oct. 4, Bro. Goodwin took me in his wagon, and we started for my appointment at Roosevelt. We stopped that night with Bro. Arnold, where I enjoyed my first visit with this dear family. It was very pleasant. I also had the privilege of working at my trade, (husking corn,) in the barn, where the second State Conference of S. D. Adventists was held. There were sacred thoughts in the remembrance of it. The next day we passed on to Bro. Edson's. Here we saw a living witness of the goodness and power of God. When I last saw Bro. E., he was confined to the house, and much of the time to the bed, with feeble voice, and fast sinking into the grave. Now he is up, around the house, out on the farm, about the town, with voice strong and clear. During the two days' meeting he was with us, and gave his full and hearty testimony for the truth. The Lord has done a great work for this church. I hope they will learn how to possess their vessel in sanctification and honor.

Returned to Oswego after the meeting. Took the boat Monday morning, in company with Bro. S. B. Whitney, for Rochester. Stopped at Bro. Andrews'. Had a sweet heavenly time talking, singing, and praying. Left the next morning for Dansville, to see and hear for two days. I was enjoying myself very well, in the society of the brethren there, when I was informed of the sickness of my family, and immediately returned home, regretting that I could not attend the Conference.

On reaching my family, I found my two remaining

children down with the diphtheria, and my wife much worn with watching and anxiety. In less than a week we were called to lay them both in the grave, one on each side of little Hiram. Three little graves mark a sacred spot on this earth; no place more so.

By this affliction we are left childless, yet we would not stop to weep and mourn beyond reason, at the sad work of disease and death; his work is most done, and the strong man armed will soon spoil him of his goods. Another tie binds us to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. In laying them away, we have the sweet consolation that we have done what we could, to prepare them for the coming kingdom; that we have used diligence and perseverance, and had the satisfaction of seeing them growing up, loving virtue, and saying they did not want to play with children that used bad language, &c. They bowed and prayed with us around the family altar. Thomas loved the Instructor, and read it carefully; and although his mind was young, he could grasp and comprehend many Bible truths. He was not afraid to die. Said he, a short time before he died, "There will be no diphtheria in Heaven."

C. O. TAYLOR.

Adams' Centre, Oct. 23, 1865.

Wanted.

BRO. WHITE: I would like to inquire through the Review where I could find a good home among Sabbath-keepers for two children, a boy and girl; the youngest, a boy, aged five, and the girl, nine years, where they can have the privilege of Sabbath-School, and good instructions at home, and where they will be taught the truths of the third angel's message. Their own dear mother died last April. Since then they have lived where the Sabbath of the Lord is not observed, and I feel that I am not doing my duty toward my God and my children.

I will make a fair recompense for their food, clothing, and care. If any one will instruct me in regard to this matter, please write soon. Direct to Howell, Mich.

W. J. MILLS.

Howell, Mich., Oct. 16, 1865.

Obituary Notices.

DIED, Oct. 15, 1865, of croup diphtheria, our oldest and only son, Thomas W., aged 8 years, 3 months and 6 days.

Also, Oct. 17, with the same disease, Gracy C., our only daughter and child.

Words of comfort were spoken to an attentive congregation on the occasion of our sorrow, by my brother, D. T. Taylor; and while we are left childless in a little short week, we have grace to say, "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord."

C. O. & M. W. TAYLOR.

Died, in Rome, Maine, Sept. 25, Carrie G., daughter of John and Cynthia Fletcher, aged 19 years and 7 months.

Death has snatched from our congregation one whom we all loved. Carrie was a good girl, and we trust she died in the Lord. The writer tried to comfort the grief-stricken family with the hope that she would come again from the land of the enemy.

L. L. HOWARD.

Died, in Otsego, Mich., Oct. 21, 1865, of dysentery, Mary E., daughter of Bro. Lewis and sister Mary E. Hadden, aged two years and seven months. We attended her funeral the 23d inst. Some two days before her death, little Mary broke the silence by singing the following hymn, beginning with,

"Out on an ocean all boundless we ride,
We're homeward bound," &c.

JOSEPH BATES.

DIED, at North Star, Gratiot Co. Mich., Sarah Barnes, the youngest daughter of Wm. Barnes, of the bloody-flux, October 8, 1865, aged 2 years and 10 months.

Also, Susan Barnes, the mother of Sarah Barnes, died of the same disease, October 10, aged 45 years, 10 months and 10 days. She leaves a husband and ten children to mourn her loss. She united with the church at Ithaca last winter at its organization. She gave good advice and encouraging words to those around her on her death-bed. She was sick fifteen days. She rests in hope, and we mourn their loss, but not as those who have no hope. 1 Thess. iv. 13.

F. SQUIRE.

The Review and Herald.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1865.

THE friends of present truth will be cheered by the article on another page from the pen of Bro. White. It is exactly the information that thousands want to be in possession of. By it they may now understand his whereabouts on the road to health, and what are his expectations toward speedy recovery. We trust that Bro. and sister W., in the midst of this peculiar trial of their faith, will have the assurance that they are remembered in the unyielding prayers of all those who have an interest at the throne of grace. Was ever the injunction of the Apostle, "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God," more in point than now?

Church of God, do your duty. G.

THE article, "A very Materialistic Christianity," found in another column, by R. F. C., will be read with interest. As will be seen, it is a reply to some wretched statements published Aug. 10, in the New York Independent against Seventh-day Adventists. This reply was immediately sent to said paper for publication, but time has shown that it was proscribed from their columns! For this reason it is now, at this late date, given in the Review. As Bro. Cottrell says, in a private note to this Office, "It speaks not very highly of the conscientiousness and moral worth of a religious journalist, to publish misrepresentations and defamatory statements concerning a people, and give no place for a correction, that the truth may appear."

SPIRITUALISM.—This potent deception of the great Arch-Deceiver is by no means abating, but like some anciently (Matt. xxiii, 15) "compass sea and land" to spread the virus of its soul-killing tenets. The interesting question, What will the Orthodox do with Spiritualism, is answered as follows in the Banner of Light for Oct. 21st.

"SPIRITUALISM OR MATERIALISM! This alternative is now fairly before the world. The church and clergy must meet it, and choose between the two. They must embrace *Spiritualism*, or reject *Immortality*. All who think that men and women live *as men and women*, after the death of the body, must inevitably be led to adopt the views of Spiritualists respecting that disembodied life. For fear they shall be regarded as Spiritualists, the clergy do not preach of Immortality one fourth as much as they did twenty years ago. They nearly ignore the doctrine of Immortality, lest they be regarded as favoring Spiritualism. They will be obliged to cast it out of their creed entirely, and become Materialists, or receive the ideas of Spiritualists in regard to the *location, occupation, relations and needs* of men and women in that state."

LIGHT BEFORE THE SUN.—"Just as the ringing of the bell produces sound, not by an emanation of particles from the substance of the bell, but by exciting the air or the sounding substance; so the light will not appear without being excited. Upon this supposition, the element or substance of light was created on the first day, and the divine power alone might be the exciter, until the sun, the instrumental exciter, was produced."—*J. Taylor, D. D., 1762.*

The above is an interesting comment on Gen. i, 3, 14. Here, on the first day of time, the great Creator said, "Let there be LIGHT; and there was light." Also on the fourth day God said, "Let there be LIGHTS in the firmament of heaven," &c. In these two verses different Hebrew words are used. In verse 3, the word for "light" is *ohr*; but in verse 14 the word rendered "light" is *mah-ohr*. *OH*R is defined by Gesenius, "*Day-light, morning light, dawn.*" *MAH-OHR*. "1. *Light, a light, a luminary.* 2. *A candlestick, candelabra.*"

He says, the difference between the two words is ap-

parent from Gen. i, 3, 14, 16, where "*ohr* is light as universally diffused," while "*mah-ohr* is properly a light, or luminary which gives light." This is an important distinction, and is recognized in other versions of Gen. i, 14. Thus in the text, "Let there be *lights* in the firmament of heaven," all modern translators render it "Light-bearers," or "luminaries," that is, bodies which emit, or excite, light. G.

THERE are some who say that the law of God has been abolished, who live and act as if they believed what they say; while there are others that say the same thing, who act as if the fourth commandment only had been abolished; so that nine-tenths of their conduct gives the lie to their profession. Which are most consistent? Both contend for the like precious, or rather suspicious, faith; the one follows it to its legitimate result, the other refuses, in part, to live it out. R. F. C.

Note from Bro. Root.

DEAR BRO. WHITE: I feel to sympathize with you in your sickness, and also with others in theirs. I send to our preaching brethren which are at Dansville, twenty-five dollars. Divide according to their wants.

Yours in love of the truth, E. H. ROOR.
Wright, Mich., Oct. 30, 1865.

The above communication with the *greenbacks* enclosed, was received at the Review Office. Such sympathy is truly of the *substantial* kind; and such as our poor—worn out—sick preachers know how to appreciate. Perhaps there are many more of our brethren who have just such kind of sympathy burning in their bosoms, and in their pockets. If so, would it not be well to give vent to the same, according to the example of Bro. Root?

We place the twenty-five dollars to the credit of Bro. White to be appropriated as he may direct.

J. M. A.

The New York State Conference.

THIS Conference was held under discouraging circumstances. Sickness deprived us of the help we expected from the General Conference, and also prevented Bro. Taylor from being present. Bro. Andrews was absent on the Eastern mission, and Bro. Fuller, at whose place the meeting was held, was in deep affliction. Still we trust the meeting was not unprofitable. There was great unanimity in our business meetings. Our meetings for worship were interesting. On Sabbath and first-day the house was so filled as to make it necessary to furnish extra seats through the length of the aisles, and good attention was given to the word spoken. Bro. Fuller gave an interesting discourse on the Plan of Salvation, showing the beauty and the perfect adaptedness of the plan to the object to be accomplished, and the necessity of accepting it by faith and obedience in order to be benefited by it. The health reform was shown to be a necessity in order to the cleansing of ourselves of all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, and the perfecting of holiness in the fear of the Lord. This was well presented by Bro. Whitney.

In our social meeting Sabbath morning we had a special season of prayer in behalf of Bro. White and his fellow-laborers and fellow-sufferers at the health institution at Dansville. We could but hope that the Lord will interpose in behalf of his cause and his people, and bless and raise his servants to health. He will do great things for us, when we are prepared to receive and appreciate his blessings. The Lord help us to do so. R. F. COTTRELL.

PERTINENT QUESTIONS:—In one of our reform exchanges, we notice the following well-stated questions, from a gentleman in Minnesota:

"1. Is there any proof in nature, or the Bible, that all men are immortal?"

"2. Is not mind the result of organization—and if so, when you destroy the organization, do you not necessarily destroy the mind?"

"3. What is the so-called soul of man? and where is the proof that the body is not, in fact, the soul?"

THE P. O. address of Eld. John Byington is Ceresco, Calhoun Co., Mich.

Appointments.

The next Quarterly Meeting of the churches of the Seventh-day Adventists of Fairview, Marion, and Lisbon, will be held at Fairview, Jones Co., Iowa, Dec. 2 and 3, 1865, according to previous notice. Bro. Ingham will be here at that time. We invite all who can come, to come prepared to work for the good of the cause. Brethren, bring your buffalo-ropes and blankets along with you. N. B. MORTON.

The next Quarterly Meeting of the Mauston church will be held at Lone Rock, Wis., Nov. 12 and 13, 1865. Will some messenger meet with us?

J. R. GOODENOUGH, *Clerk.*

Our next Monthly Meeting for Western N. Y. is to be held with the Clarkson church, on the Parma line, the second Sabbath in November.

R. F. COTTRELL.

Business Department.

Business Notes.

Geo. Inwood, of California. Your Review is paid to Vol. 28, No 1.

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 receipted pays. If money for the paper is not in due time acknowledged, immediate notice of the omission should then be given.

H A Weston in full of acct., G E Fickett 27-1, L Bullock 27-14, Sr. Mills for H C Martin 27-23, J Stryker 29-14, H Steward 27-23, W Shehan 28-23, C Choate 27-8, S T Royal 27-22, C Amy 27-14, N Stains for T Stains 28-23, and for H Turner 28-23, E N Pierce 28-23, J Smith 28-1, C S Clarke 27-21, F Palmer 28-23, M M Moody 28-23, each \$1.00.

E Eaton 28-21, N C Wheeler 28-22, E Eagles 28-21, L Ross 28-14, S A Allen 27-1, W S Lane 28-1, J G Sanders 27-18, G W Carpenter 28-23, Mrs R Smalley 29-1, W McDowell 28-23, J B Lamson 28-14, Mrs O Nye 29-1, M M Aldrich 28-1, W K Loughborough 28-13, W Clarke 28-8, J C North 27-14, L B Kneeland 29-1, S H Bennett 28-23, L W Jones 28-1, W Campbell 30-1, O B Bovee 27-1, W Langdon 28-19, J Larson 29-1, E Hallock 28-10, each \$2.00.

A K Gorden 27-23, J Blaisdell 27-23, D Hussey 27-23, S Tracy 27-23, A Tracy 27-23, H Fletcher 27-23, A E Goodrich 27-23, M Dean 27-1, each 50c. C F Worthen \$1.21 27-11, R G Cowles \$2.32 28-19, W E Price in full of acct \$1.32, C Jewett 75c 27-23.

Subscriptions at the Rate of \$1.50 per year.

M Willson 28-23, P S Stodard 28-23, C Van Giesen 28-23, each \$1.50.

Subscriptions at the Rate of \$3.00 per year.

H S Woolsey \$5.00 30-10, W Belamy \$3.00 28-10, V B Gaskill \$3.00 28-17, J Carter \$3.00 28-1.

Books Sent By Mail.

J Butchart \$1.25, W H Wild 50c, R F Andrews \$2.29, J M Bartholf 50c, R Demming 10c, W McNitt \$1.25, R G Cowles 68c, L W Jones 75c, H Gold \$1.25, L A Bramhall 75c, J C North \$1.15, J F Hammond \$3.15, J Larson 35c, H Hull \$1.35, D W Johnson \$2.00, M Willson \$3.00.

Cash Received on Account.

S B Whitney \$5.63, R F Cottrell \$20.00, J B Lamson \$14.00, H Lindsay \$9.00.

Gen. Conf. Missionary Fund.

N Y Conference \$200.00, R Smalley \$3.00, H Lindsay \$5.00.

For Bro. Bourdeau.

H Lindsay \$5.00.

For Bro. Loughborough.

S H King \$5.00.

Draft Documents.

H Lindsay \$1.00, E B Gaskill \$1.00, S. H King \$1.00.