

# *J. N. Andrews*

The Man and the Mission



Harry Leonard, Editor

*J. N. Andrews*

THE MAN AND THE MISSION

EDITED BY  
HARRY LEONARD

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY PRESS, BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICHIGAN



*[Faint, illegible text, possibly a signature or title]*

COPYRIGHT © 1985 BY  
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY PRESS  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PUBLISHED JULY 1985 BY  
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY PRESS  
BERRIEN SPRINGS, MI 49104  
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

92 91 90 89 88 87 86 85 5 4 3 2 1

ISBN 0-943872-91-X  
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NUMBER 85-71649

## LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

The posts given are those occupied by the contributors when the papers were delivered.

- D. A. Augsburg, Professor of Historical Theology, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, USA.
- P. E. Copiz, Director, Department of Education, Euro-Africa Division of Seventh-day Adventists, Berne, Switzerland.
- R. F. Cottrell, Retired, Formerly Book Editor for Review and Herald Publishing Association, Hagerstown, Maryland, USA.
- R. L. Dabrowski, Manager, Znaki Czasu Publishing House, Warsaw, Poland.
- G. De Meo, Director, Segni Tempi Publishing House, Florence, Italy.
- R. D. Graybill, Associate Secretary, Ellen G White Estate, Washington, D. C., USA.
- H. Heinz, Dean, Theology Department, Marienhoehe Seminary, Darmstadt, Federal Republic of Germany.
- R. Lehmann, Dean, Theology Department, French Adventist Seminary, Collonges-sous-Saleve, France.
- H. Leonard, Principal Lecturer in History, Newbold College, Bracknell, Berkshire, England.
- K. F. Mueller, Director, E. G. White-SDA Research Centre, Europe, Newbold College, Bracknell, Berkshire, England.
- B. E. Pfeiffer, Archivist, Marienhoehe Seminary, Darmstadt, Federal Republic of Germany.
- B. Sauvagnat, Editor, Les Signes des Temps, Danmarie les Lys, France.
- J. G. Smoot, President, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, USA.
- G. Steveny, President, French Swiss Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Lausanne, Switzerland.
- J. Zurcher, Secretary, Euro-Africa Division of Seventh-day Adventists, Berne, Switzerland.

## FOREWORD

There are certain events in the history of the Advent Movement which we do not have the right to forget. Ellen White reminds us of this in a well-known statement. "We have nothing to fear for the future, except as we shall forget the way the Lord has led us, and His teaching in our past history" (Life Sketches, p. 196).

The centenary of the death of John Nevins Andrews (1883-1983) was a very favorable occasion to recall not only the life and work of this pioneer, but also one of the most important steps in the history of the Advent Movement. It is widely known that, during the first thirty years of the Movement, Andrews was at the center of the most important decisions which marked the history of the Church. Not least among them was the decision to send a missionary to Europe. The coming of J. N. Andrews to Switzerland was the first step towards making the Seventh-day Adventist church a world-wide church.

Seventh-day Adventists, in Europe especially, could certainly not forget the one who was sent from the United States to bring them the Three Angels' Messages. Therefore, they took the initiative in organizing the John Nevins Andrews' Centennial. From 30 August to 1 September 1983, a symposium took place at the French Adventist Seminary at Collonges, France, where is kept what is left from Andrews' library. Thirty scholars from North America and from the two European divisions participated.

In addition, on 3 September 1983, a Centennial Conference took place in Basel, which was Andrews' headquarters and where his remains still lie in a little cemetery. Some 1,800 persons gathered

from France, Germany, Switzerland, and elsewhere. It was not so much to glorify the man, but rather to give thanks to God for having, by means of Andrews, opened the world to the Advent Message.

The volume which we have the honor of introducing here contains the main papers presented at the symposium. Several of them had already been presented at Andrews University in September 1979, at the Sesquicentennial of Andrews' birthday (22 July 1829). Written by several authors, these papers obviously lack homogeneity. However, after a century, and while waiting for a more systematic presentation, it is time to make known in a scholarly way the main aspects of the life and work of the pioneer who was called--and rightly so--by Ellen White herself, "the ablest man in all our ranks."

Jean Zurcher

Bern, Switzerland

## P R E F A C E

An editor who has the largest single chapter ought not to indulge himself further by writing a long preface. And a long preface would be doubly out of place because, between them, Dr. Zurcher's Foreword and Dr. Smoot's reflections (chapter 1) say most that could be said. Those of us who participated in the symposium were impressed with the man, warts and all. What emerged from these studies is a credible human being whose faults do not diminish his achievements. We still await the definitive biography of J. N. Andrews, but when it comes (and few of us had any doubt that it will come most readily from the pen of Dr. Smoot), we hope that this volume will have contributed to it.

I would like to thank the Trustees of the White Estate, Washington, D.C., for permission to quote from certain unpublished manuscripts and Alethea Mustard, Juanita Schomburg, Karl Rhoads and Alveen Thoresen for their help in typing and proof-reading.

Harry Leonard

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS . . . . .	v
FOREWARD . . . . .	vii
PREFACE . . . . .	ix
CONTENTS . . . . .	xi
THE MAN	
Andrews' Role in Seventh-day Adventist History	
Joseph G. Smoot . . . . .	1
The Family Man	
Ron Graybill . . . . .	14
The Churchman: Andrews' Relationship with Church Leaders	
Joseph G. Smoot . . . . .	42
THE SCHOLAR	
The Architect of Adventist Doctrines	
K. F. Mueller . . . . .	75
The Theologian of the Sabbath	
Raymond F. Cottrell . . . . .	105
The Author of the <u>History of the Sabbath</u>	
J. Heinz . . . . .	131
Andrews' Personal Library	
Georges Steveny . . . . .	148
Andrews' Use of His Library	
Richard Lehmann . . . . .	153
The Linguist	
Pietro E. Copiz . . . . .	164
THE MISSIONARY	
The Forerunner: M. B. Czechowski	
Rajmund Ladyslaw Dabrowski . . . . .	190
Missionary to Europe	
J. R. Zurcher . . . . .	202
Andrews and the Mission to Britain	
H. H. Leonard . . . . .	225
The Pioneer to Germany	
Baldur Ed. Pfeiffer . . . . .	261
The Italian Mission in the Time of J. N. Andrews	
Giuseppe De Meo . . . . .	272
The Missionary Editor	
Bernard J. Sauvagnat . . . . .	285
Some Financial Aspects of Andrews' Mission to Europe	
Pietro E. Copiz . . . . .	309
The Adventist Colony at Basel During the Andrews Years	
Daniel Augsburgur . . . . .	332



## ANDREWS' ROLE IN SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST HISTORY

Joseph G. Smoot

In January 1877, about two and a half years after he came to Europe, John Nevins Andrews became ill with pneumonia and nearly died. A leading Basel physician, called to treat him, refrained from using drugs at Andrews' request. The physician remarked that he appeared to be almost starved to death. Andrews concluded that a difficult regimen of work, plus a rather poor diet of baker's bread, graham pudding, potatoes and occasionally a cabbage, had weakened him thus making him susceptible to the disease. Within two weeks he had partially recovered, regained his appetite, and sat up in bed for an hour or two a day. This enabled him to begin his writing anew and to plan for his work as a leader of the infant European Seventh-day Adventist church.<sup>1</sup>

Without question, John Nevins Andrews' passion for his ministry in the Adventist cause consumed his life. God's work fully occupied his conscious efforts. Dedication becomes a rather trite word when used to describe the difficulties that he daily confronted. He labored long hours in his preaching and his writing ministry. He suffered loneliness, especially in Europe, because of his wife's death in 1872, but found beautiful comfort in the company of his teenage children, Mary and Charles.

In response to a request from James White, he wrote a short autobiographical account of his life in 1877, including his experience with health reform, for the journal, The Health Reformer. In his life story he stressed relationships with his family and with his God. He referred

to his ancestors who came to Massachusetts in 1638, the family experience which included an Indian massacre, and his two great grandfathers' service in the Revolutionary War.<sup>2</sup> He wrote tenderly of his marriage to Angelina Stevens in 1856 who "set herself apart to the work of God, and faithfully bore with me the burdens of the work." Her death before he went to Europe caused him great distress but he was comforted that "she left the most decisive evidence that she had fallen asleep in Jesus."<sup>3</sup>

Of his own religious experience, he stated simply that he found the Savior in 1843 at 13 and began to keep the Sabbath toward the end of the year 1845. In summarizing his work in the church, he stated that "near the latter part of 1850 I entered the work of the Christian ministry and to this work my life is still consecrated."<sup>4</sup>

Today, John Andrews stands somewhat remote. In the contemporary church, surprisingly little clear understanding of his contributions to Seventh-day Adventist life and thought exists. Unpublished writings include a thesis by Gordon Balharrie, written in 1949 for the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, which examines in detail for the first time his contributions to church organization and teachings.<sup>5</sup> Several papers of uneven quality, written for course requirements at Andrews University, have also explored various aspects of Andrews' life.

John Andrews' work first received historical interpretation in the 1886 edition of Historical Sketches of Foreign Missions and in John Loughborough's history of the Seventh-day Adventist church published in 1892.<sup>6</sup> William A. Spicer, Ellsworth Olsen and Arthur Spalding, in their denominational histories, retold the story of his role in Europe relying largely on the Historical Sketches as their primary source. Arthur Spalding added, here and there, brief comments about other contributions he had made to the Seventh-day Adventist church.<sup>7</sup> Subsequent church historians have relied heavily on these earlier accounts. \*Virgil

Robinson's biography, John Nevins Andrews: Flame for the Lord, was first written as a series of stories for children and published serially in the Guide.<sup>8</sup> Gerard Damsteegt has now presented rather substantial evidence of Andrews' major contributions to Adventist theology in his Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission.<sup>9</sup> Regarded as the ablest of the Adventist pioneers by the wife of a very able church leader, this has certainly given him a place of distinction in Adventist history. How able was the ablest is still, however, an unanswered question.<sup>10</sup>

The great body of Andrews' writings has been largely untouched. He wrote hundreds of articles and notes printed in church publications, and he edited two Adventist journals, one as founding editor. While some of these articles have been referred to because of their importance to doctrinal development in such areas as the law, the Sabbath, church organization, systematic benevolence, and the United States in Bible prophecy, the great bulk of them are virtually unknown today. What range of theological inquiry engaged this early Adventist Bible scholar? Is there internal consistency in his views, and particularly as he continued his study in life? How would he compare with his contemporary theological scholars? When did language study become a part of his life, and what influence did his knowledge of Biblical languages especially have on his writings? Hundreds of articles plus several books form an important literary legacy from an early church leader. These materials deserve careful attention.

More than two dozen Andrews sermons survive. He has been described as an earnest speaker. Structurally, he organized his sermons to treat several aspects of the subject in logical sequence. His preaching included an appeal to the conscience as well as to the mind. A sermon which he delivered to the largest audience ever assembled in Battle Creek, Michigan, up to the time of the dedication of the Dime Tabernacle

on 20 April 1879, is a model one with careful balance in Biblical exposition. He preached on the Law of God which, of course, was his special interest, but in the context of the life and death of Jesus Christ and His grace made available freely to all who would choose to accept it.<sup>11</sup>

We know little about 19th century Adventist preaching because a substantial synthesis does not exist. It has been asserted that Adventist ministers prior to 1888 did not preach a righteousness by faith message. Historical evidence reveals that this is not a correct view although some may have focused more clearly on this theme after 1888. At least John Andrews preached Christ in the 1860's and 1870's and the efficacy of His shed blood and death. He wrote about it in his articles and personal letters so we know what he believed and taught. In his last known letter, he wrote: "My feet are on the Rock of Ages and . . . the Lord holds me by my right hand."<sup>12</sup>

More than 100 letters written by or to J. N. Andrews are preserved in the Ellen G. White Estate Research Center with many of these constituting the correspondence between the Whites and Andrews. Most of the letters are from John Andrews to the Whites with a few written to W. C. White, Stephen N. Haskell, and Lucinda Hall. Some thirty letters survive that he wrote to James White. Several hundred more letters and notes appeared in the Review and Herald and other publications over a period of 30 years. Many of the letters that James and Ellen White wrote to him have been lost, or at least have not been located. Presumably, some may still be in Europe.

The intriguing relationship between James and Ellen White and John Andrews is of the greatest interest in his surviving papers. From an early contact with the Whites in 1849 when he exclaimed that he would "exchange a thousand errors for one truth," it became clear that he was drawn to them and they to him. They expressed much affection each one

for the other. Periods of silence and misunderstanding gave way to times of confession and forgiveness. On occasion he signed his letters to them with "much love" and addressed them as "Very dear Brother and Sister White."

James White sometimes felt that John Andrews did not support him. Ellen White, however, did not hesitate to reprove her husband concerning his attitude toward John Andrews, but on several occasions she also gave her disapproving messages to Andrews. The most severe rebuke Ellen White wrote to him came in the summer of 1883. John Andrews responded to this message about a month before he died in a very humble and contrite spirit. He told her that if she still had other reproofs to give, "do not withhold them, I pray you. I beg you to believe me as ever one who sincerely desires to follow the right."<sup>13</sup>

Ellen White had not hesitated through the years to tell John Andrews to study less and give more attention to leadership. She urged him to spend less time in research and publish his materials sooner. In her view, the church needed simple, readable material and not the fruits of exhaustive, scholarly research. She expressed to him the need for his remarriage and considered some of the actions and views about his work as selfish, yet she was tender on other occasions taking care to encourage him.

John Andrews stood foremost in supporting the unique role of both James and Ellen White in the Seventh-day Adventist church. His defense of James White through the years enabled White to maintain a wide influence on the development of the church from the earliest beginnings, through organization, church expansion, founding of institutions, and forging ahead in the midst of crises and difficulties.

John Andrews also gave his support to the prophetic role of Ellen G. White which had untold influence on her acceptance within the church. He apparently came to an acceptance of her visions slowly, but

once he had determined in his own mind that God was using her for a special work, he directed his efforts to gain wide approval for her ministry through his own personal testimony. While Ellen White primarily established her own authority, John Andrews' role in that development was of major consequence. Without his substantial influence, her work would have been much harder.

As a writer and preacher, John Andrews shaped Adventist thought with regard to the scripture. Perhaps his greatest contribution to the church centered on his deep regard for the word of God and the way he related to it on a personal as well as a scholarly level. Early in 1877, he wrote to James White about his first spiritual experience:

My earliest religious conviction was at the age of five years when I listened to a discourse by Daniel B. Randall from these words: "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them." Rev. 20:11. So vivid was the impression made upon my mind, that I have rarely read that passage since that time, without remembering that discourse.<sup>14</sup>

J. N. Andrews' recollection of one of his earliest memories centering on a text of scripture and a sermon reveals an important character trait. This familiarity with the word of God led him at a youthful age to accept the claims of Jesus Christ for himself. This commitment, in turn, led him to study the scripture to learn and to teach the truths that govern human conditions as well as the lives of individuals.

He perceived a two-fold task in his teaching ministry. He traveled widely, preaching messages of hope to people who desperately needed God's word. Beyond that, he developed a disciplined life of Bible study that caused him to write hundreds of articles and several books on important religious themes. His theological writing constitutes one of the greatest treasures of the Seventh-day Adventist church. John Nevins Andrews established several important doctrinal positions including the

unique Adventist sanctuary teaching and became the ablest defender of the Church's central teaching of the Sabbath. He also became a careful expositor of Bible prophecy, setting the pace for particular Seventh-day Adventist contributions to prophetic interpretations with reference to the Three Angels' messages and the United States in Bible prophecy.

John Nevins Andrews' personal relationship to the Bible and the approaches he used in studying it, reveal in important ways how he achieved his role in the church. He functioned at three levels in Bible study. First, he chose to study the Word in great detail, searching out particular themes and truths in a verse by verse examination of a specific topic. He knew he had to learn the ancient languages in order to be certain of the message of the Bible. For this reason he studied Greek and probably, to a lesser extent, Hebrew and also Latin. While the bulk of his private library remained in Europe, more than one hundred of his books are in the Heritage Room at Andrews University. These include Hebrew and Greek grammars published just before he went to Europe. A Greek lexicon as well as a Greek edition of Homer's Iliad, apparently used to learn the classical language, formed a part of his library.

He devoted an extensive amount of time to diligent, thorough research. He often delayed publication until he became satisfied with what he had written. Perhaps somewhat too deliberate, he may have directed his efforts to a level of scholarship that would not materially assist the young church in reaching the masses. On the other hand, no one else attempted to lay the theological foundations for Seventh-day Adventist teachings that he did. Ellen White wrote to him in 1872, urging publication of his History of the Sabbath and First Day of the Week. She declared that "souls need the work now." His love of deeper intellectual concerns led Ellen White to comment that Adventist success would be "in reaching common minds."<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, James White

had referred to him as "our theologian" in 1859, suggesting that the church had a special need for his scholarly writing.<sup>16</sup>

Much of his writing reflects a care and an original stamp that commends it even today for further study. He developed his writing on the basis of an exegesis of the scriptures and a scholarly analysis of the historical setting. He may properly be called a Biblical scholar, the foremost one in the early Adventist church. In his personal library are the Testimonies that Ellen White wrote for the young Adventist church. In Testimonies Number 9, he marked the following sentence: "Some passages are placed beyond the reach of human minds, until such a time as God chooses, in his own wisdom, to open them."<sup>17</sup> He tried mightily to unlock Bible truths.

In the introduction to his book, Three Messages of Revelation 14, he reveals more fully his view about the personal message of the Bible. He devoted great effort with significant success in making the Seventh-day Adventist church's teachings conform to God's word. Subsequently, these teachings became a vital part of the lives of those who accepted the church's exposition of the messages of the Bible. He wrote:

The Bible is full of references to the second advent of the Saviour and the events of the great day of God. It represents that day as the great day of his wrath; as the time when destruction from the Almighty shall come upon the wicked, and when the land shall be made desolate, and the sinners thereof destroyed out of it. The language of the inspired writers expresses in the most vivid manner the awful and terrific scenes of that day in which God arises from his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth. (p. iii).

Shall mankind have no warning when this destruction is about to burst upon them? Shall there be no token of coming wrath to arrest the guilty in their downward career? Shall irretrievable ruin swallow up a sinful world, and God give them no intimation of its approach? (p. iii).

The design of the three great proclamations of this chapter, is, first, to give warning of coming judgment; secondly, to set the people of God upon their watch-tower; thirdly, to gather in one body the scattered saints; and fourthly, to restore the commandments of God to his people, and to prepare them for deliverance in the time of trouble, and for translation into his kingdom (p. iv).<sup>18</sup>



The second way that Andrews influenced the church was his example of reading the scriptures for his own personal life and benefit. Andrews read the Bible as God's message to him to be meditated upon and also acted upon. In his own handwriting, he recorded the dates on which he completed a particular reading of the Bible. Beginning with the thirteenth reading in 1860, personal Bible records indicate that he read the entire Bible through at least 27 times. It also reveals that he read different translations for his devotional study, including one in French.<sup>19</sup>

John Andrews' personal Bible study enabled him to develop the values and character traits of a christian gentleman. In Testimonies Number 7, he marked the following comment:

The restraint God's word imposes upon us is for our own interest. It increases the happiness of our families and all around us. It refines our taste, sanctifies our judgment, and brings peace of mind, and in the end, everlasting life. Under this holy restraint, we shall increase in grace and humility, and it will become easy to speak right.<sup>20</sup>

This counsel surely proved true for John Nevins Andrews and his family.

Personal Bible study led Andrews to a continual communion with his God. John Nevins Andrews prayed fervently for his own salvation, for his family, for his fellow believers, and for the unconverted. A review of early church records reveals that he often prayed at public meetings such as General Conference sessions, camp meetings, and other gatherings. Individuals prized his prayers, including Ellen White and also James White who sent for him to come some distance to pray for him once when desperately ill.<sup>21</sup>

In the third approach to Bible study, John Nevins Andrews memorized large portions of scripture. Tradition recounts that he could write out the New Testament from memory. John O. Corliss, who published the claim in the Review and Herald in 1904, declared that he heard Andrews respond to a question asking about his memory of scripture in which Andrews seemed reluctantly drawn out to make the admission.<sup>22</sup> He regarded

it as no bragging matter. He must have often recited scripture from memory in his preaching. There appears to be no denial of his prodigious memory of the scripture, which included not only the New Testament but also large portions of the Old Testament.

What impact did the study of the Bible have on him? One can discern the influence in many ways. He wrote to the Review and Herald on 1 January 1875:

In coming to Europe I have tried to prepare my heart to work for God by seeking His help and by solemnly covenanting with him to be faithful to his service. I have endeavored to review my past life, and to mark every error that if possible I may here labor for God to His entire acceptance. I feel strong assurance that he will enable me to do it.<sup>23</sup>

"Faithful to his service" might well be a theme for the life of John Nevins Andrews.

He did become discouraged, especially under the difficult circumstances of his labor in Europe. At the end of his life, he concluded that he was the greatest failure of all who tried to teach the truth.<sup>24</sup> Attempting to establish a church organization and evangelistic outreach, writing and publishing a missionary paper, and seeking to communicate in languages other than English while working with people of different customs, was certainly a formidable task. Short of funds, misunderstood in Europe and America, he existed on meager means. Yet through it all, his faith stood strong. His work in expanding the world-view of the early Adventists, his own life dedicated to overseas mission service, and his pioneering work of transplanting the church outside of the United States enabling it to become a world movement has major consequences in measuring his own achievements.

Advances in the understanding of Seventh-day Adventist church history in recent years makes it imperative for us to re-examine the life and thought of J. N. Andrews, the foremost Adventist intellectual of the 19th century. Adventist scholars are beginning to understand more clearly

the historical development of theological thought in the church. A new historical interest permits the church to gain a broader and deeper understanding of its growth and development. Historical materials only recently available enable contemporary Adventist scholars engaged in investigating and writing Seventh-day Adventist church history to dig deeper and achieve a clearer perspective of what actually happened.

NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Ellen G. White Research Center, Andrews University (hereafter cited as WRCAU), The Letters of J. N. Andrews, 1862-1883 (hereafter cited as Andrews Corresp.), 6 Feb. 1877.

<sup>2</sup>J. N. Andrews, "Life Sketches," The Health Reformer, April 1877, pp. 97-99; May 1877, pp. 129-131; June 1877, pp. 161-164.

<sup>3</sup>Andrews Corresp. 8 Feb. 1877.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Gordon Balharrie, "A Study of the Contribution Made to the Seventh-day Adventist Church by John Nevins Andrews," (M.A. Thesis, Andrews University, 1949).

<sup>6</sup>B. L. Whitney, "The Central European Mission" in Historical Sketches of the Foreign Missions of the Seventh-day Adventists (Basle, 1886), pp. 9-56; J. N. Loughborough, Rise and Progress of the Seventh-day Adventists with Tokens of God's Hand in the Movement and a Brief Sketch of the Advent Cause from 1831 to 1844 (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1892), pp. 336-339.

<sup>7</sup>Mahlon E. Olsen, A History of the Origin and Progress of Seventh-day Adventists (Washington, D.C., 1925), pp. 303-310; William A. Spicer, Our Story of Missions (Mountain View, California, 1921), pp. 93-96; Arthur W. Spalding, Origin and History of Seventh-day Adventists, 4 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1961), 2:203-208.

<sup>8</sup>Virgil E. Robinson, John Nevins Andrews: Flame for the Lord (Washington, D.C., 1975).

<sup>9</sup>P. Gerard Damsteegt, Foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Message and Mission (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1977).

<sup>10</sup>WRCAU, The Letters of Ellen G. White, 1847-1915 (hereafter cited as White Corresp.), 28 Aug. 1878.

<sup>11</sup>J. N. Andrews, "Dedicatory Sermon," Advent Review and Sabbath Herald (hereafter cited as RH), 8 May 1879, pp. 146-147.

<sup>12</sup>Andrews Corresp. 17 Sept. 1883.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid. 8 Feb. 1877.

<sup>15</sup>White Corresp. c. 1872 (file A31).

<sup>16</sup>J. N. Loughborough, "Second Seventh-day Adventist Meeting-House," Missionary Magazine, June 1901, p. 267.

<sup>17</sup>J. N. Andrews Library, Heritage Room, Andrews University (hereafter cited as HRAU). Ellen G. White, Testimony No. 9 (1863), p. 21.

<sup>18</sup>J. N. Andrews, The Three Messages of Revelation XIV, 6-12, Particularly the Third Angel's Message, and Two-horned Beast (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1892), pp. iii-iv.

<sup>19</sup>HRAU, J. N. Andrews' Bible.

<sup>20</sup>HRAU, Ellen G. White, Testimony No. 7 (1862), p. 9.

<sup>21</sup>RH 27 Feb. 1866, p. 98.

<sup>22</sup>RH 15 Sept. 1904, p. 9.

<sup>23</sup>RH 28 Jan. 1875, p. 36.

<sup>24</sup>Thus Jean Vuilleumier in RH 2 May 1929, p. 11.

## THE FAMILY MAN

Ron Graybill

About 12 Friday night my husband arrived home. I was awakened by his calling my name at our bedroom window. Oh, how my heart leaped with joy at the sound of his dear voice.<sup>1</sup>

These simple words from the diary of Angeline Andrews say much about J. N. Andrews as a family man. They say that he was very often not a family man. There were many sad partings and joyful reunions for this pioneer preacher and his wife. At one time his travels with his evangelistic tent kept him away from home for nearly a year. But Angeline's diary is also a beautiful testimony to the couple's love for one another. Witness this passage from the summer of 1860:

Received a letter from my dear husband, also his picture. I can hardly be reconciled to his long absence. . . . He is one of the kindest and best husbands, and it is a great sacrifice to us both to be thus separated.<sup>2</sup>

In the nineteenth century, to speak of a family was to speak of far more than a father, mother, and their children living together in an isolated household. Grandparents, aunts, uncles, and other kinfolk all played a much more important role than they do today.

Let us go back, then, to the beginning, extending the Andrews family backward in time and outward in kinship ties. J. N. Andrews' paternal ancestors came to America eighteen years after the arrival of the Mayflower and settled near Tauton, Massachusetts. In the "Indian wars," probably King Philip's War of 1675, nearly the entire family was massacred. Telling of the tragedy, J. N. Andrews says these were men of "great stature" and tremendous physical strength, who, in their determination to "sell their lives as dearly as possible," tore up trees of "considerable size and used them as weapons." But the contest was

unequal and the Indians killed them all except one small boy, Henry, who was sick in the house.<sup>3</sup> This story has all the earmarks of legend, being so similar to dozens of others which attached themselves to family histories in New England. Still, it is entirely likely that the Andrews family suffered in King Philip's war, since there was hardly a family, Indian or white, which was unscathed.<sup>4</sup>

John's two great-grandfathers, David Andrews and John Nevins, are said to have fought in the American Revolutionary War.<sup>5</sup> This may explain why the family moved from Massachusetts to Maine. Many Massachusetts veterans, including the ancestors of Ellen White, were paid for their services by grants of forest land in Maine.

So it was that John Nevins Andrews was born on July 22, 1829, in Poland, Maine. His father, Edward Andrews, was 31 at the time, his mother, Sarah, 26. Nine years later his brother, William P. Andrews, was born. There were two other children in the family, but they both died young.<sup>6</sup>

J. N. Andrews later recalled that he "found the Savior" in February of 1843.<sup>7</sup> Even so, he almost certainly did not join the Advent movement until sometime after November of that year, for in October, he was in Dixfield, Maine, boarding with his aunt and uncle, Persis and Charles Andrews, so that he could attend Mr. Grover's school. His aunt was very favorably impressed. John, although only 14, was nearly six feet tall and wearing boots larger than most men. Although his aunt found him "clumsy and bungling at chores and not very neat," she was sure he would be a strong man: "there is no woman about him," she noted. He was a "fine, promising boy -- a very fine scholar and strictly moral." His reading voice was superb. He was through the Latin reader, two-thirds through Algebra, and superior in English grammar. "Better than all," his aunt said, he had "first rate common sense."<sup>8</sup> Clearly John was not yet a

Millerite, for his aunt believed Millerites possessed of anything but common sense.

After the "passing of the time," or the "Great Disappointment," as later generations of Adventists have come to know it, the Andrews family opened their home to the Stowells, whose 15 year-old daughter, Marian, had secured a copy of that fateful tract by T. M. Preble on the seventh-day Sabbath. The scriptural arguments convinced her, and she passed the tract to J. N. Andrews, who was also persuaded. John's parents<sup>8</sup> were the next to accept the Sabbath, and soon, seven other families in Paris, Maine, had joined in.<sup>9</sup> Among these was the family of Cyprian Stevens which included the future wives of both J. N. Andrews and Uriah Smith, Angeline and Harriet respectively.

The Adventists in Paris, Maine, were emotional and opinionated individuals, some of whom were much given to the fanatical ideas which ravaged many Adventist groups in Maine in the mid-1840's. The principal source of this fanaticism was the idea that Christ had come spiritually on October 22, 1844, and now lived in the perfect person of His saints. Since these saints were now in the seventh millennium, eternal Sabbath had dawned. Since one does not work on the Sabbath, they refused to work. Hence the "no work" doctrine about which Mrs. White writes in Life Sketches. In order to prove that they were now spiritually in heaven, they sought to humble themselves and become as little children. To do so, they dispensed with tables and chairs and crawled around on their hands and knees<sup>10</sup> like little children. Hence the "false humility" which the young prophetess, Ellen Harmon, was called upon to correct. Finally, since they were in heaven, they thought they should be like the angels who neither marry nor are given in marriage. This left them free to take spiritual wives--ostensibly platonic unions without physical congress. They also practised mixed foot-washing, not to mention other outrages on the



decency and good sense of Victorian New Englanders.<sup>10</sup>

Recently discovered evidence indicates that the Andrews family was more deeply involved in some aspects of this fanaticism than we had previously supposed. Professor Herbert D. Andrews of Towson State University in Towson, Maryland, has called our attention to the diary of Persis Sibley Andrews Black, now in the possession of the Maine Historical Society in Portland, Maine.<sup>11</sup> Persis Sibley married Charles Andrews, the politician uncle of J. N. Andrews. Her diary corrects a number of misconceptions about J. N. Andrews. For one thing, Uncle Charles Andrews was not very prosperous, and he was a member of congress for only a few months before his death of tuberculosis in April of 1852. More significantly, the diary in question clearly places the Andrews family among the "no-work" fanatics. Writing in March of 1846, Persis Andrews says:

We called upon brother Edward--who--poor deluded man--with his family still believe in the speedy coming of Christ--that the day of grace has been past this year. They have done no labor for more than two years and have lived in constant expectation that every day the world wo'd be consumed by fire. They have nearly expended all the property of their little community of "Saints" & nearly exhausted the charity & patience of their friends so that "if time continues" as Edward s'd he expected they wo'd be obliged to go to work. Some very likely families well situated with \$3000 to \$4000 of property have spent their all & what is worse have kept their children from school & from industry & educated them only in cant & delusion.<sup>12</sup>

Because of this fanaticism, the little company in Paris was so torn and divided that they had not met together for several years when the Whites visited them in September of 1849. Almira Stevens, Angelina's mother, described that time as "sad and painful," noting the "divisions and subdivisions" which prevailed as "each heart stood aloof," and mutual confidence was "almost entirely destroyed."<sup>13</sup>

That 1849 meeting was, Ellen White said, "a green spot in the desert," and proved the beginning of better days for the Paris believers. Parents confessed to children, children to parents and to one another. J. N. Andrews, in all the passion of his youth, exclaimed, "I would

exchange a thousand errors for one truth."<sup>14</sup>

A little over a year later, the White and Andrews families became even better acquainted when James, Ellen, and baby Edson moved in with Edward, Sarah, and their boys. They had come, of course, to launch the Second Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, the first number of which was issued from Paris, Maine, in November of 1850.

It was during this stay with the Andrews that incidents occurred which were to sour and strain relations between the two families for years. Things seem to have gotten off to a good enough start. Ellen White wrote optimistically:

Our home is in Paris, at Brother Andrews, within a few steps of the Post Office and Printing Office. We shall stay here some little time. This is a very kind family, yet quite poor. Everything here is free as far as they have.<sup>15</sup>

Although the Andrews may at first have offered free board and room to the Whites, before long a verbal contract was worked out between Edward and James whereby the Whites were to pay \$20 rent per year and a dollar a week for food. James did not feel this was any too cheap. After all, the local newspaper editor paid only a dollar and a half for board at a good local tavern, which was, James noted bitterly, "worth more than twice what we two dyspeptics got selecting the plainest [fare] from a farmer's table." What is more, James claimed that he seldom ate anything besides corn bread and potatoes, the latter seasoned with a little salt and a few spoonfuls of milk.<sup>16</sup>

Finally, in order to prevent "utter starvation," the Whites set up house-keeping on their own, whereupon Edward Andrews, aided and abetted by the Stevens family, began to accuse James of cheating him out of \$8. It seems a paltry sum, but the alleged injustice was long remembered. This is, of course, all based on James White's side of the story, but it fits quite well with the fact that Edward Andrews was as skeptical

of James White's leadership as he was of Ellen White's visions, and he had very little confidence in either. For many years he grasped at the most readily available defense for his doubts, the allegation that the prophet's husband had done him out of \$8.

Some time during the course of the stay in Paris, James White also had occasion to reprove the shortcomings of some members either of the Andrews or Stevens family, and the vigor with which he performed the duty was also a chronic sore point with the Paris folk.<sup>17</sup>

The Review moved on, of course, to Saratoga Springs, New York, and, in 1852, to Rochester. Whatever their difficulties with Father Andrews, the Whites were more than eager to welcome his son John into their already overcrowded household in Rochester. Later, when John's health broke down, James gave him the best room in the house, fed him free of charge, and supplied him with wood for his fire. Then he wrote out appealing to believers around the state to raise money to get him some decent clothes. James put his own name at the head of the list with a pledge of \$100.<sup>18</sup>

Shabby clothes or not, there was one occupant of that busy household on Mt. Hope Avenue who found J. N. Andrews charming and attractive. This was the youthful poet and proof-reader, Annie R. Smith. There is sufficient evidence to conclude that during the time they were both in Rochester, J. N. Andrews gave Annie Smith reason to believe that he had a romantic interest in her. In fact, she may have thought he would marry her.<sup>19</sup>

The secular poems of Annie and her mother show that she suffered a blighted love. The chief evidence that John was the object of Annie's love and cause of her subsequent heartbreak lies half-buried in a letter Ellen White wrote to John just a month after Annie's death in 1855. By this time John was courting the girl he eventually did marry, Angeline

Stevens. Mrs. White wrote to him:

I saw that you could do no better now than to marry Angeline; that after you had gone thus far it would be wronging Angeline to have it stop here. The best course you can take is to move on, get married, and do what you can in the cause of God. Annie's disappointment cost her her life.<sup>20</sup>

Although this seems a frightfully severe indictment, it was probably justified even from a medical standpoint, since depression makes one so much more vulnerable to disease and since there was plenty of disease lurking in that house on Mt. Hope Avenue. James White's brother Nathaniel and sister Anna had already died of tuberculosis in those crowded quarters.<sup>21</sup>

In the light of what we now know about the difficulties between the Andrews and Whites in Paris, we can read further in Ellen White's letter and find additional evidence to demonstrate that it was J. N. Andrews who disappointed Annie. Immediately after the sentence in which she says Annie's disappointment cost her her life, Mrs. White says:

I saw that you [John] were injudicious in her [Annie's] case and it all grew out of a mistaken view you had of James. You thought he was harsh and impatient toward Paris friends, and you stepped right in between Annie and us; sympathized with her in everything. The interest manifested for her was undue and uncalled for, and showed that you had a great lack of confidence in us.<sup>22</sup>

What Mrs. White appears to be saying is that because John believed James White to have been too harsh, he sympathized unduly with Annie Smith in some difficulty she had with James. Annie misinterpreted this sympathy as affection for her when, in fact, it grew more out of opposition to James White. When Annie discovered the truth, she was devastated.

Since this series of papers is in celebration of J. N. Andrews, some may question the propriety of public discussion of such unflattering chapters in our hero's life. The object is not to tarnish the image of this revered pioneer, but to recall that the pioneers were, after all, people.<sup>23</sup>

Although Mrs. White had opposed John's marriage plans on the basis of a vision, once those plans were in place and had advanced as far as they had by August of 1855, she encouraged John, also on the basis of a vision, to go ahead and marry Angeline Stevens. God's greatest glory might not always be served by our decisions, but God is apparently concerned with the innocent others we involve in those decisions. Angeline had every right to expect that John would marry her. That being the case, it was then God's will that John should marry Angeline. The wedding was delayed for more than a year, but finally, on 29 October 1856, John and Angeline were married. The ceremony probably took place in Iowa, where the Andrews and Stevens families had moved in November of 1855.<sup>24</sup>

The place they chose to settle was in Allamakee County, Jefferson Township, in the far northeastern corner of the state. Eighteen miles to the north was the Minnesota border. The Mississippi River ran roughly the same distance to the east. The Andrews farm was three and a half miles directly south of the little town of Waukon. Prairie land it is, flat except for an occasional sink hole. If they needed wood for fence-rails or for pot-bellied stoves, they had to go another mile or so south where the land slopes down to Norfolk Creek.<sup>25</sup>

Looking over the roster of Adventists who soon congregated near Waukon, we discover that the church in the east was losing some promising talent to the lure of rich prairie sod. Not only did the Andrews and Stevens family go, but the Butlers came from Vermont to join them. In 1856, J. N. Loughborough arrived from Rochester, bringing with him his friends and next-door neighbors, Jonathan and Caroline Orton, who, in turn, brought their daughter and son-in-law, Drusilla and Bradley Lamson. The defection of these prominent members from Rochester must have left quite a gap in that congregation, not to mention the damage suffered by

the evangelistic forces of the church when the two "J.N.'s" --Andrews and Loughborough--switched from harvesting souls to shocking hay and slopping hogs--health reform was still several years away.<sup>26</sup>

John and Angeline doubtless shared his parents house from the beginning. Farm-making was not an easy or inexpensive undertaking. Poor as they were, the Andrews would hardly be in a position to erect separate structures. Later, Angeline would continue to live with her in-laws while John was away on preaching tours, even though her own mother, sisters, and brothers were in the neighborhood.

It was just two months after John and Angeline were married that James and Ellen White made their now-almost-legendary visit to Waukon. We all recall the story of their dash across the melting Mississippi ice followed by the bone-chilling sleigh ride over the snow-covered and wind-swept prairie to Waukon.<sup>27</sup>

James White found the believers doing almost nothing to "set the truth before others." Their time, instead, was "almost wholly occupied with the things of this life."<sup>28</sup> Furthermore, they generally rejected the applicability of the Laodicean message to the Sabbath-keeping Adventists. Since this was James and Ellen White's main burden at this time, we can appreciate what James meant when he noted that they were received with "Christian courtesy," but not the affection formerly accorded them. James presented the Laodicean message, but Waukon Adventists would have it no other way than that the arguments against his position be presented the next day. The visitors from Battle Creek were getting nowhere.

As the visit progressed, James discovered that the biggest grudge the Waukon folk held against him at this time was the feeling that he had been rash in moving the Review to Battle Creek. James carefully explained his course in that matter, and, little by little, the icy

reserve of his alienated friends began to melt. "The tender spirit of confession and forgiveness was mutually cherished by all," he reported. James felt his efforts in "facing the prairie winds and storms" were more than repaid, and J. N. Loughborough returned with him to resume his ministerial labors.

J. N. Andrews was soon conducting meetings in the locality, but he did not go back to the traveling ministry until 1859, two years later.<sup>29</sup> We know of only two events in the Andrews family during the nearly three years after the White's visit, one joyous and one tragic. The joyous event was the birth of Charles Melville Andrews on 5 October 1857, a little less than a year after his parents' marriage. The next year, on 6 September 1858, Angeline's father, Cyprian Stevens, died of a rattlesnake bite after lingering for five days in incredible agony. He was 64.<sup>30</sup>

In June of 1859, John attended a conference in Battle Creek where it was voted that he should work with Loughborough in the Michigan evangelistic tent. George Amadon was sent to Waukon to take his place on the farm and Hiram Edson sent money to pay Amadon's wages.<sup>31</sup>

Beginning in October of 1859, the story of the Andrews family is enriched by one of the most prized sources a family historian could wish for: the wife's diary.<sup>32</sup> Angeline Andrews' diary is a bit sporadic in places, but it records the major events of the family's history together with fascinating insights into farm life, church affairs, and personal relationships. This diary carries all the way down to January of 1865.

John was back home as the diary opened in October of 1859. Angeline noted that her son, Charles Melville, was a "rugged little fellow," who loved to run out of doors. As befits the son of a scholar, Charlie was "much interested in his letters" and even though he was barely two, he was already able to identify more than a dozen of them.<sup>33</sup>

When John was at home, he did the work of a farmer like all of his neighbors. One day he might haul 20 bushels of wheat off to the grist mill for grinding, on another he would be out searching for a lost heifer.<sup>34</sup>

By late November, John was gone on another preaching tour and Angeline's diary takes up its frequent refrain: "Am disappointed in not getting a letter from John." A few days later, she noted romantically: "Last eve the evening star Venus was right in the window in the end of the house." The omen brought two letters from John the next day.<sup>35</sup> Six months later, John was still in New York State and was writing as though he might stay there a good while longer. "I feel [a] good deal cast down in view of his long absence," Angeline told her diary. "Yet I would have him move in the order of God. O Lord, direct him."<sup>36</sup>

Anyone who has ever been in love can appreciate Angeline's feelings as she writes: "There is a want in my heart which remains unfulfilled. I do not seem to get much satisfaction either in writing or receiving letters."<sup>37</sup> She ventured to tell John some of her "sad feelings," and confessed to feeling more cheerful once she had expressed herself. Then she added: "I want John to do just right."

In mid-June, 1860, Angeline had gone five days without a letter. She could hardly stand it. She walked the three and a half miles to Waukon hoping to find one, but she was disappointed. She waited overnight, but still no letter came. Finally, she decided she might as well retrace her steps.<sup>38</sup>

In June of 1860, Angeline's sister Harriet, the wife of Uriah Smith<sup>h</sup> was visiting. Early one morning their younger sister Frances Jeanette, or Nettie, as they called her, came down to the Andrews' home before Angeline was up with the surprising word that Harriet was returning to Battle Creek at once. Angeline and Mother Andrews hurried up to the Stevens house before breakfast to see what was the matter. Harriet was in a state of



extreme agitation and distress. She had received a letter from Sister White. "Oh," Angeline wrote in her diary, "I will not attempt to describe the state of mind Harriet was in."<sup>39</sup>

We have the very letter Ellen White wrote to Harriet on this occasion. At the same time, she wrote a very similar but considerably longer letter to John. As one reads these letters, the mind reels and staggers. The ego swells and rages. Ellen White expected as much. She told Harriet:

Those who fall into an agony, as you have, at the least censure or reproof do not realize that they are perfectly controlled by the enemy. . . . You may call your feelings grief, but you have not realized them as they were. It has been anger, and you have been selfish. . . . How much faith do you have in the visions? They do not bear a feather's weight on your mind.<sup>40</sup>

Sometimes we think we are in the first generation of Adventists to have so many questions and doubts about Ellen White's prophetic gift. But human nature does not change. It does not <sup>\*</sup>like these things. Angeline and Harriet and John may not have had parallel columns to study, but they had their own problems. "When everything moves on smoothly," Ellen White told Harriet,

then past dissatisfactions and difficulties in Paris lie dormant, but when a reproof or rebuke is given, the same dissatisfaction arises. "Brother White was wrong back there; he was too severe and he is too severe now." Then jealous, hard feelings arise. As he is in union with the visions given, as the visions and his testimony agree, the visions are doubted, and Satan is working secretly to affect and overthrow the work of God.<sup>41</sup>

Do we begin to see the problem with which James and Ellen White were faced and how crucial the Andrews and Stevens families were to the situation? Through Harriet the church's most talented writer and editor, Uriah Smith, was influenced. Meanwhile, the church's most capable biblical scholar and theologian, J. N. Andrews, also partook of the spirit emanating from Waukon.

These doubts about the visions, these resentments against James White, these feelings, Ellen White told Harriet, had been "brought down

from Paris to Rochester, and from Rochester to Waukon, and from Waukon" to Battle Creek. The Waukon believers, Ellen White said, would not

stand in the light until they wipe out the past by confessing their wrong course in opposing the testimonies given them of God. . . . Either their feelings must be yielded, if it tears them all to pieces, or the visions must be given up. There will either be full union or a division. The crisis has come.<sup>42</sup>

Ellen White confessed that sometimes she had but little courage to write to individuals, because even after she had written with feelings of deepest anguish and tears, they laid the letter aside, and said, "I believe the visions, but Sister White has made a mistake in writing it. She has heard reports of these things and has got it mixed up with her visions and thinks she saw it all."<sup>43</sup>

Angeline's diary proves that there was some substance to Mrs. White's statements about the doubts of the Andrews and Stevens families. However, Angeline saw these doubts as sincere uncertainty rather than sinful resistance. About three weeks after Harriet left, Angeline visited Thomas and Mary Mead. The Meads were a very devout couple, and Angeline opened up her heart to them, telling them how she felt about what happened in Paris and relating her doubts about the visions. "I have great confidence in Bro. and Sr. Mead," she wrote in her diary that night, "[But] I cannot yet take just the position in regard to Sr. W.'s visions they do--they fully believe them to be all right from God, consequently of equal authority with the Bible."<sup>44</sup>

Later that month the subject came up in a Sabbath meeting. "There is some difference of views as to the place [the visions] should occupy in the church," Angeline noted.

Some hold them as equal authority with the Bible and are designed to correct and guide the church. . . . Others believe [the] Bible does not sanction such use of them. Oh, that we might understand just the right position to take in regard to them.<sup>45</sup>

In spite of Ellen White's strong words in her letter to Harriet, the overall attitude of the Waukon congregation had not yet changed.

Meanwhile, farm life went on as usual. Raspberries were ripening in July, the turkeys were growing plump; the rye harvest arrived, then the wheat harvest. On the home front there was the pervasive presence of illness, disease, and death. Mother Andrews had dysentery. Charles was sick and vomiting. Angeline's face swelled up with an abscessed tooth. Late in 1860 she visited a neighbor, George Geasy. "Their little babe," she wrote that night, "is but just alive. It was a sorry spectacle. Oh, what ravages death makes. My little Charles still lives. Oh, may I bring him up for God."<sup>46</sup> Two days later, Angeline stayed up all night with the Geasy infant, but it was no use, the child died. The first frost came in mid-September, 1860. A month later, John came home. He had been gone nearly a year. Angeline had received 59 letters from him in that time.<sup>47</sup> She counted and numbered every one.

John stayed home that winter, working on his History of the Sabbath, writing religious articles for the local newspapers, and holding meetings nearby. In the summer of 1861, an invitation came for him to join the Minnesota tent, and he was off again. Angeline was five months pregnant when he left. Their second child, born 29 September 1861, was a girl, Mary Frances.<sup>48</sup>

John was back home in time for his brother's wedding in December. William married Martha A. Butler, sister of George I. Butler. It was their daughter, Edith, whom J. N. Andrews took back to Europe with him after his own daughter died in 1878. William also died in that year, and Martha came to Europe where she married A. C. Bourdeau. Thus Martha tied together, by marriage, three of the most prominent Adventist families of the nineteenth century.<sup>49</sup>

Late in 1861 fresh testimonies from James and Ellen White arrived in Waukon. We do not know what these contained, but in the end they did produce a more favorable response from the Waukon church. John sent in

his own confession to the Review in November.<sup>50</sup> More messages came, John read these to the little congregation, then wrote further confessions to James and Ellen White early in 1862. This time the letter was signed by Angeline as well:

My heart is pained in view of my past course and the position which I have occupied relative to the visions. Oh, why have I stood out in rebelling against them as I have? How dark has been my mind and how little have I realized of the exceeding sinfulness of my course. . . . Dear Brother and Sister, how many and heavy have been the burdens you have borne on my account and others of us at Paris. . . . I know I can never make amends for the past, but I am resolved to do what I can. . . . My influence against the visions has not been from a multiplicity of words against them. . . . But I confess I have not stood up for them and borne testimony in their favor.<sup>51</sup>

In another letter the same day, John enlarged on the point:

I have lacked to some extent that living faith in the visions that God will alone accept. Not that I have knowingly gone contrary to their testimony, but they have seemed to be a source of terror and distress so that I could not make that use of them that is such a blessing to others.<sup>52</sup>

At this same time, Angeline, her mother Almira, and her sister Pauline all wrote similar letters of confession and reconciliation to the Whites. It would be another year yet before crusty old Edward Andrews would unbend enough to make a similar confession.<sup>53</sup>

John left to work with the New York tent in June of 1862. In November, Ellen White wrote him encouragingly:

I saw that God has accepted your efforts. Your testimony in New York has been acceptable to him. . . . He has wrought for your wife and she has been learning to submit her will and way to God. . . . There has been a work, a good work, with some in Waukon.<sup>54</sup>

John had begun to think now of moving his wife and children away from Waukon. The brethren were urging him to settle in New York State. He wrote Angeline and laid the matter before the whole family. Angeline at first volunteered to come with baby Mary, but leave Charles behind. When she finally left in February, however, she made a clean break with Waukon and brought both children with her. Her brother-in-law William and sister Nettie rode with her to the river. "It is hard parting with

dear friends," she told her diary sadly.<sup>55</sup>

The next day she was on the train for Battle Creek. She stopped there to spend two days with Harriet, and while she was at the Smith home, James and Ellen White came for dinner and stayed on till supper. The three ladies visited all afternoon, then, after supper, Harriet and Angeline walked home with Ellen. She showed them all over her house, and Henry and Edson played their melodeon for them. Angeline and Ellen had a talk about the past with "considerable satisfaction" to Angeline.<sup>56</sup>

Finally, after eight long months, Angeline was reunited with her husband on 17 February 1863. It had been a tiresome journey with a five-year-old boy and a girl of 17 months, but Angeline rejoiced that the Lord had brought her safely through. Little Mary, however, was not so happy. She was afraid of everyone. Two days later she was still not willing to sit on her father's lap.<sup>57</sup>

For the next two and a half months, the Andrews stayed around Rochester, mostly with Bradley and Drusilla Lamson. They took the occasion to get a family portrait taken and to get some dental work done. John had his last few upper teeth removed and an entire new upper plate made to replace them. Angeline had 14 teeth extracted while she was, at least partially, under the influence of chloroform. Her new false teeth cost her \$10.<sup>58</sup>

Finally, in late April, the family decided to settle in Kirkville, New York, 10 miles west of Syracuse on the Erie Canal. "The house," Angeline noted, "is of an ordinary cast, yet very good I understand, having been recently fixed up. Attached to the house is an excellent garden containing quite a variety of fruit."<sup>59</sup>

Once they settled in their house, Charles promptly came down with scarlet fever. John took a week-end appointment in the middle of this illness, leaving Angeline alone to deal with one frightening night when

her son woke up with a high fever and a sore throat.<sup>60</sup> John was back on Sunday with a nice porcelain kettle and spent the day helping Angeline put up wallpaper. The next day he was off to Michigan to attend the conference of 1863 at which the Seventh-day Adventist church was officially organized. He was home again the last of May and gone again the second of June. "I miss him much," Angeline wrote, "but it is for the Lord's work and I will [endure] it cheerfully."<sup>61</sup>

Early in September of 1863, Angeline was nearly seven months pregnant when she was stricken with "fever and ague," probably malaria. A high fever can sometimes bring on premature labor, and this apparently happened in Angeline's case. On 9 September, after six days of illness, she gave birth prematurely to a little daughter. All that day Angeline's sufferings were so intense that she had no knowledge of what had happened. Four days later the baby died and was the first to be buried in the Andrews' family plot in Mt. Hope Cemetery in Rochester, New York.<sup>62</sup>

About this same time, after an absence of several months, John came home in the company of James White. James remembered the homecoming as one of the most sad and touching he had ever witnessed. Charlie, bubbling with joy at the sight of his father, came hopping across the street dragging a crippled leg after him. "Father! Father!" he cried excitedly. But John groaned in anguish as he scooped up his little boy and noticed how bad his leg was. Since the age of two Charlie's leg had shown strange symptoms. The ankle grew more swollen and stiff while the entire leg withered to a quarter of the size of the right leg, yet maintaining its normal length.<sup>63</sup>

Interest in health reform was now on the rise among Adventists, and just after the family moved to Rochester in April of 1864, Angeline and Mellie (as she called her son Charles by now) went to "Our Home on the

Hillside" to seek treatment for the boy's leg. Once there, Mellie got sick again, this time with the measles, but his leg improved. When the Dansville stay was over in mid-July, Angeline had a pleasant homecoming. John was "very much struck" with the improvement in his son, and Angeline was just as pleased with her new home. Fellow-believers had donated a nice new carpet for their parlor and the Whites had sent a beautifully framed photograph of their family as a present.<sup>64</sup>

On 9 August 1864, the Andrews' fourth and last child was born, a little girl they named Carrie Matilda, giving her the same initials as her big brother. She would live just a little more than a year, dying in September of 1865 of dysentery.<sup>65</sup>

That same month there was great excitement in the Andrews' household when John was chosen as a special envoy to visit the Provost Marshall General in Washington in order to secure recognition for Seventh-day Adventists as noncombatants. John may have criticized James White in the past, but now he was very anxious that James go with him to Washington. This was not to be, but James did come through Rochester on his way to Dansville and spent a day planning and praying with John. Then the two men went downtown where James spent \$50 to buy John a new suit of clothes.<sup>66</sup>

The mission to Washington was successful, and when John returned, he went to Dansville to join the Whites and Uriah Smith for a much-needed rest. Old Paris troubles were forgotten by now and when the Dansville visit was over, the Whites came to the Andrews' home for an ample dinner of sweet potatoes, pumpkin pie, bread, peaches, grapes, apples, and tomatoes.<sup>67</sup>

In January 1865, the Angeline Andrews' diary ends. For some time after this we know relatively little about the family's life aside from what we learn from obituaries. In April 1865, John's father passed

away. In September, little Carrie died, as we have already mentioned. Angeline's sister Nettie, who married J. P. Farnsworth in November of 1864, died in 1868.<sup>68</sup>

It was during the period after his father's death that John wrote his first articles in defense of James White's leadership and Ellen White's prophetic gift. It had always been hard for the Paris Adventists, sentimental and sensitive as they were, to accept the vigorous, straightforward style in which James and Ellen White issued rebukes. John's sister-in-law Harriet called James' style "cutting and slashing." John put it more euphemistically, saying of James White that "certainly no one is so faithful in plainness of speech."<sup>69</sup>

But in the spring of 1868, John spent four months working and living with the Whites. John had seen Mrs. White in vision many times, but her state in vision did not, apparently, convince him that she was a true prophet. Now, however, as he watched her work, preach, and write late into the night, his attitude changed. What impressed him most was the deep distress and anguish she suffered as she struggled to write out her sometimes unpleasant and unwelcome messages.<sup>70</sup>

On 17 February 1872, just after John and Angeline had retired, Angeline suffered a stroke. Her right side was partially paralyzed, her right arm useless. She could scarcely speak. Day after day John and the children prayed for her, and gradually she improved. One pleasant morning a month later, Angeline decided to attempt a short walk out of doors. John was helping her put on her coat when suddenly her legs gave way and she sank to the floor unconscious. Angeline S. Andrews died early the next morning, 19 March 1872. She was 48 years of age.<sup>71</sup> John wrote her eulogy for the Review:

I here bear record to the fact that she has done the utmost in her power to help me to go out to labor in the cause of God, and has never once complained when I have remained long absent. During the entire period of our married life no unkind word ever passed between us, and no vexed feeling ever existed in our hearts.<sup>72</sup>



For the future, John said, "Henceforth it shall be my business to lead our dear children toward the heavenly city, and to strive more worthily to preach Christ to perishing men." After Angeline's death John made South Lancaster, Massachusetts, his center of operations, and the children stayed there with the Harris family.<sup>73</sup>

Before he left for Switzerland in 1874, John made a trip back to Waukon to visit his widowed mother. He hastened his journey because Martha, his sister-in-law, had recently given birth to triplets. The babies died immediately, and Martha appeared to be recovering well when a dangerous relapse occurred. John rushed to Waukon fearing he might not find her alive, but she recovered, later joining him in Europe.<sup>74</sup>

On 15 September 1874, J. N. Andrews embarked for Europe. Artist Harry Anderson has immortalized the departure aboard the Atlas in a painting familiar to Adventists. Waving his hat from the deck, John looms high above the other figures. Just below is fresh-faced Charles, now nearly 17, and his sister Mary, almost 13.<sup>75</sup>

In Switzerland, John's children provided him invaluable emotional support and practical assistance. Half of each day Charles worked in the printing office learning the trade. The other half he studied French and German and helped his father read proofs. "He is perfectly steady and quiet and gives me no trouble," John wrote proudly. "He is my companion by day and by night, and seems to prefer my company to that of any young person. Indeed, I should not know [how] to live without him."<sup>76</sup>

Mary didn't like sleeping under feather quilts, but she did take well to the French language. She would read the paper over after Brother Aufranc, whose native tongue was French, and sometimes find grammatical errors which had escaped his eye.<sup>77</sup> Father and children took their language studies very seriously. They even covenanted to speak only French or German.<sup>78</sup>

Early in 1877, John became seriously ill with pneumonia. When the doctor examined him, he exclaimed: "This man is almost starving to death." John had been working terribly hard and trying to save all he could on food in order to put more money into his publishing and evangelistic work. The family lived on baker's bread, graham pudding, potatoes, and occasionally cabbage. They used milk and butter only for cooking and had almost no fruit. This diet was probably dangerously low in vitamins A and C, riboflavin, iron, and calcium. To top it all off, their housekeeper was "about the poorest cook" John ever had knowledge of.<sup>79</sup> A woefully inadequate diet was not the only threat to the family's health. Sanitary conditions were just as bad. The privies were in the house and there was no running water to clean them properly.<sup>80</sup>

It comes as no surprise that by the fall of 1878, when John was preparing to return to America for the General Conference, he felt he had to take Mary with him. "We fear consumption is fastening upon her," he explained. "She has lost much of her strength and has a considerable cough."<sup>81</sup>

It was Rochester all over again. A struggling new paper, a crowded house full of workers, poor diet, poor sanitation, and, inevitably, tuberculosis. After their return to Battle Creek, Mary died on 27 November 1878. She was buried beside her mother in Mt. Hope Cemetery. From Europe, Charlie wrote his father: "Our separation will be but short . . . and then, if faithful, we shall meet our loved ones. . . . So, pa, don't feel discouraged. . . . We pray much for you."<sup>83</sup>

Mrs. White was in Texas when Mary died. She wrote tenderly to John:

We deeply sympathize with you in your great sorrow, but we sorrow not as those who have no hope. . . . Mary, dear precious child, is at rest. She was the companion of your sorrows and disappointed hopes. . . . Through faith's discerning eye, you may anticipate . . . your Mary with her Mother and other members of your family

answering the call of the Life-giver and coming forth from their prison house triumphing over death. . . . The Lord loves you, my dear brother. He loves you.<sup>84</sup>

Mrs. White not only consoled John, she also counselled him at this juncture that he should marry again before returning to Europe and even suggested a qualified candidate. John replied that he esteemed very highly the person she had named, and that Mrs. White had led him, for the first time since Angeline's death, to seriously consider taking another wife.<sup>85</sup> However, he felt that this was impossible:

Not because I cannot find anyone good enough, but simply because I am still a deep mourner for the wife that sleeps in death and my affection seems incapable of detaching itself from her and taking up some other, however worthy. It is true that myself and children have suffered at times greatly because we lacked the care of some good woman, but we have always been supremely happy and satisfied in each other's society.<sup>86</sup>

Valuing romantic love as we do, we may at first see John's refusal to remarry as beautiful devotion to the memory of his wife. However, seen in the light of the more practical aspects of family life, and noticing that Mary had already died of tuberculosis and John would die before long, we cannot help but wonder how different things might have been if John had relinquished his beautiful but selfish grief, and taken the practical step which Ellen White had suggested. As a matter of fact, John's refusal to remarry was rather unusual for his time. Given the high death rates of the period it was quite common for a person to have two or even three spouses if he or she lived to an old age.

Ellen White would later fault John for rejecting the counsel. She wrote in 1883:

I was shown that you made a mistake in starting for Europe without a companion. If you had, before starting, selected you a godly woman who could have been a mother to your children, you would have done a wise thing, and your usefulness would have been tenfold to what it has been. You are not a domestic man.<sup>87</sup>

In Basel once more, John had not one grief but two to weaken him. He seemed feeble all the time. He cried to God constantly for help, but

said, "The restorative power in my system seems to be broken down and since the death of Mary it has been impossible for me to rally."<sup>88</sup> Dr. Kellogg had warned John that Mary's disease was contagious, but John could not refuse her wishes nor deny himself the privilege of nursing her. He had taken care of her night and day, and soon enough he realized that Dr. Kellogg had been right.<sup>89</sup>

In the spring of 1881 he was confined to bed, certain of his own death unless God intervened. He struggled on till the fall of 1883. His aged mother came to be with him. His last days, it is said, were filled with "cheerfulness, freedom of spirit, and hopeful trust in God." He died 21 October 1883.<sup>90</sup>

For J. N. Andrews, as for most of us, family life was both a source of perplexing difficulties and indispensable blessing. For a time, the doubts and criticisms of his kinfolk crippled and confused his ministry. Later, his attachment to his grief hampered his usefulness. But in the loneliness and trial of his Swiss mission, Charles and Mary had sustained him. In earlier days, on those long journeys to the wilds of Minnesota and the villages of western New York, Angeline's letters had inspired and comforted him. And, after all, few husbands can say what John did when Angeline died, that "during the entire period of our married life, no unkind word ever passed between us."

NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Loma Linda University Library, Angeline Andrews Diary (hereafter cited as AAD), 31 May 1863.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid. 6 June 1860.

<sup>3</sup>J. N. Andrews Library, Heritage Room, Andrews University (hereafter cited as HRAU), The Letters of J. N. Andrews, 1862-1883 (hereafter cited as Andrews Corresp.), 8 Feb. 1877. James White used this letter as the basis of his article, "Elder J. N. Andrews," Health Reformer, Apr. 1877, pp. 97-99, where he embellished this account with some fictional touches of his own.

<sup>4</sup>Douglas E. Leach, Flintlock and Tomahawk: New England in King Philip's War (New York, 1958).

<sup>5</sup>Andrews Corresp. 8 Feb. 1877.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.; "Obituary Notice [Edward Andrews]," Advent Review and Sabbath Herald (hereafter cited as RH), 2 May 1865, p. 174; 18 July 1899, p. 468.

<sup>7</sup>Andrews Corresp. 8 Feb. 1877.

<sup>8</sup>Persis Sibley Andrews Black Diary, 8 Oct., 5, 25 Nov. 1843, Maine Historical Society, Portland, Maine (hereafter cited as PSABD). Microfiche copies available for SDA college libraries from E. G. White Estate.

<sup>9</sup>A. W. Spalding, Origin and History of Seventh-day Adventists, 4 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1961), 1:121-22.

<sup>10</sup>E. G. White, Life Sketches (Mountain View, California, 1915), pp. 85-87; Ron Graybill, "Footwashing and Fanatics," Insight, 2 Jan. 1973, pp. 9-13.

<sup>11</sup>Herbert D. Andrews to The Editors, Review and Herald Publishing Assoc., 4 Jan. 1982; Herbert D. Andrews to Ron Graybill, 4 Feb. 1982.

<sup>12</sup>PSABD, 11 Mar. 1846.

<sup>13</sup>Present Truth, Dec. 1850, p. 16.

<sup>14</sup>White, Life Sketches, p. 127.

<sup>15</sup>Ellen G. White Estate, Washington, D.C., The Letters of Ellen G. White, 1847-1915 (hereafter cited as White Corresp.), 7 Nov. 1850. The Andrews family was probably not even comfortably well off. When the census-taker came around in August of 1850, he classified Edward Andrews not as a "farmer," but merely as a "laborer," indicating that he may not even

have owned the farm he worked. Three months later, Ellen White describes the family as "quite poor." J. N. Loughborough moved to Waukon, Iowa, in October, 1856, and described the "brethren" there, presumably including Edward Andrews, as being "all in debt": RH 26 Feb. 1857, p. 136.

<sup>16</sup> James White to E. P. Butler, 12 Dec. 1861.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.; see also almost any E. G. White letter to members of the Andrews or Stevens families up through the 1860's.

<sup>18</sup> James White to Dear Brother, 9 Feb. 1855.

<sup>19</sup> Ron Graybill, "The Life and Love of Annie Smith," Adventist Heritage, 2 (Summer, 1975):14-23.

<sup>20</sup> White Corresp. 16 Aug. 1855.

<sup>21</sup> RH 26 May 1853, p. 8; 12 Dec. 1854, p. 135.

<sup>22</sup> White Corresp. 16 Aug. 1855.

<sup>23</sup> This is the way the Bible portrays characters. See also E. G. White, Testimonies for the Church, 9 vols. (Mountain View, California, 1948), 4:10-11.

<sup>24</sup> RH 16 Mar. 1886, pp. 168-69. J. N. Andrews was in Battle Creek in November 1855, apparently on his way to Waukon, since he was already considered a delegate from that state: Ibid. 4 Dec. 1855, p. 76.

<sup>25</sup> In order to get to the location of the farm today, one would drive south from Waukon on Highway 76/9 to the place where the two highways divide, 9 going due west, 76 due east. From that junction, one would continue to proceed due south on a less well-improved road. Exactly one mile beyond the junction, one would reach the top of Section 18. From that point onward for exactly one half mile, all the land on the right of the road to a depth of one quarter mile probably belonged to Edward Andrews. In other words, he owned the north west quarter of the eastern half of Section 18. This is based on the assumption that the land which William P. Andrews owned in 1872 was the same as that which his father owned earlier. We know from an 1872 property ownership map in the Library of Congress Map Division that W. P. Andrews owned this land at that time. The other geographical features can be seen on the U.S. Geological Survey, Rossville (Iowa) Quadrangle map in the 7.5 minute series. I have also interviewed individuals who have lived in that area.

<sup>26</sup> RH 16 Mar 1886, pp. 168-89; 15 Jan 1857, pp. 84-85; AAD, 25 Oct. 1859, says "Butchered our pig Sund."

<sup>27</sup> RH 16 Mar. 1886, pp. 168-69; 30 Nov. 1886, p. 745; 15 Jan. 1857, pp. 84-85.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid. 15 Jan. 1857, pp. 84-85.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid. 23 April 1857, p. 196.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid. 18 Aug. 1927, p. 22; 28 Oct. 1858, p. 183.

- <sup>31</sup>Ibid. 9 June 1859, p. 20; 16 June 1859, p. 32.
- <sup>32</sup>See n. 1.
- <sup>33</sup>AAD, 25 Oct. 1859.
- <sup>34</sup>Ibid. 26 Oct. 1859.
- <sup>35</sup>Ibid. 23 Nov. 1859; 25 Nov. 1859.
- <sup>36</sup>Ibid. 15 May 1860.
- <sup>37</sup>Ibid. 28 May 1860.
- <sup>38</sup>Ibid. 13 June 1860.
- <sup>39</sup>Ibid. 27 June 1860.
- <sup>40</sup>White Corresp. June 1860.
- <sup>41</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>42</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>43</sup>Ibid. 11 June 1860.
- <sup>44</sup>AAD, 19 July 1860.
- <sup>45</sup>Ibid. 28 July 1860.
- <sup>46</sup>Ibid. 6, 8 Sept. 1860.
- <sup>47</sup>Ibid. 1 Oct. 1860.
- <sup>48</sup>Ibid. 19 Oct. 1861; 5 Nov. 1861.
- <sup>49</sup>Ibid. 18 Dec. 1861; RH 10 Sept. 1901, p. 598. There is one error in this obituary. It says that Martha Butler was the daughter of "Ezra Pitt and Sarah Butler Pitt," but this is incorrect. She was the daughter of Ezra Pitt Butler and Sarah Growe Butler.
- <sup>50</sup>RH 17 Dec 1861, p. 22.
- <sup>51</sup>Andrews Corresp. 2 Feb. 1862
- <sup>52</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>53</sup>A. S. Andrews to Bro. and Sister White, 30 Jan. 1862; Almira Stevens to Br. and Sister White, 23 Jan. 1862; P[auline] R. Stevens to Sister White, 27 Jan 1862; Edward Andrews to Brother and Sister White, 25 Jan. 1863.
- <sup>54</sup>White Corresp. c. 9 Nov. 1862.
- <sup>55</sup>AAD, 10 Feb. 1863.
- <sup>56</sup>Ibid. 16 Feb. 1863.

- 57 Ibid. 17,20 Feb. 1863.
- 58 Ibid. 23 Feb., 6,25 Mar. 1863.
- 59 Ibid. 29 Apr. 1863.
- 60 Ibid. 15,16 May 1863.
- 61 Ibid. 17,18 May 1863; Spalding, 1:307-308.
- 62 AAD, 3 Sept., 28 Oct. 1863.
- 63 Health Reformer, Apr. 1877, p. 99; Andrews Corresp. 8 Feb. 1877.
- 64 AAD, 5 May-11 July 1864.
- 65 Ibid. 15 Aug. 1864; RH 3 Oct. 1865, p. 143.
- 66 AAD, 26,29 Aug. 1864.
- 67 Ibid. 27 Sept. 1864; AAD ends 25 Jan. 1865.
- 68 RH 2 May 1865, p. 174; AAD 13 Nov. 1864; RH 15 Feb. 1868, p. 174.
- 69 White Corresp. 24 Sept. 1869; RH 3 Mar 1868, p. 184.
- 70 RH 26 Feb. 1857, p. 136.
- 71 Ibid. 5 Mar. 1872, p. 92; 2 Apr. 1872, p. 124.
- 72 Ibid. 2 Apr. 1872, p. 124.
- 73 Andrews Corresp. 26 Jan. 1874; See also "Thomas Harris Genealogy," HRAU, VFM1004.
- 74 Andrews Corresp. 23 Mar. 1874.
- 75 Spalding, 2:202-204; RH 22 Sept. 1874, p. 112.
- 76 Andrews Corresp. 10 Dec. 1876.
- 77 Ibid; Mary to George, 1 May 1875: George Royal Avery Collection.
- 78 See also below, p. 168.
- 79 Andrews Corresp. 6 February 1877. The degree of deficiency in this diet would depend somewhat on how the foods were cooked and how much milk and butter were used in cooking. The more of the latter the better, in this case.
- 80 Andrews Corresp. 27 Jan. 1878
- 81 Andrews Corresp. 3 Sept. 1878.
- 82 RH 5 Dec. 1878, p. 40. That Mary is buried in Mt. Hope Cemetery is confirmed by the records of the cemetery. With Mary's burial,



the family plot in Mt. Hope was full. A flat upright marble monument marks Angeline's grave. Just to the right of Angeline's grave is a smaller marker for Carrie. Mary's grave is immediately on the other (or left) side of her mother's, and just to the left of Mary's grave the unnamed infant is buried.

<sup>83</sup> Charles M. Andrews to J. N. Andrews, 26 Nov. 1878.

<sup>84</sup> White Corresp. 5 Dec. 1878.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.* 29 Mar. 1883; Andrews Corresp. 24 Apr. 1879, 22 Dec. 1878.

<sup>86</sup> Andrews Corresp. 22 Dec. 1878.

<sup>87</sup> White Corresp. 29 Mar. 1883.

<sup>88</sup> Andrews Corresp. 23 May 1880.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>90</sup> *RH* 30 Oct. 1883, p. 680. Shortly after his father's death, Charles married Marie Anne Dietschy, and soon returned to Battle Creek where he found employment in the Review and Herald Publishing house. He stayed with the Review the rest of his life. His daughter, Harriet, married Sanford Harlan who for 36 years was art director of Liberty magazine. Charles' son John Nevins, who was still living in the fall of 1979, married Elder W. A. Spicer's daughter Dorothy and became a physician and missionary to China. Charles' second son, Edwin, died in a tragic accident just a few days after Ellen White's death in 1915. He and a worker from the Review and Herald were struck by lightning as they inspected the damage another lightning bolt had done just a few minutes before to the same tree in front of the General Conference building: *RH* 26 Feb. 1959, p. 26; 22 Dec. 1977, p. 23; 6 Sept. 1962, pp. 25-26; <sup>5</sup> Aug. 1915, p. 21.

THE CHURCHMAN: ANDREWS' RELATIONSHIP  
WITH CHURCH LEADERS

Joseph G. Smoot

The collected correspondence of John Nevins Andrews (1829-1883) begins with a letter written on 16 October 1849 when he was 20 years old and ends with a letter written on 17 September 1883, almost five weeks before his death. That correspondence of 34 years includes letters to and from him, reports and other statements.

This correspondence divides into logical periods of Andrews' life. From 1849 to 1855, 18 letters have been identified relating to his activities as a minister and writer. The Waukon period, 1856 to 1862, includes 39 letters, the church leadership period, 1863 to 1874, produced another 254, and the missionary period, 1874 to 1883, added another 184 letters, reports and public statements. As of this writing, the known total for this part of Andrews' papers contains more than 500 individual documents, including letters to and from him.

In addition to his correspondence, J. N. Andrews wrote extensively on a wide range of topics that included Biblical subjects, church doctrine and character essays. To date, more than 300 articles and 200 notes have been identified in the general church paper, The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald (hereafter Review), while a similar output was published in Les Signes des Temps and other periodicals. Moreover, some<sup>23</sup> printed sermons have been recovered along with many pamphlets and his major books. These writings often give clues to J. N. Andrews' personality and character for they provide insights into his opinions, ideas and beliefs.<sup>1</sup>

Naturally, this rather broad collection of public papers and private correspondence provides the historian with a rich resource of information about the life and thought of John Nevins Andrews, the intellectual giant of the young, nineteenth-century Seventh-day Adventist church. One interesting subject that emerges from a careful examination of Andrews' papers over the entire range of his adult life is the relationship he sustained with other church leaders. This elusive topic does not easily come to light. Historians of the church have devoted little effort in recovering these long-forgotten, friendly, and sometimes antagonistic relationships.

The central purpose of this paper is to examine J. N. Andrews' relationship with the church leaders in the period leading up to his departure for Europe in 1874 and then during the nine years he worked in Europe, until his death in 1883. While his correspondence reveals interaction with perhaps a dozen people on a more extended scale, six persons have been selected because of the primary emphasis of this book on the European phase of his life. These are James White and his wife, Ellen; Uriah Smith, George I. Butler, Stephen N. Haskell, John N. Loughborough and Daniel T. Bordeau.

During the first period of Andrews' ministry, his relationship with the Whites was one of mutual admiration and trust. Ellen warmed to the young man who was willing to "exchange a thousand errors for one truth" in response to her counsel<sup>2</sup> while James must have been grateful for Andrews' work in defending him against charges of diverting church funds for personal gain. He also admired Andrews' industry and intellectual prowess; by 1855 Andrews had written more than 50 articles for the Review<sup>3</sup> as well as working as a minister--for a time with the Whites in the mid-west.<sup>4</sup> Thus, when Andrews became ill, James White launched an appeal to provide funds to purchase books that Andrews might use in his writing.<sup>5</sup>

It was not the last time that James White was to use the columns of the Review to raise money for J. N. Andrews. Early in 1864, the appeal was for a home for the Andrews family.<sup>6</sup> The Whites were anxious to move him away from Waukon, the scene of an estrangement which was accompanied by the Whites' legendary sleigh-ride across the Mississippi ice and Ellen's insistence on some sort of confession of error on John's part.<sup>7</sup> By 1862 Andrews was busy working in the New York area, establishing the New York Conference, publishing the second edition of his History of the Sabbath (1862) and supporting the establishment of the General Conference in 1863,<sup>8</sup> but the Whites clearly felt that he would be more effective if he were permanently resident in the eastern seaboard states rather than having his wife and family west of the Mississippi. A minor difference over where the new house should be (Andrews preferred Rochester to Adams Center because of its research facilities) was settled in Andrews' favor although Ellen White later pronounced this a mistake because it deprived John of the loving support of a church family and hindered him with much entertaining because of Rochester's central location.<sup>9</sup>

All that was seen at the time, however, was that Andrews' ministry was extraordinarily productive and he was elected president of the General Conference in 1867.<sup>10</sup> He held the position for two years, becoming editor of the Review in 1869 during a dispute between Uriah Smith and James White, and although he proved to be a competent editor he gladly made way for his brother-in-law in March 1870.<sup>11</sup>

John Andrews and the Whites often expressed a tender regard for each other. Ellen White called Andrews by his name, John, mostly in the 1850's. In the 1860's "Brother Andrews" became the more formal way she addressed him. In a letter of condolence at Henry White's death in 1863, John and Angeline wrote that "our hearts are filled with grief and sadness. We mourn with you in your great bereavement."<sup>12</sup> In August, 1865,

James White, stricken with a stroke, traveled to Danville, New York, to seek medical help. Early in December, Ellen White decided to take her husband back to Battle Creek and stopped for three weeks in Rochester. Andrews, laboring in Maine, returned to Rochester to pray for Elder White at his request; they experienced several meaningful days of continuing prayer.<sup>13</sup>

The Andrews and the Whites maintained a close personal affection for each other even as they worked together publicly. On 23 January 1868, Ellen White remarked in her diary that she had purchased six yards of "all wool flannel for Brother Andrews drawers. . . . Cut out drawers."<sup>14</sup> Later that year, John Andrews' wrote from Iowa asking the Whites "to counsel me in any way, or to reprove me sharply, or to express your fears of my course." He promised not to be "offended but to regard your admonitions and reproofs."<sup>15</sup>

John Andrews had considerable confidence in the role of both of the Whites in the church. In 1869, he joined with Goodloe H. Bell and Uriah Smith as a committee to defend James White against charges of using his position in the church for personal gain. They invited anyone who had knowledge of any dishonesty on White's part with respect to finances to present the evidence. Their report exonerated White.<sup>16</sup>

After leaving the editorship of the Review, Andrews renewed his determination to revise his History of the Sabbath. Throughout 1870, he maintained a heavy schedule of preaching. He attended camp meetings in New York and New England that summer. He recorded in his Bible that he completed the reading of it for the twenty-sixth time on 25 August 1870, while at the camp meeting at South Lancaster, Massachusetts.<sup>17</sup>

Late in 1870, Andrews wrote to Ellen White acknowledging her reproofs with regard to the time he devoted to study. He stated that since her reproof in 1868, he had read only his Bible, although he

acknowledged reading his three chapters a day in French. He said that he had not read anything in German or Greek recently and he spent no time with the religious journals he had been accustomed to reading. He said that his objective in living in Rochester was to "re-write the Sabbath History, and prepare one other work that I have long had on my mind." He wrote further that he and Angeline were prepared to move from Rochester. He declared that he would "never set up my light against what I know comes from heaven."<sup>18</sup>

John Andrews maintained close relationships with other church leaders. Close ties of family and friendship moved him to loyalty and love but did not prevent him from detached judgments in working with his fellow leaders. George I. Butler (1834-1918), a native of Vermont, first became acquainted with Andrews in the 1850's (probably the spring and summer of 1854), while John stayed at his family home and helped him with his assigned chores. While working together, John reached the skeptic George and helped him "out of infidelity more than all others put together." John introduced George to evangelism by convincing him to serve as tent master at John's public meetings in Maine. Years later, Butler declared that he "loved Bro. Andrews greatly."

George Butler's family became some of the earliest Adventist settlers in Waukon, Iowa. George helped them move there in 1855 but traveled rather extensively before settling down himself in 1859, when he became active in the local Adventist church and claimed land for a farm. John Andrews baptized George, and the Butlers and Andrews became close neighbors and friends. During these Iowa years, William Andrews, John's brother, married George's sister, Martha. John would, on occasion, help out on the Butler farm when he returned home from his ministerial travels. As the years passed, George Butler's leadership ability became evident, resulting in his selection to head the Iowa Conference in 1865.

Butler needed Andrews' theological judgment to save him from fanatical leanings in the interpretation of scripture. In 1868, John worked for about two weeks at Waukon to help revive the church and change Butler's attitudes about a "ridiculous" interpretation in the book of Revelation. Butler carried the burdens of leadership well, which attracted the attention of the Whites. In 1871, he became the fourth person to serve as the president of the General Conference. As a general church leader, Butler naturally turned to John Andrews for advice because of a friendship of nearly twenty years, family ties and John's own experience.<sup>19</sup>

Our story, meanwhile, turns to another church leader also bound to John Andrews through family ties. As young men inclined to intellectual interests, Uriah Smith and John Andrews must have quickly developed a mutual regard and respect that lasted throughout their lives. They encouraged each other in intellectual pursuits. They married sisters and they visited with one another in family settings. Although brothers-in-law, their discretion with regard to their public relationships apparently enabled them to escape censure because of family connections. Smith came to Rochester in 1853, met Harriet Stevens who came there to work at the Review in 1854, and married her in Battle Creek on 6 June 1857. He carried heavy burdens in Battle Creek in the later 1850's while Andrews languished in Iowa. The Smiths undoubtedly had a great influence in keeping John and Angeline close to the church in the midst of the general Waukon unrest.<sup>20</sup> In the late 1860's, as we have seen, Andrews and Smith worked together in giving Smith a rest from editorial work. The time for further cooperation was now at hand.

John Andrews continued to plan to revise his highly regarded Sabbath history.<sup>21</sup> James White concurred. He wrote in the Review in September, 1870, of the great need for a revised edition of the History of the Sabbath which had been out of print for two years. He said that

Andrews would "spend the autumn and much of the winter near Boston" to devote his "time and energies . . . to the preparation of his History." White invited 200 donors to provide £10 each to purchase a library for Andrews' use since he could not afford a library when he prepared the earlier edition. Offering almost unlimited help, James White said "we hope Bro. Andrews will prepare the second edition as soon as possible. He can have all the help and means he needs to accomplish the work on application to this Office."<sup>22</sup>

Andrews felt he needed research help and called on Uriah Smith to lay down his editorial responsibilities and come to Boston to help him. This Uriah did in the summer of 1871, spending thirteen weeks "endeavoring to assist Bro. Andrews somewhat," in the "collection of materials." He reported that they had found "some valuable testimony . . . well worth all the time and expense that would be involved in extensive research." Uriah concluded that his "association with Bro. Andrews the past summer has been of the most agreeable character."<sup>23</sup> By the end of 1871, then, Andrews seemed to have cordial relations with all the leaders of his church and all seemed to be going well. The events in 1872 changed this.

Andrews received two blows in 1872. Which event came first cannot be fully determined but in all likelihood the first was a testimony from Ellen White (either late in 1871 or early in 1872). She sent a testimony of reproof because of her feeling that Andrews devoted too much time to intellectual investigation and study. She felt he should concentrate on becoming a better balanced person. She argued that

there are very few minds that can follow you unless they give the subject the depth of thought you have done. . . . Minds become weary in reading and following you. . . . The "History of the Sabbath" should have been out long ago. You should not wait to have everything so exactly as strong as you can possibly make it before giving it to the people.<sup>24</sup>

The second calamity gave Andrews a blow from which he never recovered. His beloved Angeline died on 19 March 1872. He wrote in anguished heart



of his inexpressible sorrow. Angeline "faithfully shared my burdens," he said, doing "the utmost in her power to help me to go out to labor in the cause of God and has never once complained when I have remained long absent. During the entire period of our married life no unkind word ever passed between us, and no vexed feeling ever existed in our hearts."<sup>25</sup> The loneliness of Rochester without Angeline drove John to take Charles and Mary to South Lancaster, Massachusetts, in May 1872, where he once again took up his work on the Sabbath history.<sup>26</sup>

In the midst of this personal tragedy for John Andrews the leadership crisis that staggered the Adventist church in the early 1870's came close to separating friends of long standing. Uriah Smith stood against James White over the latter's censure of Smith for the financial debacle of the publishing association during the years 1866 to 1869 while White recovered from his stroke. James White had to devote energy he could little afford and risked his precarious health to move in and restore operating order to the publishing association in 1869.<sup>27</sup>

By September, 1871, White had come close to another breaking point because of hard work and planned to resign from the publishing association. J. N. Andrews, in a statement in the Review entitled "The Burdens Upon Bro. White," said that "we believe as the result of long experience, that Bro. White should fill the position of general counselor and business agent in the work." Yet the heavy responsibility James White carried should not require "unremitting toil in attending to the details of the several departments of the general work." Under Andrews' leadership, other appointments were made to assist James White and all pledged greater support to the venerable leader.<sup>28</sup>

White's severe criticism of Smith precipitated a rift that widened over the next four years to an unbridgeable chasm. Uriah declared in 1869 that if the two could not cooperate, he recognized that it was

his responsibility to leave Battle Creek, rather than James White. The year's absence from the editorial office in 1869-1870 only delayed the impending clash. The breach became irreparable in 1873 when Uriah questioned the authority of James White to hold a privileged position as counselor to the others.<sup>29</sup>

Butler had tried in the early months of 1873 to get the Whites reconciled not only to Smith but to Andrews as well. Early in 1873, Andrews wrote James White that he had prayed for him each day since they had parted in Battle Creek. Andrews spoke of his encouragement "to hope in God" and that he believed he could "yet be of some use in His cause."<sup>30</sup> On 20 March 1873, after the General Conference session, Butler had a long meeting with Andrews, J. H. Waggoner and the Whites. They were indeed "sorrowful times" as George Amadon wrote in his diary.<sup>31</sup>

An undated document entitled a "Statement of Wrongs in the Course of J. N. Andrews" seems to fit somewhere in this period. Andrews acknowledged that he had "failed in very many respects" in helping the Whites carry their heavy burdens. He admitted that he had not discerned the mistakes of "J. M. Aldrich in the Review Office." Andrews said that in the past, "if my mind was strongly impressed to a different action from his (James White's) advice concerning me, that I must give considerable weight to that impression." He concluded that now, though, "whenever I have the united judgment of Brother and Sister White, it will be my duty to accept it and set mine aside." He was "willing to yield to them-- each--all the deference that it is proper to yield to mortal man."<sup>32</sup>

This last qualifying statement seemed to be John Andrews' accommodation in getting along with the other church leaders and especially James and Ellen White. An essentially humble, gentle man, he naturally accepted counsel and tried to apply it to his life within the limits that enabled him to function as an independent human spirit.

Andrews returned to Boston after the March meetings. Matters deteriorated in Battle Creek. On 15 May 1873, Uriah Smith was relieved of his position of Editor of the Review. Smith left the city and got a job as a wood engraver in Grand Rapids, doubling his income.<sup>33</sup> Andrews maintained confidence in the church, writing in the Review that he had "not one doubt in my heart that this is the cause of God." He believed "God has been leading in this work by his Holy Spirit. It is not the work, nor the cause of man."<sup>34</sup>

Meanwhile, Andrews wrote an editorial in the Review entitled "Duty toward Those that Have the Rule." Ever the Bible student, he cited Hebrews 13:17 which admonishes: "Obey them that have the rule over you." Referring to those "called to bear the chief responsibility in the work of God," Andrews said that "it is in the highest degree reasonable to believe that those thus chosen should have clearer and juster ideas by far of the steps that should be taken." He asserted that it was "an honor to be the helper of such, and no disgrace to stand in a position where we are more ready to receive counsel than to give it ourselves, or to find fault with that which is given." He asked, "shall we always be fault-finders and murmurers, and think our dignity sacrificed by our acknowledging others to have clearer views of God's work than we ourselves possess?" Calling for all to be "true helpers," he concluded that this was the only way "if we would not displease God," and that it was "reasonable and just that we should do it."<sup>35</sup>

George Butler followed this with an essay on leadership that concurred with Andrews' earlier statement. During the course of several meetings in November, 1873, at the time of the General Conference session, a general reconciliation took place. All had not been settled by November 17, when the annual meeting of the publishing association convened. James White was elected president and also editor of the Review.

Nine days later, on November 26, after the reconciliation, Uriah Smith and J. N. Andrews were elected "additional editors of the Review for the ensuing year."<sup>36</sup> Several articles followed in the Review with each one of the participants in the episode of the leadership crisis asserting that harmony once more reigned in their hearts and in the councils of the church that all loved.

During this period of unrest, the work did not languish. Plans unfolded for the founding of a college and occupied the attention of George Butler and Stephen Haskell during the camp meeting season in raising funds for the project. The church increasingly began to look outside the United States also as its world mission unfolded more clearly.

The growing world vision of the work of the Seventh-day Adventist church had an evolving place in the plans of the church leaders. In the early 1860's, the leaders had not responded to Michael B. Czechowski's urging that he be sent to Europe to take the message of the Seventh-day Adventist church. The church had only succeeded in establishing a general organization in 1863. The financial position of the church was precarious at best. The only institution that existed in 1864 was the Seventh-day Adventist publishing association. There was a recognized need to establish the church in the various parts of the United States. The first statistics published in 1867, as a part of the General Conference proceedings, revealed a membership of 4320. There was also a lack of understanding of what it meant to preach the message in all the world. The little Adventist church needed much more development in order to sustain a world work ideologically and financially even though there was an emerging awareness of the mission of the church.<sup>37</sup>

Sometimes with regard to a stream, one can never quite determine its origin. Ideas seem to function the same way. How John Nevins Andrews became involved in the growing concept of world mission in the Seventh-day

Adventist church is not as precisely clear as one would like. Language study may provide one clue. In a letter to Ellen G. White written on 21 December 1870, he stated that he could read French nearly as easily as English and had been able to read his Bible in French for "something over a year." He stated that he had read nothing in German during the year 1870. When Andrews began the study of French and German is not certain although it may have been related to his desire to read historical and theological works in these languages for his research on the Sabbath history.<sup>38</sup>

The arrival of the Swiss James Erzberger was not without importance. Spending the year 1869-1870 at Battle Creek living with the Whites and learning English under Professor G. H. Bell, he became acquainted with Andrews who used his editorial position to raise funds for the Swiss Sabbath keepers.<sup>39</sup> In June 1870, he went to stay with Andrews, now in Rochester, and there completed his education with a thorough study of the tenets of the Adventist faith.<sup>40</sup> Although he lost influence with his Swiss brethren on his return, he remains a neglected link between the pioneering work of M. B. Czechowski and the mission of J. N. Andrews.

When Erzberger left for Switzerland, however, American Adventists did not think in terms of sending American missionaries to Europe. Erzberger had been encouraged to learn English so that he might translate American publications into French and German, and even as late as the spring of 1873 the church leaders were still fostering the idea of publishing literature in the United States in the various European languages, and sending it there as individuals in America embraced the message and worked for their families in Europe. This aspect of the church's understanding of its mission needs more study as a significant strand of Adventist thought for more than a decade. A clear understanding of establishing a work in Europe administered by the General Conference still eluded the leaders.<sup>41</sup>

Gradually, however, the church came to the inescapable conclusion that missionaries from the United States must go to Europe to strengthen the work and build on the faith of those who had accepted the message. At what time J. N. Andrews reached the conclusion in his own mind that he wanted to assume the assignment as the first Adventist worker in Europe remains unclear. In the summer of 1873, he published a lengthy account of M. B. Czechowski's role in establishing the Seventh-day Adventist message in Europe and the subsequent events related to that enterprise. He obviously had assumed the role of spokesman for the European Adventists in America.<sup>42</sup>

In November 1873, at the General Conference session that achieved a resolution of the leadership crisis, James White said that the meeting had been called to consider among other important matters of business, the question of "sending a missionary to Switzerland." If a discussion took place, no action was recorded in the minutes for that session.<sup>43</sup>

John Andrews gave a clue to the inaction of the General Conference in a letter to Ellen White on 6 February 1874. It perhaps had been a foregone conclusion that he would be selected to represent the General Conference in Europe. Since his wife's death, he had been deeply involved in significant church responsibilities. His delicate role in the leadership crisis must have cost him significantly in terms of emotional involvement. Ellen White had written to him pointing out weaknesses that needed to be corrected. He responded that her "message of reproof" was "nevertheless one of great encouragement." He admitted that the struggle "to regain the ground which I have lost," and "taking hold on God," had been difficult because he had lost self-confidence.

Andrews said that he had been engaged in arranging his "affairs for leaving this country." He referred to "the judgment of the conference that I should be proved for a time before sending me to Europe; or

rather that I should show that I was again made strong in God before being sent on this work." He said that he "thought this all right." On 24 February 1874, he wrote to James White that he would "be ready very shortly to go to Europe unless you think I should not go." Apparently, the question still remained unsettled. This was the ultimate test of the leadership doctrine Andrews had proposed the previous autumn.<sup>44</sup> Indecision on the part of the Whites continued. Andrews wrote to Ellen White on 12 March 1874, telling of closing "up all my matters in Lancaster so as to leave the country if thought best." He planned to sell his house in Rochester and "then I will go or stay as shall be thought best." On 21 April 1874, he wrote from Battle Creek that he was going to return to Rochester to sell his house and "start for Europe at once if there be no light to the contrary." It would appear that Andrews was determined to go and willing to do so without official General Conference approval. He wanted mostly the approval of James and Ellen White.<sup>45</sup>

It was George I. Butler, however, who pushed through a decision to send John Andrews to Europe. At the General Conference session in August 1874, he recommended to the Conference to take some action in the matter, "especially in consideration that Elder J. N. Andrews is about to take his departure to engage in the cause in Switzerland." The delegates adopted a formal resolution instructing "the Executive Committee to send Elder J. N. Andrews to Switzerland as soon as practicable."<sup>46</sup>

Butler made the formal announcement in the Review on 15 September 1874, saying that Andrews "leaves us to go abroad to look after the general interests of the cause in Europe." He expected that this event would "open the way for the progress of the work in all directions in Europe." On a personal note, he said "we can but feel sad to say farewell to one who has so long been identified with the work in our midst. We shall greatly miss him." He asked that God go with him and that the prayers of his brethren follow him.<sup>47</sup>

James White gave his blessing in a general article on the state

of affairs in the church. He said "Eld. J. N. Andrews, who has nobly defended the truth from his very youth, leaves for Europe, probably before these lines shall meet the eyes of the patrons of the Review. God bless him." He left behind, White said, not only "the results of a quarter of a century of toil in the cause of truth," but also "nearly half his family . . . in the silent grave."<sup>48</sup>

It was indeed difficult for the Whites to give J. N. Andrews up for they had labored together for a quarter of a century. Ellen White commented that she had "never heard Brother Andrews do as well as he did in Maine. He leaves for Europe next week. Our prayers are that God may go with him."<sup>49</sup> J. N. Andrews and Ellen White conferred for the last time just before he left Maine for Boston and on to Europe. They visited in the evening and he left before she got up the next morning. She wrote to her husband that "she had no opportunity to bid him good-by and I did not care to say good-by. We may never, never meet again."<sup>50</sup>

Separated physically from family and friends but never in thoughts and prayers, John Nevins Andrews embarked on a voyage on 15 September 1874 that would bring him unimagined challenges, uncalculated difficulties, heartache and sorrow, and finally an illness that claimed his life while still at the height of his powers. John Andrews wrote from London about three weeks after he left Boston telling of his trip and the brief contacts he had with English Sabbath-keepers. He declared that "the time has come when a special effort should be made" for England.<sup>51</sup>

Traveling on to Paris, he reached Neuchatel, Switzerland, on 16 October 1874. Soon after his arrival, he called a meeting of Swiss Sabbath-keepers to convene on 1 November. He wrote that the meeting encouraged him because "there are true-hearted brethren in Switzerland." Regular reports followed telling of other groups of Sabbath-keepers on



the Continent. In those reports for the first two years of his stay in Europe, he described the status of the various groups of Sabbath-keepers, difficulties he encountered, people he met, and the financial needs he had in beginning his work.<sup>52</sup>

During the first phase of his European work, J. N. Andrews proceeded to lay the foundation for the organization of the scattered Sabbath-keepers into a church. He gradually helped some of the European Adventists to accept his ideas as how best to proceed, organized a tract society, distributed literature and began publication of tracts in Europe. In effect, he proceeded to create the church from the only model he knew, that of the American Adventist church. He had a compelling urge to begin the publication of an Adventist paper in French as an arm of the fledgling church.<sup>53</sup>

Andrews studied French grammar carefully during 1875 but did not make as rapid progress as he would have liked in speaking the language. He hoped to gain converts better able to use cultivated French to assist him in his work. His great desire "to preach Christ in the French language" motivated him to engage in diligent study.<sup>54</sup>

John Andrews early began to express a broad vision for the European Adventist work. He wanted to see other countries entered and "see the work of God advanced in Europe." He called for the establishment of a mission in Great Britain where no language barrier existed. Increasingly, he wrote about the difficulties of finances. In several personal letters to James White in 1876, he told of the costs related to printing and the need for funds from America because the Swiss Adventists could not sustain the publication of a French paper alone. He asked for James White's advice on all aspects of the European work.<sup>55</sup>

White responded to the European missionary effort enthusiastically. The early reports cheered and encouraged him greatly. He raised funds

with his accustomed vigor to finance the organization and growth of the Seventh-day Adventist church in Europe. In May, 1876, he launched a campaign to raise \$10,000 to equip a printing plant in Switzerland "under the care of our worthy missionary, Elder J. N. Andrews."<sup>56</sup>

A growing concern surfaced on the part of James and Ellen White that more should have been accomplished in the first two years of the Andrews' mission. In 1876, Ellen White wrote to James that John Andrews was "shortening his days because he lifts the burdens all himself. He thinks no one can make a success unless his plans and ideas of carrying forward the work are exactly after his own order." She concluded that "the work that ought to be more widespread and nearly self-sustaining, is retarded and circumscribed."<sup>57</sup>

In addition to funds, Andrews needed help. The General Conference decided that Daniel T. Bourdeau would be the man to assist Andrews. A French Canadian, Bourdeau had labored as an Adventist minister since 1858 and had helped begin the work in California in 1868. Andrews and Bourdeau were not close but they had worked together previously on occasion. J. N. Andrews accepted the news of his coming with gratitude, comparing Bourdeau to Titus. On his part, Daniel Bourdeau admitted to his "infirmities and lacks" but trusted in God to strengthen him for this assignment. He perceived his task to be to translate some church publications into French and to help Andrews begin publishing the French paper.<sup>58</sup>

Upon his arrival in Switzerland early in 1876, Bourdeau reported that Andrews had not exaggerated the possibilities of the spread of the Adventist teachings in that part of the world. He observed that the "increasing responsibilities and burdens" carried by Andrews warranted the "need of assistance in the work." Bourdeau affirmed his commitment to unite "with our dear brother in laboring for the furtherance of the common cause in Europe."<sup>59</sup>

The promise of a harmonious working partnership was not fulfilled. Andrews regarded Bourdeau's French inadequate for the careful work of translation and writing for the paper. He soon found that Bourdeau's restless, wandering spirit caused more difficulty than help. They had different ideas about how to proceed. Both, perhaps, were correct but they obviously could not work closely together. Andrews described him to James White as too independent and strong-willed. Bourdeau's zeal and self-confidence bewildered Andrews who said he was at his "wits end to know what to do with him and for him."<sup>60</sup>

The second half of J. N. Andrews first stay in Europe passed too rapidly to encompass all he had planned. He expanded the available literature in tract form and Les Signes des Temps, begun in 1876, gained growing acceptance. His children became increasingly helpful to him. Mary, especially, became very proficient in French. Daniel Bourdeau adapted to the European challenges better as the months passed and Andrews had a good report to give James White about the change. Some of the Swiss Adventists continued to pose a problem for him.<sup>61</sup>

Financial difficulties loomed even larger as the work expanded. Andrews wrote frequently to James White in 1877 describing their poverty and the hardship under which they labored. James White doubled his efforts to supply the finances called for to advance the work. As the year progressed, talk of sending others to assist Andrews and Bourdeau increased. Andrews very much wanted W. C. White to join him to take charge of business affairs. To James White, he gave thanks "from the depth of my heart . . . for the words of encouragement you speak."<sup>62</sup>

Andrews regained his strength in 1877 after a serious illness early in the year. By the beginning of 1878, he was actively planning to establish a printing office. James White came to believe that the location of the office and mission headquarters in Basel was a mistake

because of high expenses. Andrews acknowledged that it may have been but that he and Bourdeau decided on this location because of its pivotal nature between French and German-speaking people. As the year passed, Andrews wrote more and more to W. C. White and dwelt on the need for money almost continually.<sup>63</sup>

One bright spot in 1878 was the active association of Albert Vuilleumier with Andrews in a public meeting. Another was the help of the William Ings and Maud Sisley who had arrived in Switzerland the previous December. A sad note told of the fear that Mary had tuberculosis. In the midst of triumph and tribulation, James White sent a dispatch urging Andrews to "come to the General Conference." After careful consideration, he decided to do so and to bring Mary with him for treatment at Battle Creek. He expected to remain only a short time but his stay lasted nearly a year. Mary's death and his own illness prevented him from returning as quickly as he planned.<sup>64</sup>

As J. N. Andrews left Europe, Ellen White sent a special testimony to the "Brethren in Switzerland." She reproved them for failing to accept and support Andrews more adequately. She told them that John Andrews had been needed in America but "his great caution, his experience, his God-fearing dignity in the desk" seemed to qualify him to assist them in establishing the church in Europe. "We sent you" she wrote "the ablest man in all our ranks but you have not appreciated the sacrifice we made in thus doing."<sup>65</sup>

Andrews' sacrifice included two more family graves when Mary died in Michigan and his brother, William, died in Iowa. In some ways he was a broken man. Ellen White wrote him a most supportive letter on 5 December 1878. She encouraged him to return to Europe. Addressing him as "Dear Afflicted Brother Andrews" she signed her letter "your sympathizing sister." In tender words she assured him that God still

loved him and advised him to "look up by faith now and forever."<sup>66</sup>

While Ellen White encouraged J. N. Andrews to return to Europe she also counseled him to remain in the United States until the winter had ended and he had recovered his strength to a greater degree. Later she urged him to find a wife that he could take with him to make a home for him and Charles. He responded that he had earnestly prayed about the matter but had not been impressed by God that he should take such a step.<sup>67</sup>

On May 29, Andrews sailed from New York bound for Glasgow. Traveling on to London, he was a guest of William Jones, the Seventh Day Baptist pastor; and from there he went, ill once more, to Southampton to be with John Loughborough. The Andrews party remained there with Loughborough for almost two months.<sup>68</sup>

John Loughborough and John Andrews had been close friends since 1852 when Loughborough accepted the Seventh-day Adventist faith while attending a series of meetings conducted by Andrews.<sup>69</sup> Loughborough moved to Waukon, Iowa, after the Andrews family did to sustain himself financially. Reentering the full-time active ministry after the Whites visited Waukon in 1856, he and John Andrews worked closely together in evangelistic meetings and in conducting the general affairs of the church in the 1860's. In 1868, Loughborough began a fruitful ministry in pioneering the message in California and spent ten years there before accepting the call to begin evangelistic work in England.<sup>70</sup>

He encountered some of the same difficulties that Andrews experienced even though he had no language barrier. He observed that it took "a longer time to raise an interest . . . than in America," because it was "like a new departure with many to listen to preaching requiring deep thought and study on their part."<sup>71</sup> Because of Ellen White's counsel, Andrews returned to England in the summer of 1880 to assist Loughborough in evangelistic work. Loughborough reported that "it has been our

privilege for the last four months to enjoy the society of Bro. Andrews, but we have been sad to see him so feeble."<sup>72</sup>

Somewhat alarmed as the months passed and Andrews grew ever more feeble after his return to Switzerland, the General Conference Committee set aside Sabbath, 21 May 1881 as a day of fasting and prayer. Specifically, church members were asked to "remember our beloved Bro. Andrews, one of the faithful pioneers in the work . . . for his loss would be very great. . . . His articles were never clearer or more weighty."<sup>73</sup>

George Butler wrote to John Loughborough about this time to go to Switzerland to see if anything could be done to help their old friend. Accordingly, Loughborough came on 13 May 1881, and "found Bro. Andrews better." Speaking of the anointing service on Sabbath, 21 May, the day of fasting, Loughborough described Andrews' bedroom during the service as a "heavenly place." He said, "Angels of God looked down upon the service. The presence of God was here. It was the gate of heaven to our souls. Bro. Andrews was greatly blessed."<sup>74</sup>

Before going to England in 1880, Andrews wrote to Ellen White in response to a letter of encouragement that she had written to him on 23 April 1880. He urged her to send him any counsel she had concerning the work in Europe and that he would be "exceedingly rejoiced" if she would come to Switzerland. He asked her to "accept the gratitude of my heart for what you have written."<sup>75</sup>

James White also wrote him in the summer of 1880, and Andrews responded that he was "deeply touched with the expressions of sympathy and kindness which it contains." A misunderstanding over a minor matter about subscriptions to Les Signes des Temps from French Adventists in Illinois had prompted Andrews to write to White on 6 June that he was "not alienated from Battle Creek."<sup>76</sup>

In the spring of 1881, John Andrews wrote his last letter to

James White. Apparently, White had expressed a long-held desire that he and his wife wanted to come to see the work in Europe. Andrews said that he had frequently expressed his desire that they come but he could be of no assistance to them if they should come at that time. He declared that he was "confined to my bed, struggling with terrible disease of the lungs, which threatens me with certain death unless God interposes." He hoped to rally and "then with more propriety invite you to come and bear your testimony."<sup>77</sup> Andrews did rally somewhat but time was running out for James White.

John Andrews lived to write James White's obituary. To Andrews, his friend was "in an eminent sense a minister of Christ. He did not shrink from toil, from sacrifice, nor from reproach." Referring to more than 30 years of intimate association with him, "we bear testimony to his excellence as a man, a Christian, and a minister of the Word of God." Andrews singled out White's talent for business management, declaring that "the work accomplished in America under his general supervision" was "a monument which can never be overthrown." Beyond that, Andrews noted his "deep interest in the mission of the Seventh-day Adventists in Europe."<sup>78</sup>

Stephen Haskell and John Andrews had not maintained close connections while Andrews was in Europe. They had worked together a little in New England and Andrews had supported Haskell's innovative work with Tract and Missionary Societies. Haskell became close to George I. Butler and especially so after Butler's election as General Conference president in October 1880. The two, along with H. W. Kellogg, were the members of the General Conference Committee elected that year. The opposition of James White to their policies and his efforts to unseat them undoubtedly drew them even closer together.<sup>79</sup>

Butler and Haskell, along with James White, had constituted the General Conference Committee elected in 1879 that announced the need for

a general European conference to establish the missions more firmly and make important decisions about the publishing work. It was planned to send some church leaders from America to meet with the leaders in Europe but the meeting had to be postponed.<sup>80</sup>

By the summer of 1880, Andrews wrote to Stephen Haskell that "it will give us the most sincere pleasure to see you and Willie at an early day." Apparently these two men would represent the General Conference at the European Council.<sup>81</sup> Two years later, Haskell came alone, leaving New York on 13 May 1882, visiting all the European missions and conducting various meetings to organize the church more effectively.<sup>82</sup>

Stephen Haskell had nothing but praise to say about John Andrews' work. An early impression he reported was "that more can be accomplished in Europe by publications than by the living preacher." He declared that "the results already accomplished through the efforts of Eld. Andrews are in some respects truly marvelous." John Andrews was encouraged by Elder Haskell's interest and wise counsel in enlarging and advancing the work in Europe. "We felt sad," Andrews said, "at his departure."<sup>83</sup> Haskell wrote in the Review when he got home that "few in America have been able to realize the difficulties under which those labor who go to Europe from this country." He referred specifically to the meager living conditions of Andrews and his fellow workers in Basel.<sup>84</sup>

Haskell's reports sparked a special supplement to the Review published in the spring of 1883 and devoted to the missionary outreach of the Seventh-day Adventist church. The General Conference Committee published a lengthy statement on the importance and wants of the missions. They recognized the need for even greater financing and that what had been accomplished thus far on minimal funding was truly remarkable. Referring in turn to each of the missions, the most favorable statement up to that time to appear in print gave an assessment of John Nevins Andrews' work in Europe.<sup>85</sup>



They regarded the Central European Mission headquartered in Basel "already a great success. . . . We believe that God has wonderfully sustained his servant during all his feebleness, and that he has greatly blessed his labors put forth under the greatest difficulties. . . . Bro. Andrews has done most noble work there in his weakness."

In answer to objections that too much money had been spent and perhaps unwisely at that, the committee defended John Andrews considering that "the money used in this mission" to be well spent, and ". . . the advantages thus gained to the cause are worth far more than the cost. . . . Our people will need no assurances from us that this beloved pioneer, who has labored so long and so faithfully in this cause, and who has almost given life itself for this mission, has not squandered the money raised for it. He has given for it more than any money can buy. It has cost him more than all the money given for the mission by our people could repay."<sup>86</sup>

John Andrews wrote his last report for the Review on 22 July 1883. He noted that "today I enter my fifty-fifth year. My life seems wholly filled with faults. I pray that I may be thoroughly cleansed in the blood of Christ, and I feel earnestly to ask that whenever my example has not been in accordance with the gospel of Christ, those who have seen my faults may freely forgive me." He thanked "the many friends who have manifested their interest in this mission by writing and by making contributions to its expenses." Expressing an "intense desire to continue in the work" he cheerfully submitted to God's will for him.<sup>87</sup>

Andrews was anxious for the B. L. Whitney party to arrive. In 1881, George Butler had proposed sending Whitney, president of the New York Conference, to Switzerland to help Andrews and look after him. Andrews had been closely associated with the New York Conference and had a special regard for Whitney. Ellen White had opposed this plan but

supported the idea of sending John Loughborough to Switzerland from England. In December, 1882, when Stephen Haskell made his report to the General Conference session, a resolution was approved to send Whitney to Switzerland to assist John Andrews. Undoubtedly, George Butler was responsible for Sarah Andrews, John's mother, accompanying the Whitneys to Switzerland. His sister, Martha, the widow of William Andrews, and John's sister-in-law also made the trip. The party arrived in Basel on 26 July 1883.<sup>88</sup>

Whitney brought with him a special letter from Ellen White to John Andrews; it was the last letter that she wrote to him. In the Ellen G. White papers, a long letter to J. N. Andrews dated 29 March 1883 began with the sentence "I have heretofore written you several letters and never sent them, so I attempt to write you again." A partial letter dated 17 March apparently was never completed. On 11 June, in writing to her son, Willie, she told of a 13-page letter to Andrews but it apparently did not reach Whitney before he left for Switzerland late in June.<sup>89</sup>

On 30 March, Ellen White wrote to B. L. Whitney and sent him a copy of the letter of 29 March which Whitney read to Andrews shortly after his arrival in Switzerland. Mrs. White told Whitney that she highly respected Andrews but that he must not allow Andrews to "control your movements." She said Andrews had "given the impression of suffering when he has endured no more than ordinary laborers in their first experience in this work." She regarded Andrews as having a "diseased mind." Mrs. White thought that John Andrews would die and said she "could not pray for his life, for I consider he has held and is still holding the work in Switzerland. It is most difficult to correct him and to change his plans or his course of action in anything." She concluded that she did not want Andrews "injured, neither do I want the cause of God to bear the hindrance and the mold of his diseased imagination."<sup>90</sup>

The letter she wrote to Andrews was the most severe rebuke she had ever given him. She said that "if you go down into the grave, I do not want you should go down in deception." Referring to him as "my dear and much respected brother," she proceeded to enumerate his character defects. The Andrews and Stevens families, she felt, had been a bad mix from the beginning; they had fostered his desire "to crave for sympathy, to love to be pitied, to be regarded as one suffering privations and as a martyr." She told him of his sin of dwelling on himself, of mourning for his wife and daughter as he had done, of fostering his strong will and determination as a leader, and his worship of intellect. She said that God did not design that he "should walk a path of loneliness and suffer privations in any respect amid plenty." Dwelling at length on his rejection of her counsel regarding his remarriage, she told him that he had not been a good father to his son, Charles. Finally, she said that many of his friends in America "would have plucked out their eyes for you." His "near and dear associates in your early experience" she said, "have flattered you, petted you, and construed your defects into virtues."<sup>91</sup>

This letter must have broken Andrews' spirit and will to live. He wrote to "Sister White," saying "I humble myself before God to receive from His hand the severe rebuke which He has given you for me. I most cordially thank you for your faithfulness in writing me so fully on matters that must be very painful to you to write. I have tried to humble myself before God in the dust in view of my sins." He declared with courage, though, that "my feet are on the Rock of Ages and that the Lord holds me by my right hand." He concluded by saying, "do not ever think it possible that I shall not receive whatever testimony you have for me, and if you have still other reproofs to give, do not withhold them, I pray you. I beg you to believe me as ever, one who sincerely desires to follow the right."<sup>92</sup>

After John Andrews died on 21 October 1883, the sad news was cabled to America. While Uriah Smith complied with his wishes that no eulogy be printed in the Review, he announced the death of the beloved church leader observing that "Pleasant memories in multitudes of hearts . . . will remain fresh and green while time shall last." Referring to his significant body of published theological writing, Smith declared that his books and articles gave "ample testimony to his efficiency and faithfulness in the cause in which he was engaged."<sup>93</sup>

J. N. Loughborough published the first book-length history of the Seventh-day Adventist church in 1892. He made numerous references to J. N. Andrews' contributions to the church and devoted three pages to an appraisal of his theological works. Loughborough contrasted James White's abilities as a founder and developer of institutions with Andrews' efforts to "fully develop the truth." John Andrews' greatest achievement was "in developing the literature of the denomination of Seventh-day Adventists" which continued to speak after his death. Loughborough quoted a friend who remarked that Andrews' request not to have a eulogy constituted the greatest eulogy that could have been written about him for it revealed "that the uppermost desire of his mind was that Christ should appear in his life, and that self be left out of sight."<sup>94</sup>

What can one conclude from this account of the relationship that J. N. Andrews sustained with church leaders? It is clear that John Andrews and James and Ellen White had periods of stress and tension as well as happy and tender times in their personal associations. It is also clear that the other influential leaders, Uriah Smith, George I. Butler and John Loughborough, were close to Andrews throughout this period. Moreover, in the times of stress, they maintained a close relationship among themselves as they tried to acknowledge the particular leadership role of the Whites in the church.

The early leaders of the Seventh-day Adventist church were strong-willed, talented people. They had a great task, meager resources and a relatively short span of years to gain experience but they did make enormous progress. To develop and refine a system of doctrine, to organize the church for effective growth, to plan a program and execute the plan took energy and skill. In spite of their differences, they achieved enormous success collectively and individually. John Andrews' part in that accomplishment was fully recognized by his fellow leaders.

NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Andrews also wrote for the English Seventh Day Baptist Sabbath Memorial: see below pp. 231-232.

<sup>2</sup>Ellen G. White, Life Sketches of Ellen G. White (Mountain View, California, 1915), p. 127.

<sup>3</sup>James White wrote that "for the last four years he has given himself exclusively to preaching and writing. His love and zeal for the truth, and for the salvation of souls, has been such, that he has toiled on, day and night, with little regard for health, till several times he has been brought so low that we could have but little hope of his recovery." Second Advent Review and Sabbath Herald (hereafter cited as RH), 20 Feb. 1855, p. 182.

<sup>4</sup>See RH Jan. 1851, p. 38; 25 Nov. 1851, p. 54; 2 Mar. 1852, p. 102.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid. 7 Mar. 1854, p. 56; 20 Feb. 1855, p. 183.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid. 9 Feb. 1864, p. 88; 26 July 1864, p. 72.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid. 15 Jan. 1857, p. 84; Ellen G. White Research Centre, Andrews University, Michigan (hereafter cited as WRCAU), The Letters of Ellen G. White, 1847-1915 (hereafter cited as White Corresp.) June 1860; RH 17 Dec. 1861, p. 22.

<sup>8</sup>RH 4 Nov. 1862, p. 182; 26 May 1863, pp. 204-206.

<sup>9</sup>Ellen G. White, Testimony to the Church at Battle Creek (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1872), pp. 70-83.

<sup>10</sup>RH 28 May 1867, pp. 283-284; 26 May 1868, p. 356.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid. 25 May 1869, p. 174; 15 June 1869, p. 196; 29 Mar. 1870, p. 116. See also Eugene F. Durand, Yours In the Blessed Hope, Uriah Smith (Washington, D.C., 1980), pp. 272-273.

<sup>12</sup>Uriah Smith et al., An Appeal To The Youth (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1864), pp. 84-85.

<sup>13</sup>Ellen G. White, Life Sketches (Mountain View, California, 1915), pp. 170-171; Virgil E. Robinson, James White (Washington, D.C., 1976), pp. 171-174.

<sup>14</sup>WRCAU, Ellen G. White, Diary, 23 Jan. 1868.

<sup>15</sup>WRCAU, The Letters of J. N. Andrews, 1862-1883 (hereafter cited as Andrews Corresp.), 3 July 1868.

- <sup>16</sup> RH 26 Oct. 1869, p. 144; 26 Apr. 1870, p. 152.
- <sup>17</sup> J. N. Andrews Library, Heritage Room, Andrews University (hereafter cited as AUHR), J. N. Andrews' Bible.
- <sup>18</sup> Andrews Corresp. 21 Dec. 1870.
- <sup>19</sup> Emmett K. Vandevere, Rugged Heart: The Story of George I. Butler (Nashville, 1979), pp. 14-15, 19, 76; Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, 1976 ed., pp. 209-210, 853-854; Andrews Corresp. 3, 14, 16 July 1868. See also Arthur Spalding, Origin and History of Seventh-day Adventists, 4 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1962), 2:23.
- <sup>20</sup> Durand, pp. 24, 30.
- <sup>21</sup> RH 24 Nov. 1868, p. 252.
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid. 20 Sept. 1870, p. 112; 4 Oct. 1870, p. 128; 1 Nov. 1870, p. 156.
- <sup>23</sup> Ibid. 26 Sept. 1871, p. 116.
- <sup>24</sup> White Corresp. 1872 (?).
- <sup>25</sup> RH 2 Apr. 1872, p. 124.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid. 19 Sept. 1871, p. 108.
- <sup>27</sup> Vandevere, pp. 38-39.
- <sup>28</sup> RH 19 Sept. 1871, p. 109.
- <sup>29</sup> Vandevere, pp. 40-41; Durand, pp. 271-275.
- <sup>30</sup> Andrews Corresp. 7 Jan. 1873.
- <sup>31</sup> Durand, p. 274.
- <sup>32</sup> WRCAU, J. N. Andrews, "Statement of Wrongs in the Course of J. N. Andrews," no date.
- <sup>33</sup> Durand, p. 274.
- <sup>34</sup> RH 24 June 1873, p. 12.
- <sup>35</sup> RH 16 Sept. 1873, p. 108.
- <sup>36</sup> Durand, pp. 275-277; RH 25 Nov. 1873, p. 190; 9 Dec. 1873, p. 207.
- <sup>37</sup> Rajmund L. Dabrowski, Editor, Michael Belina Czechowski, 1818-1876. Results of the Historical Symposium About His Life and Work Held in Warsaw, Poland, May 17-23, 1976, Commemorating the Hundredth Anniversary of His Death (Warsaw, 1979), pp. 140-142; RH 28 May 1867, p. 283.

- <sup>38</sup> Andrews Corresp. 21 Dec. 1870.
- <sup>39</sup> RH 30 Nov. 1869, pp. 181, 184; 26 July 1870, pp. 45-46.
- <sup>40</sup> Ibid. 30 Nov. 1869, pp. 181, 183; 26 July 1870, pp. 45-46.
- <sup>41</sup> Ibid. 20 May 1873, p. 181. James White had suggested the possibility of supporting a minister in Europe as early as 1862 but it had not materialized.
- <sup>42</sup> Ibid. 8 July 1873, p. 29.
- <sup>43</sup> Ibid. 25 Nov. 1873, p. 190.
- <sup>44</sup> Andrews Corresp. 6, 24 Feb. 1874.
- <sup>45</sup> Ibid. 12 Mar., 21 Apr. 1874.
- <sup>46</sup> RH 25 Aug. 1874, p. 75.
- <sup>47</sup> Ibid. 15 Sept. 1874, p. 100.
- <sup>48</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>49</sup> White Corresp. Sept. 1874.
- <sup>50</sup> Ibid. 10 Sept. 1874.
- <sup>51</sup> RH 27 Oct. 1874, p. 142.
- <sup>52</sup> Ibid. 24 Nov. 1874, p. 172.
- <sup>53</sup> WRC AU, J. N. Andrews, "First Report to The General Conference Committee"; RH 27 Jan. 1876, p. 30.
- <sup>54</sup> RH 28 Jan. 1875, p. 36.
- <sup>55</sup> Ibid. 15 Apr. 1875, pp. 124-125. See Andrews Corresp. 4 June, 11 Sept., 10 Nov., 10 Dec., 1876.
- <sup>56</sup> RH 18 May 1876, p. 160; 25 Oct. 1877, p. 136.
- <sup>57</sup> White Corresp. 1876.
- <sup>58</sup> RH 28 Oct. 1875, p. 132; 6 Nov. 1875, p. 140; 7 Dec. 1875, p. 181; 23 Dec. 1875, p. 197; 27 Jan. 1876, p. 30.
- <sup>59</sup> Ibid. 27 Jan. 1876, p. 29; 10 Feb. 1876, p. 45.
- <sup>60</sup> Andrews Corresp. 4 June 1876.
- <sup>61</sup> Ibid. 8 Feb., 20 June 1877.
- <sup>62</sup> Ibid. 6 Feb. 1877; RH 4 July 1878; 25 Jan. 1877, p. 28.
- <sup>63</sup> RH 6 Feb. 1880, p. 88; Andrews Corresp. 2 Jan. 1878.



- 64 Andrews Corresp. 8 June 1878; RH 3 Jan. 1878, p. 4; Andrews Corresp. 3, 9 Sept. 1878; RH 26 Sept. 1878, p. 109.
- 65 White Corresp. 29 Aug. 1878.
- 66 Ibid. 5 Dec. 1878.
- 67 Ibid. 27 Jan. 1879; Andrews Corresp. 27 Jan., 24 Apr. 1879.
- 68 RH 5 June 1879, p. 180; 17 July 1879, p. 28.
- 69 J. N. Loughborough, The Great Second Advent Movement: Its Rise and Progress (Nashville, 1905), pp. 317-318.
- 70 RH 8 Aug. 1878, p. 52.
- 71 Ibid. 26 June 1879, p. 5.
- 72 Ibid. 11 Nov. 1880, p. 316.
- 73 Ibid. 3 May 1881, p. 281.
- 74 Ibid. 7 June 1881, p. 361.
- 75 Andrews Corresp. 23 May 1880.
- 76 Ibid. 6 June, 15 Aug. 1880; RH 8 July 1880, p. 48.
- 77 Andrews Corresp. 13 Mar. 1881.
- 78 RH 14 Sept. 1881, p. 216; 5 Mar. 1872, p. 96.
- 79 Ibid. 14 Oct. 1880, p. 252; VandeVere, pp. 49-53.
- 80 RH 11 Dec. 1879, p. 189; [George I. Butler] to Elders Andrews, Loughborough and Matteson, 4 Feb. 1880.
- 81 Andrews Corresp. June 1880.
- 82 RH 16 May 1882, p. 313.
- 83 Ibid. 18 July 1882, pp. 456-457; 14 Nov. 1882, pp. 712-713.
- 84 Ibid. 2 Jan. 1883, p. 9.
- 85 Ibid. Supplement, 1 May 1883, pp. 1-6.
- 86 Ibid.
- 87 Ibid. 14 Aug. 1883, p. 523.
- 88 White Corresp. 22 Apr. 1881; RH 26 Dec. 1882, p. 786; 28 Aug. 1883, p. 560.
- 89 White Corresp. 29 Mar., 11 June 1883.
- 90 Ibid. 30 Mar. 1883.

<sup>91</sup>Ibid. 29 Mar. 1883.

<sup>92</sup>Andrews Corresp. 17 Sept. 1883.

<sup>93</sup>RH 30 Oct. 1883, p. 680.

<sup>94</sup>J. N. Loughborough, Rise and Progress of the Seventh-day Adventists (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1892), pp. 336-339.

# THE ARCHITECT OF ADVENTIST DOCTRINES<sup>1</sup>

K. F. Mueller

The shaping of doctrine played a very important part in the formation of the Seventh-day Adventist church, and it was J. N. Andrews who presented the newly-discovered truths in a precise and logical form with clear, scriptural backing. The major portion of this paper will be a demonstration of the way in which he formulated three--the Adventist position on the Sanctuary, the Three Angels' Messages and the Law of God.

Andrews enjoyed only a few years of formal education because of poor health but he loved books, especially the Bible, and in order to understand it better he asked his father to buy textbooks of Hebrew, Greek and Latin. He eventually learned seven languages<sup>2</sup> and gained a wide comprehension of history. His keen, logical mind and intellectual power were noticed early by his uncle Charles, an American congressman, who offered to pay his way through the university of his choice to be trained as a lawyer.<sup>3</sup> Andrews, then, was a scholar--humble, teachable, systematic, thorough, imbued with a lawyer's analytical mind, yet with a deep fear of God in his heart. Above all, he could write.

## 1. The Sanctuary and the 2300 Days Prophecy<sup>4</sup>

F. D. Nichol has stated that the Seventh-day Adventist movement was born when a new interpretation was given to the prophecy of the 2300 days,<sup>5</sup> and it is certain that the study of the Sanctuary absorbed the major attention of the Seventh-day Adventist pioneers in the early years. After all, it was the peculiar interpretation of the Sanctuary message by William Miller which had led to the formation of the Millerite movement

and its historic climax, the great disappointment, followed by the group's rapid decline after the memorable date, 22 October 1844. While the main body of these believers was at a loss to understand or explain their dilemma because of an unwillingness to take a new look at the Sanctuary idea, different groups drew the Millerites' attention to the necessity of reinterpreting the term "sanctuary." Foremost among these were Hiram Edson, Dr. Hahn and O. R. L. Crozier. Their collective findings were published by Crozier in an article, later endorsed by E. G. White, entitled "The Law of Moses."<sup>6</sup>

Though we have only scanty records of the so-called Sabbath Conferences of 1848,<sup>7</sup> roughly three and a half years after the great disappointment, it is not unreasonable to assume that the study of the Sanctuary must have been the major item on the agenda. To what extent Andrews may have been influenced by their collective findings on this doctrine, is difficult to tell. He himself was not present.<sup>8</sup> However, it was he who systematized this doctrinal king-pin of the emerging Seventh-day Adventist movement in his early work, The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days. The problem which prompted the 24-year-old Andrews to engage in a special study on the Sanctuary question in 1853<sup>9</sup> is stated in his introduction.

After the disappointment, the Millerites denied the connection between the 2300 days of Daniel 8 and the 70 weeks of Daniel 9, thus putting in question the accuracy of the time element which motivated the movement. J. Himes<sup>10</sup> admitted, though, that it was the time element in the presentation of William Miller that influenced him to embrace his views. Said he: "He [Miller] poured forth a flood of light from other scriptures upon every subject, and fully shut me up to the faith, both as to the manner and time of our Saviour's second advent." While Himes sensed that the two time elements should be connected, he did not see how it could be done.

Andrews attributed the dilemma of the Millerite leaders to their unwillingness to rectify their position concerning the Sanctuary. He pointed out the impossibility of retaining the relationship between the 70 weeks and the 2300 days, as long as there was reluctance to relinquish the interpretation of the term "sanctuary" as being of this earth. Andrews felt, however, that the term ought not be left to speculation but must be explained by the Bible itself. He observed, in particular, that another look should be taken at the matter of cleansing the Sanctuary by other means than by fire.

He first takes a critical look at the vision of Daniel 8, focusing on the "little horn" as preliminary to understanding verse 14: "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Andrews underlines that no doubt exists concerning the meaning of the symbols of ram and goat, since the angel explained them. Then he investigates the identification of the little horn with Antiochus Epiphanes, an interpretation which he believes was devised by the papacy to discredit the historic protestant view of this prophecy. He then explains why the little horn could not possibly be Antiochus Epiphanes.

Firstly, he observes that Antiochus was one of the 25 kings that constituted the Syrian horn of the four on the goat (Dan. 8:18). He could not at the same time be "another remarkable horn."

His second reason is an argument from language and history. The ram became great, the goat waxed very great, but the little horn became exceeding great. He then combines the adjectives with the subjects: Persia--great; Greece--very great. Now, he asks, if the Medo-Persian empire, extending from India to Ethiopia, having 127 provinces, was called "great"; and Greece, represented by Alexander, the very great, is there any justification for calling Antiochus, who paid tribute to the Roman Empire,<sup>11</sup> "exceeding great?" "Which then," Andrews asks, "was

exceeding great, the Roman power which exacted the tribute, or Antiochus who was compelled to pay it?" Furthermore, Rome started small but expanded into Asia and Africa--it really did "wax"--whereas Antiochus came into possession of an already established kingdom that he did not enlarge.

Finally, this power was to stand up against the Prince of princes (Dan. 8:25), which is Christ (Rev. 1:5, 17:14; 19:16). Now, since Antiochus died in 164 B.C., how could he possibly be that little horn?

But while Antiochus did not oppose Christ, the Roman authorities actually put him to death, a telling fulfillment of verse 25, and Andrews has no doubt that the other attributes of the little horn outlined in verses 9-10 and 23-25 also fitted either the Roman Empire or its successor, papal Rome. Rome was of fierce countenance, destroying all that stood in its path, thrusting towards the south and the east and the "pleasant land," which Andrews identifies as Palestine by reference to Psalm 106:24, Zech. 7:14 and John 11:49. It is not surprising, either, to find him linking Dan. 8:10 with the Revelator's prophecy of the dragon (12:3,4) and to find him seeing Dan. 8:24 as a prophecy of papal Rome's persecutions. His final point is that the little horn is to be "broken without hands" (verse 25), a phrase reminiscent of the manner in which the last kingdom in the prophecy of Daniel 2 is to be destroyed (Dan. 2:34). Thus, any explanation of the 2300 days will have to take into account a time span that goes far beyond Antiochus Epiphanes. The days, then, cannot be literal. But, he argues, one would not expect them to be, in a chapter so full of symbols. He is thus able to turn the days into years following Eze. 4:4,6 and Num. 14:34.

He next affirms that the beginning of the period must fall within the time of the vision given, i.e. at the height of the Medo-Persian power. In his explanation, the angel left out the time element; hence the phrase "none understood" (Dan. 8:27). This must have been a reference

to the 2300 days. Daniel understood the vision, though "the time appointed was long." Hence, argues Andrews, Daniel must have obtained his understanding in chapter 9. Here we find Daniel in prayer. In divine response Gabriel appears in order to give him skill and understanding (verses 21, 22), obviously concerning the unexplained time-element of the vision (verse 23), which at the end of chapter 8 none had understood. Gabriel launches right into the time factor by explaining the 70 weeks set aside for the Jews (Dan. 9:24-27).

Andrews cites historical and linguistic proofs that the 70 weeks were cut off from the 2300 days, or 490 years from the 2300 years. Gabriel reveals the commencement of the 70 weeks, which must be at the same time the beginning of the longer period, of which the 70 weeks form the first part (Dan. 9:24,25). Andrews then marshals extensive and reliable sources to establish the validity of the starting date as 457 B.C. He verifies historically the accuracy of all particular incidents connected with the 70 weeks in order to show that the 70 year-weeks did indeed fulfil every specific event allotted to the Jewish nation. He summarizes:

These important dates are clearly and unequivocally established by historical, chronological, and astronomical testimony. Sixty-nine of the 70 weeks from the decree in B.C. 457 ended in A.D. 27, when our Lord was baptized, and began to preach, saying, "The time is fulfilled." (Mark 1) Three and a half years from this brings us to the midst of the week in A.D. 31, where it is demonstrated that our Lord was crucified. Three and a half years from A.D. 31, the period of 70 weeks terminates in the autumn of A.D. 34. Or, to be more definite, the first three and a half years of the seventieth week ended in the first Jewish month (April) in the spring of A.D. 31. The remaining three and a half years would therefore end in the seventh month, autumn of A.D. 34.<sup>12</sup>

In conclusion he emphasized that "the first 490 years of the 2300 ended in the seventh month, autumn of A.D. 34."<sup>13</sup> The remaining 1810 years then extended to the autumn of 1844. This is in harmony with the beginning of the 70 years, which he considered to be the commencement of Ezra's work in Jerusalem rather than his start of the journey from

Babylon in 457 B.C. The termination of the prophecy therefore pointed to the autumn of 1844 as the beginning of the cleansing of the Sanctuary.

Andrews thus arrives at the point where all pre-1844 Millerites had arrived and by a similar route. His problem now was to convince disappointed Millerites that they had been mistaken over the event rather than the time and that there was no need (as they had done in their confusion and disappointment) to separate the 70 weeks from the 2300 days. Hence he enquires further into the nature of the cleansing of the sanctuary.<sup>14</sup>

In Dan. 8:11-13, two God-opposing powers are introduced, the "daily" and "the transgression of desolation." (He noted that the term "sacrifice" is not found in the original). These two powers were to desolate the Sanctuary and the host, as verified in verse 13. They are Satan's instruments to overthrow the worship and the cause of God.

Andrews adopted Miller's view that the two desolations are paganism and popery. Miller held that the only available clue to identify the "daily" is given in 2 Thess. 2:7,8 ("the mystery of iniquity" . . . will be taken "out of the way"). He considered "the man of sin" and the "wicked," to be popery. He posed the question: "What hinders popery from being revealed?" and answers, "paganism"; hence, "the daily" must mean paganism.

Satan has used these two powers to desolate the church and to trample the Sanctuary of God underfoot. Paganism, as a God-opposing power, started in the days of Assyria; it was succeeded by the papal "daily" in the sense that it confronted or harassed the cause of God daily or continuously. This is seen by the similarities of pagan priests, altars and sacrifices with the Jewish worship of Jehovah.

The change from Jewish to Christian worship also caused a change in Satan's form of worship as is indicated by Christ's reference to the



"abomination of desolation" in Daniel (Matt. 24:15). Though in A.D. 70 paganism had not yet been replaced by popery, it was essentially the same power, though modified, "that should, as the abomination of desolation, wear out the saints of the Most High." Similarly Paul points to paganism and popery in 2 Thess. 2:7,8 as the working of the "mystery of iniquity." A working together of the two powers can be seen here. A transformation of the strategy of Satan was in progress to transfer the counterfeit worship from paganism to popery. "The same temples, altars, incense, priests and worshipers were ready, with little change, to serve as the appendages of the papal abomination."

The Pantheon "became the sanctuary of all the saints." This so-called "temple of God" set aside, or "trod under foot" the true temple of Jehovah and Jesus Christ who ministers in it. Satan proffered a rival sanctuary of God during the time of pagan Rome, as well as in the Christian era (2 Thess. 2:4).

Paganism and the papacy originate from, and are activated by, the same power. This is indicated by comparing the beast in Revelation 12 with the one in chapter 13. The dragon in the former and the beast in the latter display the same characteristics. A comparison of the two chapters clearly indicates the change from paganism to popery. The whole "Great Controversy" is displayed, and can be witnessed by, the two opposing sanctuaries. Realization of this fact and the need to focus on the Sanctuary of God thus becomes the raison d'être of the new church.

Andrews pointed out that "Christ's reference to the abomination of desolation in Matt. 24:15 and Luke 21:20 is an absolute demonstration that Rome is the "little horn" of Dan. 8:9-12."<sup>15</sup>

In his systematic, step-by-step approach, Andrews next investigates the important question: What is the Sanctuary of God? His procedure is to examine all texts where the term occurs; then he weaves them

closely into strong fabric. He commences by showing that the Sanctuary cannot be either the earth, the Church, or Canaan. His analysis of 143 of the 145 occurrences of the term "sanctuary" reveals that in most cases<sup>6</sup> it refers to the typical tabernacle and the true, heavenly Sanctuary. While bringing many insights (his discussion of the Sanctuary in the book of Psalms is particularly illuminating) his main purpose is to show that the earthly Sanctuary at its various stages had the major typical function of the dwelling place of God on earth, that it ceased to have this function when Christ pronounced, "Behold your house is left unto you desolate" (Matt. 23:38), and that it ceased to exist after its destruction by the Romans, thus fulfilling the 69 weeks prophecy in Dan. 9.<sup>16</sup> Clearly, then, it was not this sanctuary that was to be cleansed at the end of the 2300 days and the cleansing would not take place on the earth. Andrews thus comes to focus upon the heavenly Sanctuary, arguing that the transition from earthly to heavenly had been foretold in Dan. 9. As well as informing Daniel that the earthly Sanctuary would never be rebuilt after the seventy weeks (9:26,27) Gabriel had also pointed to this seventy weeks as belonging to the Jews, thus showing that the rest of the time period did not because, in denying Christ, they had forfeited their right to be God's people or "host" (9:24). As a result, Gabriel pointed to a new-covenant church (host) (9:27) with a new-covenant sacrifice (the Messiah) (9:25) and a new-covenant sanctuary especially anointed for the purpose (9:24). But since this heavenly Sanctuary is the model on which the earthly one was based, it possessed all the essential characteristics of the copy, including the two holy places, a point of some importance later in Andrews' thesis and therefore supported with considerable argumentation.<sup>17</sup>

Before he is ready to use it, however, he dispenses with one important objection, namely, if the Sanctuary is in heaven, how could

pagan and papal Rome tread it underfoot? Hebrews 10:29 and 8:1,2 state that apostate men are able to "tread underfoot even the Minister of the heavenly Sanctuary, that is Jesus Christ"; hence they must also be able to tread underfoot the Sanctuary itself. Furthermore, the little-horn power, i.e. paganism and the papacy, shown in the same vision, is also capable of casting the stars to the ground (Dan. 8:10). Finally the papal power was predicted as blaspheming the tabernacle of God in heaven (Rev. 13:5-7).

But how is this figurative and predictive language to be translated into actual historical events? Andrews asserts that both paganism and the papacy trod down the Sanctuary of the Lord by erecting rival sanctuaries in divers periods of the history of Israel, Babylon and Rome, reaching a climax in Satan's "baptizing his pagan sanctuary and heathen rites and ceremonies calling them Christianity."<sup>18</sup> The final results were the "treading down of the holy city" (Rev. 11:2; 21:2) by the creation of one at Rome in which was erected a counterfeit "temple of God" (2 Thess. 2:4). Ministering in this counterfeit sanctuary was a counterfeit high priest who impersonated Christ (Eph. 4:15) by claiming to forgive sins. Thus Satan had produced a great counterfeit plan of salvation, with substitute city of God, temple, high priests and head of the church.

Having shown the reader that the present Sanctuary is in heaven and that it can be and has been trodden underfoot by activities on earth he is ready to show how it is to be cleansed. Once again, arguing from type to reality, he begins with the cleansing of the earthly Sanctuary on the Day of Atonement.

On the tenth day of the seventh month the ministration was changed from the holy to the most holy place and blood was brought into the most holy place to make an atonement for the people. Both sections of the Sanctuary and the altar of incense were cleansed from the sins of

all the people, which had been symbolically deposited there all year, and the high priest removed the sins of the people from the Sanctuary, placing them on the goat, to be carried away into a desolate place (Ex. 16).

Andrews affirms that the ministry of Christ in the heavenly Sanctuary is according to the earthly Sanctuary pattern, mainly described in the book of Hebrews (8:1-6; 10:1; 9:11-12; Col. 2:17). Christ's ministry commenced after His death and resurrection and followed precisely the earthly pattern. So by necessity it is performed in the two sections of the heavenly Sanctuary. He strengthens his case by dealing with three possible objections.

First, according to Dan. 9:24, Christ was to anoint the most holy at the end of the 70 weeks, which could be interpreted to mean that He began to minister simultaneously in both apartments. Andrews acknowledges that the anointing of the tabernacle is clearly indicated in the Pentateuch (Ex. 14:9-11; 30:23-29; Lev. 8:10; Num. 7:1), but points out that after the anointing, the ministration began in the first apartment (Lev. 8-10; Heb. 9:6,7).

The second objection is based on Heb. 10:12. If Christ was seated at the right hand of God, how could He function in both parts of the Sanctuary? Andrews brushes aside this wooden reading of the text, observing that Christ is also said to be "standing" at the right hand of God (Acts 7:56) and that He is depicted at the right hand of God again at His return in glory. There is clearly more than locality implied in the term. Andrews also uses Heb. 8:1,2 to show that Christ is minister in both parts of the Sanctuary, pointing out that the Greek hagion means holy places and is translated in the King James Version variously as "holiest" (Heb. 9:8) and "holiest of all" (Heb. 10:19). In short, Christ's ministry is in both apartments and this is not incompatible with His being at the right hand of God.

Andrews then examines the book of Revelation concerning the

position and ministry of Christ. He observes in chapter 4:1,2 an open door in heaven, and a throne. Since the throne of God is connected with the temple (Rev. 16:17; Jer. 17:12), he reasons that this must be the door to the first apartment of the heavenly tabernacle, for the second apartment containing the ark is not opened before the sounding of the seventh angel (Rev. 11:19). Further proof that the door in Rev. 4:1,2 is one leading to the first apartment is that John also saw seven lamps (Rev. 4:5; cf. Zech. 4:2) and the altar of incense (Rev. 8:3), items found in the first apartment. (Num. 8:2-4; Heb. 9:2; Lev. 24:2-4). Most important, John saw the Lord Jesus Christ in the first apartment of the heavenly Sanctuary (Rev. 5:6-8), similar to Isaiah's vision (Isa. 6:1-6). He asserts that both John and Isaiah saw Jesus Christ in the first apartment of the heavenly Sanctuary, where Christ commenced His ministration as our High Priest (cf. John 12:39-41). He must continue this priestly service "until the period arrives for his ministration within the second veil, before the ark of God's testament."<sup>19</sup>

Christ entered the heavenly Sanctuary with the sacrifice of His own blood (Heb. 9:12). This ministry is a continuation of the work He started on the cross; it is analogous to the work in the earthly Sanctuary, where the blood of animals was brought into the Sanctuary to reconcile the sinner and transfer his sins to the Sanctuary. Andrews declares: "He who bore our sins at his death offers for us his blood in the heavenly Sanctuary. But when he comes again, he is without sin (Heb. 9:28), his great work for the removal of sin is fully completed, before he comes again."<sup>20</sup>

The removal of sin, or the cleansing of the Sanctuary, must of necessity precede the return of Christ. Gabriel's message to Daniel stresses the importance of this priority: of the 2300 years, only 490 pertained to the earthly Sanctuary; the remaining 1810 years, to the

true Sanctuary. The cleansing which was to occur at the end of the revealed time must therefore be that of the heavenly Sanctuary.

Christ carried our sins into the heavenly Sanctuary. Defilement took place there, just as it had in the most holy place of the earthly Sanctuary though the glory of God was present. Thus the necessity of cleansing the heavenly Sanctuary is established. The book of Hebrews testifies to the cleansing of both the earthly and the heavenly Sanctuaries (9:22-24).

The cleansing of the heavenly Sanctuary by the blood of Christ is therefore a fact. Its beginning signalled a shift of ministration from the holy to the most holy place (Heb. 9:6,7; Rev. 11:19). While Christ's ministry in the holy place commenced at the end of 69½ prophetic weeks (Dan. 9:27), he began in the most holy place at the end of the 2300 days.

Andrews maintains that "this great work our Lord accomplishes with his own blood" no matter "whether by actual presentation of it or by virtue of its merits." "This event, the cleansing of the Sanctuary, is one of infinite importance. This accomplishes the great work of the Messiah in the tabernacle in heaven and renders it complete."<sup>21</sup> On account of His finished work, Christ will now be ready "to appear without sin unto salvation."

The understanding of the Sanctuary was vital for the emerging young church. Its investigation arose not only out of necessity because of the great disappointment, which they believed was reflected in Revelation 10,<sup>22</sup> but also out of the counsel given by divine instruction in Rev. 11:1 to "measure the temple." They were to take a closer look at the Old Testament sanctuary ministry, which explains God's method of dealing with the problem of sin. Scripture implied that one could not

Understand the antitype unless one understood the type. The suggestion of Rev. 11:1 to the church was that it should go over the dates of the Old Testament sacrificial system and compare type with antitype in order to understand the meaning and importance of Dan. 8:14, over which they had stumbled. It is obvious that they had to discover what no one had noticed before: the two-phased ministry of the antitypical Sanctuary system. Without this ministry, the Day of Atonement (i.e. the cleansing of the Sanctuary), God's Old Testament service would not have been complete. There would have been a big gap. A restudy of the Sanctuary question provided the key to their understanding of Dan. 8:14.

The Millerite movement served as a signal from God that the predicted time had arrived and with it the need to discover the significance of the event to occur at the end of the longest prophetic period. Andrews put it all together; he sought to build a theology of the Sanctuary doctrine on firm biblical grounds. By careful exegesis he sought to show the importance of the just-expired prophetic time and its relationship to the plan of salvation, and of the just-begun final phase of the ministry of Christ in the most holy place, the cleansing of the Sanctuary, the time of Judgment; and the key to understanding, he asserted, was the heavenly blueprint, the Old Testament pattern.

The angel had said: "Rise and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein" (Rev. 11:1). Andrews took the reed, "like unto a rod," and in obedience to the divine instructions, measured. Did he measure aright? Those who doubt it have not found a better solution.

## 2. The Three Angels' Messages of Revelation 14:6-12

As with the Sanctuary doctrine, an understanding and interpretation of the Three Angels' Messages of Revelation 14 constituted a very

important part of the doctrinal structure of the Seventh-day Adventist church from its beginnings. The first two messages were considered fulfilled by the spreading Millerite movement in 1840,<sup>23</sup> and following the famous sermon "Come out of her my people," preached by Charles Fitch in the summer of 1843.<sup>24</sup> The preaching of the third angel's message was assumed by the pioneers of the Seventh-day Adventist church as their duty and responsibility.<sup>25</sup> It does not come as a surprise therefore to find J. N. Andrews putting forth a clear exposition of this subject, spelling out what was meant by such expressions as "the Third Angel's Message" or "The Message," which became household words of the newly emerged church, and was considered one of the "pillars of faith."<sup>26</sup> Andrews wrote on this subject from the early days of the church but his thought is best summarized in a book published at Battle Creek while he was in Europe, and it is to this that we shall devote our attention.<sup>27</sup>

In his preface Andrews formulates the rationale of the angels' messages in Rev. 14: that if one considers the final judgments of God so soon to fall upon mankind, it is unreasonable to assume that the Lord would not have a special last warning message for the inhabitants of the earth, to give them a final opportunity of escape. This is the main objective of Rev. 14:6-12. Further purposes of the Three Angels' Messages, next to warning of coming judgment are: to alert God's people, to gather them into one body, to restore the Commandments and to prepare His true followers for the time of trouble and eventual acceptance into His kingdom.

As we have seen in his discussion of the Sanctuary, Andrews was concerned to demonstrate where post-1844 Millerites had gone wrong in their interpretation before revealing his own. Considering the events of Rev. 12:1-14:5 as a single unit, he argues firstly against those who see these events as coming after the second coming of Christ. The first



angel, having the everlasting gospel to preach, must clearly do his work before the parousia, as must the second unless it be assumed that at His coming Christ will take His people to Babylon, while the third's warning against false worship will be unnecessary once the Lord has destroyed His enemies by the brightness of His coming. Finally, the saints can hardly be said to need patience (14:12) when their Lord has returned and their sufferings brought to an end.

He is equally unhappy about those who have tried to see the messages as already given. No such warnings have been given, he argues, but even if they had they would have been false because Scripture affirms that warning of judgment is the work of the last generation. Again, such a warning could only be given when the papal apostasy, symbolized in Dan. 7; 8:9-12 as the little horn and by Paul as the man of sin (2 Thess. 2:3), had run its course and this, for Andrews with his interpretation of the 1260 days prophecy of Dan. 7:25 (which he links to Rev. 12:6,14), brings us to 1798.

He is thus able to affirm that these messages are to be given in his generation. Using the record of Christ's outline of events preceding His coming (Matt. 24:29; Mark 13:24,25) he comments:

The signs of his second coming were to commence "in those days", but "after that tribulation". In other words, the 1260 prophetic days should not be quite over, but their tribulation should be ended, when the sun should be darkened. The sun was darkened in 1780, and the tribulation of those days was then past, but the days did not expire till 1798. Thus we have the signs of our Lord's immediate advent just opening upon us, as we come down to the time of the end, the period when the vision should be unsealed, and many run to and fro with the word of warning to a perishing world [Dan. 11:33,35; 7:25; 12:4,9].<sup>28</sup>

He concludes this section with two observations. First, this three-fold message is to be distinguished from the general proclamation of the gospel, having a much more specific objective. Second, the angels symbolize a body of people.

Andrews considers the first angel to be the same as the one in Revelation 10, this chapter being explanatory to Rev. 14:6,7. In the former the angel declares by an oath that time shall be no longer. It could not mean the end of probationary time inasmuch as it precedes the voice of the seventh angel and John, and through him the church, is told to prophesy again. There would be no point in prophesying if probation had closed. The message of both angels (Rev. 10 and 14:6) is the same: the hour of God's judgment has come. The little book in Revelation 10, from which the angel preaches, is the book of Daniel, containing the time element on which the angel bases his judgment-hour message in Rev. 14:6. This message is universal and concerns all men. Though it is the same gospel which Paul preached, the message is not the same because it is conditioned by time, relating to the closing scenes of the gospel dispensation, "connected with the proximity of the kingdom," and it is parallel to Matt. 24:14.<sup>29</sup>

Andrews notes that the angel of Revelation 10 declares that the mystery of God shall be finished (verse 7) and comments that Daniel shows both when and how it is to be finished--at the end of the 2300 days by the cleansing of the Sanctuary. Andrews thus links the message of the seventh angel of Revelation 10 with the first angel of Revelation 14 and both with Daniel 8:14, and in so doing emphasizes the centrality of the Sanctuary doctrine for the young church. This is further underlined in his insistence that it is a message that should go to all nations (Rev. 14:6).<sup>30</sup>

The first angel's message, then, signalled the near completion of all great predictions, in the books of Daniel (chapters 2, 7, 8, 11 and 12) and Revelation (11, 12, 13) as well as in the gospels (Matt. 24, Mark 13, Luke 21). All these prophecies form a harmonious

whole, which Andrews considered "one voice which bore witness to the warning which God addressed to the human family."<sup>31</sup> The proclamation since 1840 was accompanied by a great outpouring of the Holy Spirit among those expecting the Lord's return in 1844. That God's waiting people were disappointed cannot annul the divine leading in the proclamation of the message. The disciples, too, were disappointed when the Lord was nailed to the cross. Disappointment is no proof that God does not lead His people. It should rather be considered a means of correcting their errors and thus strengthening their confidence in His guidance.

God's people had to realize that a second and a third message had to be proclaimed before the closing events. The preaching of the first angel solemnly declared the termination of all prophetic time and the commencement of the judgment, which by necessity had to precede the second coming of Christ. This judgment, as depicted in Daniel 7, is presided over by the Father. At the end of it, Jesus, finishing His high-priestly function, will be crowned King.

The 2300 days extended to this time of judgment proclaimed by the first angel, calling attention to the final work of Christ in the heavenly tabernacle. The work of Christ in heaven, and the proclamation of the arrival of the judgment hour on earth, are carried out simultaneously.

The message of the second angel concerns the fall of "Babylon." The term "Babylon" does not refer to the entire wicked world, nor to a specific city, but to "professed worshipers of God." Babylon is depicted in Revelation 17 as a fallen woman riding on a beast. The symbols of beast and harlot have to be kept separate: beasts symbolize governments, harlots do not. The harlot here not only rides on a beast but carries

on illicit relationships with the kings of the earth, causing the inhabitants to be made drunken, reigns over the kings of the earth, and sits on many waters, these being nations and people (Rev. 17:2,15).

By a similar interpretation of imagery, Andrews demonstrates that Babylon is not a synonym for Imperial Rome. The seven mountains associated with the woman in Rev. 17:9 are not the seven hills of Rome but, following Dan. 2:35,44 and Jer. 51:25, successive kingdoms and their heads (mentioned also in Revelation 13). He clarifies the issue by a literal translation of Rev. 17:9-10: "The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth, and they are seven kings."<sup>32</sup> Imperial Rome finds its place in Andrews' scheme as the seat of the beast which he equates with the seat of the dragon (Rev. 13:2).

What then is Babylon? He defines it as the symbol of a corrupt church. He further argues that if the virtuous woman of Revelation 12 has seed, her counterpart must also be assumed to have offspring. Consequently Babylon cannot be limited to a single ecclesiastical body, but is the sum of all corrupt churches, or the universal worldly church.<sup>33</sup> One of its major characteristics is a spirit of intolerance leading often to persecution. Such a spirit, Andrews avers, is to be found in many churches, not excluding those in the U.S.A.<sup>34</sup> Andrews recognizes hardly any difference between Protestants and Catholics in their claims and presumptions. "Romanists never can err, Protestants never do err."<sup>35</sup> Further, the characteristics are the undue acquisition of wealth, the display of fashionable attire, and the unbiblical assumption of titles belonging rightly to God;<sup>36</sup> but, of course, the primary meaning of Babylon is confusion and Andrews finds this also. While Christ interceded with His Father to have His church united and to believe in Him, the professed followers of Christ "have buried themselves in attempting to climb up to heaven some other way."<sup>37</sup> Hence all those religious

bodies opposed to biblical truth and unity constitute Babylon.

Having identified Babylon, Andrews now examines its fall. It is not to be equated with destruction since the angel bids God's people to come out of fallen Babylon; neither is it to be dated to the Catholic church's loss of civil power, since Babylon is more than the papacy. Rather it is a matter of the moral decline of the churches and God's rejection of them and the withholding of the Holy Spirit from their organization. As a result, Babylon becomes the habitation of demonic powers and subject to strong delusions. All of this is the result of "having made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication" (Rev. 18:2,3), a reference to false doctrines and the corruption of Biblical truth.<sup>38</sup>

The first message of Babylon's fall was given by those who were looking for the second coming of Christ in 1844. The fallen condition of the church, as documented by Andrews in various ways, was generally recognized. However, he also points to the other message of Babylon's fall in Revelation 18, which will be given in the future. This reveals God's mercy towards His people who are still found in various religious bodies. This final call will come shortly before the outpouring of the seven last plagues. It is the duty of God's people to respond. No one should be offended when this call is given, since it originates from God. It should be gratefully received because it is a means of leading people to repentance. Should there be a church that does not need such a message, it should be grateful that it is being preached to those who do.

Briefly tracing the history of "Babylon," Andrews shows that apostasy commenced in the fourth century, with Constantine meddling in the affairs of the church, introducing a false rest day, and creating offices and institutions unknown to the apostles. When the Eastern

Orthodox churches separated in the eleventh century, they retained these false doctrines and thus remained Babylon, though to a lesser degree, since they did not add new errors as the Roman church did later. The Reformation churches discarded some of the erroneous teachings but retained major ones and thus still remained part of Babylon. These stages of apostasy caused Babylon to be divided into three sections (Rev. 16:19): Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox and apostate Protestantism. Their punishment will be meted out according to their degree of apostasy. The fall of Babylon is also in stages; only after the last section has deteriorated is the fall complete. The angel in Rev. 18:1,2, who illuminates the earth with his glory, enables God's people, who are yet in spiritual darkness and Babylon, to recognize the perverted teachings, leave Babylon and join that people who "preach the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus" (Rev. 14:12).

For Andrews, the message of the third angel is dreadful for it warns of dire punishments from heaven for those who worship the beast and its image. It is also crucial. It points to the final and greatest decision men will have to face: to refuse to worship the beast and be persecuted now (following Rev. 12:12-17) or to worship the beast now and be punished later. It is a decision for or against eternal life, he points out, quoting Rev. 13:8.

But in order to avoid worshipping the beast one must first identify it. It is none other than the first beast of Revelation 13, which Andrews considers to be the papal form of the fourth empire of Daniel 7, its seven heads being seven successive forms of civil power. It is referred to also in Revelation 12 (as the dragon) and in Revelation 17, each mention referring to a different time period, the "dragon before the 1260 years, the beast of Revelation 13 during the 1260 years, and the beast of Revelation 17 since the infliction of the deadly wound."<sup>39</sup>

This wound was inflicted, Andrews argues, in 1798 when the pope was taken prisoner at the end of the 1260 years and he sees Rev. 13:10 as a heavenly pronouncement on the event.

It is another power that persecutes those who refuse to worship the beast and its image, however, and this is described in Rev. 13:11 ff. as a two-horned beast. Unlike, and unconnected with, any previous beast, it comes on the scene at a time when the wound of the former beast is being healed. Unlike other beasts it arises from the earth, suggestive, Andrews tells us, of its lamb-like nature. The two horns indicate the mildest power ever exercised. It symbolized the civil and religious power of the United States of America in its Republican-civil and Protestant-ecclesiastical form. The mildness of the civil power is summarized in the Declaration of Independence, "That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."<sup>40</sup> The religious power is based on the Protestant principle that the Bible alone is the rule of faith. Its interpretation and application are left to the dictates of the individual conscience. The fact that the horns do not have crowns was, Andrews considered, an indication that the people rather than kings rule in that nation.<sup>41</sup>

And yet, astonishingly, this power "spake like a dragon." It caused "the earth and them that dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed" (Rev. 13:12), thus confirming that the spirit of the dragon is behind this power. Out of the mildest power that ever existed on earth, the most extraordinary persecution for God's people will arise. It is in this context that the third angel gives his solemn warning.

### 3. Perpetuity of the Law of God

The third angel's warning was an exhortation to obey God. It is a well-known fact that the Law of God, especially the Sabbath commandment, played a dominant part in the thinking of the pioneers. Next to Joseph Bates, J. N. Andrews was foremost in defending the validity of God's Law. In his second contribution to the Review and Herald in an article entitled "The Perpetuity of the Law of God,"<sup>42</sup> Andrews laid the foundation for future Adventist discussions on the subject.

Starting with the Sermon on the Mount, he points out that Christ "did not come to destroy the law but to fulfill." Lest any should be in doubt as to what law He was referring, Christ quoted some of the commandments of the Decalogue. Christ summarized the Decalogue in "love to God and love to man" (Matthew 22), but never introduced another version of the Law. All His teachings were based on the ten commandments. Furthermore, since there was only one Law-giver, the disciples could not possibly enact another law after the death of Christ.

Reaching back in the other direction, Andrews argues that the Law did not originate at Sinai. It was written in the hearts of men before; otherwise the concept of sin would not have been in existence before Sinai, as Paul confirmed (Rom. 5:13). But Andrews was no mere legalist. Perfect obedience rendered out of a pure love for God was impossible after the fall of man, even for those upon whose hearts the Law of God was written. The inability of man to keep the Law was demonstrated by Israel's failure to keep her promises at Sinai, and man's salvation was only assured by Christ's life of perfect obedience. "He died to atone for our transgression, and to redeem us from its curse. Our hope of salvation then is through faith in Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation for our sins."<sup>43</sup>

Thus Andrews clearly tied the Ten-Commandment Law to the principle



of righteousness by faith. Assigning to law and justification their appropriate places in God's system of salvation, he declared: "To claim to be justified by Christ, does not warrant to live in violation of God's law, but to teach that our present obedience can justify, or atone for our past offences, would be an equal absurdity."<sup>44</sup> He categorically declared: "Our justification in the sight of God is solely on account of faith and not on account of works."<sup>45</sup>

This faith cleanses the heart from sin and makes man subject to the "renewing of the Holy Spirit," restoring in him that perfect love of God which Adam lost. Man is thus being changed, and therefore is now to "serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter" (Rom. 7:6). Thus he can live in conformity with the Law of God through the imparted power of Christ.

Thus Andrews argues that the Law of God forms the basis of both old and new covenants, and takes to task those who confuse Covenant and Law and affirm that the abolition of one is the abolition of the other. "To teach that the abrogation of the Covenant annulled the Law of God also, would in reality be saying that God abolished His Law, because man would transgress it."<sup>46</sup> Antinomians, he argues, misinterpret 2 Cor. 3 which is, in reality, a comparison between the ministrations of Old and New Testaments, pointing to the "more excellent ministry of Christ." The fact that the Law of God in the New Covenant is again written in the hearts of men shows that "God's Law covers all times and all dispensations, it stands out before men as the rule of their lives and the sum of their duty to God."<sup>47</sup> The Law of God which was written in the hearts of men before the fall, is rewritten in the hearts of men who enter into the New-Covenant relationship with God.<sup>48</sup>

Andrews is somewhat suspicious of the antinomian argument for another reason. By one means or another, nine of the commandments are

restored to their important position: only the seventh-day Sabbath proves to be unacceptable. But to omit this commandment is to deprive men some divinely appointed benefits, since the Sabbath was made for man, and "that which has been made for man, is certainly inseparable from his well-being."<sup>49</sup> Furthermore, its abolition would be an admission that it had failed to fulfil God's original design, that God had made a mistake. However, the Sabbath was introduced in Eden, upheld by Christ, and will be observed in the earth made new (Isa. 66:22,23). To support the view that it was abolished, he concludes, is both unreasonable and inconsistent.

#### 4. Methodology

There is no question that Andrews had the keen, analytical mind of a lawyer. Had his uncle succeeded in persuading him to be trained as such, he would, no doubt, have been a good one. Yet Andrews used his talents for a better cause. The recognition of truth and its proclamation by word and pen were his foremost goals. He devoted all his energy to reaching them and he did so methodically. Scripture was his first and foremost source; he knew how to handle it well. This did not come by chance but involved hard study and an immense amount of time.

While Andrews did not lose himself in details, he did not consider a doctrine complete until all texts bearing on the subject had been properly integrated into his presentation. His exposition of the Sanctuary doctrine is a good example of the meticulous care he took, omitting no reference, however minor, matching type with antitype, relating symbols and services to God's great system of salvation. The result was a complete picture of God's plan from which the church could benefit.

Using all Bible texts available on the subject, he played the entire Biblical keyboard masterfully, producing harmony and sense. He

did not lose himself in speculation. His approach to any subject was pragmatic and synthetic, rather than analytical. Andrews, so to speak, wasted no time analyzing the bricks he had been given but got on with the task of constructing the building. To him the building was of greater importance than the ingredients of his materials.

In his presentation he had always in mind possible objections and questions to which he paid attention first and would not condemn outright. He would enumerate the points, then discuss them one by one, revealing the flaws in their assumptions and logic, sometimes reducing opposing arguments ad absurdum.<sup>50</sup> Only then did he present what he saw to be the truth of the matter.<sup>51</sup> This he did methodically, enumerating the points, then enlarging them by drawing evidence from the whole of Scripture in any version and in many different languages. Extra-biblical evidence was also freely used and the sources acknowledged. The result was a closely textured argument but his presentations were spiced with humor, sometimes bordering on light satire but never becoming offensive, to show the untenable positions of those with whom he took issue. Thus, while he gives both sides of an argument, he is not a neutral observer. His aim is evangelistic--to convict readers by the weight of evidence to an acceptance of the Seventh-day Adventist message. The breadth, clarity and precision of his argument aimed at leaving the reader with little to discuss. It remained only for him to accept or to reject the author's doctrines.

##### 5. Conclusion

There are two basic ways to look at the pioneers of the Advent movement. The purely rational way, which allows for nothing extraordinary or spectacular in the life of the men and their mission;<sup>52</sup> and the way of faith, which affirms that God cares for this last generation and has called a people to carry a final message to this world. J. N. Andrews

belongs to the latter group. For him the Advent movement was the logical outcome of the great disappointment. His eye of faith could clearly trace the steps both of fulfilled prophecy and divine leading, and he used his pen to remove the doubts of others. He deserves to be remembered as a clear and thorough expositor of the doctrines of the early Seventh-day Adventist church. Indeed, the present writer believes that he was called by God for this purpose. As Ellen White remembered,

From what God has shown me from time to time, Brother Andrews was his chosen servant, to do a work others could not do. I have testimonies where the most distinct reference is made to his precious gift. The experience he has obtained has qualified him for the important work for these last days.<sup>53</sup>

Ever since that memorable day in 1849, when the visible power of God was manifested among the believers in Paris, Maine, in demonstration of truth, caused him to exclaim: "I would exchange a thousand errors for one truth,"<sup>54</sup> he became one of its foremost champions, formulating it in such a way that it can be honestly said of him that he wrote as one with authority, and not as the scribes.

NOTES

<sup>1</sup>A longer version of this paper is available in the Ellen G. White, S.D.A. Research Centre, Europe, Newbold College, Bracknell, England (hereafter cited as WRCE), DF2000-a-1-b. It contains a section on Andrews' family background and more extended discussions on all topics.

<sup>2</sup>Greek, Hebrew, Latin, French, German, Italian, English.

<sup>3</sup>Virgil E. Robinson, John Nevins Andrews: Flame for the Lord (Washington, D.C., 1975), p. 18.

<sup>4</sup>Andrews' position on the Sanctuary, as presented here, is based on his work: The Sanctuary and Twenty-Three Hundred Days, 2nd ed. (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1872). (Hereafter cited as Sanctuary.)

<sup>5</sup>Francis D. Nichol, The Midnight Cry (Washington, D.C., 1944), p. 478.

<sup>6</sup>Printed first in a little paper called Day-Dawn then in The Day-Star by E. Jacobs: WRCE, DF156-a.

<sup>7</sup>A. L. White, Ellen G. White, Messenger to the Remnant (Washington, D.C., 1966), p. 38.

<sup>8</sup>Andrews was present, however, at a conference of Sabbath-keepers in October 1849 in Paris, Maine. He wrote a report on it: Present Truth, 1849, p. 39.

<sup>9</sup>The first edition of Sanctuary came out in 1853. It was based on the following series of articles in the Second Advent Review and Sabbath Herald (hereafter cited as RH), 23 Dec. 1852, p. 121; 6 Jan. 1853, p. 129; 20 Jan. 1853, pp. 137,144; 3 Feb. 1853, p. 144; 12 May 1853, pp. 204, 205; 7 July 1853, p. 25; 4 Aug. 1853, p. 48; 28 Aug. 1853, p. 60.

<sup>10</sup>The main organizer of the Millerite movement, who joined Miller after a series of lectures at the Charles Street Chapel, Boston, in 1839: Sylvester Bliss, Memoirs of William Miller (Boston, 1853), p. 140.

<sup>11</sup>Sanctuary, p. 12; RH 23 Dec. 1852, p. 122, for the material in this paragraph.

<sup>12</sup>Sanctuary, p. 27; RH 23 Dec. 1852, p. 124.

<sup>13</sup>See n. 13.

<sup>14</sup>For the next three paragraphs see: Sanctuary, p. 33; RH 6 Jan. 1853, p. 129.

- <sup>15</sup> Sanctuary, p. 36; RH 6 Jan. 1853, p. 129.
- <sup>16</sup> Sanctuary, p. 68; RH 20 Jan. 1853, p. 138.
- <sup>17</sup> Sanctuary, pp. 47-75; RH 6 Jan. 1853, p. 131; 20 Jan. 1853, pp. 138-139; 3 Feb. 1853, p. 145.
- <sup>18</sup> Sanctuary, p. 77; RH 3 Feb. 1853, p. 145.
- <sup>19</sup> Sanctuary, p. 88; RH 3 Feb. 1853, p. 147.
- <sup>20</sup> Sanctuary, p. 89; RH 3 Feb. 1853, p. 147.
- <sup>21</sup> Sanctuary, p. 91; RH 3 Feb. 1853, p. 148.
- <sup>22</sup> Nichol, pp. 478-482.
- <sup>23</sup> This commenced with Miller's lectures at Chardon Street Chapel, Boston, Dec. 1839, where Joshua Himes accepted Miller's teachings: Bliss, Memoirs of William Miller, p. 140.
- <sup>24</sup> Nichol, p. 159.
- <sup>25</sup> Present Truth, April 1850, p. 65.
- <sup>26</sup> E. G. White, Counsels to Writers and Editors (Nashville, 1946), pp. 30-31.
- <sup>27</sup> The Three Messages of Revelation 14:6-12 (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1877). (Hereafter cited as TMR).
- <sup>28</sup> TMR, p. 20.
- <sup>29</sup> "We firmly believe that this proclamation has been made, and that the preaching of the immediate advent of our Lord has been in fulfillment of this prophecy. Prior to the fall of the Ottoman Empire in 1840, it had been shown by those who were preaching the immediate advent of Christ, that the hour, day, month, and year of Ottoman supremacy would expire the 11th of August, 1840. When the event verified the truthfulness of this calculation, the way was prepared for the advent message to go with mighty power. The prophecies were not only unsealed, but in the providence of God, a demonstration of the truthfulness of the mode of calculation respecting the prophetic times was given to the world." Ibid. p. 28. He had reason to be sanguine: he had witnessed four thrilling years (1840-1844) in which the message of the soon-return of Christ had swept the United States in an unprecedented way.
- <sup>30</sup> Andrews cites D. T. Taylor's description of the world-wide proclamation of the Advent message in such places as England, Germany, Holland, India, Norway, Russia, etc.: TMR, pp. 30-32.
- <sup>31</sup> TMR, p. 32.
- <sup>32</sup> Ibid. p. 41.
- <sup>33</sup> Ibid. p. 44.

<sup>34</sup> He cites examples of intolerance by non-Catholic churches: Calvin burned Servetus; Puritans hanged Quakers; churches in the U.S. supported slavery: *ibid.*

<sup>35</sup> "If Romanists claim infallibility in advance for the decrees and ordinances of their church, it is also true that Protestant bodies never afterward acknowledge wherein their churches or their councils have been in error. So that Protestant churches have all the advantage of infallibility, and leave to the Romanists all the odium of claiming it." *Ibid.* p. 47.

<sup>36</sup> "If it is a sin for the church to call her ministers Rabbi, or master, how much greater one must it be for her to apply to them the title of Reverend, which belongs to God alone! Not content with this, some of these professed servants of Jesus Christ become Right Reverend, and Very Reverend. And not a few of them become Doctors of Divinity, so great is their proficiency in the doctrines of Christ!" *Ibid.* p. 46.

<sup>37</sup> "They have been confounded in the attempt, and scattered abroad upon the face of the earth, with creeds as discordant as the languages of those who were dispersed at the ancient tower." *Ibid.* p. 48.

<sup>38</sup> Andrews lists some of the false doctrines as follows: the millennial age of peace and prosperity, infant baptism, change of the 4th commandment, immortality of the soul, the spiritualizing of the return of Christ, the lowering of standards of true godliness (*ibid.* pp. 52-53). On this last point he stated: "This has been carried so far that the multitudes are made to believe that 'every one that saith, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven.' In proof of this, I might appeal to almost every tombstone or funeral discourse." *Ibid.* p. 53.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.* p. 78.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.* p. 89.

<sup>41</sup> "The American Republic presents the first instance in the history of the world in which these two powers are separated and both are reserved by the people in their own hands. It is a government by the people and for the people, and it acknowledges them as the fountain of all authority. Here we have a state without a king and a church without a pope; and church and state are separate. The civil power recognizes the equality of all men before the law; and the spiritual power acknowledges the right of every man to worship God according to his own convictions of what God requires." *Ibid.* p. 92.

<sup>42</sup> RH Jan. 1851, p. 33.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.* p. 34.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.* p. 35.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>48</sup>The same upholding of justification by faith and the abiding nature of the law is to be found in his extended discussion of Galatians 3: *ibid.* pp. 35-36.

<sup>49</sup>*Ibid.* p. 36.

<sup>50</sup>Of proponents of a Third Angel's Message to be given in later ages, he asked: "What danger will there be that men will worship the beast at a time when there will be none for them to worship? God will never send an angel to warn men against the worship of the beast when the beast does not exist." TMR p. 13.

<sup>51</sup>A technique used in his preaching also. John Loughborough was invited to a meeting in Rochester in September 1852, so that during question time he could confound the preacher. Loughborough had prepared a series of texts he wanted to read. Andrews talked on the change of the Sabbath and used the same texts Loughborough wanted to read. Andrews had already answered them all; so there was nothing more to ask. All Loughborough's arguments had been answered and overthrown. It was the beginning of Loughborough's joining the Seventh-day Adventists: Robinson, p. 29.

<sup>52</sup>For example, Ronald Numbers declared flatly that he parted with those Adventist scholars who insist on the presupposition that the Holy Spirit guided the Advent Movement since the early 1840's: Prophetess of Health (New York, 1976), p. xi.

<sup>53</sup>WRCE, The Letters of Ellen G. White, 1847-1915, 2 Sept. 1871.

<sup>54</sup>Spiritual Gifts, 4 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1858-1864), 2:117.



## THE THEOLOGIAN OF THE SABBATH

Raymond F. Cottrell

John Nevins Andrews entered Adventist literature at the age of twenty with a report on one of the historic "Sabbath conferences." His letter to James White dated October 16, 1849, begins: "I would say to the praise of God, that the Conference recently held in this place [North Paris, Maine] resulted in much good," and concludes: "How important it is, beloved brethren, in this, our final struggle with the dragon, that we be found UNITED in 'the commandments of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ.'"<sup>1</sup> This brief letter to the editor aptly expresses the theme of his life.

Andrews' first contribution on a doctrinal subject bore the title, "Thoughts on the Sabbath," a short article of a few paragraphs in the second number of the Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, in December 1850.<sup>2</sup> The next two issues, for January and February 1851, carried his next two articles, on "The Perpetuity of the Law."<sup>3</sup> By the time of his ordination three years later, James White had published thirty-five articles by him, equivalent to approximately 550 manuscript pages, most of them devoted in one way or another to the Sabbath. Andrews had embarked on his career as a writer.

Evidence of the effectiveness of his articles in the Review was reflected in several letters to the editor in response to his series on the Sabbath under the title, "Letters to Crozier." One wrote: "I would not part with the papers that contain them for any price." Another rejoiced that "Bro. Andrews' presentation of the clear, plain direct scripture testimony on the Sabbath and the law of God . . . has done me

much good." Still another acknowledged that he had tried to justify himself in keeping Sunday instead of the Sabbath, but admitted that when he read Andrews' articles "I found my argument was mere chaff, and it was blown aside by the strong breeze of truth from the word of God." Three years later James White commended Andrews' "accustomed forcible, candid manner, which settles the question beyond all doubt."<sup>4</sup>

Between J. N. Andrews' first brief article on the Sabbath in 1850 and his departure for Europe twenty-three years later, more than 150 articles with his name or the initials J. N. A. appeared in the Review, a decided majority of them dealing with some aspect of the Sabbath. Others were on such subjects as the Bible our rule of faith and practice, the Holy Spirit, the visions of Ellen White, the three angels' messages of Revelation 14, the dark day of May 19, 1780, Hebrews 3 and 4, the two covenants, the seventy weeks of Daniel 9, the United States in prophecy, Babylon the great, non-combatancy, the sanctuary and the temple in heaven, the final judgment, and the wicked dead and the lake of fire.

J. N. Andrews proved to be so effective as a writer for the Review that James White published reprints of many of his articles, especially series of articles, in the form of books or pamphlets. The James White Memorial Library of Andrews University lists 39 books and pamphlets authored by him. Eighteen of these are on the Sabbath and the law of God, four on the three angels' messages, three on conditional immortality, two each on the sanctuary and the two covenants, and several on miscellaneous subjects.

In quantity, quality, and diversity of subject matter no other Adventist writer on doctrinal topics during these twenty-three years approached Andrews' record. His writings had a great influence but occasionally had some curious effects. In a series of articles on the

history of the Sabbath he pointed out that Sunday and the other secular days of the week all bore pagan names, and that the Sabbath was the only day of the week to which God assigned a specific name. Last of the series appeared on May 12, 1853, and the folio line of the issue gave the publication date as "Thursday, May 12, 1853."<sup>5</sup> The next issue bore the notation: "Fifth-day, May 26, 1853." No reason was given for the change, but on the basis of this circumstantial evidence we may conclude that James White did so as a direct result of Andrews' series of articles. This custom for designating Thursday, traditional publication day of the Review, as "Fifth-day" continued from the first issue of Volume 4 through the last issue of Volume 54, dated December 27, 1879. Volume 55 resumed use of the word "Thursday." This nomenclature for the secular days of the week was commonly used by Seventh-day Adventists for decades.

Andrews' first major original contribution to the doctrinal structure of the church was his Review article of December 4, 1855, which, for Seventh-day Adventists, permanently settled the issue of when to begin and end the Sabbath. During the years 1844 to 1846 those Adventists who became Sabbatarian learned of the Sabbath from the Seventh Day Baptists, who observed it from sunset to sunset.<sup>6</sup> But for some unexplained reason only a few Adventists adopted this aspect of Seventh Day Baptist teaching and observance prior to Andrews' article in 1855, ten years later. Joseph Bates, who played a prominent role in bringing the Sabbath to Adventists, including James and Ellen White and J. N. Andrews, observed it from six o'clock Friday evening until the same time Saturday evening, and both Bates and Andrews authored articles for the Review favoring six o'clock. Other Adventists began their observance of the day at midnight or sunrise Saturday morning.<sup>7</sup> Realizing that this confusion of practice would have a divisive effect, James White asked Andrews to make a thorough study of the matter and to prepare an article for the Review.<sup>8</sup>

In this article, "Time for Commencing the Sabbath," Andrews made a "thorough examination" of all relevant biblical passages. He refers to Gesenius and Greenfield for a definition of the Hebrew word 'ereb, "evening," and concludes that the Sabbath day, according to biblical reckoning, begins and ends at sunset. Clocks were not invented until 1658, he says, and prior to that time people could not have known with any precision when it was six o'clock. More importantly, he wrote: "There is no Scriptural argument in support of six o'clock, as the hour with which evening commences," and "the Bible, by several plain statements, established the fact that evening is at sunset."<sup>9</sup> In an accompanying explanatory note Andrews reaffirms the conclusion: "The result of the investigation is the firm conviction that the commencement and close of each day is marked by the setting of the sun." In an editorial comment following Andrews' note James White said that he himself had never been "fully persuaded" with respect to six o'clock, though some had taken it as indicated by "the direct manifestation of the Holy Spirit."

Another Andrews article sixteen years later, "The Definite Seventh Day; Or, God's Measurement of Time on the Round World,"<sup>10</sup> provides an excellent example of the logical, step-by-step, easy-to-follow format that made his writing so effective and so much appreciated. In March 1867 the United States purchased the Alaska Territory from Russia. Because the Russians had come to Alaska from the west and the Americans from the east, Russian time in Alaska was twenty-four hours ahead of American time there. As a result, the Russians were observing their Sunday on what was, to the Americans, Saturday, and a Seventh-day Adventist would be keeping his Sabbath on the Russian Sunday. The same problem arose in the islands of the South Pacific, most of which were first evangelized by missionaries from Europe, to the west. Later when American missionaries arrived from the east, they found themselves a day behind their European counterparts.

The Alaska purchase made people generally in the United States aware, for the first time, of the problem of Sabbath observance on a round world, with the result that opponents of the seventh-day Sabbath took advantage of the current interest in Alaska as "proof" that it was impossible to observe the same seventh day of the week as the Sabbath everywhere, and that therefore the Sabbath was to be considered as the seventh part of time rather than a specific day of the week. There was no definite the seventh day for all people everywhere on earth. Many Adventists were troubled by this seemingly impressive argument, confirmed apparently by the situation in Alaska, and James White, editor of the Review, again asked Andrews for help. In response the latter prepared twelve major articles on the subject within six months, eight of them being front-page lead articles. "The Definite Seventh Day" was the first of the twelve. Andrews begins with a clear statement of the question at issue:

Can a definite day be observed by all the inhabitants of the earth? This, of course, depends upon the proper answer to another question; viz., Is there such a thing as a definite day of the week, or month, or year, to the whole human family? If there is, all can observe it; if there is not, then chronology itself is thrown into confusion by the indefiniteness of days which necessarily ensues. On what ground, then, is it asserted that the reckoning of a definite day by the whole human family of man is an impossibility?

Next, under the subhead "Statement of the Difficulty," are thirteen column inches explaining in simple language how time is reckoned on a round world. Two travellers journey around the world in opposite directions from the same point, one going east and the other west. The one heading east moves his watch ahead one hour each day in order to keep it in time with the sun, and the one heading west sets his watch back one hour each day to compensate for his movement relative to the sun. Comparing watches when they meet twelve days later half way around the world, they discover that the person eastbound has gained twelve hours by moving his watch ahead, while the one westbound has lost twelve

hours by setting his watch back, and that as a result they are twenty-four hours apart in their reckoning though their clock time is the same. The one who went east is a full calendar day ahead of the one who went west, despite the fact that neither has actually gained or lost a moment of time. The gain or loss is simply in reckoning sun time. For the person travelling eastward, each day of the journey was only twenty-three hours long, while for the one going west each day had twenty-five hours. Neither is a day older or younger than he was; neither has lived a moment more, or less, than the other.

Following this explanation is a brief paragraph subtitled, "What Many Persons Conclude From This." Opponents of the seventh-day Sabbath "conclude that the observance of the definite seventh day is impossible, and that the fourth commandment requires, not the seventh day, but the seventh part of time." Then follows the body of the rather lengthy article. It consists of twenty-five numbered paragraphs (some with further sub-numbering) in which Andrews takes readers, step by step, to the conclusion that the same God who made our world a sphere (in "globular form") and established its relation to the sun, also set the seventh day of creation week--and thus all weeks thereafter--apart as a day of rest for the entire human family.

"The real intent" of those who argue that there cannot be a definite Sabbath day on a round world, he says, "is to excuse themselves for not observing the day enjoined in the commandment. We have shown that the excuse is without foundation in truth; and we close by calling attention to the remarkable fact that, whereas Sunday-keepers, who have a definite day to celebrate in their "first day of the week," have much to say concerning the impossibility of keeping a definite day the world over, no observer of the seventh day, wherever situated, whether Hebrew or Christian, ever found any difficulty of this kind in keeping the

definite rest-day of the great Creator."

Under the subhead, "Examination of the Facts in the Case," Andrews progresses with incontrovertible facts presented simply, point by point, interlaced with impeccable logic.

J. N. Andrews' classic History of the Sabbath provides the ultimate evidence of his eligibility to recognition as Bible scholar cum laude among the pioneers of the Advent Message. It went through four editions, the first in 1861, the second in 1873, the third in 1887 and the fourth in 1912, the last two being posthumous. To this, the third edition added an index of authors quoted and a Scripture index. In addition, a twelve-page Appendix noted the author's death and summarized Seventh-day Adventist endeavor around the world, as of 1887.

Each edition consisted of two parts: "Part I--Bible History," which remained practically unchanged through all four editions (with 192 pages in each of the first three and 194 in the fourth), while "Part II--Secular History of the Sabbath" grew from 340 pages in the first edition to 512, 517 and 599, respectively, in the later editions. This paper is limited to an examination of Part I, which we will explore in some detail for an estimate of J. N. Andrews as a scholar, theologian and exegete. Inasmuch as Part I in the 1912 edition is essentially identical with that of the original, and because this edition is now more generally available, page references are to the 1912 edition.

Under the heading "Special Notice" in the Review for 25 June 1861<sup>11</sup> James White announced the safe arrival of Andrews' 350-page manuscript on the History of the Sabbath, three days earlier. He promised Review readers that it would be "put through the press as fast as possible." Less than four months later the book was ready,<sup>12</sup> at least three times faster than most books make their way through one of our publishing houses today. The price was sixty cents per copy, cloth bound, and thirty cents

for "a few copies" with paper covers. "This work," White informed his readers, "is the result of Elder J. N. Andrews' studious and arduous researches upon the subject, as he has had opportunity, for the last ten years." The second edition, announced in the Review of 6 January 1874<sup>13</sup> was to sell for \$1.25 per copy.

In his preface to the first edition Andrews announces that . . . to correct these errors [regarding the Sabbath] is one object of the present work; a more important object in view is to set forth in clear light the character and the claims of the ancient Sabbath.<sup>14</sup>

His preface to the second edition expands the statement of purpose to read:

It is the object of the present volume to show, 1. The Bible record of the Sabbath; 2. The record of the Sabbath in secular history; 3. The record of the Sunday festival, and of the several steps by which it has usurped the place of the ancient Sabbath.<sup>15</sup>

The edition of 1887 retained the 1873 preface, while the publisher's "Introduction" to the fourth edition simply states it to be

. . . the object of this volume to present a correct and complete history of the Sabbath from creation to the present time.<sup>16</sup>

What were John Nevins Andrews' qualifications as a Bible scholar? He does not seem to have been aware of his presuppositions as such, but it is evident that he accepted the Bible as inspired in the supreme sense of the word and recognized it as his ultimate authority and norm of truth. Having read the Bible through twenty-seven times<sup>17</sup> and studied it diligently for many years, he was thoroughly acquainted with it--as his remarkable insight into its deeper meaning continually makes evident.<sup>18</sup> He was well-read, as his use of sources makes evident; friends commented that they never saw him without a book in his hand.<sup>19</sup> He had at least some knowledge of Hebrew and Greek and appreciated their value in a study of the Bible.<sup>20</sup> He was equipped with an analytical mind and logical thought processes. He was intellectually honest and objective in his attitude toward truth and toward others' opinions of truth; he invited



criticism and was ready to change his mind in the face of convincing evidence.<sup>21</sup> He had an innate penchant for painstaking accuracy and thoroughness.

With respect to his qualities as a writer, Andrews evidently had a good command of the English language. His writing reflects clarity of style and lucidity of thought. His logical, step-by-step development of a subject enables the reader--even one with a relatively limited education or understanding of the subject--to grasp what he is saying and to follow his line of thought. His continuous use of footnotes reflects conscious subordination of less significant but supporting data, a desire to provide adequate authority for his comments, and respect for discriminating readers.

With respect to Andrews' methodology as a biblical scholar, he made abundant use of original source material, including of course the Bible but also the works of classical writers, lexicographers and Bible commentators. The most notable illustration of reliance on secondary sources is his occasional resort to commentators and the King James Version margin for Hebrew and Greek word meanings. His attention to word meanings as determined by the original languages, the context and analogous use elsewhere in Scripture, reflects an endeavor to ascertain as accurately as possible the sense in which the inspired writers used them, and thus their true meaning. His constant reference to the context of a passage of Scripture reflects his purpose to interpret it in the sense intended by the Bible writers. His constant reliance on the analogy of Scripture reflects a concept of the unity of Scripture; his reliance on the context of the passages thus referred to in order to determine their import, protects his analogical use of Scripture from the common pitfall of proof-text exegesis--using a text out of context. His analysis and synthesis of the evidence is thorough and logical. His conclusions are clearly

based on the evidence he presents--with two or three exceptions to be noted later.

Textual and historical criticism were at best embryonic in Andrews' time, and it would be altogether unfair to expect him to make use of them. Apart from these, what more could be asked of any scholar, whether of Andrews' day or our own? It is always appropriate to judge a person by his standards and those of his time--not our own.

Announcing his intention to prepare "a new History of the Sabbath," Andrews invited criticisms of the existing edition and suggestions for the proposed revision. He was able to look at his own work critically and to give differing ideas a fair evaluation. Above all he sought truth:

Any suggestion whereby the work may be improved, any criticisms or review of the existing work pointing out faults, real or supposed, will be gratefully received and each will be considered. I ask the assistance of those who are its decided opponents. I desire to promote the cause of truth without mingling with that effort one particle of party spirit. The truth will stand on its own merits. Whoever has truth can afford to be candid, or rather he cannot afford to be uncandid. Truth itself is omnipotent. Falsehood often seems to outstrip truth, but truth, in the end, always wins the race.<sup>22</sup>

As the work of revision progressed he again invited suggestions and expressed his desire to get all the facts:

I have taken the utmost pains to get at the exact truth. How far I have succeeded, must be determined by others who shall trace my statements to the authorities which I have followed. . . . I do not claim that I have committed no errors, but I may with strictest truth say that I have done the best in my power to avoid mistakes of any kind.<sup>23</sup>

An author's use of sources provides us with an important clue to his level of scholarship. Part II of Andrews' History is, as we would expect, replete with references to classical writers and other historical sources,<sup>24</sup> but Part I is also fortified by references to both classical and modern works. Writing of "The Preparation of the [revised edition of the] Sabbath History" immediately prior to publication he said:

I have therefore thought it duty to make a very thorough examination of the fathers, especially of those who lived prior to Constantine. To do this alone involved the careful searching of ten thousand pages.

The result does not show a very great amount of matter, but it places the reader in possession of all of the facts concerning the Sabbath and first-day in the earliest ages.<sup>25</sup>

The introduction to the fourth edition similarly comments:

As far as possible, original works and authorities have been consulted, so that the exact truth might be ascertained in every case; and a conscientious endeavor has been made to present the extracts from these in such a light as to do justice to every work and author quoted.<sup>26</sup>

This was, to be sure, written by others, but it expresses the same appreciation of the value of original sources that Andrews himself felt as he went about the task of revising the second edition:

As far as possible I have sought information from the original authorities. I have given my references so distinctly that they can be fully traced.<sup>27</sup>

The 200 pages of text in Part I carry 376 numbered footnotes, with those of each of the eleven chapters numbered in sequence. In these footnotes approximately 650 Bible passages are cited--almost without exception in the King James Version--an average of more than three per page. Andrews refers, also, to other Bible translations--the Douay-Rheims Version and those of Luther and Wyclif. There are at least fifteen references to the non-canonical books of the Old Testament, mostly to 1 and 2 Maccabees, but also to Ecclesiasticus, the Book of Jasher and 2 Esdras. Upon occasion he refers to lexicons, particularly that of Gesenius, to dictionaries (Webster and Standard), and to the Encyclopedia Britannica. Twenty-seven footnotes consist primarily of Andrews' own additional comments.

By far most of the sources cited in Part I are works by standard Protestant commentators such as Luther, Calvin, Lange, Barnes, Kitto and Clarke, with which he was evidently familiar. Nineteen times he quotes from classical writers such as Philo and Josephus. Nine times he refers to Seventh Day Baptist works on the Sabbath.<sup>28</sup> Five times he quotes from the writings of Ellen White (principally Patriarchs and Prophets),

though without identifying the author as he does for practically all other sources. Usually he designates her simply as "another writer."

Almost without exception Andrews fulfilled his intention to give full source information to enable the reader to verify his quotations. In a few instances the information is incomplete, suggesting the possibility that he may, here, have borrowed the quotations from other works where he found them cited without adequate source information, and that he did not have personal access to them. His penchant for thorough, complete information would seem to preclude any such omissions being the result of carelessness on his part. In some instances the source information can be completed from other references to the same work. Insofar as it is possible to determine, Andrews quotes his sources in context and makes fair use of them.

The footnote style is in good form by nineteenth century standards, which indicates that he wrote with a discriminating reading audience in mind. Most nineteenth-century readers would doubtless conclude that the author had adequately supported the points he wished to make, even though they may not have concurred with his conclusions. For a person with Andrews' limited formal education, the level of scholarship reflected in his use of source materials merits special commendation. Incidentally, it also testifies to his familiarity with scholarly works.

Like all early Seventh-day Adventist writers on the Sabbath, Andrews, in his earlier articles in the Review, probably relied at least to some extent on the rather extensive Seventh Day Baptist literature on the Sabbath, much of which was reprinted in early Adventist publications. Several notices about the History in the Review, however, and a comparison of it with the Seventh Day Baptist literature on the same subject, make evident that the History represents original research on his part. Evidently he did not lean heavily on what others had written, though like

a good scholar he had become familiar with their writings.

Without exception, the thoroughness and clarity of Andrews' analysis of a passage of Scripture reflect his legal bent of mind and his logical thought processes. This step-by-step analysis is one of the noteworthy features of his writing, on both Scripture and history. For example, he quotes Exodus 16:4-30 in full, and then in eleven brief numbered points he outlines what the passage actually says.<sup>29</sup> Again, he clarifies the relationship between the Sabbath and the new covenant, the second paragraph being further sub-divided into nine items designated "a" to "i." Point "g" in this sequence has four numbered sub-divisions, and point "h" has seven.<sup>30</sup>

Chapter 11 of the History, "The Sabbath During the Ministry of the Apostles," is a particularly interesting exhibit of this method of developing an argument. In it he deals with the six New Testament passages antisabatarians commonly rely on in support of Sunday sacredness. He refers to these six passages as so many "pillars" on which "the first-day temple" rests, and then systematically sets about demolishing each pillar. In doing so he uses eight numbered sequences with as many as eleven numbered points each. In one of these, one of the sub-points has nine sub-divisions, and two of these sub-divisions are still further divided into four and seven sub-sub points respectively. From a literary point of view all of this might appear wearisome, but from the viewpoint of clarity and logic it is a masterpiece. In the eleven chapters of Part I eighteen such sequences cover 45 out of 200 pages.

Any serious exegesis of the Bible requires reference to the languages in which it was written, especially when the English translation is more or less ambiguous, or the historical circumstances are obscure, or when the accuracy of a particular English translation is in question. One of the exegete's first considerations is to ascertain as accurately

as possible the meaning of key words in any passage of Scripture. Andrews repeatedly does so. He had studied Hebrew, Greek and Latin--on his own-- and was able, at least to some extent, to read the Bible in these languages, though to what extent he mastered them we do not know. His History reflects a somewhat limited reliance on the original Hebrew and Greek. He refers to Hebrew word-meanings six times, and to those of Greek words, three times, in no instance on the basis of his own acquaintance with these languages, but always in a context of reliance on other sources.

The Hebrew words to which he refers are raqia, "firmament," sheba', "seven," qadash, "to sanctify," and shabbath, "Sabbath." For the Hebrew meaning of the word translated "firmament" he cites the marginal reading of the King James Version<sup>31</sup> as "expansion"--"spread out," "beat out." He correctly observes that "this atmosphere, or expansion, is called heaven." As a good exegete he cites an example, Job 37:18: "God spread out the sky . . . as a molten looking glass."

In a footnote to Exodus 20:11 developing the use of "seven" in the Bible he gives the root meaning of sheba' as "fulness, perfection," without citing any source for his information.<sup>32</sup> Neither Kohler and Baumgartner nor Gesenius list any such meaning, however.<sup>33</sup>

In discussing the divine act of sanctifying the Sabbath Andrews explores the Hebrew word qadash as defined by Gesenius: "to pronounce holy, to sanctify; to institute any holy thing; to appoint." "It is repeatedly used in the Old Testament," Andrews says, "for a public appointment, or proclamation," and gives several illustrations of passages in which the word is used. One of these is the appointment (qadash) of cities of refuge: "They appointed [Heb., "sanctify," margin] . . ." In a footnote on page 71 he quotes Clarke's Commentary for the meaning of qadash in Exodus 13:2: "Here the word kadash is

taken in its proper, literal sense, signifying the separating of a thing, person or place from all profane or common uses, and devoting it to sacred purposes."<sup>34</sup>

Of the word shabbath Andrews says: "The term Sabbath is transferred from the Hebrew language, and signifies rest." In his footnote he cites "Buck's Theological Dictionary, article, 'Sabbath,'" and "Calmet's Dictionary, article, 'Sabbath.'" Quoting from Exodus 5:5 he interpolates: ". . . and ye make them rest [Heb. Shabbath] from their burdens."<sup>35</sup>

Andrews' reliance, in several instances, on King James Version marginal readings--a characteristic procedure followed by those who have at best a limited acquaintance with the original languages--suggests that his knowledge of Greek and Hebrew may have been somewhat limited. In a few instances he refers to Webster's Unabridged Dictionary and the Standard Dictionary for word meanings.<sup>36</sup>

In at least three instances he does not refer to Hebrew word meanings when this would have been helpful. One of these<sup>37</sup> is based on Genesis 2:3, which the King James Version renders: "God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work." The Hebrew word here translated "had rested" is shabbath in its Qal form, which does not distinguish between the English past and pluperfect tenses. In the Hebrew only context can determine which is intended, and Genesis 2:3 does not so distinguish. As a matter of fact the translators supplied the word "had," though without italicizing it, their usual procedure for indicating a supplied word. But Andrews makes a major point of the English pluperfect, "had rested," which he italicizes in quoting the passage. From this he concludes:

Hence it was on the first day of the second week of time that God blessed the seventh day, and set it apart to a holy use. The blessing and sanctification of the seventh day, therefore, relate, not to the first seventh day of time, but to the seventh day of the week

for time to come, in memory of God's rest on that day from the work of creation.<sup>38</sup>

From the Hebrew it is not possible to determine whether the blessing and sanctification of the Sabbath occurred on, or subsequent to, the Sabbath day itself. The context seems to imply that this was done on the Sabbath day. This is one of the very few points at which we would conclude that the evidence presented does not support the author's conclusion.

In contrast, affirming that the Sabbath institution antedated the giving of the manna in the wilderness Andrews quotes Exodus 16:29: "See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; . . ." Here, the Hebrew distinction between "hath given," nathan (Qal perfect), and "giveth," nothēn (Poel participle) does justify the King James Version distinction, and thus the conclusion Andrews bases on it.

On page 78 our author draws from Deut. 33:2--"he came with ten thousands of saints"--in justification for angels being associated elsewhere in the Bible with the giving of the Decalogue on Mount Sinai.<sup>39</sup>

Andrews' three references to the Greek text of the New Testament are concerned with the meaning of the phrase eis metaxu sabbaton in Acts 13:42, "the next sabbath," par heautō, "by him," in 1 Cor. 16:2, and sunēgmenōn tōn mathētōn, "when the disciples came together," in Acts 20:7.<sup>40</sup>

Regarding eis metaxu sabbaton Andrews quotes Bloomfield:

The words, eis metaxu sabb. are by many commentators supposed to mean "on some intermediate week-day." But that is refuted by *verse* 44, and the sense expressed in our common version is, no doubt, the true one. It is adopted by the best recent commentators, and confirmed by the ancient versions.<sup>41</sup>

According to 1 Cor. 16:2, Paul directs the Corinthian believers: "let every one of you lay by him in store . . ." Andrews quotes at length from J. W. Morton's Vindication of the True Sabbath, which in



turn cites Greenfield's Lexicon to the effect that the Greek expression par heautō means "with one's self, that is, at home." He also quotes Bloomfield's Greek Testament with English Notes on heautō as meaning "by him" or "at home."<sup>42</sup>

There is something unexplained about Andrews' treatment of Acts 20:7, "when the disciples came together," for which he gives the Greek, sunēgmenōn tōn mathētōn. In a footnote he says: "Professor Whiting renders the phrase: 'The disciples being assembled,' and Sawyer has it: 'We being assembled.'" The King James Version reads as Andrews has it, "the disciples being assembled," but the Greek text, for which Nestle-Aland note no variants in the ancient manuscripts, reads sunēgmenōn hēmōn, "we being gathered together."

At this point it is appropriate to note four instances where we, today, would take exception to explanations Andrews gave in his exposition of Scripture, three of which occur on the first three pages of his History:

1. In Andrews' introductory paragraph on page 17 he identifies time as "that part of duration which is measured by the Bible. From the earliest date in the Book of Genesis to the resurrection of the unjust at the end of the millennium, a period of about seven thousand years is measured off." To this seven thousand years he refers as the "great week of time." He presents no evidence for this concept, which he assumes his readers will accept without further evidence, though in a footnote he refers the reader to three authors who do discuss the idea.<sup>43</sup>

As a matter of fact there is only circumstantial and ambiguous biblical support for the idea of earth's history being precisely, or even approximately, seven thousand years. The first known reference to the idea in extant literature is a tractate of the Talmud<sup>44</sup> which quotes two rabbis as saying that the world would exist for six thousand years and then lie desolate for another thousand. In New Testament times Jews

generally believed that nearly five thousand years had then elapsed since creation.<sup>45</sup>

2. On page 18 Andrews discusses primordial matter in the context of Gen. 1:1: "This act of creation [ex nihilo] is that event which marks the commencement of the first week of time."<sup>46</sup> On page 19 he continues: "On the first day of time, God created the heavens and the earth. The earth thus called into existence was without form, and void; and total darkness covered the Creator's works."

This is certainly one view held by Adventists, but not the only one.<sup>47</sup> Perhaps a majority, knowledgeable with respect to both the biblical and the empirical evidence of the material universe, believe that God created this primordial matter ex nihilo an unspecified time before day one of creation week.

3. In commenting on the word "rested" in Gen. 2:3--"God rested on the seventh day"--Andrews says:

Why does not the record simply state the cessation of the Creator's work? Why did he at the close of that work employ a day in rest? The answer will be learned from the next verse--Gen. 2:3. He was laying the foundation of a divine institution, the memorial of his own great work.<sup>48</sup>

As a matter of fact the basic meaning of the Hebrew word shabbath is cessation from activity, not "rest" in the sense in which we usually use the word today. In the Elizabethan English of 1611, when the King James Version appeared, the English word "rest" was more commonly used in the sense of cessation. Even today we speak of the prosecution or the defense, in court, "resting its case."

4. Still another illustration of how a better knowledge of biblical languages would have enabled Andrews to avoid what has become, to some extent at least as a result of his use of the term, traditional with Seventh-day Adventists--a consistent application of Bible passages in which the word "law" occurs, to the Decalogue. For instance, on page 21

he applies Ps. 40:8 ("I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart") and the new covenant promise of Jer. 31:33 ("I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts") to the moral law. Similarly, on pages 182 and 183 he quotes Matt. 5:17-19, and on page 184, Gal. 3:13-14, as referring to the moral law. This inaccurate definition of the term "law" in the Bible as referring specifically to the Ten Commandments has been at the root of much of the critical comment evangelical Christians level at Seventh-day Adventists.

The Hebrew word torah, "law," literally means "instruction"; likewise its New Testament equivalent, nomos, as used by the Hebrew writers of the New Testament. These terms refer either to the Pentateuch, or to all of the inspired instruction of the Old Testament, or to the Jewish religious system based on these inspired writings. To be sure, the Decalogue is an important part of those writings and is torah in the same sense that any part of the torah is torah. But only the context in which either torah or nomos is used can determine whether or not the Decalogue is specifically intended. We do well to use the word "law" in the same sense in which the Bible writers use it.

Andrews made continuous use of context to determine the meaning of a statement of Scripture, and of what is known as the analogy of Scripture--reference to other analogous passages considered to relate to the same subject as the passage under consideration--for the purpose of clarifying or amplifying its meaning.<sup>49</sup> His many references to "the connection"--the usual nineteenth-century term for "context"--make evident that he consistently recognized the importance of context in determining the meaning of a passage of Scripture. It was, in fact, his scrupulous attention to context that protected him from the mistakes commonly associated with proof-text exegesis and raised him above that level of Bible study.

Proof-text exegesis tends to make a free-wheeling use of the analogy of Scripture, with the result that purported "proof" texts are often used out of context to wrest an inspired statement from its true context and construe it as meaning something different than the Bible writer intended. Faithfulness to context safeguards the use of analogous passages of Scripture, and for that matter, good exegesis requires that every passage of Scripture be used in the sense the inspired writer intended. Verbal similarities between two passages of Scripture have led many a proof-text exegete astray--but not John Nevins Andrews. There is nothing more important in a study of the Bible than to listen attentively to every writer and to let the context of every statement be the final arbiter of its meaning.<sup>50</sup> Andrews knew how to listen.

One of the noteworthy things about Andrews' exegesis of Scripture is that there are so few points at which we might take exception to his conclusions, and this is excellent testimony to the quality of his exegesis of the Bible. In this respect he excels, by far, William Miller, Uriah Smith and most if not all of his other contemporaries, to say nothing of many since his time. We can find no excuse for casting stones at him. Instead of stones, it is appropriate to toss several well-deserved bouquets in his direction for the many evidences of his unusual insight into the meaning of Scripture:

1. With respect to the argument that the Sabbath was not commanded, nor was it observed, prior to the exodus from Egypt:

To say, therefore, that God did not sanctify the day at that time [creation], but did it in the days of Moses, is not only to distort the narrative, but to affirm that he neglected for twenty-five hundred years to do that for which the reason existed at creation.<sup>51</sup>

If the Sabbath was not sanctified at creation, but was sanctified in the wilderness of Sin, why does the narrative in each instance record the sanctification of the Sabbath at creation, and omit all mention of that fact in the wilderness of Sin?<sup>52</sup>

How can a theory which is subversive of all the facts in the record, be maintained as the truth of God?<sup>53</sup>

There is a defect in this argument [no specific command in Genesis] not noticed by those who use it. The book of Genesis was not a rule given to the patriarchs to walk by. . . . Thus the book does not command men to love God with all their hearts, and their neighbors as themselves; nor does it prohibit idolatry, blasphemy, disobedience to parents, adultery, theft, false witness, or covetousness. Who will affirm from this that the patriarchs were under no restraint in these things. . . .

[The argument is unsound] because if carried out, it would release the patriarchs from every precept of the moral law except the sixth.<sup>54</sup>

2. With respect to the argument that the Sabbath was committed

particularly to the Jews:

The Sabbath was a sign between God and the children of Israel, because they alone were the worshipers of the Creator. All other nations had turned from him to 'the gods that have not made the heavens and the earth.' For this reason the memorial of the great Creator was committed to the Hebrews.<sup>55</sup>

What, then, do these words [Deuteronomy 5:15, God commanded Israel to keep the Sabbath because He brought them out of Egypt] imply? Perhaps their meaning may be more readily perceived by comparing them with an exact parallel found in the same book and from the pen of the same writer:--

"Thou shalt not pervert the judgment of the stranger, nor of the fatherless; nor take a widow's raiment to pledge: but thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt, and the Lord thy God redeemed thee thence; therefore I command thee to do this thing." [Deuteronomy 24:17-18.]

. . . If the language in the one case proves that men were not under obligation to keep the Sabbath before the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, it proves with equal conclusiveness in the other that before that deliverance they were not under obligation to treat with justice and mercy the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow.<sup>56</sup>

The stranger and the foreigner must keep it, and it was for their refreshment. But the same persons could not partake of the Passover until they were made members of the Hebrew church by circumcision.<sup>57</sup>

3. With respect to the relationship between the moral and ceremonial

laws:

The law within the ark was that which demanded an atonement; the ceremonial law, which ordained the Levitical priesthood and the sacrifices for sin, was that which taught men how the atonement was to be made.<sup>58</sup>

4. With respect to the argument that God abhorred the Jewish Sabbaths:

The same Isaiah who condemned Israel's idolatrous sacrifices and celebrations of the Sabbath, proclaimed great blessings upon those who would keep the Sabbath as God ordained it.<sup>59</sup>

5. With respect to the argument that the Sabbath was changed to Sunday at the time of the resurrection:

In these [the resurrection] texts the foundation of the "Christian Sabbath" must be sought, if, indeed, such an institution actually exists; for there are no other records of the first day which relate to the time when it is supposed to have become sacred. . . . Yet the following facts must be regarded as very extraordinary indeed if this supposed change of the Sabbath here took place: (1) That these texts should contain no mention of this change of the Sabbath; (2) that they should carefully discriminate between the Sabbath of the fourth commandment and the first day of the week; (3) that they should apply no sacred title to that day, particularly that they should omit the title of Christian Sabbath; (4) that they should not mention the fact that Christ rested upon that day, an act essential to its becoming his Sabbath; (5) that they do not relate the act of taking the blessing of God from the seventh day, and placing it upon the first; . . . (6) that they omit to mention anything that Christ did to the first day; and that they even neglect to inform us that Christ so much as took the first day of the week upon his lips; (7) that they give no precept in support of first-day observance, nor do they contain a hint of the manner in which the first day of the week can be enforced by the authority of the fourth commandment.<sup>60</sup>

[We should find somewhere in the Bible words like these:] Remember the Christian Sabbath, to keep it holy. The first day is the Sabbath of the Lord Jesus Christ. For on that day he arose from the dead; wherefore he blessed the first day of the week, and hallowed it.<sup>61</sup>

The first meeting of Jesus with his disciples in the evening at the close of the first day of the week was mainly if not wholly upon the second day of the week.<sup>62</sup>

Without a formal education beyond a few grades of elementary school, John Nevins Andrews became thoroughly acquainted with the Bible and grew into a scholar of the first rank. His writings on the Sabbath and other doctrinal topics reflect a scholarly use of the Bible and other sources. His presuppositions and premises were valid, his reasoning was logical, his evidence supported his conclusions.

In his exegesis of the Bible Andrews made some use of biblical languages for word meanings, and developed word meanings by frequent reference to the context in which they are used. He often called attention to the "connection"--nineteenth-century term for "context"--of a passage of Scripture, and exegeted passages of Scripture in context. He made an

extensive and valid use of the analogy of Scripture, almost always safeguarding it by attention to the context, though in a few instances his limited acquaintance with the original languages led him to misconstrue word meanings and kept him from noting points he might have made to strengthen his argument.

His legal, analytical mind enabled him to see the fallacies in other people's arguments, to ferret out the relevant facts and to present them in a clear, convincing manner. Some of Andrews' remarks reflect a sense of humor. He reserved his occasional barbed shafts of logic for fallacies in another person's reasoning process that deliberately suppressed evidence known to the writer or intentionally distorted it. Otherwise he was patient and considerate of those who saw things differently. He had a remarkably open mind for a man of strong convictions, and was willing to change his mind when the evidence so indicated. "I would exchange a thousand errors for one truth," he said.<sup>63</sup> As we have seen, he had occasion to change his position on the observance of the Sabbath, from 6:00 p.m. to sunset. He was intellectually honest in the best sense of the word, absolutely fair in dealing with facts, and in his reasoning ever true to the best he knew.

John Nevins Andrews completed the edifice of the Sabbath for Seventh-day Adventists, and his concept of it became normative for the entire church. By his sound biblical scholarship he rose above the proof-text exegesis of his day and built a methodological bridge across which we can welcome him as a pioneer in methods of biblical study we recognize and pursue today.

NOTES

- <sup>1</sup>Present Truth (Dec. 1849), p. 39.
- <sup>2</sup>Second Advent Review and Sabbath Herald (hereafter cited as RH), Dec. 1850, p. 10.
- <sup>3</sup>RH Jan. 1851, p. 33; Feb. 1851, p. 41.
- <sup>4</sup>Ibid. 22 July 1852, p. 47; 19 Aug. 1852, p. 64; 27 May 1852, p. 108; 4 Dec. 1855, p. 78.
- <sup>5</sup>Ibid. 14 Apr. 1853, pp. 187-188.
- <sup>6</sup>See, for example, an article reprinted from the Seventh Day Baptist Sabbath Recorder in RH 9 Dec. 1852, p. 113. For a more complete discussion of Adventist indebtedness to SDB literature on the Sabbath, see Raymond F. Cottrell, "The Sabbath in the New World," in The Sabbath in Scripture and History, ed. Kenneth A. Strand (Washington, D.C.: 1962), pp. 244-263.
- <sup>7</sup>RH 2 June 1851, p. 92; 21 Apr. 1851, p. 71; 26 May 1853, p. 4; 21 Apr. 1851, p. 71.
- <sup>8</sup>Ibid. 4 Dec. 1855, p. 78.
- <sup>9</sup>Ibid.
- <sup>10</sup>Ibid. 14 Feb. 1871, p. 65.
- <sup>11</sup>Ibid. 25 June 1861, p. 40.
- <sup>12</sup>Ibid. 22 Oct. 1861, p. 168.
- <sup>13</sup>Ibid. 6 Jan. 1874, p. 32.
- <sup>14</sup>John Nevins Andrews, History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week (hereafter cited as Hist. Sabb.), 1st ed. (Battle Creek, Michigan: 1861), p. iii. Part 1, which is the subject of much of this paper, remained virtually unchanged through four editions. Because it is more readily available the 1912 ed. will be cited unless otherwise stated.
- <sup>15</sup>Ibid. (1873), p. iv.
- <sup>16</sup>Ibid. (1912), p. 15.
- <sup>17</sup>Patricia A. Mullins, "Love Story: The J. N. Andrews Family," (Term paper, Andrews University), p. 31.
- <sup>18</sup>For example, Hist. Sabb., pp. 23-25; see also p. 169 for his awareness of inclusive reckoning.



<sup>19</sup>Virgil E. Robinson, John Nevins Andrews: Flame for the Lord (Washington, D.C.: 1961), p. 11.

<sup>20</sup>M. E. Olsen, A History of the Origin and Progress of the Seventh-day Adventists (Washington, D.C.: 1925), p. 309.

<sup>21</sup>Hist. Sabb. pp. 6-7, 13.

<sup>22</sup>RH 24 Nov. 1868, p. 252.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid. 28 Oct. 1873, p. 157. See also Ibid. 17 Sept. 1872, p. 108.

<sup>24</sup>Hist. Sabb. p. 19 claims 190 sources quoted.

<sup>25</sup>RH 2 Dec. 1873, p. 196.

<sup>26</sup>Hist. Sabb. p. 15.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid.

<sup>28</sup>See above, n. 30; Hist. Sabb. (1861), p. iv.

<sup>29</sup>Hist. Sabb. pp. 55-57.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid. pp. 182-187.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid. p. 19.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid. p. 24.

<sup>33</sup>Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958), s.v. "sheba"; Gesenius's Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, s.v. "sheba."

<sup>34</sup>Hist. Sabb. pp. 27,71.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid. p. 51.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid. p. 25.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid.

<sup>39</sup>In his footnote, p. 78, Andrews says: "That angels are sometimes called saints or holy ones, see Dan. 8:13-16. That angels were present with God at Sinai, see Ps. 68:17." He assumes, correctly we suppose, that the "holy ones" of Daniel 8:13 are angels.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid. pp. 190, 199, 203.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid. p. 190. Andrews also notes that "Prof. Hackett has a similar note" in his Commentary on Acts, p. 233.

<sup>42</sup>Hist. Sabb. p. 199.

<sup>43</sup>Andrews cites Shimeall's Bible Chronology, part 1, chap. 6; Taylor's Voice of the Church, pp. 25-30; Bliss's Sacred Chronology, pp. 199-203.

<sup>44</sup>Sanhedrin 97a. The two rabbis quoted lived prior to A.D. 200. They based their opinion on Ps. 90:4--"One day is with the Lord as a thousand years"--coupled with the fact that there are seven days in the weekly cycle.

<sup>45</sup>Abba Hillel Silver, A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel, p. 6.

<sup>46</sup>In a footnote Andrews quotes Dr. Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Old and New Testaments on Gen. 1:1, the Westminster Confession, chapter IV, section 1, 2 Maccabees 7:28, 2 Esdras 6:38, and Wyclif's translation to this effect.

<sup>47</sup>Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, 1976 ed., s.v. "Creation."

<sup>48</sup>Hist. Sabb. pp. 23-24.

<sup>49</sup>For instance, on p. 31 he cites Ex. 20:11 for clarifying and reinforcing Gen. 2:1-3, as evidence that the Sabbath existed as an institution from creation.

<sup>50</sup>See Hist. Sabb. pp. 57, 76, 99, 161, for specific references to the "connection" of a passage of Scripture. Numerous others occur without actual use of the word.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid. p. 33.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid. p. 35.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid. p. 40.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid. p. 59.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid. p. 96.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid. p. 68.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid. p. 79.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid. p. 111.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid. p. 165.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid. p. 168.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid. p. 171.

<sup>63</sup>Ellen G. White, Life Sketches of Ellen G. White (Mountain View, California, 1915), p. 127.

## THE AUTHOR OF THE HISTORY OF THE SABBATH

J. Heinz

### 1. The Importance of J. N. Andrews' Historical Research

The first Adventist writers--such as Joseph Bates and James White--mainly dealt with the theological importance of the biblical Sabbath, i.e. the validity of the Sabbath commandment<sup>1</sup> and the connection of the Sabbath with Christ's ministry in heaven, the third angel's message (Revelation 14) and the "true Israel" of the last days.<sup>2</sup>

For historical presentations on the change of the canonical Sabbath to the traditional Sunday, Seventh-day Adventists in the beginning depended on publications of the Seventh Day Baptist church.<sup>3</sup> Thus, when J. N. Andrews published his History of the Sabbath in 1861, he became the Adventist pioneer of historical research on the Sabbath question.<sup>4</sup> According to LeRoy Edwin Froom, the book was Andrews' "greatest contribution"<sup>5</sup> to Seventh-day Adventist theology. C. Mervyn Maxwell points out that the book "remained the standard Seventh-day Adventist work in the field until well into the twentieth century."<sup>6</sup> It soon became a "classic,"<sup>7</sup> "a standard in the Adventist library,"<sup>8</sup> "a book that has stood through the years as an authority on the Sabbath truth."<sup>9</sup> In its article on Adventists the recently published first volume of the Theologische Realenzyklopädie calls it "ein Standardwerk über den Sabbat."<sup>10</sup>

The importance of the subject and its scholarly presentation made a second, revised and enlarged, edition necessary and it appeared in 1873. A third edition, almost unchanged, came out in 1887 after his death.

## 2. J. N. Andrews' Interest in the Sabbath Doctrine and History

Since almost from the beginning of his adherence to Adventism the Sabbath question played an important rôle in his thinking, Andrews became one of the leading advocates of the biblical day of rest among Adventists. At the age of seventeen--after the disappointment of 1844--he accepted the biblical Sabbath. A copy of T. M. Preble's Tract Showing That The Seventh Day Should Be Observed As The Sabbath<sup>11</sup> almost immediately convinced him of the validity of the biblical fourth commandment. Thus, his first article in the Review was dedicated to his favorite subject: "Thoughts on the Sabbath."<sup>12</sup> In further presentations, "Is the First Day of the Week the Sabbath?" (1853)<sup>13</sup> and "The First Day of the Week Not the Sabbath" (1854)<sup>14</sup> Andrews mainly repeated the arguments he had learned from Seventh Day Baptist publications. Only in 1859 did he first produce a more independent contribution to the problem, a 96-page tract entitled History of the Sabbath and First Day of the Week.<sup>15</sup> Andrews used the same title for his book which in its first edition was a work of 340 pages. The second edition of 1873, the result of studies in the libraries of the East coast of the USA, was much larger. It "offered 700 quotations from more than 200 sources."<sup>16</sup> "Andrews adhered to basic SDB concepts, but reexamined the sources and cited scores of Sunday-keeping authors."<sup>17</sup> C. Mervyn Maxwell judges: "In the main . . . Andrews handled his sources judiciously, even if a little ingeniously at times."<sup>18</sup> The third edition, published in 1887, four years after his death, "benefited from only minor editorial improvements."<sup>19</sup>

## 3. The "History of the Sabbath" and L. R. Conradi

In 1891 L. R. Conradi, one of the most gifted, powerful, but also disputed figures of European Adventism, translated Andrews' book into

German, modifying it slightly by adding material from German sources. While Andrews, when using German sources like Mosheim and Neander, depended on English translations,<sup>20</sup> Conradi offered the original texts. He omitted numerous less-known English authors and replaced them with the theological élite of the 19th century, i.e., F. C. Baur, A. Ritschl, C. J. Hefele and A. Harnack. Formal errors he tried to correct cautiously.<sup>21</sup> As to the argument itself he rather closely followed Andrews, even in statements that posed problems for him.<sup>22</sup> As to the history of the Sabbath on the European Continent, Conradi wrote seven partly or entirely newly composed chapters. In some ways both men were very similar, in others they were very different. Both were scholars who amassed information and who liked to persuade through the richness of their quotations. Both were convinced Sabbath-keepers and fond of historical studies. But while Andrews mainly depended on literary sources, Conradi was an indefatigable traveler who discovered Sabbath-traces which were believed to have disappeared a long time before.<sup>23</sup>

The 27-year-younger Conradi knew the author of History of the Sabbath only from a short encounter in April 1879. They met at Battle Creek where Andrews addressed the congregation on the occasion of the dedication of the "Dime Tabernacle."<sup>24</sup> In spite of the differences, both men had one thing in common. Both wrestled their whole life with the question of finding and showing the biblical Sabbath throughout the ages. But Conradi wanted to improve on Andrews. Thus, he planned a completely new edition of History of the Sabbath. In 1908 he wrote to W. A. Spicer,

I find the only way to deal with it is to write it anew. As I began the work, I found so many points that needed to be settled by looking up the originals. . . . I do believe the book will be greatly improved when the work is done, and will be one of the standard works we ought to have in these last days when the truth is to be attacked on every point.<sup>25</sup>

The result was the fourth "monumental edition"<sup>26</sup> of 1912, a book of 864 pages, praised as an "important work"<sup>27</sup> which "has set the pattern

for subsequent Adventist publications on the subject,"<sup>28</sup> criticized because "under Harnack's shadow" Conradi now altered Andrews' thesis that Antijudaism was responsible for the change from Sabbath to Sunday to the thesis that Gnostic influences on Christianity were responsible and thereby overemphasized the importance of Gnosticism.<sup>29</sup>

#### 4. J. N. Andrews' Argumentation in his "History of the Sabbath"

To discuss all the biblical and historical reasons Andrews presents in his work would go far beyond the scope of this short essay. Therefore, we shall limit our investigation to some crucial points in the Sabbath-Sunday discussion, for example: Was there a continual Sabbath observance in the post-apostolic Catholic church from the second to the fourth century? When do we find the first clear testimonies for Sunday-keeping and what are they? What was the character of the early Sunday in relation to the Sabbath? and finally, Who and what was mainly responsible for the suppression of the Sabbath and the rise of Sunday?

On the whole Andrews followed the teachings of the Seventh Day Baptists. C. Mervyn Maxwell summarizes their arguments in the following way: Sunday observance can be traced back nearly to the threshold of the apostolic age and was not at first a substitute for the Sabbath, Sabbath-keeping persisting among some Christians for some centuries; the shift from Sabbath to Sunday was motivated primarily by the church of Rome under the influence of sun worship.<sup>30</sup>

In some points, Andrews was even bolder in his affirmations. He was convinced that the "main body" of the church retained the Sabbath for centuries,<sup>31</sup> that the Christian Sunday at the time of Justin Martyr (c. 165) had no "title of sacredness,"<sup>32</sup> that "the first trace of Sunday as a Christian festival is found in the church of Rome"<sup>33</sup> and that Sabbath-fasting in Rome was "the first great effort . . . to put down the Sabbath."<sup>34</sup>

As to the first testimonies for Sunday, Andrews was deeply convinced that they were all falsified. Thus, the early history of Sunday represented, for him, a series of frauds.<sup>35</sup> He uses this argument so frequently that one may speak of a "fraud-theory" as a key to his investigation on Sunday. He could at times repudiate the defenders of those "frauds" with biting irony.<sup>36</sup> He finds the first testimony for Sunday in the famous passage of Justin Martyr (Apol. 1. 67) speaking of the hēméra Hēliou as the day of Christian meetings. But he instantly adds: "If the passage is genuine."<sup>37</sup> Since the epistle of Barnabas belongs to the NT Pseudepigrapha it is a "forgery"<sup>38</sup> and the passage (ch. 15) of the hēméra ogdōē therefore useless. The majority of the epistles of Ignatius of Antioch have a "doubtful character"<sup>39</sup> and, speaking of the (heméra) kyriaké, the insertion of day in the text (Magn. 9) is due to the "license" or "fraud" of the translator from Latin into Greek.<sup>40</sup> Andrews proposed the Greek version which has zōē (life)<sup>41</sup> instead of day. The only early text Andrews considers as authentic is the famous passage in Pliny (Ep. 10. 96) where Pliny addresses the emperor Trajan dealing with the Christians in Asia Minor gathering on a "certain stated day, before it was light." Andrews believed that it is "far more probable" that this day refers rather to the biblical Sabbath than to Sunday<sup>42</sup> and the text "certainly furnishes no support for Sunday observance."<sup>43</sup> Obviously Andrews could not treat the passage in the Didaché (14:1) since this document was only discovered in 1875 and published in 1883.

As to the character of early Sunday, Andrews makes it quite clear that the observance of the "so-called Lord's day" in the first centuries was completely different from Sabbath-keeping and that "no hint of the change of the Sabbath from the seventh day to the first is even once given."<sup>44</sup>

As we have seen, Andrews held the church of Rome responsible for

the suppression of the Sabbath and the rise of Sunday. He gives six reasons for this shift. The first is hatred toward the Jews by the Christians. Next he lists hatred of the Church of Rome toward the Sabbath (from the first trace of Sunday observance [c. 150] to Sabbath fasting [c. 200] up to Rome's claim to have the authority to replace the Sabbath with Sunday). The voluntary observance of memorable days "almost from the beginning" is his third reason. Christians without any apostolic commandment honored the first, fourth and sixth days of the week in remembrance of Christ's resurrection, betrayal and death. They also created Christian Passover and Pentecost observance on their own. He next deals with the establishing of tradition as an equal authority with the Scriptures as the "great error of the early church" and the entrance of the "no-law" heresy as it can be seen in Justin's theology. Finally he argues that Sunday as a heathen festival "more ancient than the Christian religion" fostered the spread of the Christian Sunday, greatly facilitating pagan conversions.<sup>45</sup>

5. J. N. Andrews' Arguments in the  
Light of Later Adventist Research

The History of the Sabbath--especially in its enlarged edition by Conradi--remained the Adventist work par excellence until the time after the First World War. Then, evangelistic endeavors, new challenges in apologetics and a deeper scientific research produced new works, partly depending on Andrews, partly following new paths.

By means of the four questions we have asked in the preceding section, we now want to point out some of the answers later Adventist research has given us and show how far it has followed Andrews or tried to correct him.



The Question of the Continual Sabbath  
Observance in the Ancient Church

As we have seen, Andrews maintained that the "main-body" of the church retained the Sabbath for centuries although it is evident that for the second century we have only a few Sabbath-traces, most of them of indirect nature (Sabbath-polemics in the epistle of Barnabas<sup>46</sup> and in Justin Martyr<sup>47</sup>) and for the third and fourth centuries mainly in the form of a double observance of Sabbath and Sunday.<sup>48</sup>

Based on a possible but not necessarily stringent interpretation of the church historian Socrates (5th cent.), F. H. Yost came to the same conclusion as Andrews.<sup>49</sup> Others frankly admit the lack of Sabbath-testimonies for the second century but believe that the argumentum e silentio is in favor of the Sabbath. D. Leutert concludes: "Wahrscheinlich war der Sabbat von der Urgemeinde her noch weithin üblich. . . . Wir sollten uns davor hüten, den sabbatfeiernden Teil grössenmässig zu unterschätzen."<sup>50</sup> Based on secondary sources, L. R. Conradi and C. B. Haynes followed Andrews at least for the whole Eastern church and parts of the Western church.<sup>51</sup> Because some of the apostolic fathers, the apologists and church fathers viewed the ten commandments as still binding for Christians, W. E. Straw concluded that Polycarp, Theophilus of Antioch and Irenaeus kept the Sabbath.<sup>52</sup> Support for Andrews' thesis can also be found in those Adventist authors who maintain that there was a common double observance of Sabbath and Sunday from earliest Christian times.<sup>53</sup> These authors seem to be at their best where they try to prove that this is at least true for the Jewish-Christian Ebionites.<sup>54</sup>

However, in the light of the few Sabbath-traces from the second century, there are Adventist authors who admit that among the majority of Pagan-Christians in the second century Sabbath-keeping was not a common practice any more<sup>55</sup> and double observance of Sabbath and Sunday among these Christians in the fourth and fifth centuries may have been "more a

revival than a survival."<sup>56</sup> The rapid disappearance of the Christian-apostolic Sabbath, similar to the soon disappearance of Paul's doctrine of justification by faith alone, may have been started by a misunderstanding of Paul already in Paul's time, when the "mystery of iniquity" was already at work.<sup>57</sup>

#### The Questions of the First Sunday Testimonies

Many of the later Adventist authors agree with Andrews in maintaining that the first nonambiguous testimony for Sunday is to be found in Justin Martyr.<sup>58</sup> Some are more specific and say Pliny<sup>59</sup> or Barnabas<sup>60</sup> have the first passage but Justin has the first unquestionable one. As to the text of Pliny, many follow Andrews in maintaining that it speaks of the biblical Sabbath.<sup>61</sup> Others, however, think that it means the weekly<sup>62</sup> or the annual Sunday, i.e., the resurrection day.<sup>63</sup> Concerning the debated text in Ignatius, the majority of Adventist theologians and historians has always followed Andrews in affirming that the original text was: "katà kyriakèn zoèn zōntes" and not "kata kyriakèn (hēméran) zōntes."<sup>64</sup> Others have wavered between the Greek text (zōe), the insertion of didachē (teaching)<sup>65</sup> or have declared that "the statement remains ambiguous."<sup>66</sup> That it may refer to Sunday as the Lord's Day<sup>67</sup> is very rare in Adventist literature. The technical use of kyriakē in the Gospel of Peter for an annual Sunday (annual resurrection day) is sometimes admitted,<sup>68</sup> but Andrews' thesis of the complete form (hēméra kyriakē) in Clement of Alexandria (Strom. 5. 106. 2) being the first example for the weekly Sunday as the Lord's Day is defended.<sup>69</sup>

#### The Question of the Character of the Early Christian Sunday

It has been recognized that Andrews "was probably at his best when showing that no second- or third-century church father provided any

evidence that Sunday was authorized in Scripture as a holy day."<sup>70</sup> Actually, Adventist research from Andrews up to today has always insisted on the fundamental fact that Sunday, from the second to the fourth century, never had the character of the Sabbath (Divine commandment, day of rest) and was "obviously, therefore, not considered a substitute for the Sabbath."<sup>71</sup> On this issue, early and recent Adventist research is in complete agreement with the opinio communis of scientific historical research.<sup>72</sup>

The Question of the Factors Responsible  
for the Suppression of the Sabbath  
and the Rise of Sunday

Andrews' thesis that Antisemitism and Antinomianism were the main factors in the suppression of the Sabbath<sup>73</sup> has been defended by many Adventist writers.<sup>74</sup> Others, following Conradi, have pointed to Antisemitism and Gnosticism in the early church of the second century.<sup>75</sup> Although the church successfully overcame the Gnostic temptation there nevertheless remained a strong Gnostic and therefore anti-Old Testament influence on its theology.<sup>76</sup> Bacchiocchi tries to show that Antisemitism was of especially Roman origin, typical of both pagan and Christian Rome.<sup>77</sup>

Andrews was also convinced that "the heathen festival of Sunday-- more ancient than the Christian religion--"<sup>78</sup> had exercised considerable influence on the rise of Christian Sunday. Bacchiocchi believes that both the existence of the planetary week in Rome<sup>79</sup> and the adoration of the sun as a local Roman cult<sup>80</sup> date from the first century A.D. In the second- and third-century, Eastern sun cults (Sol invictus Mithra as a private cult and sol invictus Elagabal as the official cult) dominated in Rome<sup>81</sup> and the importance of the Saturn-day--which was originally the first day and the Sun-day the second--was shifted to the Sun-day which then became the first day of the week.<sup>82</sup> According to Bacchiocchi this shift was of great importance in the "adoption of the very same day" by

Christians.<sup>83</sup> That Mithraism played a rôle in this development is often affirmed in Adventist literature,<sup>84</sup> although it is not clear whether there was any weekly Sunday observance in Mithraism.<sup>85</sup> Strand, therefore, believes that a noteworthy pagan influence on the development of Christian Sunday is only true for the time after Constantine:

Perhaps allowance should be made for some influence from paganism in this connection, even though Sunday observance did not enter the church directly from this source in the second century. Indeed, the effect of the pagan Sunday on Christianity was mainly a post-Constantinian development.<sup>86</sup>

Andrews had admitted that

In the Christian church, almost from the beginning, men voluntarily honored . . . the first day of the week . . . to commemorate . . . the resurrection of Christ. . . . What rendered the voluntary observance of memorable days a dangerous thing was the making of tradition of equal authority with the Scriptures.<sup>87</sup>

These Christian sources for Sunday have been underlined more and more by Adventist scholars of our day. A. Vaucher has pointed out that Sunday goes back very far ("remonte à une très haute antiquité") and is of Christian origin as a festival of resurrection ("solemnisation . . . en l'honneur de la résurrection du Christ").<sup>88</sup> This is attested by K. A. Strand who says: "Incorrect is the . . . view that the Christian Sunday was borrowed directly from paganism early in post-New Testament times."<sup>89</sup> Christians wanted to glorify Christ by celebrating the resurrection. According to Strand this was first done annually and then weekly, not in Rome first but in the East and then in the West.<sup>90</sup> He distinguishes between a Pharisaic and an Essene source. The former developed into the Christian Easter festival on Nisan 14-16 in Asia Minor, the latter into the Easter festival on Sunday after Nisan 14 in Jerusalem, Mesopotamia, Greece, Alexandria and Gaul.<sup>91</sup> Only in the second century did this annual festival become a weekly one in Rome and Alexandria.<sup>92</sup> That the Easter controversy between Rome and Asia Minor may have had an impact on the rise of the Christian Sunday was recognized by Andrews<sup>93</sup>

and others.<sup>94</sup> But the main ideas for worshiping on Sunday were the resurrection, the allegory of the Sunday as the eighth day, an over-interpretation of Paul's statements and a reaction against Judaistic extremes;<sup>95</sup> in short, a whole "theology of Sunday."<sup>96</sup>

The main goal of Andrews' arguments was, as we have seen, to prove that the church of Rome was responsible for the suppression of the Sabbath and the rise of Sunday and that this was done deliberately: "This church, as the chief in the work of apostasy, took the lead in the earliest effort to suppress the Sabbath."<sup>97</sup> In this, later Adventist researchers such as F. H. Yost have followed Andrews rather closely. Yost also tried to prove that Rome had abolished the Sabbath and introduced Sunday.<sup>98</sup> According to him, this was done first by the introduction of the annual Easter-festival on Sunday (c. 130) and then by the weekly Sunday-celebration (c. 130-150).<sup>99</sup> Others have recognized that the church of Rome played an important rôle in this development but rather in the sense of exploiting a tendency which at first manifested itself nearly unconsciously.<sup>100</sup> Nowadays, it is S. Bacchiocchi who suggests the possibility "that the abandonment of the Sabbath and the adoption of Sunday as a new day of worship could have occurred first in Rome."<sup>101</sup> While K. A. Strand upholds an Essene source for the Christian Easter-festival on Sunday,<sup>102</sup> Bacchiocchi rejects it.<sup>103</sup> Strand tries to prove that the spread of Easter on Sunday came from Christians in the East who followed the Essene calendar, with the exception of the Christians in Asia Minor who followed the calendar of the Pharisees. When this wave finally reached its climax in the second century, Sunday became a weekly festival, perhaps at first in Alexandria and Rome.<sup>104</sup> C. M. Maxwell, who believes in a wide-spread origin of Sunday, gives the following commentary on Andrews' thesis:

Andrews' position might have been somewhat different if he had realized that Justin Martyr did not represent merely the church of

Rome. Justin was born in Palestine. He conducted his famous dialogue with Trypho in the city of Ephesus. And at his trial in Rome he stated that he was then living in the city for the second time, implying that between his two visits he had lived somewhere else. Evidently, when he said that "on the day called Sunday, all Christians who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, . . . Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly", he was not thinking only of the Christians in Rome and its immediate environs.

Andrews further might have drawn a different conclusion about the uniqueness of Rome's contribution to the change of the Sabbath if he had realized how much Barnabas in Alexandria, Tertullian in North Africa, and Origen in Palestine were free from the special influence of Rome.<sup>105</sup>

The optimism with which Andrews once believed that Rome alone was responsible for the rise of Sunday worship has given way to a more differentiated spectrum of interpretation today. Nevertheless, Andrews was on the right path when we consider that Sunday as a binding commandment had its roots in the Roman pagan state and the Catholic church.

## 6. Conclusion

J. N. Andrews will always be remembered for his work as a Seventh-day Adventist pioneer in historical research on the Sabbath. If one takes into consideration the difficult circumstances under which he alone took up the challenge to defend the biblical Sabbath and follow its traces through history, one is amazed at his zeal and diligence.

Some of his conclusions are still valid today and some may not be. For the modern reader some of his observations still seem to be crystal clear; some, however, may appear as biased and too little differentiated. By no means does this diminish his work; it is only the proof that each generation has to face the problems of its ancestors again and try to solve them by profiting from what the fathers have achieved or by wrestling anew with what they have left imperfect. Although the History of the Sabbath is already today history itself, it is history Seventh-day Adventists will always hold in great esteem.

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, 1966 ed., s.v. "Sabbath."

<sup>2</sup> C. Mervyn Maxwell, "Joseph Bates and Seventh-day Adventist Sabbath Theology," in The Sabbath in Scripture and History, ed. Kenneth A. Strand (Washington, D.C., 1982), pp. 359-360.

<sup>3</sup> Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, 1966 ed., s.v. "Sabbath."

<sup>4</sup> The date of publication of the first edition varies. R. F. Cottrell ("The Sabbath in the New World," in Sabbath in Scripture and History, p. 251) and R. W. Schwarz (Light Bearers to the Remnant [Mountain View, California, 1979], p. 633) have 1861, while the Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, s.v. "Sabbath" has 1862. C. Mervyn Maxwell (Tell it to the World [Mountain View, California, 1977], p. 168; "The Sabbath in SDA History," Berrien Springs, 1978 [Mimeographed], p. 35) gives both dates.

<sup>5</sup> LeRoy Edwin Froom, The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers, 4 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1950-1954), 4:962.

<sup>6</sup> Maxwell, Tell it to the World, p. 168.

<sup>7</sup> Cottrell, p. 251.

<sup>8</sup> Arthur Whitefield Spalding, Origin and History of Seventh-day Adventists, 4 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1961-1962), 1:209.

<sup>9</sup> Emma Howell Cooper, The Great Advent Movement (Washington, D.C., 1968), p. 44.

<sup>10</sup> Theologische Realenzyklopädie, s.v. "Adventisten," by M. Schmidt and J. Butscher.

<sup>11</sup> Nashua, 1845.

<sup>12</sup> Second Advent Review and Sabbath Herald (hereafter cited as RH), Dec. 1850, p. 10.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid. 31 Mar. 1853, pp. 178-180.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid. 24 Jan. 1854, pp. 1-2.

<sup>15</sup> See Maxwell, "Sabbath in SDA History," pp. 34-35.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid. p. 35.

<sup>17</sup> Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, 1966 ed., s.v. "Sabbath."

<sup>18</sup> Maxwell, "Sabbath in SDA History," p. 36.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

<sup>20</sup> See John Nevins Andrews, History of the Sabbath and First Day of the Week, 2nd ed. (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1873), pp. 229-230.

<sup>21</sup> For example, Andrews put the Apostolic Constitutions into the third century (pp. 328-329). Conradi cautiously corrected him, speaking of the "drittes und viertes Jahrhundert": J. N. Andrews & L. R. Conradi, Die Geschichte des Sabbats und des ersten Wochentages (Basel, 1891), p. 311.

<sup>22</sup> For example, Conradi literally translated Andrews' claim, that Rome "suppressed the Sabbath and elevated in its stead the festival of Sunday." Cp. Andrews, p. 270, with J. N. Andrews and L. R. Conradi, Die Geschichte des Sabbats, p. 257.

<sup>23</sup> Thus, Conradi discovered the last Transylvanian Sabbath-keepers in 1890: Ludwig Richard Conradi, Die Geschichte des Sabbats und des ersten Wochentages (Hamburg, 1912), pp. 631-633.

<sup>24</sup> The information on the personal encounter between Andrews and Conradi I received from my son Daniel who is doing research on the life and work of L. R. Conradi.

<sup>25</sup> L. R. Conradi to W. A. Spicer, 25 May 1908, SDA General Conference Archives, Washington, D.C., RG21 Incoming Letters (Foreign) 1908-C.

<sup>26</sup> Kenneth A. Strand, "Preface," in Sabbath in Scripture and History, p. 15.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

<sup>28</sup> Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, 1966 ed., s.v. "Sabbath."

<sup>29</sup> Maxwell, "Sabbath in SDA History," p. 37.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid. p. 34.

<sup>31</sup> Andrews, pp. 332-368.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid. p. 271.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid. p. 270.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid. p. 280.

<sup>35</sup> Andrews and Conradi, Geschichte des Sabbats, p. V.

<sup>36</sup> See his remarks on p. 272 of the History of the Sabbath.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid. p. 287.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid. p. 235.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid. p. 240.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid. p. 237.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid. p. 236.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid. p. 329.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid. pp. 329-331.

<sup>46</sup> Barnabas 15: 1-9.

<sup>47</sup> Dialog 47: 1-4.



<sup>48</sup> See Hippolytus, Comm. on Daniel 4.20.3; Tertullian, De Orat. 23; Apostolic Const. 2.59.3/7.23.3/7.36.1-4/8.33.2; Gregory of Nyssa, De Castig.

<sup>49</sup> Frank H. Yost, Der ursprüngliche christliche Sabbat (Brookfield, Illinois, 1947), p. 68.

<sup>50</sup> L. Martin and D. Leutert, Der Sabbat in Bibel und Geschichte (Published by the SDA denomination in the DDR, 1971), pp. 48, 50.

<sup>51</sup> C. B. Haynes, From Sabbath to Sunday (Washington, D.C., 1928), p. 35; Conradi, Geschichte des Sabbats, p. 418.

<sup>52</sup> W. E. Straw, Origin of Sunday Observance (Washington, D.C., 1939), pp. 60-61.

<sup>53</sup> See Alfred F. Vaucher, L'Histoire du Salut, 3rd ed. (Dammarieles-Lys, 1951), p. 467; Gustav Tobler, Unser Ruhetag (Zürich, n.d.), pp. 170-179; K. A. Strand, "The Sabbath and Sunday from the Second through Fifth Centuries," in Sabbath in Scripture and History, pp. 323-326.

<sup>54</sup> Vaucher, p. 493; Desmond Ford, The Forgotten Day (Newcastle, California, 1981), p. 302.

<sup>55</sup> C. Mervyn Maxwell, "Sabbath and Sunday," Berrien Springs, Michigan, 1978 (Mimeographed), pp. 210, 211; Hans Heinz, Dogmatik, 3rd ed. (Bern, 1978), p. 140.

<sup>56</sup> Maxwell, "Sabbath and Sunday," p. 210.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid. p. 225.

<sup>58</sup> Andrews, p. 265; Vaucher, pp. 478-480; Ford, p. 310; Heinz, p. 148.

<sup>59</sup> Vaucher, pp. 470, 478.

<sup>60</sup> R. L. Odom, Sabbath and Sunday in Early Christianity (Washington, D.C., 1977), pp. 89, 298; Maxwell, "Sabbath and Sunday," p. 207; Kenneth A. Strand, How Sunday became the Popular Day of Worship (Nashville, Tennessee, 1979), p. 8; Samuele Bacchiocchi, "The Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity," in Sabbath in Scripture and History, p. 133; idem, From Sabbath to Sunday (Rome, 1977), pp. 218, 223.

<sup>61</sup> Straw, p. 65; Odom, p. 74; Yost, p. 29; Ford, p. 310.

<sup>62</sup> Vaucher, p. 470; Maxwell, "Sabbath and Sunday," p. 207.

<sup>63</sup> L. T. Geraty, "The Pascha and the Origin of Sunday Observance," Andrews University Seminary Studies (hereafter cited as AUSS), 3 (1965): 66-89.

<sup>64</sup> Yost, p. 31; Strand, How Sunday became the Popular Day of Worship, p. 12; Bacchiocchi, From Sabbath to Sunday, pp. 215-218; Tobler, p. 136.

<sup>65</sup> Vaucher, Le Jour Seigneuriel (Collonges-sous-Salève, 1970), p. 7; idem, L'Histoire du Salut, p. 473.

- <sup>66</sup>Fritz Guy, "'The Lord's Day' in the Letter of Ignatius to the Magnesians," AUSS 2 (1964):17.
- <sup>67</sup>Maxwell, "Sabbath and Sunday," p. 208.
- <sup>68</sup>Odom, p. 157; Kenneth A. Strand, "The 'Lord's Day' in the Second Century," in Sabbath in Scripture and History, p. 347.
- <sup>69</sup>Odom, p. 299; Strand, "The 'Lord's Day' in the Second Century," p. 346.
- <sup>70</sup>See Maxwell, "Sabbath in SDA History," p. 36.
- <sup>71</sup>Strand, "Sabbath and Sunday from Second through Fifth Centuries," p. 324.
- <sup>72</sup>Cf. Theodor Zahn, Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche, 3rd. ed. (Leipzig, 1908), pp. 163, 183; Willy Rordorf, Sabbat und Sonntag in der Alten Kirche (Zurich, 1972), p. XV.
- <sup>73</sup>Andrews, pp. 329-331.
- <sup>74</sup>Haynes, p. 33; Yost, p. 39; Odom, p. 297; Strand, How Sunday became the Popular Day of Worship, p. 11; Heinz, p. 148.
- <sup>75</sup>Vaucher, L'Histoire du Salut, pp. 496-498; Tobler, pp. 140-148, 166-169; Martin and Leutert, pp. 52-54.
- <sup>76</sup>Conradi, Geschichte des Sabbats, pp. 304-309, 407; Vaucher, Le Jour de Repos (Collonges-sous-Salève, 1963), pp. 53-54.
- <sup>77</sup>Bacchiocchi, "Rise of Sunday Observance," pp. 136-139.
- <sup>78</sup>Andrews, pp. 331, 258-259.
- <sup>79</sup>Bacchiocchi, "Rise of Sunday Observance," pp. 139-140; idem, From Sabbath to Sunday, pp. 242-247.
- <sup>80</sup>Bacchiocchi, From Sabbath to Sunday, pp. 238-241.
- <sup>81</sup>Ibid. pp. 240-241.
- <sup>82</sup>Ibid. pp. 242-247; idem, "Rise of Sunday Observance," p. 140.
- <sup>83</sup>Bacchiocchi, "Rise of Sunday Observance," pp. 140-141.
- <sup>84</sup>Conradi, Geschichte des Sabbats, p. 302; Vaucher, L'Histoire du Salut, p. 497; Yost, pp. 54-55; Tobler, pp. 149-161; Heinz, p. 149; Martin and Leutert, p. 57.
- <sup>85</sup>Martin & Leutert, p. 57.
- <sup>86</sup>Strand, How Sunday became the Popular Day of Worship, p. 11.
- <sup>87</sup>Andrews, p. 330.
- <sup>88</sup>Vaucher, L'Histoire du Salut, p. 492.

- 89 Strand, How Sunday became the Popular Day of Worship, p. 9.
- 90 Ibid. p. 10.
- 91 Ibid.
- 92 Strand, "Sabbath and Sunday from Second through Fifth Centuries," p. 330; Frank H. Yost, "Antichrist in History and Prophecy," in Our Firm Foundation, 2 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1953), 1:645-649.
- 93 Andrews, p. 274.
- 94 Yost, Der ursprüngliche christliche Sabbat, pp. 64-65; Heinz, pp. 148-149.
- 95 Maxwell, "Sabbath and Sunday," pp. 224-225.
- 96 Bacchiocchi, From Sabbath to Sunday, pp. 270-302; idem, "Rise of Sunday Observance," pp. 142-144.
- 97 Andrews, p. 330.
- 98 Yost, Der ursprüngliche christliche Sabbat, p. 69.
- 99 Idem, "Antichrist in History and Prophecy," 1:645-649.
- 100 Vaucher, L'Histoire du Salut, pp. 494, 499-500.
- 101 Bacchiocchi, "Rise of Sunday Observance," p. 136.
- 102 Strand, How Sunday became the Popular Day of Worship, p. 10.
- 103 Bacchiocchi, From Sabbath to Sunday, pp. 236-237.
- 104 Strand, How Sunday became the Popular Day of Worship, pp. 10-11; idem, "Sabbath and Sunday from Second through Fifth Centuries," p. 330.
- 105 Maxwell, "Sabbath in SDA History," p. 36.

## ANDREWS' PERSONAL LIBRARY

Georges Stéveny

At some stage after Andrews' death in 1883, his personal library was transferred from Basel where he lived, to Gland where the Adventist Sanitarium had been established and where the Seminary was located before 1921. From Gland, the books were sent to Dammarie-les-Lys, not far from Paris. There they remained for a long time in the administration building of the Publishing House, which continues to print Les Signes des Temps, begun by Andrews in Europe in 1876.

The books were in boxes and they cluttered up the cellars of the printshop. One day, Dr. Jean Zürcher was there for a committee and saw these boxes in a corridor. Asking by chance what they were, he was told: "They're old books we would like to get rid of." They turned out to be J. N. Andrews' library.

You can imagine the surprise. After discussion, the Publishing House generously agreed to send all these valuable volumes to the French Adventist Seminary at Collonges. But in 1971, when I was in charge of the school, the precious volumes were still in Dammarie-les-Lys. So I took the bull by the horns and sent our delivery van to Melun. The next evening, the J. N. Andrews Library was here in Collonges.

Due to the lack of space, the Seminary was forced to leave the books in their boxes for a number of years while a special section to accommodate them was prepared. Then they were carefully housed in special cupboards, sheltered from the light and fluctuations of temperature, while waiting for the construction of the Vaucher Library, finished

at the end of 1980. Since then, they have been classified by Tania Lehmann and occupy no less than 130 feet of shelf space in the archives room of the library basement. There are 316 sets of books, amounting to 847 volumes. All but 15 have J. N. Andrews' identification marks on them.

These were the tools of a great man of God. One can hardly encounter them without being deeply moved. One is also conscious of a certain austere air surrounding these volumes. They seem, almost, to be reference works of a studious monk rather than the library of an active preacher. The books are of a high intellectual standard and only an expert could make the greatest use of them and appreciate their true content.

Only five books are in French: the Huguenot Psalter, a Bible translated by Louis Segond, a New Testament, a Catechism, and the famous Littré Dictionary. A further 100 works are in Latin, 18 in German, several in Arabic, Greek, Hebrew, and in Portuguese, and the other 252 titles are in English.

He had an impressive array of Bibles:

Bengelii (Alberti), Gnomon Novi Testamenti. Tübingen, 1759.

Bezae (Theodori), Novum Testamentum. Cambridge, 1642.

Bible hébraïque, version latine interlineaire. 1636.

Bloomfield (S. T.), The Greek Testament, 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1854.

Castellionis (Sebastiani), Bible. Leipzig, 1784.

Catholische Bibel. Köln, 1571.

Livre du Nouveau Testament en Arabe. Beirut (n.d.)

New Testament with notes. New York (n.d.)

Nouveau Testament. Pau, Vevey, 1872.

Nouveau Testament: Indo-Portuguesa. London, 1826.

Segond (Louis), Bible. Paris, 1899.

Thownsend (George), The New Testament with notes. Boston, 1840.

Wakefield (Gilbert), Translation of the New Testament, 2 vols. Cambridge, 1820.

In addition he possessed nine dictionaries, three encyclopaedias, five atlases and several books concerning foreign language studies: Arabic, Italian, Latin, Samaritan, and Syriac. Andrews was able to speak seven languages.

A few books deal with astronomy, physiology, geology in connection with evolution, and archaeology. But the largest section is made up of historical and theological books. In historical studies, the scope of study is from ancient times to contemporary American history. The works of the Church Fathers are well represented--30 sets of books--as well as the history of the Councils, especially the Council of Trent.

There are several biographies, including one about R. Adam Clarke, another about George Muller, and an autobiography by Joseph Bates, presented by the author to Mrs. J. N. Andrews.

On the life of Christ, there is only one book, Geiki Cunningham's Life and Words of Christ (1880). That has the signature of his son, C. M. Andrews. There is also one book with the same signature, which is a complete treatise on sexuality entitled Plain Facts about Sexual Life, written by J. H. Kellogg in 1877. These may have been presents from the father. There is at least one volume which Andrews gave to his wife. On the flyleaf he wrote: "Presented to A. S. Andrews on the birth of Charles M. Andrews." The book was John Dowling's History of Romanism from the Earliest Corruptions of Christianity to the Present Time. 815 pages!! I hope the mother enjoyed it very much. Perhaps also the father . . .

The works of E. G. White are represented by only one book, The Great Controversy (the first edition from 1858), and a collection of

pamphlets that were to appear later under the title Testimonies for the Church.

In theology, one finds critical and dogmatic studies dealing with most books of the Bible. As happens in almost every library, some of them appear to have been unopened.

Besides their intrinsic value, a good number of these books are worth a great deal of money because of their age: two from the sixteenth century, thirteen from the seventeenth and about fifty from the eighteenth. But their market value is insignificant compared with the vibrant and living witness of their contents, which still offer the substance, depth, precision and exactness of research to which J. N. Andrews bravely devoted himself.

As is to be expected, his History of the Sabbath is to be found in its 1873 edition which Andrews spent much time on not long before coming to Europe. It is the most well-known example of Andrews' work in defending Adventist doctrines. But, as Dr. Mueller has shown,<sup>1</sup> it is by no means his only contribution. In those early years, many questions arose in regard to Biblical teaching on various subjects. James White, burdened with caring for the church as a whole, frequently turned to Andrews and invited him to make investigation. Several points of our doctrine emerged from his studies.

But the man with the scholarly library was also an effective soul winner. In an appeal he sent to the Review and Herald from Switzerland, he wrote: "My heart is wholly bound up in this sacred work. I have no desire but to live in the service of God. I do not ask that any burden shall be light, nor my situation pleasant, but I pray that while I live I may be the means of leading men from sin to righteousness."<sup>2</sup>

But in his view, this did not exempt him from basing his preaching

on solid information. He loved the truth. He respected the truth. He lived for the truth. To have died for the truth was the most fitting end possible.

Without a doubt, Sister White was not wrong when she wrote to the brethren in Switzerland, in 1878: "We sent you the ablest man in all our ranks!"<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Above, pp. 75-104.

<sup>2</sup>Quoted in British Advent Messenger, 4 Oct. 1974, p. 10.

<sup>3</sup>Ellen G. White - SDA Research Centre, Europe, Newbold College, Bracknell, The Letters of Ellen G. White, 1847-1915, 28 Aug. 1878.



## ANDREWS' USE OF HIS LIBRARY

Richard Lehmann

The study of the annotations we can find in the books of J. N. Andrews' personal library is a task the difficulty of which escapes no one. Are the annotations really from the owner of the books? Have the pencil strokes in the margin or in the text been added by a former reader, by a later one, or by the owner himself? Are the books second-hand? What meaning should be given to these remarks or to that exclamation mark? Here are some questions that all researchers must ask. We must recognize that there is no signature by the side of each pencil stroke found in J. N. Andrews' books which could certify their authenticity. Yet we think the research deserves to be done on the basis of what we believe to be a sound methodology.<sup>1</sup> We have rejected all forms of unusual annotations (use of coloured pencil, French remarks, signs of peculiar form). The straight pencil marks being far more frequent, we did not take into consideration the wavy lines. J. N. Andrews' handwriting remained clearly the most important element. Finally, the numerous convergences and the consistency in the picture that emerged convinced us that the findings, if they did not bring anything new, could at least enrich our knowledge about the Bible scholar who was the first Adventist missionary to Europe.

1. The Sources

The principal sources to which we had access for our research were of three types:

- A. First of all an Index.<sup>2</sup> This tool of 268 pages was largely filled

up by Andrews' handwriting. It not only contains references to books dealing with the subjects quoted, but also the Bible. In the beginning of almost each alphabetical letter J. N. Andrews has put a reference to baptism. We can find them under words such as: Calvin, D'Aubigné, Ebaptizato, Fathers, History, Infant, Justin, Luther, Maimonides, etc.

Evidently, the first book which Andrews indexed is the one in two volumes entitled Theodosia Ernest. The Heroine of Faith.<sup>3</sup> This book is totally centered on baptism. The meticulousness with which he has quoted this book comes perhaps from the fact that he offered it to his wife in March 1859. But our readings have shown us that the problem of infant baptism is a question that has called his attention.<sup>4</sup>

The two other books the most often quoted are those of Edward Gibbon, The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, and of Archibald Bower, The History of the Popes from the Foundation of the See of Rome to A.D. 1758.<sup>5</sup> These titles alone show how much Andrews was interested in the history of the Roman Catholic Church.

B. The second important source for our research consists of two volumes of Gilbert Wakefield, Translation of the New Testament.<sup>6</sup> This edition contains in between each printed page a blank page which has been largely filled up. As we read those pages, we wondered if the handwriting was really that of Andrews. Some comparisons between this handwriting and letters he wrote or with his Index, permitted us to find many similarities. Perhaps a confirmation by an expert would be necessary. We include the work for the sake of completeness and have based no conclusions upon it.

C. Finally, as we turned the pages of all the books of his library, we found 77 volumes containing some notes or pencil marks. These vary from simple pencil-strokes in the margin to remarks or personal criticisms. We can find some references to another page, or a Bible quotation; resúmes of the contents of a paragraph, or indications such as "nota bene,"

"quote," "note this." Sometimes, important paragraphs of the book are listed on its first page, or on its last. All these are signs of the interest that the reader gave to the material contained in the books.

## 2. The Scholar

When handling Andrews' books, one can discover right away that he was a student and a scholar. He reads Greek<sup>7</sup> and Latin,<sup>8</sup> corrects the spelling mistakes<sup>9</sup> or misprints.<sup>10</sup> If a reference is false he rectifies it.<sup>11</sup> Whatever the size of the book, he reads it all through including the small notes at the bottom of the pages.<sup>12</sup> Often he writes "see" in front of bibliographical references at the end of an article.<sup>13</sup> Sometimes he notes in the margin a date which is missing in the paragraph. So, for example, he punctuates with chronological precision (A.D. 632, A.D. 634, A.D. 688) the seventh-century Moslem expansion reported by Gibbon.<sup>14</sup>

Andrews must have possessed a great knowledge of history, and something which is rare among us, of patristics too. All his books from the Ante-Nicene Christian Library are covered by pencil strokes.<sup>15</sup> There are many references to the Church Fathers in his History of the Sabbath.<sup>16</sup> His friends are well acquainted with his inclinations. Thomas Rise, for example, offered him a book entitled The Church of the First Three Centuries.<sup>17</sup>

It must not have been easy to debate with him on the origins and the doctrine of the Catholic Church when one considers the number of signs and remarks that he placed in his books about the Popes,<sup>18</sup> Roman paganism<sup>19</sup> and heresies. Andrews neglects nothing. The Clementine Homelies have been read in their entirety, as has the big and heavy book of A. Butler which relates the lives of the calendar saints, to find nine references on the Sabbath, a tremendous labor.<sup>20</sup>

Andrews reads critically and his taste for precision appears here and there. So, for example, when H. Smith speaks about the pope's decree,

Andrews, hard to please, notes in the margin: "which one?"<sup>21</sup> When the same author considers prophetic writings of the thirteenth century as authentic, Andrews notes in the margin that they have been written after the events took place.<sup>22</sup>

A further group of annotations suggest a man well versed in Scripture.<sup>23</sup> When Gibbon declares that Egypt has lost its power, falling from the hands of the Romans into the hands of the Turks, Andrews puts in the margin: "Ez 29:14, 15,"<sup>24</sup> and when the same author outlines two pages later the development of paganism and idolatry in Rome, Andrews comments "Sanctuary of all the Gods" and quotes Dan. 8:11, 31.<sup>25</sup> The reference to Stoics and Epicureans makes him think of Acts 17:18.<sup>26</sup> The discourse of Abubeker inviting his armies not to do any harm to the trees, the animals and the monasteries, makes him quote, of course, Rev. 9:4.<sup>27</sup> The repetitive earthquakes at the time of Justinian reminds him of Matt. 24:7, 8, the pestilence in Constantinople and Athens, Luke 21:11. When Gibbon declares that "an affrightened people is more forcibly moved to expect the end of the world, or, to deprecate with servile homage the wrath of an avenging Deity," Andrews quotes Mark 13:7, 8 where Jesus declares that the believers need not be troubled for such things must needs be but the end shall not be yet.<sup>28</sup>

Here and there Andrews corrects his authors. When John Cumming writes that Jesus came to live as a priest, Andrews encircles the word and puts in the margin: "error."<sup>29</sup> Or when he asks: "what was it that made these sufferings (of Christ) so fragrant before God?" and declares "Christ explains it," Andrews corrects in the margin and writes that it is Paul and not Christ who explains it.<sup>30</sup> Or if the same author places the light of the golden candlestick in the midst of the most holy place, Andrews writes in the margin: "What a Blunder."<sup>31</sup>

Andrews is interested in questions of chronology. He has carefully

read the difficult and complicated book of W. C. Thurman, Our Bible Chronology Established, although he is not impressed. On page 53 he writes, "This author is better chronologist than interpreter" and on page 58, "A great effort to bring the end of 2300 days to 1895. A pity for such a mind." On the other hand he is happy to find Cumming making a connection between the allusions to the Tabernacle in Revelation and the book of Exodus.<sup>32</sup> Surely, Andrews would have had something to say in the actual debate on the Sanctuary.

### 3. The Missionary

As well as being a scholar, however, Andrews was a real Adventist missionary in the subjects that particularly interested him.

#### A. The Sabbath

More than twenty of his books have annotations or pencil marks in front of declarations on the Sabbath. These range from the Koran to Ellen White's Spiritual Gifts. Those who know that he has written a book on the History of the Sabbath would not be surprised. But you would be amazed if you could see how carefully he has read many books to find here and there some declarations about the Sabbath.<sup>33</sup>

#### B. The Papacy

Another of his interests is the birth and the development of the papacy. In Gibbon's first volume, for example, we find written by Andrews on page 210, "Supreme Pontiff;" on page 24, "Popish Jubilees a continuation of the secular games"; on page 337, "Pontiff Maximus"; and on page 447, "Pope and Pagan." In Ranke's History of Papacy, he points out the Pope as the "Man of Sin" (1:497); and that the "Papal gov't (was) abolished (in) 1798" (2:310), noting on the next page that it was a "deadly wound." Some references to Bower quoted in the margin of the same book show that he studied specifically the question of the Papacy.<sup>34</sup>

On page 312 of his second volume, Ranke wrote about the establishment

of Roman Catholicism in France. Andrews has written in the margin, "Healing of the deadly wound." When Gibbon speaks of the non-unified organization of the primitive church, Andrews asks, "Where was the Pope then?"<sup>35</sup> The Council of Trent is for him "The last general council of the Papists."<sup>36</sup> He also dissents from Uriah Smith's view that although its "deadly wound was healed . . . the papacy was re-established . . . with a diminution of its power by the election of a new pope."<sup>37</sup> Andrews underlines with two strokes of his pencil "was healed" and with one stroke "with a diminution of its power," noting in the margin, "Compare v. 3 and 4!!" On Andrews' reading of Revelation 13, the papacy would increase its power rather than see it diminished.

#### D. The Nature of Man

Another center of interest was the nature of man. Here and there appear many pencil marks in front of paragraphs speaking about the union of the soul and the body.<sup>38</sup> Here, he notes in the margin that "Platonists get into the church."<sup>39</sup> There, that the faith in the immortality of the heroes drove the ancients to believe in the immortality of the soul.<sup>40</sup> He was interested in the origin of the belief of the immortality of the soul in heathen Germany.<sup>41</sup> Finally, he agrees with von Mosheim when he says that the noble simplicity of the Christian religion was impaired when the philosophers presumed to associate their dogmas with it.<sup>42</sup>

#### E. Social Questions

Andrews was also concerned with social problems. He notes some paragraphs about slavery.<sup>43</sup> Spiritual Gifts of Ellen G. White is largely pencilled on the question of health reform. When Cumming writes, giving some comments on Exodus, that the forbidding of eating blood was merely temporary, purely Jewish, Andrews writes in the margin after having underlined "temporary," "No! Acts 15."<sup>44</sup>

The autobiography of Joseph Bates in which the subject of temperance

looms large is frequently pencilled too. The words "wine," "cigar," "tobacco," "smoke," are frequently underlined.<sup>45</sup> When Ellen White writes on the Last Supper and says that the wine was unfermented, Andrews underlines twice "unfermented."<sup>46</sup> These questions seem to have been the subject of a special meeting because in one book entitled 24 Tracts on Intemperance we read, "The use of intoxicating drink in this day of light, is incompatible with the hope of receiving any general effusion of the Holy Spirit." This sentence is underlined and in the margin is written, "September 1882."<sup>47</sup> It cannot have been easy to teach this to Swiss wine-growers.

We could make many more remarks on details,<sup>48</sup> but we would like to end this survey with a more personal and touching aspect.

#### 4. The Preacher

J. N. Andrews was first of all a missionary. He was interested in missionary stories or reports. He underlines in Gibbon the development of the gospel in Asia, India and Abyssinia.<sup>49</sup> He reads the Journal of Joseph Wolf<sup>50</sup> and his study on the missionary labor for the Jews and Moslems.<sup>51</sup> The most touching is that on the last page of this book, where there is a reference to page 129 which speaks about the responsibilities the first apostles had to carry and about the necessity of preaching the Gospel, taking care of the church as well. Andrews certainly read again and again the Memoirs of William Miller.<sup>52</sup> In this book, the number of lectures given and meetings held, and the number of baptisms are underlined.

In a very little note at the bottom of a page of his book, Lord Macaulay writes, "My notions of the temper and relative position of political and religious parties in the reign of William the third have been derived, not from any single work, but from thousands of forgotten tracts . . . mouldering in old libraries."<sup>53</sup> One can ask why in all this

book, only "thousands" and "forgotten" are underlined. Is it because Andrews was concerned with the problems of tracts forgotten on shelves, and with the work of publication in Basel?

The missionary work was certainly not easy. Among the early Testimonies of Ellen White, we find underlined an exhortation to give a good education to his children on pain of being disqualified from the ministry;<sup>54</sup> the paragraph on black clouds which separate us from Christ;<sup>55</sup> likewise the one about black balls thrown against the children of God are underlined too.<sup>56</sup>

In a collection of 13 volumes of the Theological and Literary Journal, only one paragraph is underlined. Perhaps it is the expression of his own experience: "It was the common sentiment of the apostles and early martyrs, that trials were to be welcomed rather than shunned . . . It is very commonly regarded as a mystery that he afflicts them as he does, with poverty, bereavement, dishonor, suffering and sorrow; and often in the most humbling and agonizing forms. Many of what are now deemed trials, are such, more because they disappoint hopes of ease, wealth, honor and enjoyment, than of any positive suffering which they involve."<sup>57</sup>

Perhaps it is also because of the trials he has known that in his commentary on Matt. 11:28 he writes and underlines, "all who are labouring are bearing heavy burdens." But he also underlines in Matt. 3:13, "the power of God," and in Matt. 4:17, that after the temptation Jesus began to preach. This corresponds well with his last message to the readers of the Review and Herald: "The seed has been sown with bitter tears, but the harvest will bring eternal joy."<sup>58</sup>

Those who are well acquainted with his life can confirm or disagree. But from our study of his library Andrews appears to us, in the likeness of St. Paul, a scholar dedicated to missionary work and ready to pay the price it demands.



NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Our approach is not new. Thus, it has been confirmed that J. N. Andrews read his Bible 27 times from annotations found on one of the front pages. Some have said that he could also read nearly 8 or 9 languages on the basis of the books he possessed. Each reader may judge for himself the distance that may exist between the facts given and their interpretations. We are also aware of this in our work.

<sup>2</sup>John Todd, Index Rerum or Index of Subjects: Intended as a Manual to Aid the Students and the Professional Man in Preparing Himself for Usefulness (Northampton, Massachusetts, 1859).

<sup>3</sup>Nashville, Tennessee, 1857, without author's name.

<sup>4</sup>For example, in John L. von Mosheim, Institutes of Ecclesiastical History Ancient and Modern (New York, 1874), 1:42, the word "immersion" relating to baptism practiced by John the Baptist is emphasized in the text, written and underlined in the margin and especially noted by two pencil marks. See also the writings on baptism in his library.

<sup>5</sup>Edward Gibbon, The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, 6 vols. (Boston, 1850); Archibald Bower, The History of the Popes from the Foundation of the See of Rome to A.D. 1758, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, 1845).

<sup>6</sup>Cambridge University Press, 1820. According to the indications on the front page, it would appear that it was bought second-hand in England.

<sup>7</sup>In Ernestus Zimmermannus, Corpus Patrum graecorum Graece et Latine (Frankfurt, 1822), 1:369 ἐν μόνῃ τῇ τῆς κυριακῆς ἡμέρᾳ is underlined in the Greek Text. See also pages 365, 367, on Eusebius of Caesarea, Ecclesiastical History, book V, chap. XIII.

<sup>8</sup>Cf. his numerous Latin works and the pencil marks in Iohannes Semler's Commentarii Historici de Antiquo Christianorum (Magdeburg, 1771).

<sup>9</sup>For example, in W. C. Martin, The Great Reformation, vol. 1 (New York, 1966), p. 441, where he corrects "Luthur" by "L.".

<sup>10</sup>Ellen G. White, Spiritual Gifts, 4 vols. (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1858-1864), 1:97.

<sup>11</sup>Cp. John Dowling, The History of Romanism from the Earliest Corruption to the Present Time (New York, 1853), p. 615, where "see Supplement p. 706" is corrected by "p. 769."

<sup>12</sup>For example, in Leopold von Ranke, A History of the Papacy, Political and Ecclesiastical, in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, 2 vols. (Glasgow, 1860), 1:37.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

- <sup>14</sup> Gibbon, 5:191, 202, 210, 228, 275.
- <sup>15</sup> Alexander Roberts, The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers, 24 vols. (Edinburgh, 1870),
- <sup>16</sup> History of the Sabbath and First Day of the Week, 2nd ed. (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1873), especially the second part: "Secular History."
- <sup>17</sup> Alvan Lamson, The Church . . . or Notices of the Lives and Opinions of Some of the Early Fathers, With Special Reference to the Doctrine of the Trinity (London, 1875).
- <sup>18</sup> We find 17 works in his library on the history of the Papacy. Those by Bower, Dowling, Gibbon and Ranke are very underlined.
- <sup>19</sup> Cp. John L. von Mosheim, An Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern, 3 vols. (Cincinnati, 1871) and Dowling.
- <sup>20</sup> Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs and Other Principal Saints, 2 vols. (Dublin, no date), 1:11, 225, 245, 594, 617, 752, 764. Each reference has a number. Numbers 1 and 2 are lacking. Vol. II bears also some marks of reading. Each volume has more than 1000 pages.
- <sup>21</sup> J. J. I. von Dollinger, Fables Respecting the Popes in the Middle Ages, transl. by Alfred Plummer (New York, 1872), p. 368.
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid. p. 369.
- <sup>23</sup> We omit the copious note on Wakefield (above, p. 154), since neither the handwriting nor the theological style appear to be Andrews'. The book was purchased in England.
- <sup>24</sup> Gibbon, 1:30.
- <sup>25</sup> Ibid. 1:39.
- <sup>26</sup> Ibid. 1:36.
- <sup>27</sup> Ibid. 5:189.
- <sup>28</sup> Ibid. 4:292-294.
- <sup>29</sup> John Cumming, Sabbath Morning Readings on the Old Testament: Leviticus (Boston, 1855), p. 94.
- <sup>30</sup> Ibid. p. 237.
- <sup>31</sup> Exodus (Boston, 1854), pp. 313, 324.
- <sup>32</sup> Ibid. p. 252.
- <sup>33</sup> Cp. n. 20. Lyman Coleman, Ancient Christianity Exemplified in the Private, Domestic, Social, and Civil Life of the Primitive Christians (Philadelphia, 1854), chapter entitled "The Christian Sabbath"; S. Cobat, Journal of Three Years Residence in Abyssinia (New York, 1851), pp. 93, 249, 454, 517 n. 25.
- <sup>34</sup> 1:608, 629; 2:246, 306.
- <sup>35</sup> 1:558.
- <sup>36</sup> Dowling, p. 475.

<sup>37</sup>Thoughts, Critical and Practical on the Books of Daniel and the Revelation (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1882), p. 683.

<sup>38</sup>Mosheim, Institutes, 1:90, 91; Charles Rollin, The Ancient History of the Egyptians, Carthaginians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Medes and Persians and Macedonians (New York, 1865), p. 161.

<sup>39</sup>Gibbon, 1:450.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid. 1:34-35.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid. 1:271.

<sup>42</sup>Mosheim, Institutes, 1:105.

<sup>43</sup>Cumming, Exodus, pp. 165-170; Lucius Matlack, The History of American Slavery and Methodism from 1780 to 1849 (New York, 1849).

<sup>44</sup>Cumming, Leviticus, p. 27.

<sup>45</sup>Joseph Bates, The Autobiography of Elder Joseph Bates (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1869), pp. 167-168.

<sup>46</sup>Spiritual Gifts, 3:227.

<sup>47</sup>Tract 276, p. 7. (A bound collection of a much larger series of tracts. Those included bear numbers ranging from 24 to 475).

<sup>48</sup>For example, when Andrews reads the curses pronounced by the Council of Trent he underlines only the one on justification by faith.

<sup>49</sup>4:544, 547, 565.

<sup>50</sup>Joseph Wolff, Journal of the Rev. Joseph Wolff . . . in a Series of Letters to Sir Thomas Baring (London, 1839).

<sup>51</sup>Joseph Wolff, Researches and Missionary Labours Among the Jews, Mohammedans and the Other Sects (London, 1835).

<sup>52</sup>Sylvester Bliss, Memoirs of William Miller (Boston, 1853).

<sup>53</sup>Thomas Macaulay, The History of England from the Accession of James the Second, 8 vols. (New York, 1868), 4:151.

<sup>54</sup>Testimonies for the Church, Numbers One to Ten (bound to form the second part of Spiritual Gifts, 4, but separately paginated), p. 6.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid. p. 99.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid. p. 108.

<sup>57</sup>Theological and Literary Journal, 1 (1848-1849):438.

<sup>58</sup>Advent Review and Sabbath Herald, 14 Nov. 1882, p. 713.

## THE LINGUIST

Pietro E. Copiz

One of the great challenges faced by missionaries is the need to communicate in the languages spoken in the countries where they are called to serve. How did the first missionary sent out by the fledgling Seventh-day Adventist Church fare in this respect? What foreign language skills did he acquire and how effectively did he use them? In addition, what are the main characteristics of his language style, especially during the European period of his life? These are some of the questions dealt with in the following study.<sup>1</sup>

### 1. The Background

To a certain extent, a somewhat legendary appraisal of J. N. Andrews' foreign language skills lingers in Adventist circles. Since he did not acquire them through formal education, it is through their use that his proficiency may be evaluated.

His History of the Sabbath and The First Day of the Week offers evidence that he was able to use intelligently both Hebrew and Greek in dealing with Biblical texts, although there are very few quotations in these two languages. His knowledge of Latin is documented both by the Latin quotations and references and by the large number of scholarly books in Latin still to be found in the large portion of his personal library kept at Collonges and which represents one of the treasures of the Alfred Vaucher Library. Grammars, readers and lexicons for most of these ancient languages--as well as a grammar of the Samaritan language and Bibles in ancient languages, sometimes with interlinear translations--are also part of his library and testify to his active interest in the

original languages of the Bible and in the documents of the "world of scholarship"<sup>2</sup> available at his time. Not all his books show evidence of having ever been read; but their acquisition discloses the orientation of the owner's mind.<sup>3</sup>

Andrews' knowledge of ancient languages was not wasted in Europe. Hebrew words, in Hebrew characters, were used in the second issue of Les Signes des Temps (Aug. 1876).<sup>4</sup> The year before, his familiarity with the Greek language put him at the right level of scholarship during a courteous polemic with a learned pastor in Prussia.<sup>5</sup> His articles in Les Signes des Temps demonstrate a good foundation in the original languages of the Bible. The whole Adventist community, both in the United States and Europe, benefited from the possibility of relying on a Biblical scholar at a time when learned ministers represented the exception in its midst.

It is not totally surprising, however, that a self-taught person may have acquired a working knowledge of ancient languages. But what proficiency did Andrews demonstrate in modern languages before he went to Europe?

Among the books of his library at Collonges, there is a Dutch and English New Testament printed in New York in 1865. A pencil note on the first page says "J. N. Andrews Rochester N.Y. April 9 1868." Thus Andrews manifested an interest in information which could be unlocked by a translation of the Bible in a less common European language long before he may have considered the possibility of laboring in Europe. A Portuguese New Testament, printed in London in 1826, also belongs to his library at Collonges. The absence of notes would normally leave unknown the date of its acquisition but an accidental finding provided an answer.

The Euro-Africa Division keeps in its archives a small collection

of old books, letters and other documents concerning the beginning of the Seventh-day Adventist work in Europe. Among them, there is a loose page, evidently the blank page of a Bible, which is ranged together with a sheet of pencil notes by Andrews--"(from Eld. J. N. Andrews' Bible.)," says a note written by another person in ink on this sheet. On the loose Bible page, after faded words written by another hand, there is the following pencil notation: "J. N. Andrews Bought in Boston Mass May 15 1871 Pd. 50 cts. (Portuguese N.T.)." This loose page matches the one missing in the Portuguese New Testament kept at Collonges.<sup>6</sup> Portuguese was, then, another language which stimulated Andrews' interest while still in the United States.

We cannot determine when he purchased some of his other foreign books: a New Testament in Arabic, Arabic reading lessons, history books in German and a number of dictionaries for some of the most important European languages. No dates are marked either on a very old German Bible (1619) or on a French New Testament in his library. The latter shows that it was acquired while Andrews was in Europe, since the name of Gabert--one of the workers in Basel or her father--was originally written on the first page with pencil and later erased.<sup>7</sup> And there are no doubts concerning one of his books for learning the Italian language, since it was printed in New York in 1882.<sup>8</sup>

It is certain, however, that Andrews possessed a good reading knowledge of French before leaving for Europe. He stated, shortly after his arrival in Switzerland, "I have for years as I have had opportunity read French works with some degree of satisfaction as I have sought to gain information not otherwise to be found."<sup>9</sup> Around 1870, he read daily three chapters in the Bible in French.<sup>10</sup> It is very likely that he even gave a French New Testament to his daughter in 1871. On the second blank page of a small French New Testament kept in Berne, is written, with pencil

as usual, "Mary F. Andrews Dec. 4 1871."<sup>11</sup> The handwriting is almost surely that of J. N. Andrews.

In summary, before 1874, this "prince of scholars"<sup>12</sup> used his keen mind and his passion for reading and learning in order to acquire, among other skills, a good working knowledge of Greek, Hebrew, Latin, and a reading knowledge of French. He also manifested an interest in other modern languages. From the point of view of the linguistic background, Andrews was reasonably well fitted for his mission in Europe, although his lack of oral practice prevented him from foreseeing realistically his aptitude for acquiring conversational skills in the languages of the Old World.

## 2. The Learning Process in Europe

J. N. Andrews was already forty-five years old when he sailed for Europe-- not an ideal age for acquiring fluency in new foreign languages. But he could hope that his habits of diligent study and persevering efforts could qualify him for rapid progress. He also had to provide language training for his two children, Charles, seventeen and a half years old, and Mary, barely thirteen.

Already, aboard the Cunard liner S.S. Atlas bound from Boston to Liverpool, Adémar Vuilleumier, who had spent a few years in the United States and was to act initially as a French interpreter for the first Adventist missionary, "agreed to hold daily classes in French with the Andrews children while they crossed the ocean."<sup>13</sup> It is likely that their father did not miss the opportunity to check his own skills.

Upon his arrival in Switzerland, Andrews decided that his first task was to learn French. In his first report to Review readers, he declared: "I have now to educate my ear to distinguish, and my tongue to utter, the sounds of the French language."<sup>14</sup> From visual understanding, he had to move to oral comprehension, proper pronunciation and conversational skills. His expectations of rapid progress were high, as is

evidenced by his reports and letters. "I hope within a short time to be able to speak in the French language,"<sup>15</sup> he states, less than three weeks after reaching Neuchâtel.

On 1 January 1875, a time of the year when plans are reviewed and resolutions made, Andrews wrote in his report for the Review:

My first important work here is to become master of the French language so as to speak it correctly and to write it grammatically. It is not a light task to accomplish this. I have toiled early and late, and have made some progress. I feel certain of success with God's help. It is now the great desire of my heart to preach Christ in the French language with freedom, and to see sinners converted to Him.<sup>16</sup>

Total immersion in the new language appeared to be the key to its rapid acquisition. Andrews convinced Charles and Mary to ban the use of English, except from five to six in the evening. Sometimes the frustrated children "just waited for their English hour in the evening, then talked as fast as they could."<sup>17</sup> At the end of the following year, the whole family joined in signing a Christmas resolution:

Covenant concerning the French Language Made Between Charles, Mary, and Their Father.

We hereby covenant together that we will use only the French language in our conversation with one another. We will not depart from this arrangement except by mutual consent when there shall exist good reasons for so doing. We will try in the fear of God to keep this covenant, and we ask His help that we may fulfill it faithfully. But it shall be our privilege to use the German language whenever we can speak a word or sentence of it.

J. N. Andrews  
C. M. Andrews  
Mary F. Andrews.  
Bâle, Suisse, Dec. 24, 1876.<sup>18</sup>

The Andrews family had taken in the beginning regular French classes at the Roulet boarding school, in front of the Neuchâtel railway station.<sup>19</sup> Later, some of the workers, often new converts, gave language lessons to the children. Andrews studied mostly by himself, and very hard. Soon he added German to his program, and later Italian. But it was not an easy task. His letters and reports to the brethren in Battle Creek and





The second negative factor was the lack of cooperation of the Swiss members. When J. Erzberger had been sent to Battle Creek (1869), many persons, especially in the home of James and Ellen White, "spared no means to educate him in the English language. We all tried to be his instructors."<sup>24</sup> "Three dedicated people began to teach Erzberger English, each teacher spending four hours a day with the eager pupil . . . [In addition,] Erzberger spent a number of weeks studying English at Elder Andrews' home."<sup>25</sup> Adémar Vuilleumier, who went to the United States after Erzberger, received a similar treatment. The least Andrews could expect was to be offered "similar help, but had to meet the most painful disappointments."<sup>26</sup>

The third factor depended on Andrews' studious habits, age and nature as well as on his priorities. Two years before turning fifty, he says, "I can educate my eye [spelling, visual understanding] with much less difficulty than my ear [oral understanding, pronunciation, conversation]."<sup>27</sup> Intellectual learning appears easier and more natural for him than the acquisition of practical conversational skills. It is, however, his purpose to prepare tracts, and especially to publish a paper in French--later also in German and Italian--that determined the priority he put on the study of grammar.

"My first great object to accomplish in Switzerland is the publication of a paper in French . . . The day which witnesses the publication of a paper in French in behalf of the cause of truth will mark a new era here."<sup>28</sup> Andrews repeated similar statements in letters and reports. Together with the paper went the obligation, in Andrews' mind, to master the French grammar. This paper "must be published in correct French; not merely such French as can be understood, but in such as shall not expose the truth to derision from its awkward construction."

He further recognizes that:

I could make greater advancement in speaking the language to pay less attention to grammar and to take more time to mingle with those who speak the language. But . . . I dare not bear the responsibility of such publication without sufficient knowledge of French to judge of the correctness of what is printed. I do not expect to avoid all mistakes, but I wish to know with some degree of certainty what I am doing.<sup>29</sup>

Unfortunately, the two Vuilleumier brothers, on whom Andrews had to depend in the beginning, displayed neither a knowledge of grammar nor interest in it, although their language appeared correct. This greatly surprised the learned missionary, who decided he "must be more perfectly instructed in the grammar of the language" before rushing "ahead on the tracts."<sup>30</sup> Even after the paper had been published for more than a year Andrews expressed his "extreme anxiety," not so much about having it "free from faults of spelling and the ordinary typographical errors," which he naturally wished to avoid, but because "there is a great danger in using a foreign language of making blunders that will render the truth ridiculous."<sup>31</sup> With this noble purpose in mind, the missionary, turned increasingly editor, was bound to spend an important part of his time both studying the language and assuring the correctness of the paper. "It is a very serious task to get out a paper in a language not your own. I commence work with the daylight and end it late in the evening or night."<sup>32</sup> In addition, his failing voice and his deteriorating health, as well as his tendencies for diligent study and writing, made desk work a natural result.

But Switzerland has three major official languages, also spoken in large neighboring countries. Since Andrews already possessed a knowledge of French and also because he first lived in a French speaking area, it was natural that he would concentrate initially on French. And French was "generally known" in many European countries "by the better classes": this made the publication of a periodical and tracts in that language an obvious choice.<sup>33</sup>

From 1876 on, however, the mission headquarters was located in Basel, where German is spoken. Also, the strong interest cultivated in Germany by J. Erzberger made the study of German desirable even before Andrews moved from Neuchâtel. "I have made some effort in German," he states in 1875.<sup>34</sup> "We take daily German lessons," he communicates two years later.<sup>35</sup> Because of the interest for the work in Italy and possible publications in Italian, a letter written toward the end of 1877 reveals that he has added Italian to his studies:

I have three languages to learn--the French, the German, and Italian. It is no child's play for me to get them so that I can use them correctly. I cannot express to you what anguish of spirit I have suffered over them.<sup>36</sup>

Of course, as initially for French, one of Andrews' aims was to be able to supervise the content of Adventist publications in the new foreign languages: "I wished to make further progress in German that I might be more certain that everything is correct in them,"<sup>37</sup> he writes in 1878.

As one reviews Andrews' process of learning languages in Europe, it is obvious that his former training, his nature, his proficiency in written over oral form and the priority he gave to publishing a paper in French made the concentration of his efforts on written knowledge almost inevitable. To these reasons should be added the fact that it was very difficult at the time to establish direct contact with the inhabitants of France. This made a regular paper, and accompanying tracts, a most desirable means of entering new territories. Andrews adapted the orientation of the skills he endeavored to acquire to the needs of his mission in Europe.

### 3. The Results

Experience shows that young persons make the most rapid progress in foreign languages, especially in oral skills, if the learning takes place in a country where the language to be studied is spoken. This was

the case also for the Andrews family. "Mary has made great progress in French," her father reports in June 1875.<sup>38</sup> A letter of December 1877 confirms the different levels of progress, although it is clear that Andrews himself was at the center of the acquisition process, as a guide and colearner:

Mary and Charles are ahead of their father in the languages. Bro. Aufranc says, Mary speaks French as well as a native. Their father has led them along in his own tracks with book in hand, from morning till night.<sup>39</sup>

What about Andrews himself? In the beginning, he had to rely on interpreters in order to communicate. For reasons which appear somewhat surprising (jealousy and prejudice) he was not faithfully translated into French by Adémar Vuilleumier.<sup>40</sup> On the other hand, J. Erzberger was very efficient in interpreting him into German.<sup>41</sup>

A report shows Andrews partly on his own in French only a few weeks after his arrival: "Eld. Andrews had so far mastered the French language as to be able to give three addresses at the meetings."<sup>42</sup> The meetings were very likely those held at Le Locle around 16 November 1874.<sup>43</sup> Such a performance, just one month after arriving at Neuchâtel, appears extraordinary. Since the sentence was quoted in the Review from the paper The Sabbath Memorial, it is possible that the correspondent misunderstood the information he received and thought that Andrews spoke in French. In any case, in view of all the information available, the statement should at least be considered with great caution.

It is not easy to assess Andrews' progress in French during the first two years. It appears certain, however, that he must have achieved a good level of writing skills by 1876, otherwise he would not have started Les Signes des Temps if he wanted to remain consistent with the prerequisites he had set himself for a paper in French. Of course, he expected to obtain more help than he actually received in the beginning. As early as 1875, he writes: "It has been my hope that God will raise up competent French

scholars here in Europe who will render the assistance necessary in the grammar of the language."<sup>44</sup> For the paper itself, he states:

When we entered upon the publication of our French paper, we had the assurance that Brother Morin, a competent French scholar, would come immediately to our assistance. Had it not been for this, we should not have dared to commence our paper.<sup>45</sup>

Louis Aufranc, a former school teacher from Le Locle, was the only French-speaking assistant when the paper was started. D. T. Bourdeau was supposed to provide the ideal help when he joined Andrews in 1876; his best skills, however, were not of an editorial nature. Mary Andrews helped a great deal until 1878, but she could not master the fine points of language like a native. After 1878, Sister Gabert is mentioned as "the best translator we have in Europe."<sup>46</sup> She assisted very efficiently in the office. But it is clear that for years a great burden rested upon Andrews' shoulders.

A rapid analysis of the first issues of Les Signes des Temps does not reveal grammatical mistakes, although some expressions give a feeling of translation. In the first issue, a preposition is literally translated from English: "dans les Etats-Unis" instead of "aux Etats-Unis."<sup>47</sup> The American order for dates--the month before the day--is sometimes followed: "août 22-29"; "sept. 7-12"; "sept. 19-26."<sup>48</sup> In a number of issues the American custom of adding the name of the state after a town, with a comma between, is followed. Occasional "false friends" of translators play a role, but very rarely. For example, one may find "éditeur" instead of "rédacteur,"<sup>49</sup> and Dr. Sauvagnat has discovered a number of other tell-tale signs.<sup>50</sup>

On the other hand, French very subtly influenced Andrews' English. In some of his reports in English, it may be observed that sometimes the figure "7" is written the French--or European--way, with a bar across. "Suisse" instead of "Switzerland" appears not only in addresses, but also in the body of some letters. "Bâle" is used in French in letters and reports written in English even during the time the family lives in Basel;

occasionally, however, "Basel" also occurs, or even "Basle."<sup>51</sup>

One of the first dated statements reflecting the degree of achievement is that of July 1878. Andrews writes to W. C. White: "I write every day in French, German and Italian, but I feel that I am slow in these matters." Immediately before, he states: "We need some competent person to lean on in German and in Italian in order to safely get out a paper in each of these languages."<sup>52</sup> It is evident that Andrews considers himself competent only in French, unless he means that competent assistants are already available in French. Some time after 1876, he assesses his oral proficiency: "I can preach in French so as not to make myself ridiculous, and so as to reach the hearts of those who hear."<sup>53</sup>

Some reservations concerning his competence in writing in French at that time are in order. In 1972 Giuseppe De Meo read and commented on a document kept in Berne.<sup>54</sup> This manuscript by Andrews is entitled "Réponses aux Questions d'une Frère italian." It is written in English, with a Bible quotation in French. The three mistakes are rather striking. The word "Réponse" is repeated correctly in the text for each answer, but sometimes without the accent. A translation of this document--which lacks the end of the 5th question and the 6th question and answer--was published in Les Signes des Temps in June 1878.<sup>55</sup>

There is a second similar sheet in Berne, but the title is in English, "Response to Questions." The content, with two additional questions not in the manuscript, was published in the following issue of Les Signes des Temps under the same title, "Réponses aux questions d'un frère d'Italie."<sup>56</sup> This shows that the two documents belong together. The expression "the actual successor of the heathen pontifex maximus" of the second manuscript was wrongly translated "effectivement le successeur du Pontife païen Maximus," which necessitated a correction in the next issue of the paper.<sup>57</sup>

Andrews had the habit of answering in his journal the questions which were addressed to him. The items above prove that, in 1878, he wrote at least some of his articles in English, that someone else translated them into French, and that his proficiency in writing rapidly in French was not high at that time. Finally, the fact that Andrews provides a Bible text already in French shows that the manuscripts had been prepared for Les Signes des Temps and not to be sent to Italy. The manuscripts give also evidence of an effort to write in simple and clear language. In addition, there are very few corrections in these drafts.

Andrews was absent from Switzerland from the early autumn of 1878 until August 1879. This absence could not be beneficial for progress, or even continuous proficiency, in the foreign languages he was studying. In a letter he wrote in English from Battle Creek to Albert Vuilleumier in 1879, he adds at the end in French: "Faites bien mes amities à soeur Vuilleumier et à tous nos amis. Votre frère en Jésus-Christ J. N. Andrews."<sup>58</sup> The simple greeting formula was written almost correctly, since only an accent mark is missing. But he hesitated at the end of "amis," which he corrected; also, there is almost an unnecessary "s" after "votre." One month later, he added a paragraph in German for Brother Jaspersen in a letter to Anna Rasmussen.<sup>59</sup> It would be interesting to study this paragraph, unless it contains only simple greetings.

A precious document--the diary of Jean Vuilleumier, of which Daniel Augsburgger has studied the essential portions concerning Andrews--quotes the missionary two days after his return to Switzerland as hoping to have soon recovered from his weakness and to be able to make progress in French and German (16 August 1879). Two days later, Andrews is in charge of the worship period. "He translates the verses word by word in order to make progress in French."<sup>60</sup> One month after this incident, in dealing with a manuscript by D. T. Bourdeau, he lets Miss Gabert "judge of the French



style. She has made a few verbal changes not at all affecting the argument. I have read it carefully to judge of the sentiment."<sup>61</sup> In October 1879, he reads in German with L. Aufranc, as he has done several other times. He "hopes to continue," notes Vuilleumier, who adds, "he has, it seems, already studied this language well."<sup>62</sup> In December, after commenting on a sermon on Daniel by Andrews, Vuilleumier evaluates his performance in stating: "He makes progress in French."<sup>63</sup> It appears evident that Andrews spoke in French that Sabbath. A few days later, Andrews himself says, "I have made earnest effort to advance in the knowledge of the three languages which we are called to use."<sup>64</sup> He continues to study them. With reference to Italian, it should be added that two years earlier he could declare: "I have made some progress in Italian and find it very easy."<sup>65</sup>

A remark of a practical nature should be made concerning the linguistic environment of Andrews. With the exception of his long visit to the United States, he lived mostly in Basel from April 1876 to October 1883. During this time, he concentrated more on French than on the other European languages. But, aside from many of his assistants, he was not surrounded by a French-speaking community. On the other hand, his progress in German was certainly hindered by the Basel dialect, which he heard more often than "high German." These factors influenced negatively his progress in oral fluency in both languages. They may have also provided an additional incentive for studying French and German grammar.

We can only guess at the level of proficiency reached by Andrews in 1881 and 1882 in the languages he studied, since there is a lack of helpful documents for that period. For 1883, the evidence is that he wrote his articles in English, that they were usually translated by L. Aufranc--who disappointed the editor in this task--and that J. Vuilleumier often checked the inaccuracies of the French translations.<sup>66</sup>

Vuilleumier notes in August 1883 that Andrews reads again the pages of translation of his articles for Les Signes des Temps and finds many mistakes.<sup>67</sup> On the other hand, the same Vuilleumier reveals that Andrews talked with him both in English and French during 1883.<sup>68</sup>

During the last year of his life, Andrews writes therefore in English--anyway, in view of his weakness, it was wise to act in the manner that required the least effort--and continues to survey efficiently the translations which are made, mainly into French. He often speaks in French, sometimes even with persons who understand English. And he goes to breakfast "in the morning, his German Bible under his arm."<sup>69</sup> Until the end he fights on, weak in his body, but his mind ever challenged by the unfinished task and the progress still to be made.

#### 4. Remarks on Style

A serious study of Andrews' writing style deserves to be made. It is very likely that a gradual change could be observed by examining, in chronological order, the articles he wrote while still in the United States. But the best results would be yielded by a comparison between the first edition of his History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week and the second one.

Among the precious books of the Euro-Africa Division Collection there is a copy of the first edition, with pencil notes and corrections by the author. On the cover is written "Revised Copy." A copy of the second edition is also available.<sup>70</sup>

The second edition has more pages, of course (528, including 16 pages of indexes, instead of 340). There was not enough room in the empty spaces on the pages of the first edition for all the additional notes which were ultimately published. But a rapid analysis of some key corrections shows that Andrews strove for accuracy, more scholarly quotations, more complete information and more appropriate expressions.

The second edition stands as a testimony to an accomplished scholar, familiar with the nuances of language and able to give to his arguments the subtle order of logic and persuasion.

After he went to Europe, Andrews made a conscious effort in a different direction. He not only left relatives, friends and country; but he somehow stripped himself of some of his attributes: in other words, he humbled himself in writing to the supposed level of his European readers. This had nothing to do with accuracy and correct language. He is reported to have spent more than one day adding by hand a missing accent mark on the front page of three thousand copies of Les Signes des Temps.<sup>71</sup> Even during his last days he made incredible efforts to proof-read the paper.

Of course, many of his communications--letters and reports--were written in great haste. Detailed information and expressions are often repeated and the punctuation is frequently loose at this level of writing. But Andrews' style in Europe should be judged by his articles.

The English draft of his "Réponses à un frère d'Italie" was so simple that it convinced Dr. De Meo that it was a concession to an Italian correspondent's elementary knowledge of the language. In fact, as we have seen, it was a draft for an article for Les Signes; the elementary level of expression is striking evidence of a voluntary stylistic metamorphosis.<sup>72</sup> In this context, a remark he made in a letter in 1880 is quite revealing: "I have to write in so simple a style for European readers who are not Bible scholars . . ."<sup>73</sup> He would have felt uncomfortable if the same articles had been read by American readers. It is true that he was emphasizing in his remark the Bible background and level, but his language style was also affected.

Andrews' European manuscripts show that he wrote with few corrections, erasures and additions, as if the topic's organization were a

natural process for him. His articles often take the form of an exhaustive Bible study, with many Scriptural references. He has a preference for the question and answer formula or he stimulates dialogue. From January 1881 to March 1883, he runs a series of 27 "evenings" under the general title "A Conversation Concerning the Destiny of Man." Otherwise he distributes his material in many points, which he numbers. Actually and ultimately he is teaching. His information is as solid as the organization of his material. And even in his polemic he is extremely courteous.

Two of his close associates pay a deserved tribute to his European style. B. L. Whitney states three years after Andrews' death that

. . . he labored to present the truth in the most clear and simple manner, and in the way best calculated to bring it within the intelligent comprehension of all into whose hands it should come. His success in these efforts was certainly remarkable, and the present truth, as presented in the early volumes of this journal, furnishes an admirable example, and one rarely attained, of simplicity, clearness, and force.<sup>74</sup>

As for Jean Vuilleumier, who deeply admired Andrews during his youth and who was strongly influenced by his writings, he declared many years later:

The biblical . . . studies of J. N. Andrews . . . in Les Signes des Temps . . . are characterized by a remarkable simplicity, conciseness and mastery. . . . The journal has not exceeded, and not even reached since, the heights to which the limpid style, the wide knowledge, the Biblical richness, the deep views and the exquisite urbanity of its founder had brought it.<sup>75</sup>

## 5. Conclusion

At the conclusion of this study, it is safe to confirm that, toward the end of his life, Andrews could read the Bible in seven languages--Hebrew, Greek, Latin, French, German and Italian, besides English. He also manifested a passing interest in Dutch, and maybe in Portuguese and Arabic.

Orally, he endeavored to make progress until the end of his life, especially in French. He could communicate in this language, both in

public and in private, at an acceptable level. His degree of proficiency in German or in Italian is less known.

It is in writing, above all in French, that he obtained the best results, particularly in grammar. "Perhaps another could do better in the grammar than myself, but I think the judgment will show that I have done what I could," he writes to James and Ellen White.<sup>76</sup> His approach to languages was intellectual.<sup>77</sup> This may have hindered his progress in the total acquisition of foreign languages.<sup>78</sup> Mrs. White felt free to tell him in 1883:

Had you, my brother, worked more through an interpreter in the place of studying so much to speak the language, you would have been working your way into the hearts of the people and into the language too . . .<sup>79</sup>

Normally, such a practical remark could have been offered even by a foreign language specialist. But there are many factors to be taken into consideration. As B. L. Whitney assessed the contemporary situation, the best way to reach the European public at that time was through the printed page.<sup>80</sup> In addition, during the last four years of his life, Andrews' health was so poor that he could be much more effective from his desk. Also, we have already mentioned the failure of those near to him to give him the help he desired in learning French, at least in the beginning. Of course, there were many tasks which could have been taken care of by others, but one needs to keep in mind the total picture. And Andrews' age when he labored in Europe should not be forgotten. It is only through exceptional efforts that he obtained satisfactory conversational skills.

Natural tendencies should not be neglected either: "at heart he was a writer."<sup>81</sup> A public letter, almost certainly written by Jean Vuilleumier in April 1883,<sup>82</sup> shows Andrews miraculously gaining strength every month, when the deadline of his articles approached, writing them in a very short time, and then returning to his normal state of total physical prostration and mental exhaustion. Beside the grace of God and his sense

of duty, it was certainly also Andrews' call to write that gave him the power to rally, even if only for a short time. In a certain way, he was kept alive by the needs of the paper and he totally identified himself with his task as a writer.

His insistence on the study of grammar deserves to be pointed out also for some basic reasons. After having placed for a while oral skills above the study of grammar, modern language authorities claim again that a serious grammar foundation remains a prerequisite for the thorough acquisition of a foreign language. It is only on solid grammatical structures that additional skills may be safely built. The intensive language programs for missionary appointees offered at the university which bears Andrews' name have been based on this principle.

But how well did Andrews write in French? A well-informed Adventist historian states that Andrews "wrote articles in French . . . and translated others from American Adventist papers."<sup>83</sup> It seems normal to accept that Andrews could write, and that he actually wrote, some articles directly in French--especially the editorial portion of many issues of the paper, where the language and style often are of an inferior level--but we cannot affirm that they were ready for publication without corrections. This researcher knows of no extensive manuscripts of Andrews in French which could provide any proof in this sense. Unless new documents become available for study, any assessment of his writing skills in French must remain tentative. It is known, however, that he wrote many--probably most--of his articles in English. But, through his thorough knowledge of theoretical grammar, to which should be added his natural ability, he had acquired an exceptional aptitude for criticizing correctly the translations that his assistants made of his and others' articles. He had an eagle's eye for the perfection of their final written form.

A writer at heart: Andrews was this and more. He was an educator,

a teacher, a church doctor and a preacher. And yet, on his deathbed, oppressed by the unaccomplished task, he felt and said that his life had been a failure, since it had not brought forth the fruit that he had expected. His sister-in-law replied that his writings remained and would continue to bring light.<sup>84</sup> She was certainly right. For years, after his death, translations of his articles provided intellectual food and inspiration for many European readers. Some articles were published in Italian as late as World War II. But he could also contemplate extraordinary results while still alive. By the end of 1882, nearly 200,000 copies of Les Signes des Temps had been distributed to "almost the entire French Protestant population of Europe."<sup>85</sup> The paper was being sent to twenty-four countries on four continents already in 1880.<sup>86</sup>

Together with his task as an editor, the study of foreign languages occupied a very important portion of Andrews' time in Europe. In doing this, he demonstrated a broad outlook, a constant opening of his mind toward new and challenging horizons, a world--or at least a European--vision of the task ahead, and the need to be prepared for it, linguistically and culturally. Did he offer any counsel to future missionaries?

As early as 1875, Andrews wrote, ". . . each nation must have the truth in its own tongue." He then addressed a call, both to Europeans who learned English in the United States and to Americans,

young men of approved piety, and of good understanding in the Scriptures, and of capacity to teach, who understand no language but the English . . . I think that if such young men were willing to give themselves to the work . . . they would speedily become able to speak the language of the country to which they should go.

He suggests, as many modern methods do, total immersion in the target language, with teachers who do not know English, but who speak correctly and distinctly. And he warns pointedly, ". . . let none come to Europe for the romance and sight-seeing of the journey. This kind of poetry will speedily turn to sober prose."<sup>87</sup>

J. N. Andrews understood early in his experience the needs of Europe and labored with total dedication in order to meet them. Although some cross-cultural differences remained, by studying the local languages he endeavored to be Swiss with the Swiss, French with the French, German with the Germans and Italian with the Italians. If the last message is to be finally delivered to every nation and tongue, it will require from today's messengers a willingness to follow in Andrews' steps.



NOTES

<sup>1</sup>The research for this topic was conducted mainly at the Euro-Africa Division headquarters in Bern, Switzerland, and briefly at the Alfred Vaucher Library, Collonges, France. Complete collections of The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald and of E. G. White's correspondence, as well as other documents, were not available. The conclusions are therefore tentative. Some essential material was provided by the E. G. White--SDA Research Centre Europe, Newbold College, Bracknell, Berkshire, England (hereafter cited as WRCE).

<sup>2</sup>The expression "Latin unlocked the world of scholarship" was used by Joseph G. Smoot, "The Measure of The Man: A Tribute to John Nevins Andrews," Focus, 14 (Fall, 1978):36.

<sup>3</sup>To be fair, it should be added that Andrews' library reveals that he was fond of scholarly books in general and old books in particular, probably bought from secondhand bookdealers in Europe. On the other hand, experience shows that one often buys a book read previously in order to own it. This was probably the case for John Milton's works, which Andrews seems to have read--according to the question about Milton he once asked E. G. White ("The Truth about the White Lie," Ministry Insert, Aug. 1982, p. 5)--although Milton's books in his library do not appear to have been opened.

<sup>4</sup>Lack of funds may have prevented their use in later issues.

<sup>5</sup>The Advent Review and Herald of the Sabbath (hereafter cited as RH), 11 Mar. 1875, pp. 84-85.

<sup>6</sup>The loose page has now been reunited with the Portuguese New Testament at Collonges.

<sup>7</sup>There is a single note, written with pencil, in this copy of the French New Testament. In the margin above Rev. 1:10, which had in the text "dans la journée dominicale," Andrews wrote "seigneuriale" to correct the implications of the adjective chosen by the translator.

<sup>8</sup>Ollendorf's New Method of Learning to Read, Write and Speak the Italian Language . . . with Additions and Corrections by Felix Foresti (New York, 1882).

<sup>9</sup>RH 17 Nov. 1874, p. 166.

<sup>10</sup>Following a testimony sent by E. G. White in 1868, Andrews wrote to her from Rochester, N.Y., on 21 Dec. 1870: "My entire set course of study since the time of your reproof two years since, has been the reading of three chapters in the Bible each day. For something over a year this has been in French . . . For the year past I have read no Greek--not one verse-- . . . and nothing in any other language." Quoted by Virgil E. Robinson, "What Manner of Man," RH 19 Sept. 1974, p. 8. Andrews had evidently received a reproof concerning his study and reading habits and he had accepted Mrs. White's counsel.

<sup>11</sup>Le Nouveau Testament de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ: d'après la version revue par J. F. Ostervald (New York, 1868). Euro-Africa Division of Seventh-day Adventists Archives, Bern (hereafter cited as EADA).

<sup>12</sup>Virgil E. Robinson, "J. N. Andrews, Prince of Scholars," Guide, 28 Aug. 1974.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid. 28 Aug. 1974, p. 22. Adémar Vuilleumier gave some French lessons also in 1875, for which he received 100 francs in April and the same amount in June of that year (J. N. Andrews' Expense Report to the General Conference before commencing in Basel [1876]: Archives of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.).

<sup>14</sup>RH 17 Nov. 1874, p. 166.      <sup>15</sup>Ibid. 24 Nov. 1874, p. 172.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid. 28 Jan. 1875, p. 36.

<sup>17</sup>Robinson, Guide, 4 Sept. 1974, pp. 11, 19.

<sup>18</sup>J. N. Andrews, M.D. [the missionary's grandson], "Elder J. N. Andrews," RH 11 May 1944, p. 11.

<sup>19</sup>Jean Vuilleumier, quoted in "J. N. Andrews Rédacteur," Revue Adventiste (Numéro Spécial), Oct. 1974, p. 17.

<sup>20</sup>RH 26 Aug. 1875, p. 60.

<sup>21</sup>WRCE, The Letters of J. N. Andrews, 1862-1883 (photocopied transcripts) (hereafter cited as Andrews Corresp.), f. 121.

<sup>22</sup>WRCE, DF2000-a-e, pp. 10-11 (following the original numbering).

<sup>23</sup>RH 8 July 1875, p. 13.

<sup>24</sup>EADA, E. G. White to the Brethren in Switzerland, 29 Aug. 1878. French translations of this and other letters were made at an early date and are kept in the same collection.

<sup>25</sup>Robinson, Guide, 28 Aug. 1974, p. 21.

<sup>26</sup>WRCE, Photocopied transcripts of Andrews' letters to Lucinda Hall, Susan Jacqueline Collection, DF2000-a-1(39), (hereafter cited only by number) 3 Oct. 1877.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid.

<sup>28</sup>RH 26 Aug. 1875, p. 60.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid. 24 June 1875, p. 204.

<sup>30</sup>Andrews Corresp. f. 80. The letter has been misdated 8 June 1878 but its contents--only the first two tracts are completed--show that it cannot have been written later than 1875. Jean Vuilleumier's Diary confirms Andrews' remarks, at least for his father Albert. Around Christmas 1879, Jean, then fifteen, writes that he plans to invite his father to study French grammar and to use a better and more correct language, especially in sermons. The diary (hereafter cited as Vuilleumier Diary) is at present in the hands of the Vuilleumier family.

<sup>31</sup>DF2000-a-1(39), 3 Oct. 1877. This concern of Andrews was not out of place with European readers. If a personal note may be allowed, I would agree that Andrews' worries were well-founded. As a young convert, I learned the first elements of doctrine in Italian. Many documents, including E. G. White statements, had been hastily translated from English or French. I still remember how puzzled I was that truth could be expressed through such a poor syntax. The inferior quality of the language in which the beautiful message was wrapped acted initially for me as a deterrent toward its acceptance.

<sup>32</sup>Andrews Corresp. f. 76. The letter has been tentatively dated 1 May 1878 but the allusion to the trip to Paris (f. 75) and an entry in Andrews' account book for 18 March 1877, suggest the year 1877.

<sup>33</sup>B. L. Whitney, "The Central European Mission," in Historical Sketches of the Foreign Missions of the Seventh-day Adventists (Basel: 1886), p. 20 (hereafter cited as Hist. Sk.).

<sup>34</sup>WRCE, DF2000-a-e, p. 10.

<sup>35</sup>Andrews Corresp. f. 76 (see n. 32 on dating). This statement is confirmed by Andrews' account book (Heritage Room, James White Library, Andrews University, Michigan). Between 8 Dec. 1876 and 3 Sept. 1877, there are twelve entries for payment for German lessons (the first time to a "Docteur allemand") for a total of 217.18 francs. French lessons by Br. Aufranc are also mentioned in 1876 but at least some of them were given to the children, since one entry specifies "leçons données a Ch. & à Marie."

<sup>36</sup>DF2000-a-1(39), 3 Oct. 1877.

<sup>37</sup>Andrews Corresp. 4 Mar. 1878 (with additions 12 & 18 Mar.).

<sup>38</sup>Ibid. f. 80 (on dating, see n. 30).

<sup>39</sup>WRCE, The Letters of William & Jenny Ings while in Europe (microfiche), 18 Dec. 1877.

<sup>40</sup>WRCE, The Letters of Ellen G. White, 1847-1914 (photocopied transcripts) (hereafter cited as White Corresp.), 29 Aug. 1878; Andrews Corresp. f. 79 (see n. 30 on dating).

<sup>41</sup>RH 1 Apr. 1875, pp. 108-109.

<sup>42</sup>W. M. Jones, "Progress of the Work," The Sabbath Memorial, quoted in RH 4 Feb. 1875, p. 44.

<sup>43</sup>Hist. Sk., p. 16.

<sup>44</sup>RH 24 June 1875, p. 204.

<sup>45</sup>Andrews Corresp. 29 Dec. 1879.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid. 4 Mar. 1878.

<sup>47</sup>Les Signes des Temps (hereafter cited as Les Signes), July 1876, p. 4.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid. Nov. 1876, p. 40.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid. May 1877, p. 88.

<sup>50</sup>See below, p. 301.

<sup>51</sup>It is impossible to judge Andrews' linguistic competence from his Account Book: the entries are not all his and there are no sentences. There are a few minor errors in the entries for the first two years.

<sup>52</sup>Andrews Corresp. 9 July 1878.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid. f. 121 (undated fragment, after 1876).

<sup>54</sup>A large sheet, written on both sides: EADA. De Meo published his comments in "Una lettera . . .," Il Messaggero Avventista, April 1972, pp. 42-44. He suggested that the person for whom the answers were prepared was probably Enrico Volpi. See also, G. De Meo, "Granel di Sale," Un Secolo di Storia della Chiesa Cristiana Avventista del 7<sup>o</sup> Giorno in Italia (1864-1964) (Torino, 1980, pp. 82-83.

<sup>55</sup>Les Signes, June 1878, p. 192. <sup>56</sup>Ibid. July 1878, p. 200.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid. Aug. 1878, p. 208.

<sup>58</sup>EADA, 15 Apr. 1879.

<sup>59</sup>Andrews Corresp. 23 May 1879.

<sup>60</sup>Vuilleumier Diary, 18 Aug. 1879.

<sup>61</sup>Andrews Corresp. 19 Sept. 1879.

<sup>62</sup>Vuilleumier Diary, 11 Oct. 1879.

<sup>63</sup>20 Dec. [in reality, 22], 1879.

<sup>64</sup>Andrews Corresp. 29 Dec. 1879.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid. 11 Jan. 1878.

<sup>66</sup>Vuilleumier Diary, 28 Jan. 1883; 17 Feb. 1883; 9 Aug. 1883.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid. 9 Aug. 1883.

<sup>68</sup>Ibid. 9 Aug., 25 July, 25 Oct. (relating events of 10 Oct.), 1883; etc. See also Jean Vuilleumier, "Early Days of the Message in Europe," RH 25 Apr. 1929, p. 19; 2 May 1929, pp. 11-12.

<sup>69</sup>Vuilleumier Diary, 6 May 1883.

<sup>70</sup>J. H. Waggoner has noted on the preface page of this first edition, "I find that the edition of 1887 is according to the revision of this book."

<sup>71</sup>Robinson, Guide, 11 Sept. 1974, pp. 13-14.

<sup>72</sup>See above, n. 54.

<sup>73</sup>DF2000-a-1(39), 26 Feb. 1880.

<sup>74</sup>Hist. Sk., p. 24.

<sup>75</sup>Jean Vuilleumier, "J. N. Andrews Rédacteur," Revue Adventiste (Numéro Spécial), Oct. 1974, p. 18.

<sup>76</sup>Andrews Corresp. f. 80 (see n. 30 on dating).

<sup>77</sup>"You worship intellect," she told him: White Corresp. 29 Mar. 1883.

<sup>78</sup>In a letter which may not have been sent, since it is so similar to one written only 12 days later (see previous note), Mrs. White tells Andrews rather bluntly: "Books and study and minutious aiming to perfection has retarded your work and crippled your efforts from the beginning of your life." Ibid. 17 Mar. 1883. Eight years before, as a result of a vision, E. G. White had stated that "Eld. Andrews is God's chosen servant to do a special work; but he made a mistake in keeping the Sabbath History from the people in order to present a perfect work . . . He should have given this important work much sooner, and then improved it as he could do so." (RH 4 Nov. 1875, p. 139.) This tendency toward "perfectionism" could be traced in his painstaking efforts to proofread the paper even on his deathbed, when others could have taken care of this task. But was he able to do anything else at that time? Had he any other way to remain usefully associated with his paper? In his reply to E. G. White, he writes on 17 Sept. 1883, "I try still to read the proof sheets of our French paper but I have no longer the power to prepare any articles for it." (Andrews Corresp.) He truly did what he could.

<sup>79</sup>White Corresp. 29 Mar. 1883.

<sup>80</sup>Hist. Sk., p. 55.

<sup>81</sup>Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, 1976 ed., p. 44.

<sup>82</sup>This letter, of about four pages, exists in draft and final copy: EADA. Vuilleumier mentions it in his diary, on 25 Apr. 1883, and even uses some of its expressions.

<sup>83</sup>C. Mervyn Maxwell, "John Nevins Andrews, 'Ablest Man in Our Ranks,'" Focus, 10 (June-July 1974):20.

<sup>84</sup>Vuilleumier Diary, 8 Sept. 1883.

<sup>85</sup>RH 14 Nov. 1882, p. 713.

<sup>86</sup>The countries are France, Switzerland, Italy, Austria, Hungary, Prussia, Belgium, Holland, Wales, England, Scotland, Sweden, Russia, Hindostan, Egypt, Mauritius, Spain, Bermuda, Canada, United States, Costa Rica, Chili, Brazil (Andrews includes also Saxony, Alsace, Sicily): RH 20 May 1880, p. 332; Japan mentioned later: Ibid. 17 June 1880, p. 395.

<sup>87</sup>RH 15 Apr. 1875, p. 124.

THE FORERUNNER: M. B. CZECHOWSKI

Rajmund Ladyslaw Dabrowski

"We regarded Elder Czechowski as an upright man, and one that feared God."  
J. N. Andrews<sup>1</sup>

Some seven years ago the city of Warsaw welcomed participants to an historical symposium about the life and work of Michael Belina Czechowski, first Adventist missionary to Europe. The meeting endeavored to uncover facts about a pioneer European Adventist preacher, whose name in Adventist historiography has largely been forgotten or left in an unmerited shadow.

Several Adventist church historians and amateur history buffs dived into numerous pages and artifacts of early Adventist history to discover that there would be no European church without its European roots. Symposium participants concluded that these roots were well established by the lonely, yet colorful and in many ways controversial, figure of a great Polish son of Romanticism--Pastor Michael Belina Czechowski.

At the conclusion of our Warsaw meeting a statement was prepared in which it was suggested that research should be continued in regard to the roots of European Adventist history and heritage. "It is suggested that at any future Symposium consideration be given to studying the work of J. N. Andrews in Europe," we read in the symposium's statement.<sup>2</sup>

The aim of this paper is to present Czechowski's achievements in Europe, which prepared the ground for an official Seventh-day Adventist European missionary enterprise associated generally with the work of J. N. Andrews.

There has been considerable discussion in Adventist academic circles about the various controversial aspects of the work, life style

and achievements of Czechowski. Often comments have been made in which a picture of a "good Andrews" and a "bad Czechowski" cast a shadow on Adventist historical research. Such a picture does justice to neither of these two missionary giants of the Adventist church.

1. "Now is the Time . . . To Do Something"

Still, I feel that there is great responsibility resting upon me in regard to my dear unfortunate Polish nation, and that I must do all in my power to enlighten them in regard to Scripture truth; and also other European nations to whom I could have access.<sup>3</sup>

Czechowski wrote these words within weeks of his departure for Europe in 1864. They are a testimony of a missionary who knew precisely what he was about to do. Why was he so earnest in his life mission? What were the qualities of the man who, though unofficially, became a father of European Adventism?

When in 1851 Czechowski, his family and his secretary sailed from London to New York, he was already a mature and experienced man of many abilities and virtues. Research on his early life shows him to be a man of deep social concerns, a pastor, an intellectual, a revolutionary-- a child of the age of Romanticism. Later, we discover him to be a man of vision, a writer and editor, an able multilingual speaker, a man of adventure and spontaneity, and last but not least, a lover of Bible prophecy, Christ's second advent and Sabbath truth.<sup>4</sup> As Oosterwal observes,

Czechowski differed in many ways from his co-workers and fellow believers, in background, talents, interests, abilities, experience, education, ideas, and spirituality. All this was readily recognized. But only too few could appreciate it. The person and life and work of Czechowski were evaluated in light of people's own limited values and ideas. The Church thereby not only lost a precious gift which God so graciously had given His people to equip them for their mission in the whole world, it also lost thereby precious opportunities to accomplish that work in due time.<sup>5</sup>

Or again,

The great significance of the life and work of Michael B. Czechowski is that he has set an example in faith and humility, obedience and

dedication. He has given us a model of missionary vision and methodology, missionary identification and missionary spirit. In light of what he has accomplished, and compared with the work established by some whom the church had sent out officially, Czechowski's mission appears as the fulfillment of God's plan for His church in Europe.<sup>6</sup>

Another writer adds: "There is a quality of urgency combined with drive, in this man."<sup>7</sup> And despite his less positive assessment of the man, J. N. Andrews admitted in 1869 that Czechowski was a "Seventh-day Adventist minister," "a noble-hearted man," an "upright man," "one that feared God."<sup>8</sup>

A rather positive statement was given to Czechowski by Ellen G. White herself, who in 1864 wrote clearly: "Your zeal is good. You are ambitious to see the work moving forward. You are conscientious and perfectly honest before God."<sup>9</sup>

Czechowski was a product of his age--the age of European Romanticism. This is clearly seen in his educational background, church activities and social concerns. Educated in Roman Catholic seminaries, engaged in political and revolutionary activities during the so-called People's Spring in Europe (1848), involved in advocating temperance as a priest (his work is recorded in the annals of the Roman Catholic temperance societies in Poland),<sup>10</sup> Czechowski came to America only to discover that the missing features of his life philosophy would soon be enriched and uncovered in America's Advent Spring--the Advent Movement.

A Roman Catholic priest in the 1840s, Czechowski became a Protestant pastor in the 1850s. His reformatory spirit was well channelled in spreading the Adventist message especially among non-English speaking Americans. Soon he discovered that his European compatriots on the Old Continent were deprived of the greatest truth of all--the Advent hope, based on sole biblical teachings. Here is what he wrote:

Now is the time, my dear American brethren, to do something for the enlightenment of the nations that are in comparative darkness as regards gospel light. Dear brethren, please help me to go there, and give me your prayers that God will give me success in bringing many to the knowledge of the truth.<sup>11</sup>



## 2. Back in Europe

Though supported by Adventist bodies not connected with Seventh-day Adventists, Czechowski arrived in Europe in 1864--ten years ahead of our first official missionary. Czechowski's relationship with the General Conference leaders is well discussed in two papers presented at Warsaw's Symposium by Alfred Vaucher<sup>12</sup> and K. P. Mueller.<sup>13</sup> The differences which existed between Czechowski and Seventh-day Adventist church leaders in regard to his missionary proposal for European mission will not be discussed in detail here. Some leaders felt (it is so plainly stated in J. N. Andrews' statement) that he was:

. . . not at that time prepared for so responsible an undertaking. We therefore requested him to wait, hoping that he might be better prepared after a time, and that circumstances might be so ordered in the providence of God that we could feel safe and advisable to send him on this mission. We regarded Elder Czechowski as an upright man, and one that feared God. But we did not think him a prudent manager, especially in financial matters. For reasons of this kind the Seventh-day Adventists held back as to his mission to Europe, and also with respect to some of his plans for work in this country. We expected that he would at some time be sent to Europe, but did not see the way clear to send him then.<sup>14</sup>

He was "not . . . prepared," we read. Was he not, actually?

It is worth looking closely at Czechowski's achievements in Europe. It will be soon discovered that not only was he prepared to light a fire for European Adventism, but that he had actually created a church which was well grounded in European culture and civilization. How European was this mission, and how well it was set in the European soil is uncovered in the difficulties Andrews experienced with the first Seventh-day Adventist companies in Europe, which did not easily accept an American brand of Adventism on the Old Continent. As Oosterwal remarks,

Czechowski was European and followed the European way. Andrews was an American who applied American solutions to basically European problems. Sometimes that worked all right; more often, it did not! Czechowski realized that for a church to be strong in mission, in faithfulness to the truth, in its influence on its surroundings, it must be rooted in the soil in which it is planted. Andrews, and most of the other American missionaries, failed to see that. Neither did they realize how vast the gulf was between the European mentality and that of the American frontier.<sup>15</sup>

When in 1874 J. N. Andrews arrived in Europe he found a well established "church," which, however, we must objectively admit, was like a flock without a shepherd. Czechowski's achievements in 1874 needed the fresh blood of management and encouragement. Researchers agree that Czechowski's missionary abilities were not well grounded in sound financial management. He was a man of action, a program-maker. His "overgrown" missionary enterprise needed--as we so clearly see also today in our church work--an able managerial hand. How far Andrews was adequately briefed as to the extent of Czechowski's work and of the approach needed has not yet been determined.

### 3. Features of Czechowski's Work

Research on Czechowski's work in Europe suggests at least three areas in which we should see him as a true pioneer of the Adventist European church.

#### A. Theological Concepts

I shall never forget the good Wilbraham campmeeting, and the kind Christian counsels of the leading brethren there, who have said to me, 'Go, Bro. C., to Europe, to preach the pure gospel of Christ, and never be a sectarian; and God Almighty will be with you and bless you.' With the grace of God, this have I done.<sup>16</sup>

Seventh-day Adventist leaders in Czechowski's time were often puzzled whether he had departed from Seventh-day Adventist truth before his arrival in Europe. He was supported by non-SDA bodies. By asking these groups for support, it was concluded, he must have departed from the truth! J. N. Andrews wrote: "it was supposed by ourselves, at the time that he . . . had virtually renounced the seventh day as the Sabbath."<sup>17</sup>

The best testimony about Czechowski's sound Adventist theology and the Bible preaching was given by those who at first supported him financially in Europe:

Eld. M. B. Czechowski, a native of Poland, and formerly a Roman Catholic priest, but converted to Protestantism and to the second advent faith while in America, felt strongly impressed with the duty

of going to Europe to proclaim the advent message. He received encouragement from the New England General Conference of Adventists, who recommended him to Christians abroad and contributed money, raised as a European Missionary Fund, to sustain him. He was an intelligent, educated, and pious man, well fitted to travel among strangers with such important tidings as the message of the Lord's immediate coming, being able to speak in many languages. He visited Switzerland and Italy, preaching in many towns, publishing and scattering tracts as he went. The Lord blessed his efforts, and several churches of believers were gathered, and many Christian hearts received the word with readiness of mind, also several ministers embraced the faith. The reports which he gave of his labors, for some two years, from those parts of Europe which he visited, were very interesting. We suppose he is still in that country as he has not returned to this, but we have heard nothing from him of late. Having become a Sabbatarian, and allowing that theme to absorb his special interest, it has neutralized his efforts and cut off his usefulness in the great work which led him into that important field.<sup>18</sup>

Though sent by other Advent companies in America, Czechowski preached the message he embraced in Battle Creek in 1857. He was a lover of the Second Advent. He strongly preached the biblical prophecies of Daniel and Revelation and the sanctuary truth. He also emphasized the importance of grace and the redeeming work of Christ, while the Ten Commandments (including the Sabbath truth) were ever present in his preaching and writing. His Christ-centered messages also urged greater unity upon the church on earth. "The goal of my work was to unify the different branches of believers into one body."<sup>19</sup>

Czechowski's theology is well documented in the publications which he so ably wrote, edited and printed, especially L'Evangile Eternel, a periodical issued for two years in Switzerland.

Two statements will complement Czechowski's theological dimensions-- "God has given Sister White enough visions that they [the brethren of Battle Creek] do not need other testimony to show them my cause,"<sup>20</sup> he wrote to Albert Vuilleumier.

In 1868 he wrote:

As to your second letter, I would simply ask you to compare what I have preached with the beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventists of Battle Creek, and to judge whether or not my teachings were in accordance with theirs . . . I am in full unity of faith before God with the true children of God of the church of Battle Creek.<sup>21</sup>

## B. Missionary Concepts

Czechowski's missionary work is well seen in the philosophy he expounded and methodology which supported it. He was, in a sense, the true forerunner, a maker, of Adventist foreign missions. His missionary concepts are results of his missionary vision. Professor Oosterwal writes,

Czechowski's labours became the starting point of a whole new era in SDA mission, during which the message spread in all the world . . . This is the beginning of a new era in SDA mission. But Czechowski's tremendous contributions to the cause of SDA mission do not end here. His significance is further enhanced by the nature of his mission work and the kind of churches he established. He lectured, visited the people in their homes, shared in their sufferings and trials, offered them help and encouragement, gave Bible studies, mingled with the people socially, etc.<sup>22</sup>

Czechowski's methodology conforms well with our current understanding of what is involved in starting up a new church, in evangelism and pastoral work. We see Czechowski as one who organized the first European churches, and as one who knew how to inspire his first converts to continue the work. He was on the move; yet he knew there were others on whom he could rely in continuing the advance of God's work. Several of Czechowski's first converts became missionaries in their own right, adopting and applying similar methods and forms of missionary advancement. European Adventist historiography well recorded names of these early pioneers: Jean P. Geymet and Francois Besson in Italy, Albert and Jean Vuilleumier, J. D. Hanhardt and J. H. Guenin in Switzerland and James H. Erzberger in Germany.

The work, which was so evident in the deeds of Czechowski and his associates, is well seen also in the establishment of various missionary enterprises which supported evangelism--the publishing and colporteur work--even a printing plant was established in St. Blaise near Neuchâtel to produce leaflets, tracts and other literature.

Czechowski also well employed such forms as correspondence, house-to-house visitation, public meetings, welfare work, features which corresponded with the life style of his prospective converts.

It was also a "wide mission" approach, we should add. When J. N. Andrews arrived in Europe, he discovered that there was something to build on, with several groups of believers in Switzerland, Italy, Germany, France and other countries. It took quite a missionary with quite a vision to bring about the embryonic Adventist church in Europe.

In order to achieve his goals and apply his methods of evangelism, he travelled and walked and travelled and walked--tirelessly. He was constantly on the go. There was a restless quality in his methodology.<sup>23</sup>

### C. Cultural Concepts

D. T. Taylor, writing in 1865 in World's Crisis, speaks about Czechowski in the following way:

At first, he allied himself to the Seventh-day Adventists, and preached their views. Then they threw him off from being one of their accredited ministers, not from any fault in his character, but because he, preferring an enlarged sphere of action, and greater catholicity of spirit, failed to fully abide by their views and rules. Then he chose the major body of Adventists for his associates . . . His thorough education, his wonderful mastership of languages, his romantic career, his gentle, loving spirit, his majesty and urbanity of demeanor, won our admiration and our hearts; and we sent him back to Europe with our money and prayers, a missionary at large for all the Adventists,--the Herald, Crisis, and Voice, saying with one voice, Go, and God be with you.<sup>24</sup>

The success of Czechowski's missionary work and his example to our current church missionary program is best seen in his recognition that the Gospel had to be communicated in the language, manner and form which people readily understood. He understood that a church must have roots in the culture in which it intends to grow. His fluency in French and German, his knowledge of European history and his love of all things European all helped him in his task of adapting what might easily have been regarded as an American religion to the European mind. He became, in the words of St. Paul, a Jew to the Jews and a Greek to the Greeks.

As a result, he was well accepted by both noblemen and simple folk. In his correspondence with various people, including writers, and in his articles he often commented on the political, social and cultural events

of his day. He saw in these events a fulfillment of Bible prophecy and sensed a Europe hungry for the Advent hope. He therefore had no time to waste. He had to move on.

#### 4. Ten Years After

The role of Czechowski's missionary work in Europe was probably best described by the General Conference in the Review and Herald some four years before Andrews' arrival in Europe in 1874.

We regard the circumstances of this case as a wonderful call to us from the Providence of God to send the truth to Europe. We cannot refrain from acknowledging our backwardness in this work. But it is in our power to redeem the past, by discharging our duty for time to come.<sup>25</sup>

And while we acknowledge the hand of God in this, we feel humbled in view of the probabilities of the case, namely: that in consequence of our fears to trust money with Bro. Czechowski, and our lack of care to patiently counsel him as to its proper use, God used our most decided opponents to carry forward the work.

And while we acknowledge the hand of God in this work, in which we took no part, and feel that we have cause for humility on account of our past unfaithfulness, let us see to it that we come fully up to present duty. Gladly Mrs. W[hite] and self [James White] risk \$100 in the effort to help the cause in Europe. And when our people fully learn the facts in the case, and also their duty, there will be hundreds of them pressing into the enterprise with their hundreds, their fifties, their twenty-fives, and their tens.<sup>26</sup>

A year later, the following was resolved at the 10th Annual Council of Seventh-day Adventists:

R e s o l v e d, That we deem it a duty to especially acknowledge the hand of God in planting the truth in Switzerland; and that we feel very deep interest in the promotion of the work in that country, and will, so far as the providence of God shall open our way, do what lies in our power to assist in the spread of the truth in that country and in other countries of Europe.<sup>27</sup>

It is correct to say that the arrival of J. N. Andrews in Switzerland ten years after Czechowski began his mission opened a second stage of Adventist missionary activities in Europe. Czechowski was still on the continent, travelling somewhere in its south-eastern part. Andrews' reactions to what he discovered in Europe found their place in the Review and Herald, thus bringing forth to the American church frequent news about

the Advent movement's victories in the Old World.

New methods were soon suggested, new areas covered and new features became more and more evident as the church grew in size and numbers. It was suggested by Dr. Zurcher that Czechowski was the one who sowed the seeds, Andrews was the reaper, but God made it grow. It is well to uncover our early Adventist history in Europe and find for our present-day benefit that history is the mother of the wise.

It was providential that a European preacher returned to his own continent to introduce the Advent hope; it may also be providential to be reminded that the Adventist church is best served when those who seek to extend it take account of the social and cultural background of its potential converts. Adventism is a unique family: a world-wide movement, united in its cultural diversity. And it is also big enough to be able to accommodate such different characters as Czechowski and Andrews who, in their different ways, helped to found the European Seventh-day Adventist church.

NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Advent Review and Herald of the Sabbath (hereafter cited as RH), 8 June 1873, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup>Symposium took place in Warsaw on 17-23 May 1976; statement is published in a book entitled Michael Belina Czechowski, 1818-1876 (Warsaw, 1979), (hereafter cited as MBC). Particularly relevant to the present study was B. B. Beach's paper, "M. B. Czechowski--Trailblazer for the J. N. Andrews Central European Mission," pp. 404-450.

<sup>3</sup>"Mission to Italy," World's Crisis, 5 April 1864, p. 4.

<sup>4</sup>R. L. Dabrowski, "M. B. Czechowski--First Missionary to Europe," Research Seminar Paper, Andrews University, 1972.

<sup>5</sup>Gottfried Oosterwal, "M. B. Czechowski's Significance for the Growth and Development of Seventh-day Adventist Mission," MBC, p. 180.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid. pp. 202-203.

<sup>7</sup>Beach, p. 444.

<sup>8</sup>RH 30 Nov. 1869.

<sup>9</sup>Ellen G. White, Letter C-3-1864.

<sup>10</sup>Archivum Generale Ordinis Fratrum Minorum, Rome, Collection Polonia Maior et Minor, 1818-1899.

<sup>11</sup>World's Crisis, 5 April 1864.

<sup>12</sup>"M. B. Czechowski--His Relationship With the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists and the First-day Adventists," MBC, pp. 132-159.

<sup>13</sup>K. Mueller, "Ellen G. White and M. B. Czechowski," MBC, pp. 359-403.

<sup>14</sup>RH 8 June 1873, p. 23.

<sup>15</sup>Oosterwal, p. 196.

<sup>16</sup>World's Crisis, 22 Nov. 1865, p. 80.

<sup>17</sup>RH 8 July 1873, p. 29.

<sup>18</sup>I. C. Wellcome, History of the Second Advent Message and Mission (Yarmouth, Maine, 1874), pp. 554-555.

<sup>19</sup>Archives of the Euro-Africa Division of Seventh-day Adventists, Berne, Letter to A. Vuilleumier from Basel, 5 July 1868.



<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.

<sup>22</sup>Oosterwal, pp. 190-192.

<sup>23</sup>Beach, p. 426.

<sup>24</sup>World's Crisis, 22 Nov. 1865.

<sup>25</sup>RH 30 Nov. 1869, p. 181.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid. 11 Jan. 1870, pp. 21-22.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid. 2 Jan. 1872, pp. 20-21.

## MISSIONARY TO EUROPE

J. R. Zurcher

It is not generally known that the pioneers of the Seventh-day Adventist church did not realize from the beginning the magnitude of the task which rested on them. Early in 1859, for example, a reader asked the editor of the Review and Herald: "Is the third angel's message being given, or to be given, only in the United States?" To which Uriah Smith replied that it "might not perhaps be necessary" to proclaim this message "in any country besides our own . . . since our land is composed of people from almost every nation."<sup>1</sup> The vision of a world mission asserted itself only little by little, and by pressure of circumstances. It took exactly thirty years to lead the little group of Adventists in the United States to understand that the message which had been entrusted to them was certainly to be preached "to them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people."

In 1864, a year after the organization of the General Conference, and ten years before Andrews' departure, when M. B. Czechowski offered his services to carry the message to Europe, the brethren had no hesitation in declining the offer. First they considered that Czechowski was not the man for such a mission. Then the financial means were lacking. But above all, our pioneers had not yet become conscious of the world-wide mission of the church. As that consciousness grew, so did the conviction that their church's first missionary should be J. N. Andrews.<sup>2</sup>

Andrews was president of the General Conference when the first appeal for help was received from Swiss Sabbath-keepers<sup>3</sup> and it was he who gave their spokesman, James Erzberger, a course in Adventist theology while

he stayed at the Andrews household in Rochester in 1870.<sup>4</sup> Not surprisingly, it was Andrews who raised the question of a mission to Switzerland at the General Conference of 1870.<sup>5</sup> He next interested himself in the economic plight of the Swiss brethren as outlined by their second emissary, Adémar Vuilleumier, and offered to sell the watches they made through the columns of the Review.<sup>6</sup> Finally, it was Andrews who had to explain to the readers of the Review the strange case of M. B. Czechowski who, although sent to Europe by the First-day Adventists, preached the message of the Seventh-day Adventists. If there was one man familiar with the situation of the few Adventists in Europe, it was certainly Andrews.<sup>7</sup>

It is not surprising, then, that the name of J. N. Andrews was suggested as a probable missionary well before the official decision. Several hints were made in the Review, probably by James White, while George I. Butler, then General Conference president, wrote in November 1873: "There has been considerable said in the Review in regard to Brother J. N. Andrews going to Switzerland this season to look after the wants of the cause there."<sup>8</sup> Several weeks later, James White announced, "Elder Andrews is expected to go to Europe soon."<sup>9</sup> Yet when he pleaded for a missionary to be sent to Switzerland at the General Conference session in November 1873, his words found no response.<sup>10</sup>

At the same time, however, a missionary spirit was pervading the church. New immigrants won to the message began to write letters to members of their families, and to send tracts to all parts of the world. The Vigilant Missionary Society was then founded, and its new missionary vision led in 1874 to the launching of a monthly magazine, The True Missionary. James White was apparently its editor. The magazine lasted only a year, from January to December, 1874, but this was long enough to achieve its purpose.<sup>11</sup> The scripture verse chosen as a motto and placed at the top of the first page leaves no doubt as to the objective in view.

"Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature" (Mark 16:15). The main article in the first issue was from the pen of Ellen White and had for its theme the world-wide mission of the church.<sup>12</sup>

Several months later, in April 1874, when the Whites were in California, Ellen had "an impressive dream," which helped to overcome the last opposition and to open everybody's eyes. Here are some of the particularly significant statements:

You are trying to plan the work so that you can embrace it in your arms. . . . Your house is the world. Never lose sight of the fact that the message you are bearing is a world-wide message. It is to be given to all cities, to all villages. The message will go in power to all parts of the world . . . to Europe, to Australia, to the islands of the sea, to all nations, tongues, and people . . . Go forward . . . Nothing is impossible with God. The light of the binding claims of the law of God is to test and prove the world.<sup>13</sup>

For James White and J. N. Andrews this testimony was decisive. For them the time to act had come. James White had privately arranged for Andrews' departure. For want of an official decision, Andrews was to leave for Europe informally. Also under the pressure of events and in the light of Ellen White's detailed instruction, "the interests of the Swiss Mission were introduced" to the delegates of the General Conference in August 1874.

The president (G. I. Butler) recommended to the Conference to take some action in the matter, especially in consideration that Elder J. N. Andrews is about to take his departure to engage in the cause in Switzerland.<sup>14</sup>

The call was voted on the 14th of August, 1874. One month later, on the 15th of September, Andrews embarked at Boston on board the steamship Atlas of the Cunard Line. He was accompanied by his daughter Mary, aged 12, his son Charles, aged 17, and Adémar Vuilleumier, his future interpreter. Andrews was a widower. Two years before he had lost his beloved wife Angeline Stevens. Earlier, he had also lost two of his children. Anyone other than Andrews would have refused the call in such circumstances.

But the call having been voted, Andrews accepted it as coming from the Lord. Nothing would have been able to hold him back. Like the apostles of old, "immediately" he left all to answer the call of the Master.<sup>15</sup> Following the example of the great apostle Paul, he "conferred not with flesh and blood,"<sup>16</sup> and left for Europe, having consecrated body and soul to the mission to which he had just been called.

In a note sent to the Review on the eve of departure, he wrote, "It has not been without difficulty that I have been able to close up my matters in this country, so that I could without embarrassment give myself to the work of God in Europe."<sup>17</sup> On the very day of Andrews' departure for Europe, 15 September 1874, the General Conference president wrote in the Review,

This sending of one of our leading men as a missionary to the old world, is an event in the progress of the cause of great interest. We can but expect it will open the way for the progress of the work in all directions in Europe.<sup>18</sup>

Andrews realized that the success of his mission depended to a large extent on the interest he would be able to maintain among the brethren and sisters in his homeland. He was thus to be a faithful correspondent for the Review. Only five weeks after his leaving Boston, its readers could peruse the fascinating report of his arrival in England, of his interview with William M. Jones, the leader of the Seventh Day Baptists, and of his visit to several historic spots especially dear to Sabbath-keepers.<sup>19</sup> The following week, a still more detailed article appeared on "The Sabbath cause in Great Britain."<sup>20</sup> Then a fortnight later, there was an account of his arrival in Neuchâtel and his first impressions of Switzerland.<sup>21</sup> In all, Andrews had 35 articles published in the Review and Herald between 1873 and 1882, in relation to his work in Europe. Thanks to these regular reports, and thanks also to his correspondence with the principal leaders, with James, Ellen and Willie White in particular, it is possible to follow Andrews in his work, and to understand

better the difficulties he had to contend with.

From the first day of his arrival in Switzerland, Andrews found himself terribly frustrated in no longer being in a country where his own language was spoken. "To cease to hear the English language," he wrote, "and to take in its place the rapidly spoken and peculiarly blended sounds of the French language, is a change which is attended with some degree of pain and with considerable labor." But as a true missionary Andrews realized that his "first important work (in Switzerland) is to become master of the French language so as to speak it correctly and to write it grammatically."<sup>22</sup>

This seemed to Andrews all the more necessary as he quite often felt that he was let down by his translators. Certain difficulties in the churches were the result of deliberately false translations. In a letter to the brethren in Switzerland, Ellen White did not hesitate to lay the blame on Adémar Vuilleumier. She wrote:

He did not help Elder Andrews as we had a right to expect he would. He created suspicion and jealousy of Elder Andrews. He did not give the correct translation of his teaching, but made some of his remarks to be regarded with disfavor because they were made stronger than Elder Andrews designed to give them.<sup>23</sup>

Andrews realized very quickly, too, in his editing of tracts and other publications, that he could not rely on the grammatical knowledge of his Swiss fellow-workers. He wrote to the Whites:

In coming here I have been disappointed with respect of the scholarship of our friends here. I hoped to find Brother Albert Vuilleumier tolerably well posted in French grammar. To my surprise, I find that he has never had interest to study it to any extent. I think he uses very good French, but as to the rules of grammar, he is not at all posted. I cannot regard Adémar as much of an authority in such things; but these two men are my dependence so far as our people are concerned. This has made it a matter of absolute necessity for me to diligently and faithfully learn the complicated rules of the French language--and its rules certainly are much more complicated than those of the English language. I think in the study of the grammar I have made good progress. But be sure of one thing--I have had to labor under quite serious and painful disadvantages.<sup>24</sup>

In order to learn French more quickly, Andrews went so far as to ban English in the home. With his children he decided that English would be allowed only from five o'clock to six o'clock each morning. This was a harsh decision, but in a short time, Andrews was in a position to write articles in French, while with his daughter Mary, he translated others from Adventist magazines from America. This was certainly a feat which we can but admire.

Andrews had "the great desire" to be able "to preach Christ in the French language with freedom."<sup>25</sup> This was easier said than done, however: "It is a greater task to really master the French and German languages than I supposed . . ."<sup>26</sup> This probably explains why he directed his missionary activity essentially through the printed page.

As soon as he arrived in Switzerland on 16 October 1874, Andrews was impatient to make contact with the several little groups formed by Czechowski. The names of six only are given,<sup>27</sup> with 70 to 100 members in all.<sup>28</sup> A first informal meeting gathered them together at Neuchâtel on 1 November 1874, only two weeks after Andrews' arrival. This was an opportunity to become acquainted, and for Andrews to outline the history and purpose of his church, and to emphasize the interest which the brethren in the United States had in the development of the work in Switzerland and in Europe.<sup>29</sup>

Wishing to redeem the time, Andrews suggested a second meeting to be held at Le Locle, a fortnight later. But this time, it was to discuss the organization of the work and better methods of labor. A committee of three was chosen for the year and funds were raised to commence the publishing work.<sup>30</sup>

At the close of these two meetings, Andrews wrote: "It gives me great pleasure to say that these brethren seem to be in earnest to do

their whole duty. . . . Our meeting has given me courage."<sup>31</sup> Likewise, the Swiss believers were very happy to have an experienced leader at last. For as Andrews wrote in his first report to the General Conference committee,

On my arrival in October last, I found things in a less favourable condition than I had hoped. And this discouragement has brought in its train serious backsliding from God. The brethren and sisters were not doubting the truth, but the ardor of their zeal and the warmth of their first love was lost."<sup>32</sup>

Furthermore, James Erzberger, who should have been the guardian of the flock after his return from America, had failed in his duty.<sup>33</sup>

But encouraged by the revival and the new missionary zeal aroused by these two meetings, Andrews suggested to the Swiss brethren a method of working which he had seen operated in England by William Jones.<sup>34</sup>

Andrews remarked:

When I began to think seriously of this mission one of the first things which suggested itself to my mind, was to advertise in the most widely circulated papers of Europe.<sup>35</sup>

. . . setting forth the object of the mission and asking responses from those interested . . . On reading Elder Jones' reports from London . . . I was pleased to see that he was acting on this very plan with respect to England, Scotland, and Ireland, and that he was seeing some good result from it.<sup>36</sup>

At his own expense Andrews published a series of six advertisements in French in the Journal de Genève, beginning 20 December 1874, intending to do the same thing in a Swiss-German newspaper, a Dutch one and even a Russian.<sup>37</sup> For as far back as his arrival in Switzerland, Andrews had been informed that there were "many Sabbath-keeping Christians in Russia," as well as in Germany. "It is my conviction," said Andrews, "that there are Sabbath-keeping Christians in most of the countries in Europe."<sup>38</sup> Andrews hoped therefore to reach the greatest possible number "by means of advertisements . . . in the most widely circulated papers of Europe."<sup>39</sup>

Scarcely two months after the beginning of this campaign, Andrews



was happy to inform the readers of the Review about the first results obtained by the method of advertisements in the Journal de Genève. This encouraged him to do the same "in an Amsterdam paper for Holland Sabbath-keepers, and in a Berlin paper for other Sabbath-keepers in Prussia or in the German Empire," as he specified.<sup>40</sup> Astonishing as it may seem, by this very simple means Andrews succeeded very quickly in cementing contact with correspondents in various countries and thus establishing bases for the work in several of them. On his way to Switzerland he had already contacted Sabbath-keepers in England and Scotland<sup>41</sup> and had been aware of Sabbath-keepers in Russia when he wrote his History of the Sabbath.<sup>42</sup> He was even more encouraged on that score when he arrived in Europe. "There are," he wrote at the beginning of 1875, ". . . from all that I can learn, many thousand Sabbath-keepers in Russia. I am extremely anxious to open communication with them and to establish a permanent minister there. Can you not find a Russian Sabbath-keeper in the United States?"<sup>43</sup>

Soon after, a first attempt was made by sending some tracts to Russia. Andrews was happy to report in 1876, "One sister, who has a relative that is a servant in the household of the emperor of Russia, sent publications to that relative for the benefit of his Imperial Majesty."<sup>44</sup> We do not know what happened to these first publications sent to Russia. But we do know that through Les Signes des Temps the contact with some active readers was made. In the report of 21 October 1880 Andrews could announce that twice he received money from Russia from subscribers to the journal.<sup>45</sup> One of them--a woman whom Andrews called a "sister"--had even written him "an encouraging letter."<sup>46</sup>

As we can see, Andrews was always much interested in the Sabbath-keepers in Russia. And who knows whether he is not also at the beginning of the work there as in many other countries of Europe? One thing is

sure: the first Adventists in Russia were gained through the printed page. And, if I am well informed, our brethren in the Soviet Union are celebrating--in this centennial year of Andrews' death--the hundredth year since the beginning of the work in their country.

Andrews knew the importance of the printed page. For this reason, he had no hesitation in saying to the delegates of the second general business meeting, held at Bienne, on 12 December 1875, that the "most important work" was the formation of a "Tract and Missionary Society." In fact, summing up the work accomplished in the domain of publication during his first year in Switzerland, Andrews could report that there had already been translated and printed "3,000 copies of each of the following tracts: The Millennium, The Second Advent, The Two Thrones, The Judgment, The Sanctuary, and 10,000 copies of Which Day do You keep, and Why?"<sup>47</sup>

But Andrews considered that it was more and more necessary to publish as well as tracts, a monthly magazine in French. He had not been in Europe long before he wrote in the Review, "My first great object to accomplish in Switzerland is the publication of a paper in French,"<sup>48</sup> and two months later, "It is in the highest degree important to have a paper at the earliest day possible."<sup>49</sup>

This "monthly paper in French" was to become the main theme of his correspondence with the General Conference, as much before as after its appearance. And what joy was his when the brethren in Battle Creek decided "to establish a printing office in Europe."<sup>50</sup> In the course of a special session in April 1876, the General Conference voted to raise the substantial amount of 10,000 dollars "to establish a press in Europe."<sup>51</sup> The Whites were the first to support Andrews' plan, and James gave an example by subscribing 1,000 dollars "for the mission and the press in Europe."<sup>52</sup>

From now on, Andrews made plans to establish the headquarters of the work in Basel, a city situated at the crossroads on the frontier of Switzerland, France, and Germany, and where, too, he believed he would find a good printer. Everything was arranged for the publication of the French Signs of the Times: Les Signes des Temps. It was really a wonderful day when the first copy appeared in July 1876.

As can be imagined, this monthly paper inevitably monopolized the major part of Andrews' time. Not only was he its principal contributor, but also he had to translate the articles of his American fellow-workers: Ellen and James White, Uriah Smith, George I. Butler, Dr. H. H. Kellogg. It has been calculated that Les Signes des Temps had printed "over 480 articles, or an average of five or six a month," written by J. N. Andrews.<sup>53</sup>

But there was not merely a paper in French. Very soon, Andrews thought that there should be one in German and another in Italian, not to mention fresh tracts, printed in several languages and sent throughout Europe. To read his correspondence with James and Willie White is to be amazed at Andrews' concern for all aspects of the publishing work: the monthly, the tracts, the printing type, the thickness of the paper, the cost of the equipment, in fact anything that had to do with the printed message. It reached such a point that the leaders at Battle Creek began to ask if Andrews was not allowing himself to become absorbed by his paper to the detriment of direct evangelism in the field.<sup>54</sup>

Andrews replied that he was really anxious "to get out in the field." But, as he explained, "It is very serious work to get out a paper in a language not your own."<sup>55</sup> To which he could have added that it is even more difficult to conduct evangelistic campaigns in a foreign tongue. The brethren in America were naturally very badly placed to understand properly the difficulties Andrews had to meet on the ancient continent with its many languages, its different political systems and its historic

religious strongholds, not to mention Andrews' financial difficulties.

It would be unfair not to mention here what Andrews did in direct evangelism, especially during his first term in Europe. As early as the first weeks of his arrival in Switzerland, he visited the different scattered groups, instructing them, organizing them to do missionary work in the community.

A marvellous opportunity presented itself in the month of January 1875 only three months after Andrews had settled at Neuchâtel. Through a travelling beggar, the Swiss brethren learned that there was a group of about forty Sabbath-keepers at Elberfeld, in western Germany, near the Dutch border. Contact was made with them and a suggestion to visit them was sent. At the meeting in January 1875, the Swiss brethren voted 300 francs for Andrews' and Erzberger's travel expenses. For several weeks, an evangelistic campaign was conducted for the Sabbath-keepers of Elberfeld. Andrews did most of the preaching while Erzberger did the translating. Erzberger stayed on for some time in Germany after Andrews left and ultimately a good number of these people joined the Adventist church. The first baptism took place on 8 January 1876, following which it was possible to organize the first church in Germany. Thus the foundations of the work in Germany were established.<sup>56</sup>

At the same time, Daniel T. Bourdeau arrived in Basel. He was sent from the United States to assist Andrews essentially in the publishing work.<sup>57</sup> Of French-Canadian origin, he was, with his brother, the pioneer of the work among the French-speaking people of America. As French was his mother tongue, it was thought that he would be in a position to take the responsibility for Les Signes "and thus leave Elder Andrews free to preach and travel."<sup>58</sup> In actual fact his knowledge of grammar left very much to be desired. Furthermore, Bourdeau was an evangelist

and not an editor. Andrews learned that very quickly. So he enlisted him entirely in the work of evangelism, first in Alsace,<sup>59</sup> then in the south of France,<sup>60</sup> where he had the joy of baptizing 20 persons and of founding the first church.<sup>61</sup>

Because of a "dangerous attack of pneumonia,"<sup>62</sup> Andrews was not able to go to France before the spring of 1877 to take part in this evangelistic campaign. In fact, the situation was very difficult. The opposition of the religious element was strong, and the political conditions were not conducive to public efforts. We should not forget that France was still in a difficult situation, having lost the war against the Prussians in 1870. In reality, as Andrews reported, "the law of France would permit us freely to preach the Sabbath or the Advent Faith, if we go into the temple of any denomination." But, as Andrews explained, the "great opposition from the Protestant ministers" prevented Adventists from preaching in any of their temples, and the law prohibited meetings of more than 20 people in a private house.<sup>63</sup>

In addition to these restrictions, the circulation of periodicals was also attended with serious difficulties. Therefore, in March 1877, Andrews and Bourdeau decided to go to Paris to the proper authorities, in order to try to obtain more liberty in public preaching and in the distribution of religious printed matter. Andrews solicited the intervention of the United States ambassador, and a written request was sent to the Prime Minister, Jules Simon.<sup>64</sup> After this intervention, Bourdeau returned to Valence where he extended his effort until the end of spring, 1877. As for Andrews, he continued his journey to Italy.

For some time already, Andrews had had a burning desire to visit Naples to go to see one of his faithful correspondents. Dr. H. P. Ribton, a graduate of the University of Dublin. The latter had been interested in the message by the publications he had received from Basel. After a

series of Bible studies, Andrews had the joy of baptizing the doctor, his wife, his daughter and another person "in the sea at Puteoli, the port at which Paul landed when on his journey as a prisoner to Rome."<sup>65</sup>

Even before his baptism, doctor Ribton assisted Andrews in public evangelistic effort in Naples. Here also, unfortunately, because of the intense opposition stirred up by the priests, they were forced to confine themselves to visiting from house to house. Be that as it may, the work in Italy took on a new start. Doctor Ribton continued the effort already begun, and by the year 1878, in Naples, 22 persons had been won to the message.<sup>66</sup>

On his way back, Andrews made a detour in the Waldensian valleys. He stayed at Torre Pellice where Catherine Revel, the first Adventist in Europe, lived and where others had been baptized by Czechowski some twelve years earlier. This was naturally a great encouragement for this little group which had remained faithful for so many years without having had contact with anyone of the same faith.<sup>67</sup>

Towards the end of the year 1877, Andrews prepared to receive his new fellow-workers in the work of publication: William Ings and his wife, and Miss Maud Sisley. Andrews made the journey to London to welcome them, at the same time intending to purchase material for the printing house and to renew his acquaintance with his Seventh Day Baptist friends.<sup>68</sup>

Many other details could be mentioned which show to what extent Andrews participated directly in evangelism. In a letter dating from this time, in reply to the brethren who thought that he was not holding enough public efforts, Andrews wrote: "I go out regularly and spend Sabbath and first day of each week in meetings, speaking five or six times, and then give the rest of my time to the paper."<sup>69</sup>

Besides, the greatest obstacles to direct evangelism were not only the language difficulty nor even lack of time because of his editorial

work. The real difficulties came much more from the religious and political situation of the European countries. Andrews explained this in detail to James White in a letter of 7 August 1878. Even in Switzerland which had the reputation of being a free country,

. . . we find a great difficulty as to halls. In each village there is a Town Hall which is the property of the Government and is of course under the control of the National Church. After we have preached a few times, this hall is closed against us. Then we must take rooms in a private house if we can get them, or do any way that we can. You will say that we should use a tent. This will do as soon as we have broken down the spirit of persecution. At present a tent would be torn in pieces in this canton on very short notice.<sup>70</sup>

In spite of these obstacles, the work in Europe had, by 1878, reached the point where it was necessary to counsel with the leaders in America. In a short note to the Review, published on 12 September 1878, Andrews reported twelve countries apart from Switzerland in which there were Christians who were observing the Sabbath.<sup>71</sup> Andrews was, therefore, invited to be present at the General Conference session in October 1878. At his own expense he took his daughter Mary with him, as she was very seriously ill with tuberculosis.<sup>72</sup> Alas, one month later, she was to die in the Battle Creek sanitarium, despite the expert care of Dr. Kellogg.

Mary's death was such a moral and physical shock for Andrews that he did not recover from it. He recognized this himself: "The restorative power in my system seems to be broken down, and since the death of Mary it has been impossible for me to rally."<sup>73</sup>

In view of his poor health he was recommended to remain in America until the spring of 1879. Furthermore, Ellen White counselled him firmly not to return to Europe without remarrying beforehand. She even went so far as to suggest someone for him. Andrews' reply outlined more fully by Dr. Graybill shows what kind of a man he was. Sensitive to the feelings of his advisor and of the woman she had proposed, he retained an affectionate loyalty to his dead wife and took great comfort from the love and companionship of his children.<sup>74</sup>

If Andrews was happy with his children, his way of life in the home, from a domestic point of view, left much to be desired. In this respect the counsel of Ellen White was fully justified. Andrews and his children lived in Switzerland in a very poor, if not to say poverty-stricken, fashion. First, Mrs. W. Ings wrote that "Mary has not had an opportunity to learn to cook or anything else except studying." Then she added, "The way he (Andrews) was living, he must break down soon. Having . . . an improverished diet makes him look as if he had not a friend on earth."<sup>75</sup> On the other hand, however, she wrote to Ellen White: "We can find everything here necessary to live hygienically, and since we have a stove to bake our bread, we are happy."<sup>76</sup>

This situation needs explaining. The General Conference had not granted Andrews a regular salary. It was planned that he would be sent money from time to time and that he should simply report what he had need of. For the first few years money did not arrive too often, so that Andrews was sometimes several months behind in paying his printing bills and his rent. So he had scruples in taking one penny for his own needs from the money that was sent to him from America.

Andrews recognized that in order to help others, he had sometimes allowed his own family to go short.<sup>77</sup> This goes some way to explain Mary's sickness and finally her death prematurely at the age of 17, as well as the increasingly serious state of health of Andrews himself.

In the spring of 1879, Andrews attended a special session of the General Conference. Then on 29 May 1879 he left for Europe accompanied by his niece, Edith Andrews, and Miss Anna Oyer. His health had scarcely improved. He was extremely weak when he disembarked at Glasgow and was compelled to rest for three months with the Loughboroughs before continuing his journey to Basel.<sup>78</sup>

However, back in Switzerland, Andrews gave himself wholeheartedly



once more to the proclamation of the message by the printed page. By using new methods of distribution he succeeded in increasing the circulation of the Signes des Temps finally to 3,500 copies which found their way into nearly every country of Europe, as well as many other parts of the world.<sup>79</sup> Nothing demonstrated better the influence of this paper than the fact that Andrews was made

. . . an honorary member of the leading temperance society in France, and his periodical was given honorable mention in the reports of the society, as a journal exerting a widespread influence on the side of total abstinence.<sup>80</sup>

Public evangelism was not neglected but his participation in a campaign in England in 1880 proved to be disastrous for his health.<sup>81</sup> An English doctor confirmed that he was "suffering from consumption. One lung is nearly gone, and the other is infected too."<sup>82</sup> Andrews never recovered his strength again.

On his return to Basel, he had to rest in bed most of the time. From then on, he dictated his letters and articles and cared for church business from his bed. However, if his physical strength continued to weaken, his mind was as bright as it had always been. He wrote articles in English, in French, in German and in Italian, without a break. His interest in the publications did not cease for a moment. Again in 1882 he was very busy launching three new periodicals: the German Herold der Wahrheit (Messenger of Truth), the Italian L'Ultimo Messaggio (The Last Message) and the Rumanian Adeverulu Present (Present Truth).<sup>83</sup>

In a last letter to Ellen White, written a month before his death, he said:

I have given up the control of everything to Brother Whitney. I try still to read the proof sheets of our French paper, but I have no longer the power to prepare any articles for it. I am a mere skeleton and have not attempted to put on my clothes for many weeks.

Then follows this expression of his faith: "However, I can say that my feet are on the Rock of Ages and that the Lord holds me by my right hand."<sup>84</sup>

One month later, while an important conference was being held at Basel with representatives from several countries, Andrews fell peacefully asleep on 21 October 1883, at the age of 54. One of his last acts was to take a pen to write, with trembling hand, a cheque for 500 dollars for the work of God. It was probably all the worldly wealth he possessed.<sup>85</sup>

In his first reports after his arrival in Switzerland, Andrews wrote these almost prophetic words: "I came here to give my life to the proclamation of these sacred truths concerning the near advent of Christ and the observance of God's commandments."<sup>86</sup>

Truly, Andrews gave his life, and he proclaimed the message in such a way that he can still serve as an example to God's servants today. He did not leave anybody wondering about who he was and what his message was. An example of Andrews' directness in preaching the message can be found in his original advertisement which appeared in the Journal de Genève, only three months after his arrival in Switzerland:

J. N. Andrews, a gospel minister, sent to Europe by Christians in America, observing the Seventh-day Sabbath, would like to communicate with other Christians observing that day or desirous of knowing about it. Please write to him at Neuchâtel (Switzerland).

Following that, Andrews was soon in contact with a number of people, several of whom he was able to win to the Advent message.<sup>87</sup>

Another example illustrates this same direct approach. After a meeting in Germany, the pastor of the local national church came to meet Andrews. He said he wished to know the object of Andrews' mission.

I told him [replied Andrews] that I would answer his questions with great pleasure, that I had come to Europe to preach to the people upon the prophecies which indicate the speedy return of the Son of Man, and also to preach in behalf of the Sabbath of the Lord, which the great apostasy has trodden under foot during the first three hundred years.<sup>88</sup>

In the same direct way, the Advent message was announced in Les Signes des Temps. Without hesitation Andrews explained in his journal all about D. T. Bourdeau and himself. "We have been sent to

Europe as missionaries by a Christian denomination from the United States, known under the name of Seventh-day Adventists."<sup>89</sup> So, from the beginning the readers of this first issue were able to be acquainted with some of our fundamental beliefs. They could even find a pictorial illustration of the visions of Daniel and John, as produced by the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, Battle Creek, Michigan.

Thanks to Andrews' methods of work, to his complete dedication to his task and also to his boundless perseverance, the number of members in Switzerland almost tripled in the space of ten years, in spite of all obstacles. There were about 75 at Andrews' arrival in 1874; in 1884, one could count more than 200. Furthermore, through the printed page Andrews had sown all Europe with the everlasting gospel, and at his death, those who came after him had already harvested almost a thousand Adventists. As Jesus said: "One man sows, and another reaps."<sup>90</sup>

The real work of a servant of the Lord can never be evaluated at its true worth during his lifetime, and Andrews is no exception to this rule. Indeed, on one occasion, the General Conference complained that Andrews spent "nearly the whole force of the European Mission . . . on a monthly sheet," and expressed themselves as "becoming terribly anxious about the mission in Europe."<sup>91</sup> Ellen White herself, in her last letter to Andrews, written only a few months before his death, made a severe criticism of the work of our first missionary, holding him partly responsible for the work "almost standing still in Switzerland when it should be grandly triumphant."<sup>92</sup>

Maybe after a lapse of a century, we are better able to assess the real value of the nine years' activity of Andrews as missionary in Europe. In particular, those who work today in this historic continent, can appreciate better than anyone else the extraordinary results obtained by Andrews and his fellow-laborers.

Everyone will agree that we cannot compare the beginning of the work in the United States with the beginning of the work in Europe. However, it is most interesting to compare the results in both continents after a century of mission activities. In 1944, the North American Division had exactly 206,908 members. In 1974, that is one hundred years after Andrews' arrival in Switzerland, there were spread over the continent of Europe--from the Atlantic to the Urals--200,395 Adventists. A difference of only 6,513 members, in favor of the North American Division, in spite of all the political and religious difficulties which have always existed in Europe, and still exist today.

Today, in all of Europe, from Portugal to Russia, there are about 240,000 Adventists. With the eye of faith Andrews had caught a glimpse of this harvest of souls, and had rejoiced. In his last message to the readers of the Review he wrote,

Under the great disadvantages our work has made steady progress, and if we do not forget God, we shall at no distant day see a multitude of Sabbath-keepers on the continent of Europe. The seed has been sown with tears, but the harvest will bring eternal joy.<sup>93</sup>

The real value of the work of Andrews, missionary to Europe, cannot be measured by figures and statistical reports. In the first place, Andrews should be considered as the Christopher Columbus of the Advent Movement. He was the first official missionary to cross the Atlantic and to open the way for the preaching of the everlasting gospel in all the world. With him starts a new day in the proclamation of the three angels' message.

J. N. Andrews had many talents: he was a successful scholar, theologian, preacher and editor--"the ablest man in all our ranks."<sup>94</sup> But it is primarily as a missionary that we should remember him. His life, consecrated to the world mission of the church, has been a source of inspiration to the thousands who have followed in his footsteps. There is no reason to doubt that it will continue to be so.

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Advent Review and Sabbath Herald (hereafter cited as RH), 3 Feb. 1859, p. 87; Gottfried Oosterwal, "The Shut Door Opens," *ibid.* 17 Jan. 1974, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> See also above, pp. 52-56.

<sup>3</sup> J. N. Andrews was the third president of the General Conference, from May 1867 to May 1869: SDA Encyclopedia, 1976 ed., p. 495.

<sup>4</sup> RH 26 July 1870, pp. 45-46; SDA Encyclopedia, rev. ed. (1976), p. 430.

<sup>5</sup> Virgil E. Robinson, John Nevins Andrews, Flame for the Lord (Washington, D.C., 1975), p. 83.

<sup>6</sup> RH 14 Jan. 1873, p. 40.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* 8 July 1873, p. 29.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* 30 Dec. 1873, p. 20.

<sup>9</sup> Robinson, p. 83.

<sup>10</sup> RH 25 Nov. 1873, p. 190.

<sup>11</sup> Gottfried Oosterwal, "Into all the World," RH 24 Jan. 1974, pp. 6-8.

<sup>12</sup> The True Missionary, Jan. 1874. This magazine was advertised in RH 23 Dec. 1873, p. 16, and 13 Jan. 1874, p. 40, by G. I. Butler.

<sup>13</sup> Life Sketches (Mountain View, California, 1915), pp. 208-209; Testimonies for the Church, 8 vols. (Mountain View, California, 1948) 7:35-36.

<sup>14</sup> RH 25 Aug. 1874, p. 75.

<sup>15</sup> Mark 1:17-20.

<sup>16</sup> Galatians 1:16, 17.

<sup>17</sup> RH 22 Sept. 1874, p. 222.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* 15 Sept. 1874, pp. 100, 102.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.* 27 Oct. 1874, p. 142.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.* 3 Nov. 1874, p. 2.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.* 17 Nov. 1874, pp. 166, 164.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.* 17 Nov. 1874, p. 166; 28 Jan. 1875, p. 36.

<sup>23</sup> To the Brethren in Switzerland, 29 Aug. 1878, p. 6: E. G. White--SDA Research Centre, Europe (hereafter cited as WRCE), Letters of Ellen G. White, photocopied transcripts (hereafter cited as White Corresp.).

<sup>24</sup> To Brother and Sister White, 8 June 1878: WRCE, Letters of J. N. Andrews 1862-1883, photocopied transcripts, DF2000-a-1-g, (hereafter cited as Andrews Corresp.). The content and the place where this letter

has been written suggest that it should be dated 1876. In RH 14 Oct. 1875, p. 116, Andrews wrote: "In the matter of publishing a French paper no one is thoroughly competent to assist in the difficulties of the French language, and those most competent to help, especially if they could take some time to improve themselves, do not see how to devote much time to such work."

<sup>25</sup>RH 28 Jan. 1875, p. 36.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid. 12 July 1877, p. 20. Cp. RH 7 June 1877, p. 180: "Our beloved brother, Elder D. T. Bourdeau, was sent to Switzerland to help Elder Andrews who labored under the embarrassment of his imperfect French. It was very difficult for him to edit a paper in the French language, or to speak in French."

<sup>27</sup>Ibid. 24 Nov. 1874, p. 172. The names of the six are: Tramelan, Le Locle, La Chaux-de-Fonds, Fleurier, Bienne and Bruckten. To which, of course, should be added Neuchâtel.

<sup>28</sup>Andrews' report to the General Conference Committee, 1875, p. 13: WRCE, DF2000-a-e; see also RH 14 Oct. 1875, p. 116. In RH 27 Jan. 1876, p. 30, Andrews wrote: "There are some seventy-five Sabbath-keepers in this country, besides a considerable number of Sabbath-keeping children." J. Erzberger noted 74 members at the end of 1872 in his report to the General Conference: WRCE, DF2000-a-10.

<sup>29</sup>RH 24 Nov. 1874, p. 172.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid. 15 Dec. 1874, p. 196.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid. 24 Nov. 1874, p. 172.

<sup>32</sup>WRCE, DF2000-a-e.

<sup>33</sup>RH 24 Nov. 1874, p. 172.

<sup>34</sup>"He (Elder W. Jones) is by means of advertisements opening a correspondence with all the scattered Sabbath-keepers in Great Britain and Ireland, and with all who are friendly to the Sabbath." RH 27 Oct. 1874, p. 142; see also ibid. 15 Dec. 1874, p. 197.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid. 28 Jan. 1875, p. 36.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid. 18 Mar. 1875, p. 92.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid. 28 Jan. 1875, p. 36; 18 Mar. 1875, p. 93.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid. 24 Nov. 1874, p. 172. Andrews gave a proof of his conviction in ibid. 18 Mar. 1875, p. 93, citing a particular case in Bohemia.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid. 28 Jan. 1875, p. 36.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid. 18 Mar. 1875, p. 93. Andrews reported the first results of these advertisements in the papers in the cities of Amsterdam and Rotterdam: ibid. 8 July 1875, pp. 12-13.

<sup>41</sup>See below, pp. 227-231.

<sup>42</sup>J. N. Andrews, History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1873), pp. 464-467.

<sup>43</sup>WRCE, DF2000-a-e; RH 26 Aug. 1875, p. 160; 1 Jan. 1880, p. 9, on the Malakani.

<sup>44</sup>RH 25 May 1876, p. 164.

- <sup>45</sup>Ibid. 21 Oct. 1880, p. 264.      <sup>46</sup>Ibid. 28 Oct. 1880, p. 280.
- <sup>47</sup>Ibid. 27 Jan. 1876, p. 30.      <sup>48</sup>Ibid. 26 Aug. 1875, p. 60.
- <sup>49</sup>Ibid. 14 Oct. 1875, p. 116.      <sup>50</sup>Ibid. 26 Aug. 1875, p. 59.
- <sup>51</sup>Ibid. 6 Apr. 1876, p. 108.
- <sup>52</sup>Everett N. Dick, Founders of the Message (Washington, D.C., 1938), p. 319; RH 2 Mar. 1876, p. 70; 29 June 1876, pp. 4-5; 20 July 1876, p. 29.
- <sup>53</sup>Dick, p. 321. For further details of Andrews' editorial work, see below, pp. 285-308.
- <sup>54</sup>RH 7 June 1877, pp. 180-181.
- <sup>55</sup>Andrews Corresp. 1 May (1878?). The contents of this letter prove that it was written on 1 May 1877, and not 1878, after Andrews' visit to Paris and before his journey to Naples.
- <sup>56</sup>See below, pp. 261-271, for a more extended treatment.
- <sup>57</sup>RH 10 Feb. 1876, p. 44.      <sup>58</sup>Robinson, p. 95.
- <sup>59</sup>RH 24 Aug. 1876, p. 269; 5 Oct. 1876, p. 182.
- <sup>60</sup>Ibid. 23 Nov. 1876, p. 164; 7 Dec. 1876, p. 182; 25 Jan. 1877, p. 30; 25 July 1878, p. 37; 8 Aug. 1878, p. 55.
- <sup>61</sup>Ibid. 12 July 1877, p. 20.      <sup>62</sup>Ibid. 22 Feb. 1877, p. 60.
- <sup>63</sup>Ibid. 18 Apr. 1876, p. 124.
- <sup>64</sup>Historical Sketches of the Foreign Missions of the Seventh-day Adventists (Basle, 1886), pp. 27-28 (hereafter cited as Hist. Sk.).
- <sup>65</sup>RH 9 Aug. 1877, p. 52; 13 Sept. 1887, p. 92.
- <sup>66</sup>Ibid. 11 Oct. 1877, p. 116; 6 June 1878, p. 180.
- <sup>67</sup>Ibid. 20 Sept. 1877, p. 100. Andrews requested "a man of God to give himself to the work in Italy in the region where Sister Revel lives. This is the first person in Europe who embraced the Sabbath under the labors of Eld. M.B.C.": *ibid.* 26 Aug. 1875, p. 60.
- <sup>68</sup>Ibid. 3 Jan. 1878, p. 4; for further information on this and subsequent developments in England, see below, pp. 233 ff.
- <sup>69</sup>Andrews Corresp. f. 121, undated fragment.
- <sup>70</sup>Ibid. 7 Aug. 1878.
- <sup>71</sup>Twelve countries are reported in RH 12 Sept. 1878, p. 96, to which, of course, should be added Switzerland. In *ibid.* 20 May 1880, p. 332, more than 20 countries are reported.

- 72 Andrews Corresp. 9 Sept. 1878. <sup>73</sup>Ibid. 23 May 1880.
- 74 Ibid. 22 Dec. 1878.
- 75 WRCE, Letters of William & Mrs. Ings while in Europe, microfiche, 18 & 13 Dec. 1877.
- 76 Ibid. 13 Feb. 1878.
- 77 Andrews Corresp. 27 Jan. 1879.
- 78 Ibid. 23 May 1879; RH 5 June 1879, p. 180; 26 June 1879, p. 4; 17 July 1879, p. 28; 11 Sept. 1879, p. 92. He sought to be a missionary while in England: see below, pp. 238 ff.
- 79 RH 20 May 1880, p. 332; 9 May 1878, p. 3. Andrews' last report to GC Committee, 1 Sept. 1882: WRCE, 2000-a-1-e.
- 80 M. E. Olsen, A History of the Origin and Progress of Seventh-day Adventists (Washington, D.C., 1932), p. 307.
- 81 For a fuller discussion of this episode, see below, pp. 241 ff.
- 82 Virgil E. Robinson, Guide, 25 Sept. 1974, p. 6.
- 83 Hist. Sk. p. 42.
- 84 Andrews Corresp. 17 Sept. 1883.
- 85 Olsen, p. 308; RH 23 Oct. 1883, p. 672; 30 Oct. 1883, p. 680; 20 Nov. 1883, p. 730.
- 86 RH 17 Nov. 1874, p. 166.
- 87 Journal de Genève, 20 Dec. 1874; RH 18 Mar. 1875, p. 92.
- 88 RH 11 Mar. 1875, p. 84.
- 89 Les Signes des Temps, July 1876, p. 8.
- 90 John 4:37.
- 91 RH 7 June 1877, pp. 180-181.
- 92 White Corresp. 29 Mar. 1883, p. 20.
- 93 RH 14 Nov. 1882.
- 94 White Corresp. 29 Aug. 1887, p. 7.



## ANDREWS AND THE MISSION TO BRITAIN

H. H. Leonard

John Nevins Andrews' role in the English mission of the Seventh-day Adventist church is a neglected episode in his life. Convention dates the beginning of the mission from the enthusiastic reports of William Ings to the Review and Herald in 1878 and the decision of the General Conference of that year to send J. N. Loughborough to Southampton. That Andrews had been urging such a mission for four years and had been preparing the ground as best he could seems to have gone unnoticed. The English mission is not, of course, central to the Andrews story, but his attitude towards it and work for it do throw some interesting light upon the character, views, methods and achievements of the man.

Andrews was sent to continental Europe.<sup>1</sup> The fact that he passed through England on his way was partly the accident of America's ancient ties with England and England's commercial supremacy at the time: all roads, so to speak, led to England. That being so, however, Andrews appears to have decided to make the most of the opportunity. He was not unaware of the existence of a handful of English Seventh Day Baptists, the heirs of the heroes of his chapter on the Sabbath-keepers of the seventeenth century.<sup>2</sup> As we shall see, Andrews regarded all Sabbath-keepers as brethren, but seems to have formed a particularly warm attachment for the pastor of the London Seventh Day Baptists, W. M. Jones. When the friendship began is difficult to determine. Andrews was known and appreciated by Seventh Day Baptists as the author of the History of the Sabbath, at least by 1867 when their American Sabbath Tract Society published Nathan Wardner's Natures's God and His Memorial in which the

author acknowledges his debt to Andrews.<sup>3</sup> Jones was later to advertize and print portions of the History in his Sabbath Memorial.<sup>4</sup> If he attended his church's General Conference of 1871, he would have seen and heard Andrews, who was the first ever Adventist delegate.<sup>5</sup> It is unlikely that the two men got to know each other, however. Andrews did not mention Jones' part in the conversion of J. W. Morton when he produced the second edition of his History of the Sabbath in November 1873.<sup>6</sup> But in 1873 he was again a delegate at the Seventh Day Baptist conference and would have listened to "an interesting letter from William M. Jones, of London."<sup>7</sup> Since the European mission was already in Andrews' mind, it is possible that some sort of correspondence began soon after. Jones' defense of Seventh-day Adventists in the London Christian Shield in January 1874<sup>8</sup> might have been the first fruits of a burgeoning friendship. Since there were no Seventh-day Adventists in London, Jones must have sent his article to someone in America for it to be published in the Review, and Andrews is the most likely candidate. If the speculation about an early correspondence is incorrect then it must surely have been the Review reprint of Jones' defense which brought Jones to Andrews' attention for the second time and prompted him to make contact, for when he wrote an article for the American Sabbath Recorder in May Jones knew that Andrews was preparing for a mission to Switzerland.<sup>9</sup> By then, Andrews' plans were far advanced, as his correspondence with the Whites shows, and by April only the sale of his house, and a desire to be sure that he was doing the right thing, detained him.<sup>10</sup> That Jones was party to Andrews' plans almost as soon as the Whites says something about the confidence Andrews was already placing in him, and it comes as no surprise to find Andrews informing Review readers that he expected to meet him in London,<sup>11</sup> and that Jones met him at the station and planned a fortnight's activity for him.<sup>12</sup> But Andrews was anxious to do more than see the historic

sites of the Seventh Day Baptists and to rejoice in their present successes.

From time to time England had appeared in the columns of the Review and Herald. In July 1861, for example, John Sisley reported that he had had a favorable response from relatives in England to whom he had sent copies of the church paper,<sup>13</sup> and Andrews told Review readers in 1875 that he had gone to England armed with a list of interested persons which he had compiled from the recommendations of friends and the columns of the Review.<sup>14</sup> The previous issue carried a report of a man in the Grimsby area who was keeping the Sabbath as a result of literature sent from an American Adventist friend, and of a citizen of Belfast who had read Andrews' History of the Sabbath and had been keeping the Sabbath before he knew of an organized Sabbath-keeping church,<sup>15</sup> while a still earlier issue informed readers of a mother and father in Lincolnshire who were observing the Sabbath as a result of their daughter's sending literature from Tuscola County, Michigan.<sup>16</sup> Clearly, England was on the mental agenda of the pioneers even if at this stage it did not figure in conference resolutions or budgets.<sup>17</sup> Andrews wanted to test the temperature of the water.

Andrews, his two children and Albert Vuilleumier docked at Liverpool late on Saturday evening 24 September.<sup>18</sup> Deciding that "it was necessary for us to remain till Monday"--possibly because Jones was not expecting him before then, possibly because long rail journeys were difficult on an English Sunday--he booked in at an hotel, probably the Washington, which he was to recommend for the Ings and Maud Sisley as "a first class hotel at reasonable prices."<sup>19</sup> On Sunday he went to hear one of the leading Baptist ministers of the city, Hugh Stowell Brown. He was favorably impressed. He reported the sermon at some length in the Review, and must have talked with the minister afterwards, for he

was able to discover that Brown held, with Andrews, that immortality was only bequeathed at the Judgement, and that such a view was not uncommon in England, it being held even by the late Archbishop of Canterbury, Whatley. The discovery evidently delighted him. He contrasts the tolerance of such views in England with attitudes in America where to hold such a doctrine was to be counted as an infidel. As well as making his first investigations into the prevailing doctrinal climate, Andrews also took note of the size of the congregation (the church, capable of holding a large congregation, was well filled), and church architecture (he likens it to Mr. Beecher's chapel in Brooklyn). Andrews wasted no time in trying to form a picture of the English religious scene.

The next day, he travelled south to London. Jones and his wife had travelled four miles to meet the Andrews family at the station, and had already found them moderately priced accommodation.<sup>20</sup> Jones had been appointed to his London pastorate in 1872 and had begun to revive the flagging fortunes of his new church,<sup>21</sup> which Andrews described as possessing a "neat and tasty appearance" as a result of Jones' labors. Revival was needed, for Andrews estimated that there were only about 30 members in the whole of Britain in 1875 and some of these were a result of a meeting held in Glasgow in 1874.<sup>22</sup> Andrews blamed "covetousness and desire to obtain favour with the great" for this decline in their fortunes;<sup>23</sup> he was lamenting what Wesley had observed earlier, namely that the first fires of a movement are all too easily dampened by a growth in prosperity which the adoption of a Christian life-style tends to bring.<sup>24</sup>

But present decline was overshadowed by past greatness. Some time during that week Andrews was shown the sites of the early English Sabbath worthies. They walked the route taken by John Trask when he was pilloried, whipped and sent to the Fleet prison, went to Newgate where Trask's wife remained faithful to the Sabbath through fifteen years of imprisonment

ended only at her death, to Pinners Hall where the second Sabbath-keeping church in London was established only to become extinct "within the present generation," and to Tyburn where John James was executed, as well as to the public house where he was forced to pay for the liquor of those who arrested him.<sup>25</sup> It was no small pilgrimage.

Andrews was much less impressed with an internationally renowned preacher of the Second Advent that he decided to hear on one of his Sundays in London. Dr. Cumming was the minister of a church in Covent Garden and Andrews possessed at least one of his books--a gift from an unidentified friend.<sup>26</sup> Cumming's popularity had posed something of a problem for Andrews for he could not understand why the rich and the fashionable, especially in an age which had come to believe in the inevitability of progress, should flock to hear him. He was, Andrews thought, a man of unremarkable voice but of great ability, but the reason for his popularity lay in the kind of second advent he was preaching. Cumming taught that the second coming would lead to a time of massive conversions--a second chance doctrine for which Andrews had no time.<sup>27</sup>

Andrews is silent on what else impressed him in London, but part of the week must have been spent in trying to contact those persons whom he had listed before sailing. "Here I met with painful disappointment," he was to tell Review readers the following April. A Methodist minister of whom he had high hopes and who was apparently still in contact with "Brother Stillman of Brookfield, N.Y." refused to answer his letters, one written on his only complete day in Liverpool, and the other while in London. Looking back on the activity of this period, Andrews concludes with an affirmation of faith and with devastating honesty that he believed there were searchers after truth but he had not found them.<sup>28</sup>

He was, of course, referring to those on his list. He certainly met some who were keeping the Sabbath or convicted of the Sabbath truth

during this, his first, visit. On the first Sabbath (2 Oct.) he went to the Mill Yard Church where he heard Jones preach on Psalm 8 in the morning, preached himself in the afternoon (on James 2:12) and joined in the communion service.<sup>29</sup> On 5 October he travelled with Jones to Tewkesbury, Gloucestershire, where they were entertained overnight by the Baptist minister of Natton who took them next morning to the village to meet with three of the five existing members of the only other Seventh Day Baptist church in England.<sup>30</sup>

The night train from Tewkesbury brought them to Glasgow. They can hardly have been refreshed after this journey on wooden seats but the meeting on 8 October was probably the high point of Andrews' second week in England for it demonstrated to him that there were men and women seeking, and willing to stand for, truth. The meeting, called rather grandly the Sabbath Conference both by Jones and the lady in whose house it was held,<sup>31</sup> brought together six persons, one from Ireland, the rest from Scotland, all, apparently, contacts of Jones who had sent them invitations. How many did not come cannot be determined, but apologies for absence were read. The meeting was a success. Experiences were shared, a man from North Scotland was baptized, a report on the work in America was given and a regular Sabbath meeting was organized. The group was still meeting the following year when the Vigilant Missionary Society of New England heard that six people were regularly attending the Sabbath prayer meeting.<sup>32</sup> How the society got the address of the Glaswegian Sabbath-keeper to whom they sent publications is not clear, for neither names nor addresses appeared in the account of the Sabbath Conference in the Review or the Sabbath Memorial. One must suspect the hand of J. N. Andrews.

The conference over, Jones and Andrews returned to London where Andrews spoke twice at the Mill Yard Church on Sabbath and then prepared to leave for Switzerland via Newhaven, Dieppe and Paris on Monday

12 October.<sup>33</sup> In April 1875 he looked back, as we have seen, with some disappointment on those two weeks in England.<sup>34</sup> But his article in the Review had stimulated interest in a British mission and his pen argued persuasively for a start to be made. In that same letter where he confessed disappointment, he put before his readers both the opportunities and the needs of England. One Seventh Day Baptist minister in London, however good (and Andrews is always warm in his praise of Jones), was hardly a sufficient witness to the Sabbath truth. In any case, the Adventist message was much more than the Sabbath: he specifically mentioned the second coming<sup>35</sup> and the third angel's message. Finally, he urged his brethren to repay a debt of gratitude to England since it was from England that the Sabbath truth first reached America. The obligations were many, the task great. Great, yet easier to accomplish than his own on account of a common language and an existing evangelistic tool, the American Signs. But only easier if sufficient men were sent. He thus expressed pleasure that the experienced J. N. Loughborough was being sent and dismay that only Loughborough was being sent.<sup>36</sup>

He might have been more dismayed had he known that it would take over three years before the decision to send Loughborough was finally taken, and nearly four before the work in England began.<sup>37</sup> But he was not dismayed into inactivity. Believing that the proclamation of the Sabbath truth was more important than narrow denominational interests, he did all he could to ensure the success of Jones' Sabbath Memorial. Even before the first issue had seen the light of day he was encouraging Adventists to take out subscriptions<sup>38</sup> and was busy writing the first of a number of pieces for its columns. This was a sort of newsletter telling of his discoveries of Sabbath-keepers in various parts of Europe. His intention is clearly evangelistic. He seeks to show that the Sabbath is more widely kept than was thought and to bring courage to Sabbath-keepers,

or waverers, in England: "God is about to revive this cause of His down-trodden Sabbath in Great Britain and Ireland," he writes. "May the friends of this divine institution be workers together with Him, and they will see that their labour is not in vain."<sup>39</sup> For the second issue he contributed a short history of the Seventh-day Adventists to accompany the second half of a history of Seventh Day Baptists by Jones<sup>40</sup> and a second newsletter, this time about the growth of Sabbath-keeping in Prussia.<sup>41</sup> He used his third newsletter in July as a thinly veiled excuse for a study on the Sabbath, stressing that it had not been abolished, and that prophecies concerning mystical Babylon and false doctrines led Bible students to expect an attempt to change it. He ends with an eloquent plea for men to follow truth:

How long will it be that men who fear God will stand on the side of error? How long will they continue to trample beneath their feet the memorial of the great Creator? How long will they halt between duty and convenience? The present is the time when God will cause men to show what is in their hearts. Reader, what do you think of the Fourth Commandment, and what are you doing with respect to what it commands?<sup>42</sup>

Half a year later Andrews followed this up with a short but considered piece arguing against the notion that Sunday had somehow become the Christian Sabbath. The Sabbath is the memorial of creation; it cannot now become a memorial to something else, even the Resurrection. What is needed, he pointed out, are two memorials, and this is precisely what Scripture gives us: the Sabbath for creation, baptism for the Resurrection.

In addition, Andrews' personal letters to Jones provided the editor with news which he used to fill his pages,<sup>44</sup> and occasionally with quotable quotes. Under the heading "How to work in the Sabbath cause," Jones cites Andrews as saying, "I know of but one way:--find a field of labour;--ask God to help;--take off your coat, and pitch into the work as a man who has a big job to accomplish."<sup>45</sup> It was this that Jones found so admirable in Andrews and other Adventist preachers. Writing in the



first issue of his paper he had commented that they "seem to have one very necessary qualification for our common pioneer work, and this is grit."<sup>46</sup>

Grit Andrews certainly had. In the midst of busy, and by no means trouble-free, pioneer work on the European mainland, he managed, by frequent but judicious use of his pen, to support the Sabbath cause in England as a sort of Adventist missionary in absentia. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that when he returned to England late in November 1877<sup>47</sup> he was warmly received by Jones and his congregation. His relationship with the Seventh Day Baptists was both cordial and ecumenical. "God forbid," he had written in 1875, "that we should not rejoice in their success in leading men to obey God,"<sup>48</sup> and now, in the report on his visit of 1877 he prays that "the efforts which Bro. Jones is making . . . be greatly blessed of heaven."<sup>49</sup> In 1877 we have examples of that friendship at work in matters practical and ecclesiastical. "Elder Jones," he told Review readers, "took unwearied pains . . . to aid us in the many matters of business which we sought to investigate. We owe him a debt of gratitude we shall not forget."<sup>50</sup> Jones' experience in producing the Sabbath Memorial was presumably useful in finding Andrews the printing materials he required at a price he could afford.<sup>51</sup>

As on his previous visit, he worshipped at Mill Yard on both Sabbaths and preached at least once.<sup>52</sup> His text was Romans 8:1-4 and the sermon is a clear statement of his theology of law and gospel. "God did not send His Son to abolish the holy law which condemns the sinner, but . . . to deliver men from the guilt of sin, and to place them where they can render acceptable obedience," he writes. Obedience is thus a consequence of justification. Before justification, obtained for us at Calvary, and applied to us on our request to our High Priest on condition of repentance towards God and faith towards Jesus, man is incapable of

rendering "the loving obedience [the law] demands." The law cannot change this condition; nor can man. But God, through the sacrifice of Christ, does. From this flow justification, repentance, conversion and an ability "from the heart, to render obedience to all the commandments of God." But Andrews did not confine his attention to Sabbath-keepers. We have already mentioned his visits to churches in Liverpool and London;<sup>53</sup> on this occasion he contrived to worship at both the Metropolitan Tabernacle and Westminster Abbey. He was most impressed with Spurgeon's sermon on the sins of ignorance, and told his readers that he would send a copy for publication when it came out in print. In the event, it did not appear in the Review but Andrews wrote a long summary and commentary on it for the Sabbath Memorial which got front page treatment.<sup>54</sup> Neither was he unappreciative of Dean Stanley's sermon to a packed and attentive Abbey on Romans 13:12. "Mr. Stanley spoke principally upon the character of the judgment, but he also expressed the idea that it is an event at hand."<sup>55</sup>

By the time Andrews visited England again, the mission for which he had called had finally been established. The General Conference committee, through the pen of James White, urged the believers on 1 August 1878 to vote for the mission at the coming session.<sup>56</sup> It is remarkable, he tells his readers, that the church should have raised \$100,000 to support the mission work in four European countries and publications in seven different languages and yet have neglected the country which by reason of its language was both easier and cheaper for Americans to work in. Here we have an echo of Andrews' plea of 1875, but White's advocacy goes further: the other countries of the British Empire will be more readily reached once an English mission is established; England is the door to the English speaking world.<sup>57</sup> Furthermore, as a result of Andrews' brief work, the time for such a mission is right. The doctrines of the church are beginning to be known by the small group of English

Sabbath-keepers and, especially after the failure of a Seventh Day Baptist missionary, Nathan Wardner, who was recalled after a division "for certain causes which need not here be named," "there is a general expectation among the discouraged few in England and Scotland that we are to send them help very soon."<sup>58</sup> Church members were certainly being well prepared. On 15 August George I. Butler added his voice in favor of the mission<sup>59</sup> and the following week, in a note about the sending of missionaries to Denmark, the mission to England was impatiently anticipated.<sup>60</sup> On 5 September the second of Ings' glowing reports on the prospects in Southampton was accompanied by a plea from James White for 20,000 members to contribute five dollars over the next two years in order to provide funds for the proposed mission.<sup>61</sup> After such a build-up it would have been strange indeed if the conference session had voted against starting a work in England but if any persuasion was needed Andrews was present to provide it. The delegates duly voted unanimously for "a three part resolution which named J. N. Loughborough as the missionary and placed the whole of the European work in the hands of what amounted to a three-man subcommittee of the General Conference--Loughborough, Andrews and a third whom they were to co-opt."<sup>62</sup> But Andrews was most concerned that the good relations built up with the English Seventh Day Baptists should not be soured by the mission. There were already rumblings. Reporting to James White in June 1877 on the missionary cooperation over prospects in Italy between himself and Jones, Andrews confided that "Elder Jones has acted very honorably toward us in this matter. He does not like the action of the Seventh Day Baptists and they bear down on him very hard."<sup>63</sup> It may not be without significance that Jones' General Conference passed a resolution in 1876 that approved an interchange of delegates with Adventists but drew attention to the fact that the two churches held "such opposite views concerning important doctrines,"<sup>64</sup>

while in 1878 Varnum Hull read a paper on the differences between the two denominations.<sup>65</sup> In the same year the Seventh Day Baptist Sabbath Recorder took up the case of a disaffected Adventist, Dr. Charles Lee, and James White wrote a vigorous editorial protest in the Review.<sup>66</sup> This was distressing to Andrews who, as far as Seventh Day Baptists were concerned, was an ecumenist. He had twice been a delegate to the Seventh Day Baptist General Conference,<sup>67</sup> expressed his disappointment at the non-arrival of their delegate at the hastily called Adventist conference of 1873,<sup>68</sup> gave the welcome to L. C. Rogers at the conference of 1874 and responded warmly to his "stirring address" on working for a closer union between the two bodies.<sup>69</sup> He would also have had a hand in an irenic resolution of 1873 referring to Seventh Day Baptists as a people highly honored of God as the depositories of His law and especially the Sabbath, and committing the Adventist church to cooperate with them "in leading men to the conscientious observance of the commandments of God."<sup>70</sup> He would thus have rejoiced that the air had cleared sufficiently for Nathan Wardner to be warmly welcomed by the conference delegates of 1878<sup>71</sup> and may have been instrumental in finding him a place in the program to preach. It was certainly Andrews who proposed the continuation of the custom of sending a delegate to the Seventh Day Baptist General Conference<sup>72</sup> and an article by him in the conference edition of the Review may well be an extended version of the speech that he made on that occasion. It is a moving plea for good relations between the only two Christian bodies that had the Sabbath in common. In Andrews' view, this fact made them "substantially one" despite doctrinal differences. The article is worthy of extended treatment, but in a paper of this length and on this subject there is only time to observe that Andrews already had one eye on the English mission and urges that it give no offence to Seventh Day Baptists with whom he has worked so harmoniously. He concludes with the hope that

Adventists will "meet the Seventh Day Baptists in such a manner that we shall be helpers to them and they to us." The Seventh Day Baptists are not strong, he points out; they have only two churches in England, and "we would gladly see these little churches strengthened and enlarged." His final sentence sums up his whole article, and philosophy: "There must not be strife between us; for we are brethren."<sup>73</sup>

It might well have been decided during the conference that Loughborough and Andrews should go together to set up the mission: they were certainly expected to sail for Europe together and were billed to speak at a camp meeting in Wellville, N.Y. on 9-11 November just before leaving.<sup>74</sup> Bereavement intervened. Andrews' daughter, Mary, died of tuberculosis on the morning of 27 November. He was devastated. A year later the wound had not healed. "I cannot tell," he wrote, "why one who promised to be so useful should be taken away. God's judgements are a great deep."<sup>75</sup>

Ellen White wrote a hurried, and then a more considered, letter of condolence, urged him to stay in America at least for a time, to marry again to ease the load, and finally, if he returned, to spend some time first in "Old England."<sup>76</sup> He did not stay in America for long and, much to Ellen's chagrin, he did not remarry,<sup>77</sup> although he did take Anna Oyer, who was to double as housekeeper and helper in the publishing work (a replacement for Maud Sisley), and his niece ("to avoid all appearance of evil and all occasion for foolish speeches," he commented to W. C. White).<sup>78</sup> He did, however, spend some time in "Old England." He left from New York on 29 May aboard the steamship Virginia in a first class cabin.<sup>79</sup> The frugal Andrews was not a little troubled at the apparent extravagance. The man who always travelled third class on European railways was at pains to inform Review readers that "our accommodations have not been so stylish as we might have had by higher priced lines," a point he repeated, with

details, in a letter to Anna Rasmussen on 23 May.<sup>80</sup>

The steamship Virginia may have been chosen for reasons other than its cheapness, for by going to Glasgow Andrews was able to visit the Sabbath-keepers he had helped to form into a company five years earlier,<sup>81</sup> and who were now languishing without a minister as a result of the sudden departure of Nathan Wardner.<sup>82</sup> He visited a draper who is named in the Review William Wills, but this may be a mistranscription of Mills. Loughborough was to describe Mills as Wardner's right hand man, a friend of Adventists and one who had embraced the Adventist position on immortality.<sup>83</sup> Perhaps significantly Loughborough has crossed out the word "Sabbath" in this sentence, for Andrews describes his man as taking "a very deep interest in the promulgation" of the Sabbath issue without being a strict observer. He may well have been the one described in 1875 as a regular attender at the Sabbath prayer meetings though not fully keeping the Sabbath.<sup>84</sup> Andrews' intention may therefore have been not only to encourage the Sabbath-keepers (two of them he described as being "in circumstances of distress") but also to see whether there was any enthusiasm for an Adventist initiative. He appears to have received some encouragement at least from Mills, for Loughborough was to report in 1880 that if Andrews were fit enough he would hold the summer's tent effort in Glasgow and he links Mills' name with the proposal.<sup>85</sup>

Andrews arrived in London on 12 June.<sup>86</sup> The friendship with the Jones was revived and he stayed with them until he left for Southampton six days later. The contact was a godsend. The day after his arrival he was "seized with chills and fever" and the Joneses took him into their home and nursed him. He was well enough to spend the Sabbath (14 June) with the Mill Yard Church: "we had interesting services . . . about forty persons were present, nearly all . . . friends of the Sabbath," he told Review readers. Jones gives us a fuller account. Andrews preached

at the afternoon meeting on Matthew 5:20--"a very interesting discourse, in which he showed from the model sermon of Christ, that it is the duty of all ministers of the gospel to preach obedience to the commandments of God." At 5.00 p.m. they all had tea in the burial ground and at 6.00 they returned to the church for a prayer meeting and "conference."<sup>87</sup> What they conferred about we are not told, but we may suppose that Loughborough's mission was on the agenda. Possibly also Jones urged Andrews to write him another article, based on the efforts of some churchmen to make the English Sunday more of a strict Sabbath. Certainly Andrews wrote such an article and it was published in November.<sup>88</sup> Again, they may have discussed the best way of dealing with Christadelphian criticisms of Adventists-- they were certainly dealt with in the July issue--or even the publishing of sections of Andrews History, which began in October.<sup>89</sup> And, of course, Jones would have wanted news of the Glasgow believers, especially after the collapse of the Wardner mission.

Andrews left London for Southampton, still unwell, on 18 June.

A severe chill broke while he was at the station, lasted the entire journey, and turned to a fever on his arrival. The Loughboroughs put him to bed and there he remained for some days. "I can go no further," he wrote, requesting the prayers of fellow believers, "till some change takes place."<sup>90</sup> By the time Andrews arrived, the summer evangelistic campaign had been running for a month.<sup>91</sup> A summer so abnormally wet that prayers were said in Southampton churches on 6 July<sup>92</sup> caused the tent to be covered with mildew and to be in danger of deteriorating beyond repair, so the tent meetings came to an end on 17 August, with 30 people covenanting to keep the Sabbath, but with no baptisms.<sup>93</sup> Three days earlier Loughborough had moved into a large property called Ravenswood from which he was able to continue his work.<sup>94</sup> Three days before that, Andrews had left for Basel. He had not been a great help.

In the midst of a tough campaign, Loughborough had had to give up his bed to an invalid and carry a preaching load of six sermons a week which he had hoped to share.<sup>95</sup> Andrews was confined to bed until 5 July<sup>96</sup> when he got up for a short while, a practice he continued at least until 17 July.<sup>97</sup> It was the beginning of August before he was able to undertake any public work, helping in the Sabbath morning service of 2 August and preaching on Matthew 19:16 a week later.<sup>98</sup> It was his first and only sermon in Southampton that year. He was not fully recovered when he left, for the journey to Basel rendered him feeble, and incapacitated him for a time.<sup>99</sup> He never fully recovered. The autumn and winter were spent struggling with his health as well as with the tasks of directing the mission, preparing Les Signes, and trying to follow up contacts. England was not on his agenda.<sup>100</sup> But Loughborough was in trouble. He no longer had the energy of a young man (he was 47 in 1879)<sup>101</sup> and the prospect of coping with another summer's evangelism single-handed filled him with consternation. But because he regarded the success of the English mission as crucial (and also, possibly, because he was tired and had had his fingers burnt in America) he did not want inexperienced, risky men. Loughborough was no Barnabas. Ideally he would have liked a healthy J. N. Andrews but Andrews had intimated that his health was not up to it. There was, then, more than a hint of frustration and despair in the letter he wrote to S. N. Haskell and W. C. White outlining the problems and asking if they really did expect him to carry the mission single-handed.<sup>102</sup> Whatever they expected, they did not find him a worker from America. Perhaps Loughborough's conditions were too demanding; possibly they thought he was exaggerating--he did, after all, have William Ings. But preaching was not, apparently, one of his talents. The reader will scan Loughborough's carefully kept record of evangelistic meetings in vain for the name of William Ings.<sup>103</sup> And it was here that Loughborough felt the pressure.



It may have been at this stage that Ellen White intervened, urging Andrews to help Loughborough once more.<sup>104</sup> She was, in any case, a little sceptical about the European mission. In January 1879 she had advised Andrews not to hurry back to Switzerland but to spend some time in England. And this was not solely on account of his health and bereavement; the European brethren had to learn to shoulder the burden of the work themselves instead of relying on America. The work was at a standstill in Europe, she believed, for this cause.<sup>105</sup> She was later to observe that Andrews, through his unwillingness to delegate, was part of the problem.<sup>106</sup> The need for an experienced worker in England and the need for European workers to take more responsibility were thus two sides of a single coin. Andrews was ordered to Southampton.

For some time it seemed that ill health would prevent his going and it was 26 June before he arrived.<sup>107</sup> Sickness was compounded by worry. There had been criticisms in 1877 of the amount of money Andrews was using to produce Les Signes and fears expressed for the success of the mission.<sup>108</sup> His talks at the General Conference of 1878 had probably done something to allay these fears but now the brethren suspected that Andrews was complaining about their funding of the mission and they accused him of trying to raise funds independently from French believers in Illinois. Andrews refuted the charges in a letter to James White on 6 June and was still smarting over a week later when he penned a letter for the Review about his intentions to go to England. He may even have been accused of foot-dragging on the English mission. Why else would he feel the need to let his brethren know that he went "cheerfully to labour in England, because I have an interest in whatever concerns the work of God," and to emphasize it with "I have no sectional interests"?<sup>109</sup> It would have been surprising if misunderstandings had not arisen. None of the General Conference officers had visited Europe, and the sole means of communication was by

surface mail across the Atlantic. Distance may also have revived the antipathy that James White had felt some 10 years before.<sup>110</sup> Relations between the two men appear to have been easily disturbed. White wrote somewhat testily in 1875, as if he felt that Andrews was implying that insufficient money was being sent, "If Elder Andrews needs means to carry on the work, he has only to state what the cause in Europe really needs and the General Conference will promptly forward it to him."<sup>111</sup>

It is quite clear that in 1880 Loughborough felt that both White and Whitney were being unreasonable to press Andrews to return to attend the General Conference and to "assist" (the inverted commas are Loughborough's) White with his writing.<sup>112</sup> That Loughborough should have written at all is remarkable; that he should have written as soon as the letter had been received, and while Andrews was too unwell to reply, suggests a sense of crisis.<sup>113</sup> And perhaps something more. Beneath Loughborough's controlled courtesy one detects a feeling of anger that new demands are being made of a sick man, demands which in Loughborough's view could only exacerbate Andrews' condition. Already in February he had become convinced that Andrews' worries contributed to his ill health. "If Brother Andrews would cease worrying, and trust in the Lord more, his health will be better," he had written to S. N. Haskell and W. C. White. And he perceived that the attitude of the conference officers was the main source of Andrews' anxiety. Andrews had become convinced that the only reason for a proposed visit of men from America was their lack of confidence in his management of the finances of the mission. "If he takes it to heart for the next three months as he has in the past," Loughborough concluded, "the conference will find him still in bed."<sup>114</sup> In the event the brethren deferred their visit, but this would have done little to assuage Andrews' anxiety. Thus, when he arrived in England, he was still both a sick and a worried man.

In the circumstances, one wonders whether Andrews was more of a hindrance than a help in the campaign. He arrived a week after it began,<sup>115</sup> so ill that he was confined to bed for thirty-six hours, and spent the best part of a week being nursed back to some semblance of health. He was able to speak in the tent only five times at more or less weekly intervals, and then only with great difficulty, coughing every few sentences. Indeed, on some days, Loughborough informed James White, it was virtually impossible for him to read a whole chapter of the Bible "and the least tax of his mind is a great task."<sup>116</sup> The miracle of healing which was the object of a world day of fasting, and a service of anointing, had not come to pass.<sup>117</sup> The day planned for his departure, 23 August, found him writing to the Review that he was too ill to travel.<sup>118</sup> The fact that he preached a few days later<sup>119</sup> leaves us wondering whether he was a hero or a hypochondriac, but the question is answered by subsequent events. By 15 September, Loughborough had begun to take him to see doctors<sup>120</sup> and two of them advised him to give up preaching because of the state of his lungs. "They do not speak very encouragingly in respect to my restoration of health," Andrews wrote, and Loughborough and Ings both thought it unwise for him to travel back to Switzerland unaccompanied.<sup>121</sup> On 14 October, Loughborough noted cryptically, "Bro. Andrews bled today."<sup>122</sup> Two days later his son, Charles, arrived and on 18 October they began the journey back to Basel.<sup>123</sup> As his brethren had anticipated, the journey was almost too much for him and it was 12 December before he was able to report that he was feeling better.<sup>124</sup> It is not surprising, then, to find Anna Loughborough confiding to Mary K. White, "Unless the Lord works for him, he will surely die of consumption."<sup>125</sup>

Yet, somehow, Andrews made a contribution, at least during July and early August. He told Review readers that he had spoken occasionally in the tent, and twice a week in the hall at Ravenswood, Loughborough's

headquarters in Shirley Road, Southampton.<sup>126</sup> Loughborough's record, to be found in his diary, is at first sight difficult to reconcile with Andrews' account, for it has Andrews speaking at a Sunday afternoon tent meeting at Romsey on 4 July, and thereafter until 3 August at the Tuesday evening tent meeting, and on Sabbaths at Ravenswood until 28 August--only once a week at Ravenswood.<sup>127</sup> It appears, however, that the very faithful record of services which the diary gives us is incomplete, probably because Loughborough is concerned to record only the services at which he was present. We know, for example, that there was a meeting at Ravenswood on Sunday evening 4 July with about fifty present, yet Loughborough records only his 8.00 p.m. appointment in Romsey.<sup>128</sup> Loughborough did record a Sunday evening prayer meeting in addition to the evangelistic service the previous year<sup>129</sup> and began to record the subjects at an evening meeting at Ravenswood when the Romsey meetings were cut to one at 3 o'clock.<sup>130</sup> It appears, then, that we have here evidence of a regular, but largely unrecorded, Sunday meeting, and that it is unrecorded because Loughborough was engaged elsewhere, for the Wednesday and Sabbath meetings at Ravenswood are faithfully noted. Only by assuming the existence of such a regular Sunday evening meeting can we account for the two weekly Ravenswood appointments of which Andrews writes. If this is correct, Andrews was able to halve Loughborough's speaking load during July and early August. There were two meetings in the tent at Romsey on a Sunday, and one on Tuesday and Thursday evenings. In addition there was a Wednesday and (almost certainly) a Sunday evening meeting at Ravenswood--six appointments of which Andrews took three. Doubtless Loughborough would have preferred more help at Romsey, but his load was lightened. And although he may have seen it otherwise at the time, the destruction of the tent by storms on the night of 7 August, the removal of the Sunday meetings into the Romsey Town Hall<sup>131</sup> and the consequent elimination of

the Tuesday and Thursday meetings<sup>132</sup> came at just the right moment, for it saved Loughborough from the overload of meetings that Andrews' deteriorating health would otherwise have created.<sup>133</sup>

The subjects of Andrews' evangelistic sermons at Romsey were clearly determined by the pattern that Loughborough had worked out.<sup>134</sup> Thus, on his first appearance on 4 July he spoke on judgment, to be followed in the evening by Loughborough on the signs of the end found in Matthew 24. Again, his discourse on the Tree of Life on Tuesday 20 July came after two Sunday sermons on the wages of sin and the gift of God and Jesus' exhortation in John 6:27 to labor not for meat but for eternal life. Finally, Andrews followed two basic gospel presentations based on Isaiah 53:6 and Hebrews 2:6 with a discourse on Isaiah 40:31--"They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength" and Loughborough in turn followed with a discussion of the promise of 2 Peter 1:6 that men may be partakers of the divine nature.

What surprised the present writer was what he can only call the basic gospel approach of the evangelistic series in the first two months. Distinctively Adventist topics were barely touched on: Daniel 2 was dealt with at the fourth meeting, and the judgment at the seventh and ninth, the signs of the end at the tenth, the emergence and destruction of the "Wicked" at the end of time at the sixteenth, the second coming again, this time based on John 14:1-3, at the twenty-third,<sup>135</sup> but in between these topics, and forming the bulk of subject material, were a large number of presentations which appear to have been staple evangelical fare. Loughborough and Andrews appear to have taken great pains to ensure that their hearers became Christians as well as Adventists. Nor was this simply a public relations exercise--a "breaking down of prejudice," to use twentieth-century Adventist jargon--for the record of Andrews' Sabbath morning services at Ravenswood reveals a similar pattern. He gave four

apparently devotional studies on Ephesians 6:13ff, Deuteronomy 8:2-3, 2 Corinthians 5:7 and Psalm 1, but only one doctrinal--on baptism.<sup>136</sup>

It is, of course, possible that some of these neutral devotional texts had an Adventist sting in their tails, but in that unlikely case, it would still be true that Andrews and Loughborough approached some of the testing truths obliquely or late--it was September before Loughborough began dealing with the Sabbath and the messages of the three angels of Revelation 14.<sup>137</sup>

We have a non-Adventist verdict on only one of Andrews' evangelistic sermons and that comes from the friendly pen of William Jones. "Elder Andrews," he reported, "preached a sound scriptural sermon on the judgment, which the audience heard with devout attention."<sup>138</sup> Jones' visit on 4 July was one of those occasions of brotherly cooperation that Andrews valued so much. Also present were a veteran Seventh Day Baptist missionary, Dr. S. Carpenter, and Henry Veysey, a schoolmaster contact of Jones' who was already helping Loughborough in a number of ways.<sup>139</sup> At an evening meeting in Ravenswood, Carpenter spoke about the work in China, Veysey on the Unjust Steward, and Jones on "What I must do to be saved."<sup>140</sup>

Jones was enthusiastic about the campaign. "It does not take long for simple folk to find the Sabbath," he rejoiced; "they turn to their Bibles and there it is--'The Seventh Day is the Sabbath.'"<sup>141</sup> Jones was not a public evangelist. He worked through the tracts he published, the letters he wrote, and the advertisements he placed in the press. His contacts tended, therefore, to be literate and from the middle classes. This may have been his first encounter with "simple folk."

But what was thrilling from one point of view could be frustrating from another. For Jones' "simple folk" were the poor, and in some cases the illiterate,<sup>142</sup> and as Loughborough had discovered by the time he had run his first campaign, "those of wealth do not expect to listen to the

same man to whom the poor listen."<sup>143</sup> Andrews reached a similar conclusion: "the tent does not give access to the better class of people as readily as in America."<sup>144</sup> He is clearly perturbed that the mission is so far reaching mainly Jones' "simple folk," and longs to be able to reach what he calls in his report to the General Conference session "the better classes" who are reluctant to enter a tent because it is associated with "a class of men whose influence is not good"<sup>145</sup> and who regard both tent and tract as being designed solely for the lower orders.<sup>146</sup> And when men were persuaded to attend, they had to contend with the concerted opposition of the local clergy who in both pulpit and house-to-house visitation urged them against a decision for the Sabbath.<sup>147</sup>

Andrews' precarious health gave him time to reflect on the problems of the English mission. "It seems to me," he wrote, "that we have almost everything to learn in beginning labor of any kind in the Old World."<sup>148</sup> The tent, which Loughborough had used with such success in a classless Mid-West and in temperate California, was something of a liability in class-ridden and storm-raked England. "To reach the middle and upper classes to any great extent, it is necessary to hire respectable halls," Andrews observed, and respectable halls were expensive.<sup>149</sup> Just how expensive is difficult to determine. As we have seen, funds were found to hire the Romsey Town Hall when necessity demanded, and meetings were held there until 5 December.<sup>150</sup> On the other hand, the mid-week meetings were dropped, and earlier in the year Loughborough had cancelled a hired hall in Taunton for fear of squandering his meager resources on small audiences during the excitement of a General Election.<sup>151</sup> For want of money, it seemed to Andrews, the English mission was likely to limp along in an unsatisfactory fashion. American believers would have to come to the rescue. If they did not, he comments gloomily, "we may as well abandon the attempt to get present truth before England. "But," he

apparently devotional studies on Ephesians 6:13ff, Deuteronomy 8:2-3, 2 Corinthians 5:7 and Psalm 1, but only one doctrinal--on baptism.<sup>136</sup>

It is, of course, possible that some of these neutral devotional texts had an Adventist sting in their tails, but in that unlikely case, it would still be true that Andrews and Loughborough approached some of the testing truths obliquely or late--it was September before Loughborough began dealing with the Sabbath and the messages of the three angels of Revelation 14.<sup>137</sup>

We have a non-Adventist verdict on only one of Andrews' evangelistic sermons and that comes from the friendly pen of William Jones. "Elder Andrews," he reported, "preached a sound scriptural sermon on the judgment, which the audience heard with devout attention."<sup>138</sup> Jones' visit on 4 July was one of those occasions of brotherly cooperation that Andrews valued so much. Also present were a veteran Seventh Day Baptist missionary, Dr. S. Carpenter, and Henry Veysey, a schoolmaster contact of Jones' who was already helping Loughborough in a number of ways.<sup>139</sup> At an evening meeting in Ravenswood, Carpenter spoke about the work in China, Veysey on the Unjust Steward, and Jones on "What I must do to be saved."<sup>140</sup>

Jones was enthusiastic about the campaign. "It does not take long for simple folk to find the Sabbath," he rejoiced; "they turn to their Bibles and there it is--'The Seventh Day is the Sabbath.'"<sup>141</sup> Jones was not a public evangelist. He worked through the tracts he published, the letters he wrote, and the advertisements he placed in the press. His contacts tended, therefore, to be literate and from the middle classes. This may have been his first encounter with "simple folk."

But what was thrilling from one point of view could be frustrating from another. For Jones' "simple folk" were the poor, and in some cases the illiterate,<sup>142</sup> and as Loughborough had discovered by the time he had run his first campaign, "those of wealth do not expect to listen to the



same man to whom the poor listen."<sup>143</sup> Andrews reached a similar conclusion: "the tent does not give access to the better class of people as readily as in America."<sup>144</sup> He is clearly perturbed that the mission is so far reaching mainly Jones' "simple folk," and longs to be able to reach what he calls in his report to the General Conference session "the better classes" who are reluctant to enter a tent because it is associated with "a class of men whose influence is not good"<sup>145</sup> and who regard both tent and tract as being designed solely for the lower orders.<sup>146</sup> And when men were persuaded to attend, they had to contend with the concerted opposition of the local clergy who in both pulpit and house-to-house visitation urged them against a decision for the Sabbath.<sup>147</sup>

Andrews' precarious health gave him time to reflect on the problems of the English mission. "It seems to me," he wrote, "that we have almost everything to learn in beginning labor of any kind in the Old World."<sup>148</sup> The tent, which Loughborough had used with such success in a classless Mid-West and in temperate California, was something of a liability in class-ridden and storm-raked England. "To reach the middle and upper classes to any great extent, it is necessary to hire respectable halls," Andrews observed, and respectable halls were expensive.<sup>149</sup> Just how expensive is difficult to determine. As we have seen, funds were found to hire the Romsey Town Hall when necessity demanded, and meetings were held there until 5 December.<sup>150</sup> On the other hand, the mid-week meetings were dropped, and earlier in the year Loughborough had cancelled a hired hall in Taunton for fear of squandering his meager resources on small audiences during the excitement of a General Election.<sup>151</sup> For want of money, it seemed to Andrews, the English mission was likely to limp along in an unsatisfactory fashion. American believers would have to come to the rescue. If they did not, he comments gloomily, "we may as well abandon the attempt to get present truth before England. "But," he

added more optimistically, "it can be done; for it ought to be done and must be done."<sup>152</sup> What he proposed was the adoption of a plan he had found to work in Switzerland and was itself a refinement of the method used by Adventist tract societies in America and by William Jones in England.<sup>153</sup> The plan involved the monthly mailing of a minimum of a thousand (he would have preferred two thousand) copies of Signs to selected families. The first copy would contain a letter of introduction, the fourth an invitation to subscribe or to receive further copies gratis. Those who failed to reply, or who responded negatively, would be dropped from the list, and replaced by others. In this way, Andrews concludes with unconscious pessimism about the English public's receptiveness, "we reach in a few months' time many thousand families."<sup>154</sup>

Even before he wrote, a beginning had been made. A National Tract and Missionary Society had been formed on 11 January with 36 members sending Signs and tracts through the post and placing them in libraries and (following William Ings) on ships; the response was encouraging.<sup>155</sup> Andrews wished to see the work enlarged, systematized and funded. The magazines had to be purchased, shipped and finally posted in England. The cost of the postage alone would be \$10 per thousand. All this was beyond the resources of the small group of English believers and sympathizers but Andrews had a remedy. "There are plenty of persons in America," he wrote in August, ". . . who would esteem it a privilege to become responsible for a certain number of the Signs, each according to his ability to pay, so that a sufficient number of copies might be sent from Oakland."<sup>156</sup> He was not the last missionary to believe that financial salvation lay in America. He was not entirely disappointed. The American brethren sent Loughborough his 1000 Signs and 25 Reviews as well.<sup>157</sup>

It was only the cost that prevented him from pressing another idea that was close to his heart: a "paper printed in England would be

better than one from America for obvious reasons," he wrote in October.<sup>158</sup> A year earlier, during his first visit to Southampton, he had received the first issue of a German paper intended primarily for work among the German-speaking immigrants. While congratulating the brethren and wishing the paper success, he comments, "but a German paper in America will not fully meet the wants of the cause in Europe. We must print such a paper here as soon as Providence shall render it practicable."<sup>159</sup> Among the "obvious" but unstated reasons for an English-based paper may have been a belief, articulated by Loughborough, that the English were innately suspicious of imported religion.<sup>160</sup> Andrews had certainly been impressed early on by the insularity of the European popular press. "Even in England the papers mention very little of American affairs," he lamented.<sup>161</sup> He also detected a much lower level of popular theological literacy: "I have to write in so simple a style for European readers who are not Bible scholars that I fear our American readers will not think they are very instructive," he wrote of some articles from Les Signes des Temps that he had sent to California in answer to a request for material.<sup>162</sup> But however cogent the reasons for an English-based publication, the funds were not available: James White's appeal of 1878<sup>163</sup> had apparently not been successful. By the year of Andrews' death, however, the longed-for British periodical (Present Truth) was launched from Grimsby, the event being signalled by a short review by William Jones in the Sabbath Memorial.<sup>164</sup> By 1885, 13,000 had been sold or given away.<sup>165</sup> If the work had been slower than Andrews had imagined when he told James White that the obstacles to progress in England would be far fewer than they were in Switzerland,<sup>166</sup> modest gains had been made. Between the arrival of Loughborough and the death of Andrews, over 49,000 families and ships had been visited and nearly 1.75 million pages of tracts and 85,000 periodicals, distributed; and the membership stood at 100.<sup>167</sup> The infant church, at

whose conception and birth Andrews was present, was beginning to grow.

It is not surprising that Andrews' work in and for England has received little attention. He spent, in all, some 29 weeks in England, many of them because he was too ill to leave. When he was not an invalid, he was only a visitor. But not a tourist. His visits were purposeful and fruitful, and the shortness of his time in England belies its significance. He was, in many ways, the father of the English mission. The first Adventist worker to visit the country, he was also the first to point out its challenges and opportunities. His early reports made sufficient impression for plans to be made to send Loughborough in 1875 (even if they were not implemented until 1878), and in the absence of a physical presence, he provided an Adventist voice through his writings for the Sabbath Memorial. He was also behind William Ings, whose enthusiastic reports from Southampton gave impetus to plans already made, for it was Andrews who encouraged him to follow up his exploratory holiday in Southampton by giving him a 16-week leave.<sup>168</sup> He was predictably to the fore in the Conference of 1878 where the mission was finally approved and then, despite bereavement and declining health, he willingly gave both help and counsel in the summer campaigns of 1879 and 1880. Finally, his thoughtful reports to the General Conference of 1880 did much to secure a regular supply of evangelistic literature to keep the infant English church growing.

He was, of course, not above criticism. His sensitivity to criticism may have contributed to the illness which limited his usefulness in England, and his over-scrupulous sense of stewardship can but have confirmed Loughborough's view that good quality halls were beyond his reach--an attitude which Ellen White was later to blame for the slow progress

of the work.<sup>169</sup> His attitude to the poorer classes is also disappointing. It is interesting--and probably significant--that with the acute powers of observation and description manifested in his letters from England in 1874,<sup>170</sup> he never once mentions the dwellings, or the general condition, of the working classes. And when faced with audiences mainly of the lower classes in 1880, he frankly regrets the fact. He was certainly no William Booth. But then, neither was any other Seventh-day Adventist missionary to Europe. Andrews was a member of a church which from its earliest days had had its greatest impact upon men of at least some property.<sup>171</sup> It was difficult to be confronted by those who had none.

The absence of such differences goes some way towards explaining his striking and moving relationship with William Jones. Scholars, writers, editors and Sabbath reformers, they helped one another, prayed for one another, preached for one another, and took communion together. Doctrinal differences and his belief that the Adventist church had a special message to proclaim did not cause Andrews to lose sight of their common Christian calling as guardians and proclaimers of the Sabbath. And Jones returned that friendship and respect many times over. Like John the Baptist, he was first in the field. He had the contacts. Some of them passed eventually under the influence of Andrews' more organized and resourceful church while his own stagnated. Yet he remained magnanimous, opening his pulpit to both Loughborough and Haskell,<sup>172</sup> and welcoming each new Adventist success, especially while Andrews lived. The English mission in its early stages owed much to William Jones. And it was Andrews who sought him out and won his confidence. "To us," Jones wrote in a moving obituary, "he was a dearly beloved brother and counsellor." He left it to Andrews' own people to sum up his achievements for his own church. We are still trying to do it a century later.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>For the ecclesiastical politics leading to Andrews' appointment, see above, pp. 52-56.

<sup>2</sup>John Nevins Andrews, History of the Sabbath and the First Day of the Week, (hereafter cited as Hist. Sabb.), 2nd ed. (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1873), ch. 26.

<sup>3</sup>Nathan Wardner, Nature's God and His Memorial. A Series of Four Tracts on the Subject of the Sabbath (Westerly, R.I., 1867). See the preface for his acknowledgment, and the fourth sermon especially for the evidence, of his indebtedness.

<sup>4</sup>The Sabbath Memorial (hereafter cited as SM) commenced publication in London in January 1875 and was a quarterly. Excerpts from Hist. Sabb. appear irregularly starting in Oct. 1879 (pp. 133-136), advertisements more regularly, especially from July 1882-April 1883. The covers of individual numbers may also have carried advertisements--the only one in the British Library contains a 3/4 page advertisement for two of Andrews' books.

<sup>5</sup>For the minutes recording attendance of SDA delegates at SDB General Conferences, see Seventh Day Baptists in Europe and America (hereafter cited as SDBIEA), 2 vols. (Plainfield, N.J., 1910), 1:198ff. Andrews reported his visit in Advent Review and Herald of the Sabbath (hereafter cited as RH), 19 Sept. 1871, pp. 108-109; R. F. Cottrell had attended in an unofficial capacity in 1870: RH 29 Sept. 1870, p. 109; on SDA/SDB relations, see R. C. Cottrell, "The Sabbath in the New World" in The Sabbath in Scripture and History, ed. Kenneth A. Strand (Washington<sup>D.C.</sup>, 1982), pp. 252-254.

<sup>6</sup>In Hist. Sabb. p. 498, Andrews says that Morton came in contact with Sabbath publications while a missionary in Haiti; for Jones' role in Morton's conversion, SM July 1878, pp. 81-84.

<sup>7</sup>SDBIEA, 1:202. Andrews' reception and Jones' letter are mentioned in the same sentence of the minutes--an almost prophetic link.

<sup>8</sup>Reprinted in RH 14 Apr. 1874, p. 141.

<sup>9</sup>"Seventh Day Baptists and Seventh Day Adventists," Sabbath Recorder, 28 May 1874, reprinted in RH 9 June 1874, p. 205.

<sup>10</sup>Ellen G. White and European S.D.A. Research Centre, Newbold College, Bracknell (hereafter cited as WRCE), The Correspondence of J. N. Andrews, photocopied transcripts, (hereafter cited as Andrews Corresp.), 6 Feb., 23 Mar., 21 Apr., 1874.

<sup>11</sup>RH 22 Sept. 1874, p. 112.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid. 27 Oct. 1874, p. 142.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid. 2 July 1861, p. 47.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid. 15 Apr. 1875, p. 121.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid. 8 Apr. 1875, p. 117.      <sup>16</sup>Ibid. 1 Jan. 1875, p. 6.

<sup>17</sup>Andrews felt constrained to pay his expenses in England out of his own pocket: WRCE, DF2000-a-1(10).

<sup>18</sup>The account in the next two paragraphs is based on Andrews' report in RH 27 Oct. 1874, p. 142, unless otherwise stated. The date of arrival is established by internal evidence.

<sup>19</sup>Andrews Corresp. 2 Nov. 1877.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>SDBIEA, 1:39-45.

<sup>22</sup>RH 15 Apr. 1875, p. 124. The Religious Census of 1851 gave two SDB churches with 83 attendances on the day of the census: R. Currie, A. Gilbert & L. Horsley, Churches and Churchgoers. Patterns of Church Growth in the British Isles since 1700 (Oxford, 1977), p. 216. Allowing for people attending more than one service (there were three possible), and for visitors, the membership figure may not have been much more than 30 in 1851.

<sup>23</sup>RH 3 Nov. 1874, p. 148.

<sup>24</sup>J. H. Plumb, England in the Eighteenth Century (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1950), p. 97.

<sup>25</sup>RH 3 Nov. 1874, p. 148; 1 Jan. 1875, p. 5.

<sup>26</sup>John Cumming, Sabbath Morning Readings on the Old Testament. The Book of Exodus (Boston, 1854)--among Andrews' books now in the library of the Seminaire Adventiste, Collonges-sous-Saleve, France.

<sup>27</sup>RH 22 Dec. 1874, p. 215.

<sup>28</sup>RH 15 Apr. 1875, p. 124.

<sup>29</sup>RH 27 Oct. 1874, p. 142.

<sup>30</sup>The account in this paragraph and the next is based on RH 3 Nov. 1874, p. 148, unless otherwise stated.

<sup>31</sup>SM Jan. 1875, p. 3; RH 1 Jan. 1875, p. 6, quotes a letter from the lady to the Vigilant Missionary Society of New England.

<sup>32</sup>RH 1 Jan. 1875, p. 6.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid. 3 Nov. 1874, p. 148.

<sup>34</sup>Above, p. 229.

<sup>35</sup>A trifle unfair on Jones, who was a great Second Advent preacher, but apparently not all his brethren shared his conviction: SM July 1878, pp. 85-86.

<sup>36</sup>RH 15 Apr. 1875, p. 124.

<sup>37</sup>See below, pp. 235 ff.

<sup>38</sup>RH 15 Dec. 1875, p. 197.

<sup>39</sup>SM Jan. 1875, p. 4.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid. Apr. 1875, p. 6; histories of the two churches featured in the first number of Les Signes des Temps (July 1876, p. 4).

<sup>41</sup>Ibid. pp. 7-8.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid. July 1875, p. 15.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid. Jan. 1876, p. 17--a front page article.

<sup>44</sup> For example, "Six converts to the true Sabbath were baptized on the 27th ult at Neuchatel. Elder Andrews is much encouraged in his work": ibid. July 1875, p. 16. (See also July 1876, p. 28; Apr. 1877, p. 44). There are other notices about the work of Adventists, though whether these came from Andrews or from Jones' reading of RH has not been determined: see, for example, SM Jan. 1876, p. 20; Apr. 1876, p. 24.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid. Oct. 1877, p. 32.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid. Jan. 1875, p. 3.

<sup>47</sup> The date of Andrews' arrival has not been determined. He had come partly to meet the Ings and Maud Sisley who arrived in Liverpool on 29 November, arriving in London the same day: WRCE, The letters of William and Jenny Ings while in Europe (microfiche), (hereafter cited as Ings Corresp.), 18 Dec. 1877; cp. Ings' letter dated 29 November which says that he intended to spend a few days in Crewe before journeying to London: RH 20 Dec. 1877, p. 195. Andrews had expected them one week before this (RH 3 Jan. 1878, p. 4) and was already in London by 24 Nov. 1877: SM Jan. 1878, p. 69. The whole party left for the Continent on 7 Dec. 1877: Ings Corresp. 18 Dec. 1877.

<sup>48</sup> RH 15 Apr. 1875, p. 124.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid. 3 Jan. 1878, p. 4.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> Andrews Corresp. 2 Jan. 1878. He was unable to pay for them--Ings had not been given the necessary money: an alternative proof-press was purchased at Basel: ibid. 13 Feb. 1878. With typical loyalty, Andrews does not mention the muddle to Review readers who were left with the impression that the purchase had all gone smoothly: RH 3 Jan. 1878, p. 4. Jones also helped in the purchase of a stove on which Mrs. Ings was to improve the diet of the Andrews family: Ings Corresp. 18 Dec. 1877. A glance at the new, improved diet makes one blanch to consider what the old one must have been like.

<sup>52</sup> Strangely, Andrews does not mention his preaching in his account (RH 3 Jan. 1878, p. 4), but Jones gives an extensive summary of a sermon preached on the afternoon of 24 November 1877 in SM Jan. 1878, pp. 69-70. He calls these "notes" of the sermon. Whether they are Andrews' or Jones' is not absolutely clear but the use of Andrews' name in the title and the omission of any reference to Jones suggests the former.

<sup>53</sup> Above, pp. 227-229.

<sup>54</sup> "Ten Great Krupp Guns," SM Apr. 1878, pp. 73-75. Perhaps Andrews had second thoughts about publication for the Review for although he praises the sermon he also finds it wanting on the relationship between grace and law. In Andrews' opinion, Spurgeon rightly stressed that no man is justified by keeping the law, but omitted to warn his hearers that the sacrifice of Christ brings "forgiveness, but not permission to sin." Forgiveness, Andrews reminds his readers, harping back to the theme of an earlier article, is given only when asked of God through our High Priest and is dependent on repentance wrought of the Holy Spirit--and no one "can repent of sins and still persist in them. Repentance that does not produce obedience and rejoice," which is all very well in its place, but on that occasion, would that it also had said to him in the words of Christ, 'Go and sin no more!'" (p. 75)



<sup>55</sup>RH 3 Jan. 1878, p. 4. Andrews evinced a similar spirit towards the clergy of other denominations in his decision to attend a world session of the Evangelical Alliance in Basel in 1879. Unfortunately illness frustrated his plans: ibid. 11 Sept. 1879, p. 93; 30 Oct. 1879, p. 149.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid. 1 Aug. 1878, p. 44.

<sup>57</sup>Ings was to make both these points based on personal experience in an article published in the Review three months later: RH 31 Oct. 1878, p. 141. Ings had been urging an English mission ever since his visit to Southampton in May: RH 11 July 1878, p. 19 and 5 Sept. 1878, p. 87. He also wrote enthusiastically to Jones, who reported his work in SM (July 1878, p. 85; Oct. 1878, p. 104).

<sup>58</sup>RH 1 Aug. 1878, p. 44; the reasons for Wardner's sudden departure from what was apparently successful work in Ireland and Scotland are unclear. The American Sabbath Tract Society, which sent and recalled him, note in their minutes, on his recall, only that they have full confidence in the work he did and regret that he has had to return by reason of the health of his wife and the emptiness of the treasury: SDBIEA, 1:440. He had certainly spent a lot of money on tracts: the British Library contains a set of eight four-pagers claiming to be the fourth edition of 60,000. The tracts were free but postage was requested: Nathan Wardner, The Sabbath . . . [Eight tracts on the Sabbath], Glasgow, Nos. 1-6, 1876, Nos. 7-8, 1877. Andrews appears to have got wind of something by July from Charles B. Barber, a lay associate of Jones' (SM Apr. 1876, p. 24) and reported it to S. N. Haskell and W. C. White: Andrews Corresp. 9 July 1878. The Wardner mission may have been in trouble earlier: the last advertisement for the Glasgow church appeared in SM in Nov. 1876.

<sup>59</sup>RH 15 Aug. 1878, p. 60.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid. 22 Aug. 1878, p. 72.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid. 5 Sept. 1878, pp. 87, 88.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid. 24 Oct. 1878, p. 129.

<sup>63</sup>Andrews Corresp. 19 June 1877.

<sup>64</sup>SDBIEA, 1:206.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid. 1:208.

<sup>66</sup>RH 15 Aug. 1878, p. 60.

<sup>67</sup>SDBIEA, 1:200, 202.

<sup>68</sup>RH 25 Nov. 1873, p. 188.

<sup>69</sup>Ibid. 25 Aug. 1874, pp. 74-75.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid. 25 Nov. 1873, p. 190; cp. his statement made to the SDB General Conference: RH 19 Sept. 1871, p. 108.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid. 17 Oct. 1878, p. 121.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid. 24 Oct. 1878, p. 129.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid. p. 132. Andrews' deeds were as good as his words. His cordial relations with Jones and his welcome for Wardner, is reflected also in his relations with the new Dutch Seventh Day Baptist pastor Gerhard Velthuisen whom Andrews calls "our brother" and with whom he corresponded: RH 15 Aug. 1878, p. 59.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid. 24 Oct. 1878, p. 136.

<sup>75</sup>RH 1 Jan. 1880, p. 18; WRCE, DF2000-a-1(13)

<sup>76</sup>WRCE, The Letters of Ellen G. White, 1847-1915 (photocopied transcripts), (hereafter cited as White Corresp.), 5 Dec. 1878; 22 Jan. 1879. She even named her choice of a wife: Andrews Corresp. 22 Dec. 1878; 27 Jan. 1879.

<sup>77</sup>She regarded this as a major cause of his later troubles: White Corresp. 17 Mar. 1883.

<sup>78</sup>Andrews Corresp. 15 May 1879. Andrews must have been much concerned for "foolish speeches" for he does not mention Oyer in his accounts for the Review: RH 26 June 1879, p. 4; 17 July 1879, p. 28. He also felt exercised enough to write a two paragraph defense of his action in taking Anna Oyer to S. N. Haskell: Andrews Corresp. 23 Dec. 1879. Had the brethren criticized him?

<sup>79</sup>Unless otherwise stated, the account in this paragraph is based on RH 26 June 1879, p. 4.

<sup>80</sup>Fares by the State Line were between \$20 and \$45 less than by other lines, he advised: Andrews Corresp. 23 May 1879.

<sup>81</sup>The account given in the next two paragraphs is based on RH 17 July 1879, p. 28, unless otherwise noted.

<sup>82</sup>See above, p. 236.

<sup>83</sup>WRCE, Letters of John and Anna Loughborough while in England (microfiche), (hereafter cited as Loughb. Corresp.), 18 Feb. 1880.

<sup>84</sup>RH 1 Jan. 1875, p. 6.

<sup>85</sup>Loughb. Corresp. 18 Feb. 1880.

<sup>86</sup>RH 26 June 1879, p. 4.

<sup>87</sup>SM July 1879, p. 126.

<sup>88</sup>"Sabbath Reform," *ibid.* Nov. 1879, p. 147.

<sup>89</sup>*Ibid.* July, pp. 121-128; Oct. pp. 133-136.

<sup>90</sup>RH 17 July 1879, p. 28. A. McLarty ("Loughborough and the Founding of the English Mission, 1879-1883," unpublished paper, Andrews University, 1974, p. 7) has Andrews preparing and delivering a discourse on faith and works on the day of his arrival, but this appears to be a misreading of Loughborough's cryptic entry in his diary for 18 June.

<sup>91</sup>Loughborough had already held a winter campaign beginning with 15 lectures in Shirley Hall, moving to Stanley Cottage when he set up home there: McLarty, pp. 3-4.

<sup>92</sup>The Hampshire Advertiser, 7 July 1879, p. 2; p. 3 carried a gloomy forecast for the harvests if the weather continued; see also 5 July 1879, p. 5.

<sup>93</sup>McLarty, p. 7. Privately, Loughborough admitted to other reasons for taking down the tent--the strain of running a campaign single-handed and the end of the lease on the plot where the tent was pitched: Loughb.

Corresp. 17 July 1879, p. 8. The date of the letter shows that the closure was not a sudden decision, a point borne out by his advertising-- he ceased 15 days before closing: The Weekly Hampshire Independent (hereafter cited as Wkly. Hants. Ind.), 2 Aug. 1879, p. 4.

<sup>94</sup> McLarty, p. 7. It had a hall that could seat 200, as well as 15 other rooms.

<sup>95</sup> Loughb. Corresp. 18 Feb. 1880, p. 1; number of sermons computed from advertisement in Wkly. Hants. Ind. 17 May 1879, p. 4, and McLarty, p. 6.

<sup>96</sup> WRCE, The Diaries of J. N. Loughborough (photocopies), (hereafter cited as Loughb. Diary).

<sup>97</sup> Loughb. Corresp. 17 July 1879, p. 9.

<sup>98</sup> Loughb. Diary. There are as many entries of loans to Andrews as there are to his activities. He left owing £9:11:0. Loughb. Diary, 11 Aug. 1879.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid. 11 Sept. 1879, p. 93. See also letter of 28 Feb. 1880: "I had quite a serious sickness at Brother Loughborough's and had to keep my bed some weeks after my return to Bâle": WRCE, photocopied transcripts from Susan Jacquette Collection, DF2000-a-1(39), hereafter cited only by the number.

<sup>100</sup> Andrews Corresp. 23 May 1880. He intended to spend the summer following up contacts in France.

<sup>101</sup> Loughb. Diary, 26 Jan. 1879.

<sup>102</sup> Loughb. Corresp. 18 Feb. 1880.

<sup>103</sup> Loughb. Diary, *passim*.

<sup>104</sup> The letter is known only from Andrews' reply: Andrews Corresp. 23 May 1880. He must have received it at least a month earlier, for he was already writing to Sister Hall of his plans to return to England by 29 Apr. 1880 (WRCE, DF2000-a-1(39)) and even earlier to the Review: RH 22 Apr. 1880, p. 266.

<sup>105</sup> White Corresp. 22 Jan. 1879.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid. 29 Mar. 1883.

<sup>107</sup> Andrews Corresp. June 1880 to S. N. Haskell; 6 June 1880 to James White; RH 17 June 1880, p. 395, 8 July, p. 46; Loughb. Diary, 26 June 1880.

<sup>108</sup> RH 7 June 1877, pp. 180-181.

<sup>109</sup> Andrews Corresp. 6 June 1880; RH 8 July 1880, p. 36 (written 15 June).

<sup>110</sup> White Corresp. 2 Sept. 1871.

<sup>111</sup> RH 15 July 1875, p. 24.

- <sup>112</sup>Loughb. Corresp. 12 Aug. 1880. The letter is addressed to "Bro. White"; Loughb. Diary makes it clear that it is James White.
- <sup>113</sup>Andrews wrote 3 days later: Andrews Corresp. 15 Aug. 1880.
- <sup>114</sup>Loughb. Corresp. 18 Feb. 1880, pp. 3-4.
- <sup>115</sup>The campaign began 20 June, Andrews arrived 26 June: Wkly. Hants. Ind. 19 June 1880, p. 7; Loughb. Diary.
- <sup>116</sup>Loughb. Diary, 4, 13, 20, 27 July, 3 Aug; Loughb. Corresp. 12 Aug. 1880.
- <sup>117</sup>Loughb. Diary, 24 July 1880. <sup>118</sup>RH 9 Sept. 1880, p. 185.
- <sup>119</sup>Loughb. Diary, 28 Aug. 1880. <sup>120</sup>Ibid. 15 Sept. 1880.
- <sup>121</sup>RH 28 Oct. 1880, pp. 280-281. <sup>122</sup>Loughb. Diary.
- <sup>123</sup>Ibid. <sup>124</sup>RH 4 Jan. 1881, p. 9.
- <sup>125</sup>Loughb. Corresp. 30 Jan. 1881. <sup>126</sup>RH 9 Sept. 1880, p. 185.
- <sup>127</sup>Loughb. Diary, 4, 10, 13, 17, 20, 27, 31 July, 3, 14, 28 Aug. 1880. He did not speak on Sabbaths 24 July or 7 Aug.
- <sup>128</sup>Ibid. 4 July 1880; SM July 1880, p. 196.
- <sup>129</sup>Loughb. Diary, 6 July 1879.
- <sup>130</sup>Ibid. 31 Oct. and subsequent Sundays.
- <sup>131</sup>Wkly. Hants. Ind. 14 Aug. 1880, p. 7; Loughb. Corresp. 12 Aug. 1880.
- <sup>132</sup>Loughb. Diary. No Tuesday or Thursday meetings recorded on 10 Aug. or subsequently.
- <sup>133</sup>In view of the hypothesis of the unrecorded Sunday meeting, it is unwise to claim dogmatically that Andrews' last sermon was preached on 28 Aug., but it was certainly his last Sabbath sermon and Loughborough went with him to seek medical advice on 15 and 20 September: Loughb. Diary.
- <sup>134</sup>The reconstruction in this paragraph is based on Loughb. Diary.
- <sup>135</sup>Loughb. Diary, 24, 29 June, 4, 15, 27 July.
- <sup>136</sup>Loughb. Diary, 10 July (here he gives Ephesians 5 but writes "Christian armour" in shorthand. One can only surmise that the text was a slip of the pen for Ephesians 6), 31 July, 14 & 28 Aug., 17 July.
- <sup>137</sup>Loughb. Diary.
- <sup>138</sup>SM July 1880, p. 196.

139 Henry Veysey accepted the Sabbath after receiving Wardner's Nature's God and His Memorial and the January 1879 issue of SM from a former pupil and corresponding with Jones: SM April 1879, pp. 117-118; Loughborough wrote to him sending him tracts on 16 June, and on 27 June Veysey and his wife began a ten-day visit to the Loughboroughs, towards the end of which Veysey preached at a Sabbath service and a Sunday prayer meeting: Loughb. Diary, 16 June, 27 June-7 July; Loughb. Corresp. 17 July 1879, p. 5. The following January he was a charter member of Loughborough's newly formed Tract Society: McLarty, p. 10. A Christadelphian at the time he became a Sabbath-keeper, he raised up a small company which met in the preparatory school of which he was principal, and which he put at Loughborough's disposal for campaigns in March 1880 and again in 1881: Loughb. Corresp. 17 July 1879, p. 5; 16 Mar. 1881; RH 22 Apr. 1880, p. 268. Loughborough was aware of the possibility of poor relations developing with SDB's if he appeared to be sheep-stealing and asked the Whites not to publish the news of his early contacts, of whom Veysey was one: Loughb. Corresp. 17 July 1879, p. 9. Veysey became an Adventist, for by 1886 he had served as a teacher at Battle Creek: Historical Sketches of the Foreign Missions of the Seventh-day Adventists (Basle, 1886), p. 82 (hereafter cited as Hist. Sk.).

140 SM July 1880, p. 196. Jones and Carpenter and their wives appear to have taken a short holiday in Southampton towards the end of August. They worshipped at Ravenswood on Sabbath 21 August and Jones spoke to the Sabbath School about the progress of the Sabbath cause in Holland which he had recently visited: Loughb. Diary, 21, 24 Aug. 1880; RH 16 Sept. 1880, p. 204; SM Oct. 1880, pp. 205-206, for a written account of Jones' visit to Holland.

141 SM July 1880, p. 196.

142 Loughb. Corresp. 30 Mar., 17 July, 15 Dec. 1879, 4 Apr., 22 Apr. 1880; W. O'Neill, "Records of the Southampton Church," Missionary Worker, 25 July 1924, pp. 9, 24.

143 RH 23 Jan. 1880, p. 60.

144 Ibid. 9 Sept. 1880, p. 185.

145 Ibid. 21 Oct. 1880, p. 265.

146 Ibid. 9 Sept. 1880, p. 185.

147 Ibid. 28 Oct. 1880, pp. 280-281.

148 Ibid.

149 Ibid. 9 Sept. 1880, p. 185.

150 Above, p. 244; Loughb. Diary.

151 Loughb. Diary; RH 22 Apr. 1880, p. 268.

152 RH 21 Oct. 1880, p. 265.

153 Andrews' genius lay much more in his ability to see a good idea and try it out than in his creativity or originality, which Kenneth Wood mistakenly praises (RH 20 Mar. 1875, p. 2). Andrews' placing of an advertisement in the Journal de Genève soon after his arrival in Switzerland (RH 28 Jan. 1875, p. 46) came after he had seen the results of William Jones' advertising in Britain: RH 7 Oct. 1874, p. 14.

154 RH 9 Sept. 1880, p. 185; *ibid.* 21 Oct. 1880, p. 264. He had already described the working of the plan in Switzerland to Ellen White: Andrews Corresp. 23 May 1880. Andrews was not without guile in his request. According to Loughborough, he asked for 2000 in the hope that he would get 1000: Loughb. Corresp. 3 Jan. 1881, pp. 9-10.

155 N. G. Barham, "The Progress of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Great Britain 1878-1974" (Ph.D. thesis, University of Michigan, 1976), p. 63, asserts that by June 1000 copies a month were being circulated but his sources do not bear him out. It would have been strange if Andrews had appealed for 1000 copies a month if that size of circulation had already been reached.

156 RH 9 Sept. 1880, p. 185. A similar appeal was made in his official report to the General Conference (RH 21 Oct. 1880, p. 264). He was at pains there to point out that such a scheme would not burden the Battle Creek treasury. He appears to have remembered the complaints of 1877 that "nearly the whole force of the European mission" was being spent "on a monthly sheet": see above, p. 241.

157 Loughb. Corresp. 7 Apr. 1881. 158 RH 21 Oct. 1880, p. 264.

159 RH 28 Aug. 1879, p. 76. Loughborough had already had printed 14,000 tracts: McLarty, p. 11.

160 RH 23 Jan. 1880, p. 60; Loughb. Corresp. 17 July 1879, p. 8.

161 RH 17 Nov. 1874, p. 166. 162 DF2000-a-1(39) (26 Feb. 1880).

163 See above, pp. 234-235.

164 SM Oct. 1884, p. 480; Apr. 1886, p. 584. A compromise of a British supplement to the Signs had been tried in 1882, the first issue appearing on 15 March. It was marketed as a new publication (Signs of the Times, no. 1) and was published at Southampton. A copy, and an incomplete run of subsequent copies, is available in the British Library (Newspaper Division), Colindale, Middlesex. Barham asserts that the cost of the operation cut the circulation from 1000 to 500 but gives no evidence: Barham, p. 65.

165 Hist. Sk., p. 85. The statistical table from which this figure is computed is unclear--I have assumed that the totals are annual totals despite the word "monthly" written in the column concerned. If the figures are monthly, the total would be 156,000.

166 Andrews Corresp. 7 Aug. 1878.

167 J. N. Loughborough, Rise and Progress of the Seventh-day Adventists (Battle Creek, Michigan, 1892), p. 336.

168 Ings. Corresp. 10 May 1878; SDA Encyclopedia, 1976 ed., p. 647.

169 White Corresp. 18 June 1887.

170 E.g. RH 27 Oct. 1874, p. 142.

171 R. Graybill, "Millenarians and Money: Adventist Wealth and Adventist Beliefs," Spectrum 10 (August 1979): pp. 31-41.

172 SM July 1880, pp. 183-184; July 1882, pp. 327-330.

## THE PIONEER TO GERMANY

Baldur Ed. Pfeiffer

The early scene of the Seventh-day Adventist church in Germany was Vohwinkel in western Prussia. In the middle of the nineteenth century the hills around Wuppertal were the home of numerous independent religious movements. Intensive study of the Scriptures gave cause to the establishment of ever-new pietistic groups. In this general religious atmosphere also developed the "getaufte Christen-Gemeinde" (baptized Christian Church), the forerunner of the German Seventh-day Adventist church.

Sources date the earliest activities of the leader of the "getaufte Christen-Gemeinde," J. H. Lindermann, to 1850. As a weaver he lived a quiet life on one of the hills between Vohwinkel and Elberfeld, the Kiesberg, where on his private estate he operated a small domestic weaving mill. Like Adventists in Switzerland, who enjoyed a certain amount of economic independence, due to their watchmaking and farming professions, early German Adventists found themselves, with their weaving industry, in a similar position.<sup>1</sup>

Lindermann appears in early manuscripts as an independent Bible student. Searching his Bible whenever his loom stood still he discovered one Bible truth after another. An earnest Christian, he demonstrated also the ability of strong leadership, not deviating from his course despite adversity. Because of his spiritual radiancy he gradually attracted a following sharing his views. Having a healthy relationship to relatives and fellow weavers, his group not only developed along spiritual interests but also demonstrated indigenous signs with strong family ties and social contacts.

Since not everyone in his group was literate, the Bible readings in the home of Lindermann proved most important. Since education was not compulsory in Prussia before 1870, Lindermann's followers depended much on his reading the Scriptures to them and interpreting Bible truths. Thus acting without the assistance of the spiritual leadership of any church, the group slowly worked itself through the major Bible topics, discovering by themselves the basic truths of Adventism.

In due time the "getaufte Christen-Gemeinde" gained knowledge of the biblical understanding of baptism; a text-by-text study brought them to the conclusion they were still lacking baptism by immersion. Since no church was known that performed this rite, the group helped themselves. Lindermann first baptized a fellow-believer, Wilhelm Hoffmann, who in turn baptized him. From here on Lindermann baptized all the other members, acting as elder of the group.<sup>2</sup>

Next to baptism by immersion the question of righteousness by faith caused considerable problems. Unclear as to the role works play in the life of a Christian, they concluded that keeping Sunday as well as performing other works was no longer required. While trying to implement this, however, problems were encountered which subsequently led to the discovery of the biblical Sabbath. Though this group still lacked insights in observing the Sabbath properly, after some experimenting they finally arrived at the biblical understanding of keeping Sabbath from sunset to sunset.

For economic reasons some members moved from Vohwinkel to Gladbach on the left side of the Rhine, where Hoffmann apparently functioned as leader, though Lindermann served as the spiritual elder for both churches of about forty members. For a few years a friendly atmosphere characterized their relationship, even though Hoffmann must have established links with a Christian group in Strasbourg and Switzerland in the meantime.



Suddenly the Sabbath question plunged the movement into a crisis. Lindermann, who called all members to a conference to Gladbach, must have been very surprised at the presence of pastors from Strasbourg and Switzerland, who apparently had been invited by Hoffmann. The discussion was characterized by lengthy debates, for the movement dissolved thereafter. Though some members of the Vohwinkel group remained loyal to Lindermann, advocating the keeping of the Sabbath, most members of the group in Gladbach joined Hoffmann in retaining Sunday.<sup>3</sup>

Lindermann's work was very badly shaken but not destroyed. Still of physical strength and strong courage, he began to build up his movement anew. Gradually the "getaufte Christen-Gemeinde" grew in membership up to the former level of about 40 to 50 members, a group existing again in Vohwinkel and one in Gladbach by 1875.

The quiet and organic process of this development, however, was suddenly interrupted a second time, when the Sabbath-keepers in Vohwinkel and Gladbach were informed of the existence of another Adventist movement in Switzerland and America. A beggar, knocking at the door of Lindermann and receiving shelter for a few days had become aware of the existence of the "getaufte Christen-Gemeinde." Continuing his begging along the Rhine, he eventually reached Basel, where he was introduced to James Erzberger, the Swiss Adventist preacher, who had previously attended the General Conference in Battle Creek on behalf of the Swiss Adventists.<sup>4</sup>

The report of this beggar, who apparently could still remember Lindermann's address, must have appeared as an unbelievable surprise to Erzberger. This can be detected in his first inquiry to Lindermann.

I stand near the window and watch the street. What busy activity is there going on. How these people run to and fro, while it is Sabbath today. Now I have been informed by a pilgrim that people in Germany also keep the Sabbath, and I would like to ask for some information whether or not it is so. And should it not be the case, the Word of God shall still remain the truth.<sup>5</sup>

Soon information was exchanged. The Sabbath and the Second

Coming were right away recognized as close affinities, while the fact that Adventists were also successfully running a press in America made a deep impression.

The beggar's information was thus confirmed, and the Swiss brethren sent Lindermann's letter on to Battle Creek. Evidence leads to the conclusion that the letter may have arrived in America before Adémar Vuilleumier's and J. N. Andrews' departure for Europe. The expectations were great in Battle Creek; the missionary-by-invitation looked forward to the establishment of the Seventh-day Adventist church in Switzerland and also in Germany.

J. N. Andrews arrived in Neuchâtel on 16 October 1874. Immediately J. N. Andrews began visiting the Swiss believers while getting ready for the organization of the mission-church. Two weeks after settling in Switzerland the first general meeting was held in Neuchâtel on 1 November 1874, but the organization of the mission did not take place before 31 January 1875, three and a half months after his arrival.<sup>6</sup>

With his advanced knowledge of the situation in Switzerland, Andrews<sup>5</sup> hoped to overcome obstacles created by the collapse of M. B. Czechowski's activities, by the aftermath of Erzberger's cultural shock after his arrival from the United States, and by the precarious financial situation of some believers, who had borrowed \$2000 in gold from American Adventists for their watchmaking business, which had still to be paid back.<sup>7</sup>

The Adventist mission was organized in Switzerland on 31 January 1875. The next day J. N. Andrews and his interpreter, James Erzberger, were on their way to Germany, hoping for an equally quick response. Two days later they arrived in Vohwinkel and were received with all honors. Unfortunately, the initial warm welcome slowly faded away and the mission eventually ended with a crisis for the "getaufte Christen-Gemeinde."

In his first report to the committee of the General Conference

(1875), J. N. Andrews stated clearly the intention of his mission: "Be sure of one thing: I shall do all in my power to have the brethren in Europe one with those in America."<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, it had been his aim to achieve this task as soon as possible, originally planning to stay no longer than two weeks. Yet his initial stay in Germany finally lasted five weeks.

To begin with, the two Sabbath-keeping movements recognized much common ground on a wide range of beliefs. As already mentioned, the most outstanding links proved to be the keeping of the Sabbath and the hope in Christ's second coming. There was also common ground on such teachings as abstaining from alcohol, tobacco and objecting to carrying arms. The prophecies, however, seemed not to have been of great interest to the Germans.

While discussing each other's positions, however, one difference slowly surfaced. In connection with their belief in the second coming of Christ Andrews and Erzberger expected a peaceful millennium in heaven while Lindermann expected it to take place on earth, a minor difference but the tip of an iceberg. Since Lindermann feared that his movement was being taken over by J. N. Andrews and incorporated into the Advent Movement, he retained the discussion on the theological surface and continued to elude the question of peace and war during the millennium. This was easily done, since he had an authoritative text from Scriptures that backed up his position and could not, at least for the time being, be harmonized with the view of the two foreigners.

Thus a basic sociological problem was not tackled and a theological issue not solved. Lindermann cited Isaiah 2:4, "and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks," while Andrews and Erzberger countered with Joel 3:10, "Beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruninghooks into spears." Since both texts take opposite stands,

no final agreement was reached. Lindermann, therefore, stayed aloof, preferring not to join the Seventh-day Adventist church.<sup>9</sup>

Certainly, the question of peace or war was not of such prime importance. It should not have led to such a stalemate. The reason for the differences must rather be sought somewhere else. Most likely the problem lay in Andrews' and Erzberger's lack of time. In their haste they did not give enough consideration to winning the confidence and the heart of the German leader, who had lost his sheep once before. The roots of the problem must be seen in this context, an area causing considerable problems to Andrews. This can easily be detected in his first report to the General Conference committee concerning the Swiss believers:

I found things in a less favorable condition than I had hoped . . . Though I was very kindly received I soon found things were very different from what I had left in America. There, if counsel is given, it will generally, at least, be regarded at once. But here it will be heard respectfully, but most likely without producing the slightest change. Very possibly it will be said that "we cannot think this is so" or "we are obliged to act as the custom is." I tried prudently but faithfully to change or to correct various things, but found it was like ploughing upon a rock. I grieved those that I tried to correct, but produced no change. It seemed that the work of reproof was quite unknown, and wholly misunderstood. I found myself for the time unable to accomplish the work to be done in the case of those that I associated with, for they have no such ideas as mine,<sup>10</sup> and I have not influence to constrain them to act upon my counsel.

Apparently Andrews tried to introduce changes too quickly. He was still unknown and did not yet have the charisma of a leader. Opposition could not be ruled out. As a newcomer he may have had the ability to observe certain wrong behavior, but he still lacked enough insight into the functioning of the social and cultural setting of the German and also the Swiss people. That he was to encounter strong opposition lay in the nature of his mission.

I have found it so difficult to introduce reforms and to correct evil habits that I have not felt it to be wise to make a very special effort in this thing till God should give me greater influence to help things. I have said such plain things on foolish and evil customs here as almost to sour my best friends. But God is opening their eyes, and I am not discouraged.<sup>11</sup>

Certainly, Andrews seems to have forgotten that his own puritanical outlook had not developed overnight. Adventism in America had taken in a number of socio-religious values from its environment and had developed them further since 1844. Transplanting them into European soil would of necessity be a slow process. Yet in the basic premise Andrews was unknowingly right:

Though I speak very strongly concerning the difficulty of changing customs and manners, I do not think there is so great difficulty with respect to their receiving the Sabbath and the Advent doctrine.<sup>12</sup>

Definitely, this is true. It is easier to introduce doctrines than to change customs. And herein lay his basic problem. Andrews had come to Europe with the clear vision of expanding the influence of his church: "My object was to establish a permanent mission in Germany."<sup>13</sup>

With this goal in mind and the short time in which he wanted to accomplish it, he was bound to encounter obstacles. Lengthy sermons, home-visitations, public lectures and long discussions could, of course, not change the Germans overnight. The many tears shed by Lindermann and his followers during Andrews' sermons cannot be reckoned as a basic change of outlook. Yet after just one month Andrews could report that some of the 50 German Sabbath-keepers were ready to join his mission. They even paid all his expenses: travel, advertising, rent and board. "Our work in Germany, therefore, bids fair to be self-sustained at once."<sup>14</sup>

J. N. Andrews was satisfied with the success of his mission. But apparently he failed to notice the problems created within the "getaufte Christen-Gemeinde." First of all he was not able to win over Lindermann. Though he recognized his "native talent," "very great firmness," and "strong combativeness and natural talent of leadership," he was not able to make use of these. When Lindermann tried to save his movement and caused great opposition, Andrews explained it this way: "He is . . . an old man almost in his second childhood . . . I think Satan made him

envious also as he saw the work pass out of his hands."<sup>15</sup>

Certainly, to see his church pass out of his hands was the major cause of Lindermann's apparently strong opposition. Once before he had suffered the very same experience of seeing his flock dwindle. Now he feared losing it once more. However, this time he was too old to start all over again. Though Andrews showed some perception of the problem, he had no way of handling it properly.

Thus Lindermann, at first receptive and cooperative, soon turned to opposition and withdrew behind Isaiah 2:4. While Andrews and Erzberger were busy holding public efforts in and around Vohwinkel, Lindermann rushed over to Gladbach warning his members of the intentions of the two foreigners. His efforts were not in vain for the church in Gladbach imposed a total blockade by not allowing Andrews and Erzberger access to their homes. Years later Erzberger complained that they had to eat their sacklunch on the sidewalks of Gladbach. Thus Gladbach remained loyal to Lindermann, while most of his own people in Vohwinkel joined Andrews' mission. Interestingly enough, even Lindermann's wife and two of his children joined, showing the severity of the tension the mission created.<sup>16</sup>

In the long run the position of the Gladbach group proved to be disastrous for its further development. Lindermann, now an old man, was no longer able to serve their spiritual needs. Disappointed, he also lost track of himself by giving up important principles. Consequently, contacts between Vohwinkel and Gladbach broke off for several years. Only when the members of Gladbach were informed about the spiritual decline of their leader were they alarmed. Over this exchange of information contacts were again established and four members of the Gladbach community eventually joined the first Seventh-day Adventist church in Germany. The demand of rebaptism by Erzberger, however, made their joining difficult. Though they consented, they regretted it long afterwards.<sup>17</sup>

J. N. Andrews and his assistant failed to recognize the sociological dimension in this development. Andrews rather judged: "He [Lindermann] is an old man almost in his second childhood. . . . Satan got advantage of him. . . ." Though this is a harsh and short-sighted interpretation, one must also say in Andrews' defense that he was also concerned for the man. "Nor do I wholly give up Bro. L. He is an old man, who has lead [sic] out alone many years."<sup>18</sup> Yet Lindermann did not return to his post. The "getaufte Christen-Gemeinde" had come to an end; its leader paid a heavy price.

Certainly Andrews was too ambitious in setting up an Adventist branch in Germany. He should have exerted more patience and given time while gaining insights into the historical and sociological developments of the "getaufte Christen-Gemeinde." Lindermann needed time to adjust more than anything else, for the course of events was pressing on him too suddenly. But Andrews being under pressure of success apparently moved too fast, pressing hard for the achievement of his goal and causing affliction rather than gaining support. Even in Switzerland, where contacts with American Adventists had existed since 1868, unity was not achieved without pain, though plenty of information had been exchanged, which made the two groups merge six years later.

While intensifying their contacts with the German Sabbath-keepers, Andrews and Erzberger also made use of holding public evangelistic efforts. Since the state church had barred them from church- and school-buildings, the two preachers were satisfied with obtaining common public meeting-places such as dance-halls. Though the meetings proceeded in an orderly fashion, the preachers reported their astonishment at the custom of drinking beer and smoking while attending religious lectures.<sup>19</sup>

After a five-week intensive visitation and lecturing program Andrews returned to Switzerland. Never before had the German Sabbath-keepers

experienced such intensive discussions on nearly all major Bible topics; never before had they seen their beliefs presented with such vigor to the public. Andrews could finally report that about 50 persons manifested interest in the message of the Seventh-day Adventist church.

James Erzberger, staying behind and nursing the young church, soon ran into ever more restrictions on his public lectures, facing considerable opposition from the authorities and public opinion. This was especially so when the position of the church became ever more evident through publications translated by Erzberger such as: Scripture References, What is Truth?, Which Day do You Keep, and Why?, and Who Changed the Sabbath?.

The initial contacts with the German Sabbath-keepers were eventually crowned with the first Seventh-day Adventist baptism in Germany on 8 January 1876. With the breaking of the ice on a small lake for the baptism of eight persons and the organization of a church in Solingen the same year, the ground was laid for the Seventh-day Adventist church in Germany.<sup>21</sup> One hundred years after the death of the pioneer J. N. Andrews the results of his work in Germany can still be seen and his efforts appreciated.



NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Note by Dorchen Weilenmann. Archiv für Europäische Adventgeschichte, Darmstadt (hereafter cited as AEA), N6-1.

<sup>2</sup>H. Osterburg, "Der Väter Weise," Der Adventbote, 15 Oct. 1958, p. 311.

<sup>3</sup>Weilenmann, AEA, N6-1.

<sup>4</sup>See above, p. 53.

<sup>5</sup>Weilenmann, AEA, N6-1.

<sup>6</sup>Historical Sketches of the Foreign Missions of the Seventh-day Adventists. With Reports of the European Missionary Councils of 1883, 1884, and 1885, and a Narrative by Mrs. E. G. White of Her Visit and Labors in These Missions. Basel, 1886, p. 16f. (hereafter cited as Hist. Sk.).

<sup>7</sup>Baldur Ed. Pfeiffer, The European Seventh-day Adventist Mission in the Middle East 1879-1838 (European University Studies, XXIII, 161, Frankfurt a.M., 1981), p. 23.

<sup>8</sup>Ellen G. White and European SDA Research Centre, Newbold College, Bracknell (hereafter cited as WRCE), DF2000-a-1-e.

<sup>9</sup>H. Osterburg, "Der Väter Weise," Der Adventbote, 1 Jan. 1959, p.9.

<sup>10</sup>WRCE, DF2000-a-1-e. Though this report demonstrated actually Andrews' disability of understanding the mentality and customs of the Swiss believers at this stage, it is cited here as a general demonstration of his limited insight into another cultural setting, since his handling of the German situation a few weeks later followed just the same pattern.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

<sup>14</sup>RH 8 Apr. 1875, p. 116.

<sup>15</sup>WRCE, DF2000-a-1-e.

<sup>16</sup>Notes of Rudolf Dörner, AEA, N6-1.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

<sup>18</sup>WRCE, DF2000-a-1-e.

<sup>19</sup>Hist. Sk., p. 19.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>21</sup>100 Jahre Gemeinschaft der Siebenten-Tags Adventisten in Solingen, p. 5, AEA, G5-6.

THE ITALIAN MISSION IN THE  
TIME OF J. N. ANDREWS

Giuseppe De Meo

From the few European documents concerning the figure of J. N. Andrews, one gets the impression of being confronted by a totally consecrated man. Yet although capable and zealous, his personal prejudices handicapped him as he sought to lead the company of European believers.

From the report he sent to the General Conference following his arrival in Europe, one can get an insight into his personal sentiments:

There [in America] if counsel is given it will generally, at least, be regarded at once. But here it will be heard respectfully, but most likely without producing the slightest change . . . I tried prudently but faithfully to change or to correct various things, but found it was like ploughing upon a rock . . .

If these were Americans I could with God's blessing change their course of life very soon, but it is not thus with Europeans.

Be sure of one thing: I shall do all in my power to have the brethren in Europe one with those in America. I think they wish to be such.<sup>1</sup>

His initial inability to open himself totally to the European mentality must have frustrated his efforts in reaching those desired goals. From the beginning he was preoccupied with the thought that his views or philosophy of life as an American might be opposed to those of his European brethren. He sensed differences: even the newspapers were different.<sup>2</sup>

J. N. Andrews was an intellectual. Nevertheless he was capable of combining his intellectual gifts with a spirit of creativity in the field of practical activity including management. It is important to note at this point two essential factors contributing to his success. First, he did not have to start from scratch, for groups of Sabbath-keepers had already been established through the efforts of M. B. Czechowsky.

Second, being officially sent from an organized church should have given him confidence.

Andrews began by considering the vastness of the territory he was sent to evangelize and by trying to devise a realistic strategy to accomplish the task.<sup>3</sup> Having first publicly distanced himself from M. B. Czechowsky,<sup>4</sup> he concentrated his efforts principally on Switzerland and Germany.<sup>5</sup> Only when this had been done did he find much time for Italy. As his health declined, Andrews' energies were more and more reserved for the publishing work and for the brethren in Switzerland.<sup>6</sup> Judged by this brief outline, it appears that Italy was not high on Andrews' list of priorities but that should not lead us to ignore his contribution and the work that he started there.

Preaching in Italy, particularly in the southern sector around 1877-1882, seems to have developed according to the general plan established by Andrews for Europe.

From the smallest of beginnings, the Italian mission experienced a period of encouraging growth followed by a partial decline, characterized by a possible lack of enthusiasm.

Upon his arrival in Europe in 1874, J. N. Andrews contacted Sister Caterina Revel at Torre Pellice (Sister Caterina Revel, incidentally, was the only Seventh-day Adventist living in Italy at that time). At their meeting, attempts were made to re-establish good working relations with sympathizers of the S.D.A. cause, particularly with Elder Ferraris.<sup>7</sup>

In spite of these contacts, church membership was not increased. However, the situation was soon to change. In the June of that year, Andrews sent from Switzerland to a Mrs. Bofantini, whom we have not been able to identify, a copy of The Health Reformer, which she sent on to her brother who then sent it to a Dr. Zimple in Naples. Dr. Zimple, after

reading the periodical, took an interest in it and wrote to the editor. His name subsequently appeared in the magazine and was noticed by Rev. William Mead Jones, the influential pastor of the Seventh Day Baptist Church in London. At that time Jones was not only responsible for the Mill Yard church, but also editor of a paper called the Sabbath Memorial. He sent Dr. Zimple some publications of the Seventh-day Adventist church concerning the Sabbath and some copies of his own paper. Dr. Zimple's interest did not go beyond his mere curiosity, but he thought that the material might interest an acquaintance of his, Dr. Herbert Panmere Ribton, who was an Irish doctor, an ex-professor of Hebrew at the University of Dublin, and at that time a resident of Naples.

Ribton was a member of the Methodist church, but this did not prevent him from studying Bible topics proposed by other religious movements. Thus, for a brief time, Jones and Ribton began to exchange letters and information on religious problems in general and on the Sabbath question in particular. It was not long before Ribton was a Sabbath-keeper.

Shortly after, the two men went into print together. A booklet, printed in Naples in Italian, was published simultaneously both in Naples and in London. Its title was The Seventh Day, an Appeal to all Christian Bretheren of all Denominations. Bearing the date January 1877, it is an appeal to believers of all denominations to study and accept the rediscovery that the seventh-day Sabbath is the day of rest. The paper was pompously endorsed with the name of "The Seventh-Day Christian Church" which was, at that time, only in the hopes and aspirations of the two editors. Ribton and Jones hoped that in beautiful Italy all believers would show themselves ready to walk rightly according to God's statutes.

It was Jones who put Ribton in touch with Seventh-day Adventists and Ribton was soon corresponding with both J. N. Andrews and James White and accepting all the doctrines of the church. On White's suggestion,

Andrews went to Naples and there baptized the Ribtons and their daughter in 1877 near Pozzuoli.<sup>8</sup> A new chapter in Seventh-day Adventist history had begun.

Ribton had come to Naples because of the health of his daughter Nina. As a physician, he was in a good position to work for the foreign community in Naples. After his conversion he embarked on his pastoral ministry. He began his work, which was quite intense, by public preaching. He engaged in public debates, home visitations and a large correspondence with people in the various countries of Europe (including Russia), and America. He also engaged in editorial work, translating many pamphlets from English into Italian. In addition, he probably published some works whose authors were unknown.<sup>9</sup>

Although he was involved with the movement for only a short period, his successes in organizing and spreading the faith won for him the title of leader of the Italian S.D.A. Mission.<sup>10</sup> In order to receive support in his efforts, Dr. Ribton gathered around him a number of brethren who were willing to help him in preaching the gospel message.

Ribton was aided by Romualdo Bertola, an established itinerant preacher, and also hoped to send to north Italy a man by the name of Garofano who was preparing for the ministry. Of this dear friend, Ribton remarked, "he is the most patient Christian that I ever came across."<sup>11</sup> Prof. Antonio Biglia also contributed much to the success of the movement. Of him Ribton wrote, "he is not perfect, but he is very well taught in his Bible, very intelligent and thoroughly honest."<sup>12</sup> Biglia would be the one to succeed him when he left for Alexandria in Egypt. Other assistants included two women and a man who helped with Ribton's correspondence and other practical matters.

With the help of these loyal and dedicated assistants, Ribton's mission soon spread to different parts of Italy and by 1877 he even

invited Andrews to consider the possibility of leaving Basel in order to establish the central headquarters for the European Adventist church in Naples.<sup>13</sup> He was certainly enthusiastic about the way the work was going.

In a letter dated 8 October 1878, and sent to James White, president of the General Conference, Ribton reports:

We have already in Italy, three distinct centers . . . one here, one at Bari and one at Corleto in Calabria . . . a young brother who received the Spirit in our hall is working faithfully and reports in two months ten who have heard the truth for the first time and have taken it up.<sup>14</sup>

So far, we know about the Corleto group only from this letter but more details are available about the community in Bari. There was in this city a Protestant church belonging to the Baptist Apostolic Union. It appeared to have experienced some difficulty. Some members appealed to the Italian Free Church requesting a new minister. In response to their request, Pastor Ercole Volpi was chosen.

Ercole Volpi had prepared himself for the ministry in Milan from 1867-1870 under the guidance of Francesco Lagomarsino and Oscar Cocorda at the school directed by William Clark. Upon completion of his studies he entered the ministry. By 1874 he was in the city of Carrara where he also directed a church school. In that year he separated himself from the Italian Free Church and associated with the Baptists.<sup>15</sup>

After his arrival in Bari, Volpi contacted Dr. Ribton in Naples and then J. N. Andrews at Basel. Today's information is not sufficient enough to discover the reason for his corresponding with these two men.<sup>16</sup> However, what is known for certain is that they both had trust and confidence in his work, so much so that he was almost ready to accept the Adventist message.

On 28 June 1878, he wrote a letter to J. N. Andrews, which in turn was mailed to America.<sup>17</sup> Volpi began by thanking Andrews for his interest and response to his questions relating to Sabbath observance. Having been

confronted by church members themselves, Pastor Volpi goes on to say: "I perceive that the spirit of truth is aiding us to guide one another in the investigation of all that concerns the doctrine and the object of the Commandments of God, and our duty, contained in them, to observe the Sabbath." Volpi mentions that there were seven who had begun to hold meetings on Saturday, including a woman from Manduria, of the province of Lecce. For a long period of time it had been reported that she had been secretly faithful to the gospel:

Among the brethren who compose my church there are some who uphold the observance of the Sabbath, and set a truly practical example by the manner in which they observe it themselves. There are some others who fully recognize it, but are still compelled to work on that day because they are placed under the authority of others. Among these is a brother in the army.

I and my wife along with two brothers and two sisters in Christ have commenced holding special worship on the Sabbath, in my home in which a widowed sister aged 58 has also taken part, who was baptized on the 16th. She was convinced a few days previously, equally and at the same time both with regard to baptism and also the observance of the Commandments, with regard to which she had not been able to obtain information in her solitary abode at Manduria, Province of Lecce, where for some years past she had held the Gospel of Christ, although persecuted and alone in her profession of the truth that has buried under such a mass of false doctrine. She is happy now to be able to return to her country after having received and recognized the commandments of God and His Son Jesus Christ.<sup>18</sup>

Answering Andrews' request for a meeting, Volpi warned that his church members might be against the creation of any new Protestant denominations in their city. Consequently, he proposed that they meet in Naples. He even suggested possible topics for consideration: "If it is permitted to me to meet with you, I want to speak about what are the best means for facilitating the propagation and the acceptance of the Commandments of God and of the observance of the Sabbath." He goes on to suggest that "an ordinary tract in two columns" be published "having on the right the Decalogue according to the Vulgate edition, and on the left the translation as made by Diodati."

Volpi remained in contact with Ribton even after the latter's

departure for Egypt, continuing to preach on Sabbath observance. His name appeared on the first S.D.A. Italian quarterly, L'Ultimo Messaggio, until the year 1884,<sup>19</sup> when he was connected with a group of Italians who had doctrinal questions. After 1884, his name no longer appears on church documents but it is important to note that, according to oral testimony, the Bari community remained faithful to the Sabbath although remaining completely independent of the Seventh-day Adventist church. This continued up to the first decade of the twentieth century.

While Volpi worked in Bari, Ribton was busy in Naples where a church of twenty-two adults had been formed.<sup>20</sup> In 1878 this group made an appeal for funds in order to rent a new place for worship. The letter, published in the Review & Herald, also includes a list of the major Adventist doctrines these brethren freely accepted, and they speak lovingly of the "apostolic zeal" of Ribton, their leader.<sup>21</sup>

Ribton was soon to leave, however, and from the end of 1878, or at least from the first few days of 1879,<sup>22</sup> the church had no resident pastor. The community at Naples had demonstrated a great deal of drive in its evangelistic endeavors throughout Italy and abroad and it is difficult to understand why the pastoral work on the Italian peninsula did not receive attention from Basel and Battle Creek. Ribton did his best to fill the gap by writing to the believers in Naples and Bari.<sup>23</sup>

A transitional leader, a lawyer by the name of Tongobardi, was chosen by the Naples group.<sup>24</sup> He would later be succeeded by Prof. Antonio Biglia, one of a number of accomplished intellectuals who supported the church at this time. Perhaps, if Andrews had taken a more active interest in these intellectuals, the Italian mission would have been more successful. Biglia was still pastor of the Naples church when he was called by B. L. Whitney to represent the Italian Adventists at the first European Adventist conference at Bienne in Switzerland in 1884,<sup>25</sup> a point which may



have caused some jealousy on the part of Ercole Volpi.

Following the Bienne Conference Biglia and Daniel T. Bourdeau made a trip to the region of Puglia and reported that Volpi remained faithful and continued to preach with personal conviction on Sabbath observance and the second coming of Jesus.<sup>26</sup> Had he been called to participate in the Bienne Conference, he would have been able to meet and exchange ideas with his colleagues and receive support and encouragement, and the Bari community might not have gone independent.

The Italian mission was thus not free from periods of perplexity and tension; the distance between Naples and Basel was not only geographical.

From Italy, the Adventist message spread to other parts of south-east Europe and the Mediterranean, primarily through the activities of Romualdo Bertola. Born of Jewish parentage and an active member of the Italian Free Church,<sup>27</sup> Bertola became a Seventh-day Adventist, sold his business, and became a self-supporting missionary. His work took him not only to Italy but also to Egypt, Greece, Turkey, Malta and Rumania, where in 1884 he helped organize the first Adventist church at Pitesti with the help of A. C. Bourdeau. Even at that stage, the Italian brethren were still interested in the work and Biglia visited the believers there.<sup>28</sup> Bertola's first foreign mission, however, was Egypt where he went in 1875,<sup>29</sup> and soon had small communities of baptized members in Alexandria and Cairo.<sup>30</sup>

An account book belonging to J. N. Andrews attests to the fact that this Egyptian mission was dependent upon the Italian believers and for this reason Ribton might have sensed the importance of going to Egypt in order to preach, for more English was found spoken there at this time. Upon his arrival in Egypt, Ribton opened a school for European children. He then encountered difficulties and wrote to Andrews seeking his advice

about appointing Prof. Antonio Biglia as director. Originally generous and supportive,<sup>31</sup> Andrews appears to have lost patience at this point, became convinced that Ribton had gone to Egypt because of personal interests and accused him of painting too rosy a picture of prospects in Egypt.

The expense of Dr. Ribton has given me great distress. He managed the matter in such a way that it seemed impossible for me to avoid the expenses of his removal to Alexandria.<sup>32</sup>

He continued to write such appeals with respect to the progress of the work in Alexandria, the need of his wife's assistance in the work and the sad condition of his daughter that I finally consented to incur the expense of their passage. He had said so much of the number and excellence of the friends in Alexandria that I supposed the most of his subsequent expenses, or much of it, would be paid by them.

But after a time came a piteous appeal for help to pay the freight on her goods and then still later he was sick and in great distress for some help.

Then it began to come out that there was not more than a mere handful of true friends in Alexandria and that they were very poor and that there was no interest to hear the truth by the Italians . . . he had presented things in a false light and . . . much money had been lost by this.<sup>33</sup>

In December 1878 he had told Review readers that he thought it Ribton's duty to go to Egypt.<sup>34</sup> Twelve months later he had changed his mind and was still reproaching Ribton in May 1880.<sup>35</sup>

Before the rift could be healed, Ribton and two Italian associates<sup>35</sup> were brutally murdered during a demonstration against the European presence in Egypt on 11 June 1882. They were returning from distributing religious literature among sailors.<sup>36</sup> The memory of their martyrdom contributed much to the firm establishment of the Seventh-day Adventist church in nineteenth-century Egypt.

When J. N. Andrews came to Europe to interest men's minds in the Adventist message there were many competing voices. Nationalism, with the

achievement of the unification of Italy and Germany, attracted many. The Catholic church at the first Vatican Council sought to grapple with the problems of a swiftly changing society. Evolution and Marxism in their different ways attracted some and worried others. In Italy, Protestant preaching sought to respond to the changing spiritual needs of the new nation, and it is within this context that the doctrines of the Adventist church were first proclaimed. By 1880 a firm foothold had been established in the south of the country largely by Italians or people resident in Italy (like Ribton) but with help and guidance from Basel and Battle Creek. In my opinion, however, Andrews and the other General Conference brethren would have seen even greater progress had they cooperated more fully with the leaders of the growing communities of believers. Perhaps a better judgment can be made when we know more about the membership and activities of these communities.

NOTES

- <sup>1</sup>Ellen G. White S.D.A. Research Centre Europe, Newbold College, Bracknell (hereafter cited as WRCE), DF2000-a-1-e, pp. 1, 2, 11, 12.
- <sup>2</sup>The Advent Review and Herald of the Sabbath (hereafter cited as RH), 17 Nov. 1874, p. 166. The believers were also different: Ibid. 14 Oct. 1875, p. 166.
- <sup>3</sup>Ibid. 17 Nov. 1874, p. 164; 28 Jan. 1875, p. 36; 4 Feb. 1876, p. 70.
- <sup>4</sup>Ibid. 8 July 1873, p. 29; 23 Sept. 1875, p. 92; Les Signes des Temps, Jan. 1880.
- <sup>5</sup>RH 24 Nov. 1874, p. 166; 4 Mar. 1875, pp. 75-76.
- <sup>6</sup>Ibid. 23 Aug. 1881, p. 138; 31 Jan. 1882, pp. 72-73; 14 Nov. 1882, p. 713; 18 Apr. 1878, p. 124.
- <sup>7</sup>Ibid. 20 Sept. 1877, p. 100.
- <sup>8</sup>Ibid. 9 Aug. 1877, p. 52; see also Giuseppe De Meo, Granel di Sale: Secolo di Storia della Chiesa Cristiana Adventista del 7° Giorno in Italia, 1864-1964 (Torino, 1980), pp. 71-90.
- <sup>9</sup>Les Signes des Temps, Oct. 1881, p. 255, has a list of books sold by the Seventh-day Adventists. In a book found in the National Library of Florence (foundation Guicciardini, cat. 8, 1<sup>2</sup>8XXIII), Il Sabato per Elihu, which must have been translated by the Naples' group under Ribton's guidance, there is a list of the books published by the SDA society of Basilea. Two pamphlets, La Grande Statua di Daniele 2 and Le Quattro Bestie di Daniele, do not appear on the 1881 Les Signes list. They might have been written by Ribton: WRCE, Letters of H. P. Ribton, 1877-1879 (microfiche) (hereafter cited as Ribton Corresp.), 24 Oct. 1877. Several protestant writers published pamphlets on the Sabbath issue: Della Santificazione della Domenica, Ossia della Sola Festa Ordinata da Dio (Firenze, 1860); Societa' di Giovani Cristiani in Torino, Il Giorno di Riposo (Torino, 1879); Francesco Sciarelli, Resoconto della Prima Assemblea Generale degli Evangelici di Roma, in Favore dell'Osservanza del Giorno di Riposo (Londra, 1882, 1883); idem. Il Giorno della Gioia, Manuale d'Istruzione sul Giorno di Riposo (Roma, 1882); Il Sabato, Trasferito per Autorità Divina dal Settimo al Primo Giorno della Settimana. Estratto dai Discorsi di Daniele Wilson (Napoli, 1883). In 1884 the group of Italian SDA's of Naples published a new pamphlet: E. L., Il Giorno del Signore, Risposta all'Opuscolo il Sabato Cristiano di Daniele Wilson (Napoli, 1884). The Protestant church soon answered with other publications: La Bibbia sulla Questione del Giorno del Riposo (Napoli, 1884); Il Giorno del Riposo, Trasferito per Autorità divina dal Settimo al Primo Giorno della Settimana. Tesi e Ragionamenti (Napoli, 1884); Il Giorno del Riposo (Firenze, 1st ed. 1887, 2nd ed. 1888). Pastor F. Sciarelli wrote in 1887, "We found ourselves in the necessity of defending Sunday from a small nucleus of Sabbatarrians, that in Naples, with great zeal, said and wrote that Sunday is an arbitrary and sinful institution. Mr. Lombardi wrote

to me saying that these sectarian opinions that Adventists try to spread among believers concerning Sabbath observance, should be fought . . . It is deplorable to see sincere hearts being upset by such sectarian opinions, without knowing how to fight them. It would be necessary for a special publication to be edited for such a purpose" (I Miei Ricordi [Salerno, 1887], p. 300). Pastor Oscar Cocorde writes in the same terms in his review L'Ape Biblica, May 1887, p. 21: "the question of the Sabbath is now debated even in Italy. The Sabbatarians have started a work of propaganda and they already have some followers. On this subject meetings have been held and some pamphlets pro and con their theory have been published." Cp. Fra Pietro (Arbanasich Pietro), Senza Stiracchiare: una Risposta alle Domande dei Sabatisti (Napoli, 1886).

<sup>10</sup>The phrase "Italian Mission" is Andrews: "Grand Livre a J. N. Andrews" (an account book), pp. 54, 68. Archives of the Euro-Africa Division of Seventh-day Adventists, Bern (hereafter cited as EADA).

<sup>11</sup>Ribton Corresp. 18 Mar. 1878.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

<sup>13</sup>Ribton Corresp. 13 Sept. 1877; in RH 4 July 1878, p. 13, he writes of interests in Torino, Genova, Bari and Sicily. In the same paper (p. 13) Andrews says, "the labor necessary to instruct men in the truth is greater here than in America."

<sup>14</sup>Ribton Corresp. 8 Oct. 1878.

<sup>15</sup>Giorgio Spini, L'Evangelo e il Berretto Frigio: Storia della Chiesa Christiana Libera in Italia, 1870-1904 (Torino, 1971), pp. 35-38, 55, 56, 79.

<sup>16</sup>Volpi might have had only a theological interest at this time.

<sup>17</sup>Ribton Corresp. 28 June 1878.

<sup>18</sup>EADA, [J. N. Andrews], "Responses [sic] aux Questions d'une [sic] Frère Italian [sic]." J. N. Andrews answers here five questions certainly raised by Elder Ercole Volpi. In the same manuscript there is a long article on the sanctuary question. Cp. G. De Meo, Il Messaggero Avventista, Apr. 1872, pp. 42-43. On E. Volpi see Les Signes [des Temps], Apr. 1878, p. 175.

<sup>19</sup>L'Ultimo Messaggio, Giornale Religioso Trimestrale Pubblicato dalla Società degli Avventisti del 7 Giorno. E' Consacrato alla Spiegazione degli Uomini per questo Glorioso Avvenimento (Basilea, Napoli, 1884, 1887). For a long time, both Biglia and Volpi cooperated. It is interesting to notice that the SDA church was organized in 1863 but in this paper it is said to be a "society."

<sup>20</sup>Historical Sketches of the Foreign Missions of the Seventh-day Adventists (Basel, 1886), p. 33.

<sup>21</sup>RH 6 June 1878, pp. 180-181.

<sup>22</sup>Ribton Corresp. 10 Mar. 1879; 5 Apr. 1879.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

<sup>24</sup>RH 6 Mar. 1879, p. 76.

<sup>25</sup> M. E. Olsen, A History of the Origin and Progress of the Seventh-day Adventists (Washington, D.C., 1925), p. 314.

<sup>26</sup> RH 9 Dec. 1884, p. 779; Spini, p. 139. See also RH 16 Dec. 1884, p. 797; 27 Jan. 1885, p. 59.

<sup>27</sup> Spini, p. 164.

<sup>28</sup> Dumitru Popa, "M. B. Czechowski in Romania," in Michael Belina Czechowski 1818-1876, ed. R. L. Dabrowski & B. B. Beach (Warsaw, 1979), p. 348.

<sup>29</sup> RH 4 July 1878, pp. 12-13.

<sup>30</sup> Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, 1976 ed., p. 60. It was while here that he met Sabbath-keeping Greeks who gave him names and addresses to start a mission to Greece: RH 3 Apr. 1879, pp. 108-109.

<sup>31</sup> Between Oct. 1878 and July 1880 Ribton and his wife received a total of 4,793.85 golden francs including his fare paid by the General Conference: EADA, "Grand Livre à J. N. Andrews," p. 68; Olsen, p. 306.

<sup>32</sup> Andrews Corresp. 23 Dec. 1879.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid. fo. 119.

<sup>34</sup> RH 12 Dec. 1878, p. 192.

<sup>35</sup> Andrews Corresp. 23 May 1880. In this letter he quotes the unsolicited support of Ellen White for his point of view.

<sup>36</sup> Seventh-day Adventist Encyclopedia, 1976 ed., p. 1217.

## THE MISSIONARY EDITOR

Bernard J. Sauvagnat

One month after arriving in Switzerland, J. N. Andrews gathered the believers together at Le Locle on 15 November 1874. Among the decisions that were taken was the raising of 2,000 F. to publish tracts in French. Eighteen thousand francs was collected; the rest would come later.<sup>1</sup> So began the work of S.D.A. publications in the French language.<sup>2</sup>

J. N. Andrews had a good reading knowledge of French. At the end of 1870, he wrote to Ellen G. White that he had just stopped, upon her counsel, reading three chapters of the Bible in French every day. He estimated that it was not really more difficult than if he had done it in English, and said that it took him 30 to 40 minutes every day.<sup>3</sup> In his first European report to the Review and Herald he confirmed that for several years he had had a good reading knowledge of French.<sup>4</sup> But he felt that one of his top priorities was to acquire a better knowledge of the language in order to be able to preach, write and publish in French. Frequently he wrote about his efforts and the difficulty of reaching this objective.<sup>5</sup>

Andrews read the newspapers. After only a week in Switzerland, he felt that the European papers did not give reports of what was going on in America. So he asked the American brethren to send him American papers to be better informed.<sup>6</sup> He was well aware of the services a newspaper could render to his mission. He prepared a short notice to explain his objectives and to ask those Christians who observed the seventh-day sabbath to contact him. He paid for it to be published in several papers of Europe in several successive editions,<sup>7</sup> and a few weeks later he stated that he had received two answers.<sup>8</sup>

To these people, and to all those with whom he got in touch, he gave tracts, but little by little he felt the need of publishing a regular paper to instruct both believers and unbelievers, to defend his church's doctrines and to refute opposing theories. In August 1875, he wrote:

My first great object to accomplish in Switzerland is the publication of a paper in French. The most, even of our own people here in this country, can have no real idea of the work in America as our publications are all in English with the exception of a few tracts. The day which witnesses the publication of a paper in French on behalf of the cause of truth will mark a new era here. The time is at hand when with God's blessing we will have this.<sup>9</sup>

This wish was supported by the General Conference in its session of 16 August 1875, which recommended the establishment of a publications office in Europe.<sup>10</sup>

During the second general business meeting in Switzerland held in Bienne on 12 December 1875, the matter was discussed and approved. Financial help from America was expected but the Swiss brethren agreed to put into practice a plan of systematic benevolence and raised at once \$460. A tract and missionary society was also created.<sup>11</sup>

Financial and human help came from America. The General Conference sent \$2,000 and James White exhorted the American believers to give within the year 1876 \$100 per family, if possible, in the hope of raising \$10,000 to establish the publishing work in Europe.<sup>12</sup> D. T. Bourdeau and family arrived in early spring and began working in Le Locle. One of their first converts was Louis Aufranc, a school teacher, who joined Andrews when he moved to Basel to launch the paper.

The city of Basel was chosen because of its reputation for religious publication; Andrews had been disappointed with the work done by printers in Neuchâtel for some of his tracts and hoped to find better quality printers in Basel. The geographical situation of the city was also considered favorable for circulation, near, as it was, to the French and German borders.<sup>13</sup>



Perhaps nothing revealed Andrews' reliance upon his American heritage more than the first issue of the paper. Its title, Les Signes des Temps, was the French equivalent of his church's first, and revered, paper. Its page size (12" x 17.5") conformed to its American namesake after Andrews had been dissuaded by the General Conference Committee from using a smaller size (10" x 4").<sup>14</sup> The layout in four columns reflected American rather than Swiss practice,<sup>15</sup> while an American prophetic chart, untranslated in order to save the expense of making a new plate, was further evidence to readers of the foreign origin of the publication.

The work of composition was nearly completed in the early part of June and the 2,000 copies came off the press the first week of July. The bill paid to the printer, G. A. Bonfantini, amounted to \$54, and the price of subscription was set at 5 F. for one year or 12 issues (\$1.15).<sup>16</sup>

Seventh-day Adventists were clearly identified as the sponsors of the paper on its front page. The committee responsible for publication (Andrews, Albert Vuilleumier and J. E. Dietschy) was named, and an editorial address given, while on page 4 (the editorial page, following Review and Herald convention) the responsible editors (James White, Andrews and Uriah Smith) were listed under another identifying text: "Hereux ceux qui font ses commandements." There follow three editorials, all by Andrews, explaining the nature of the paper, and outlining the cardinal beliefs and activities of both Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh Day Baptists,<sup>17</sup> while on the back page Andrews and D. T. Bourdeau made a statement about the purpose of the Seventh-day Adventist mission to Europe. News about the extension of the Advent message was given in an article (again following

Review and Herald practice) entitled "Progrès de la cause" (p. 6); the Sabbath was again stressed in a two-column article by the newly converted Louis Aufranc. The eschatological bent of the paper can be seen in two poems ("Le Temps est court"--a free translation of one that appeared in the first edition of the Signs of the Times,<sup>18</sup> and "Regardez en haut" by Louis Aufranc), and in several shorter pieces, including one by Andrews on the Kingdom of God. The reader thus had ample opportunity to acquaint himself with the major emphases of Adventists and to see them as coming from a group of Christians belonging to the minority churches which stemmed from the Reformation, with a rather fundamentalist approach to the Bible and with a major interest in eschatology and fidelity to God's commandments.

The major articles increased that acquaintance. Nearly a quarter of the paper (22%) is occupied by an article by James White on the millennium, an article that had already been published twice in the American Signs of the Times.<sup>19</sup> Twenty percent is devoted to an introductory article<sup>e</sup> by Uriah Smith on the prophecies, together with "A Pictorial Illustration of the Visions of Daniel and John" (in English) borrowed from the SDA Publishing Association of Battle Creek, Michigan. The size of the illustration and of the article stressed its importance in the mind of the editor. This is confirmed by the summary of the articles that appeared on page 8 where this article is said to concern "les sujets les plus importants sur lesquels nous désirons attirer l'attention du lecteur dans la suite." Smith's article was prefaced by a short piece by D. T. Bourdeau which sought to encourage readers to study the prophecies; it was entitled: "Pensées sur les prophéties. Possibilité et importance de comprendre les prophéties."

A further 12.5% is taken up by a devotional article by Ellen G. White on Christ's sufferings that had appeared in the Signs of the Times

of 25 November 1875,<sup>20</sup> and there are a number of shorter devotional articles and exhortations. Finally, three articles on generosity (by Butler, Huntley and Haskell) and two on temperance reflect not only traditional Adventist concerns but also the problems Andrews was facing with the Swiss believers.<sup>21</sup>

From this short analysis, we conclude that Andrews wanted to give a message where eschatology had the main place, but where the law of God and the sufferings of Jesus were uplifted; he wanted to urge his readers to a life of obedience, generosity and temperance. He was aware that this message was not very popular and answered in advance the criticisms that he was judging other Christians by his teaching,<sup>22</sup> and announced his intention never to use anger in an argument.<sup>23</sup>

The lay-out was very simple: 8 pages of 4 columns each. Every main article has a title one column wide, centered, in capital letters, and is separated from the following one by an ornamental border. There are no illustrations except the big prophetic chart in the middle of page 5. Space at the bottom of four columns (col. 4, page 3; col. 4, p. 7; col. 1, p. 8; col. 3, p. 8) is filled with thoughts probably chosen by the editor.

The type face is predominantly Bodoni, 10 points body, 11 points space, with a justification of 14 ciceros. The titles are of the same body in heavy capital type. Some Biblical texts are in smaller type, heavy Bodoni, 7 points body, and some phrases, and the addresses, are in Caslon italic 10 points body. Some paragraphs have a narrower space (10 instead of 11). The general impression is one of clarity and good taste. The paper is easy to read in spite of the lack of blank spaces.

The language was a serious problem for J. N. Andrews. He thought that it was necessary to publish in the best possible French, but much of

his material came from America. Just over half this issue had to be translated. We know that Louis Aufranc, D. T. Bourdeau and J. N. Andrews took part in this work.<sup>24</sup> It would be interesting to know who translated what and to compare their translations with the original English and measure their ability in this difficult task. Lack of time and documents prevented us from doing so. Though Andrews wrote that D. T. Bourdeau's help was "invaluable,"<sup>25</sup> it is evident that both thought it better for him to start evangelistic work in Southern France than to stay in editorial work in Basel.<sup>26</sup>

The rest of the paper was originally written in French: by A. C. Bourdeau, the brother of D. T. Bourdeau,<sup>27</sup> Louis Aufranc and J. N. Andrews. In A. C. Bourdeau's articles we could find no mistakes. In those of D. T. Bourdeau, we find a mistake of tense: (p. 4, col. 4, l.17): "Les propheties sont comparées à une chandelle qui a brillé dans un lieu obscur." The present tense "qui brille" should have been used, for the perfect tense indicates here that the candle does not give light any more, and that is certainly not the idea that D. T. Bourdeau wanted to convey in this article! His 15th paragraph begins with a heavy sentence, the meaning of which is not very clear.

We could not find any grammatical mistake in J. N. Andrews' contributions; some expressions seem a bit strange to a French mind today but it is very difficult to state whether they are French archaisms or Americanisms. It would be useful in that matter to compare an article written in French and one translated from English into French by J. N. Andrews.

In the letter of Louis Aufranc published on pp. 6-7, there is a sentence just at the beginning of the paragraph in the middle of the first column of p. 7, which gave some perplexity to J. N. Andrews. Louis Aufranc had originally written: "La substitution du samedi au premier jour de la semaine," instead of what is correctly printed: "La substitution du

premier jour de la semaine au samedi." In this case, J. N. Andrews had to convince both D. T. Bourdeau and Louis Aufranc that it was not correct.<sup>28</sup>

It seems that Andrews did most of the work of proof-reading himself. Later on his daughter, Mary, and Louis Aufranc participated in this difficult task.<sup>29</sup> Besides the usual duties of an editor, then, Andrews had to cope with "composing, translating, reading proof, looking after the details of all sorts, mailing papers, etc, etc."<sup>30</sup>

Except for a few trips to Italy, France and England, Andrews remained in Basel until his departure to attend the General Conference that began on 4 October 1878 in Battle Creek, Michigan. During these two years, his main task was to publish the paper regularly. Every month, 2,000 copies came from the press. After sending out the fifth issue, he stated that he had 400 addresses in Switzerland, Italy, France, Germany, Holland, Poland, England, Canada and the United States. Every month, he had new addresses, and received letters from persons that wanted to subscribe to the paper.<sup>31</sup> About a year later, he said that Les Signes des Temps was being sent to many parts of France, Jersey and Guernsey, the West Indies, various places in Africa, Canada and the U.S.A. Altogether, he now had nearly 400 subscribers.<sup>32</sup> The report of the Annual Conference of Seventh-day Adventists in Switzerland showed that the four missionary societies of Tramelan, Bienne, Le Locle and Basel had distributed 821 copies of Les Signes up to 30 August 1878.<sup>33</sup>

At the beginning of 1877, Andrews received the \$8,000 collected in America. The Swiss brethren sustained the paper with generosity, and

most of the readers paid by subscription, so the financial state of the paper was healthy.<sup>34</sup>

In the spring of 1877, needing to buy the paper necessary for the next six months, he asked the Secretary of the General Conference for \$500, explaining his efforts to stimulate the brethren in Europe so that the work would become and remain financially self-supporting. He hoped to receive between 1,000 and 1,500 F. at the time of the renewing of subscriptions in July and August.<sup>35</sup>

In July 1877, he reported that nearly all the readers in Switzerland, Alsace, Italy and Germany paid their subscriptions, and that many of those in France and in America did the same.<sup>36</sup> In November, he noted that due to severe economy there were no debts and that he had a stock of between 2,500 and 3,000 F.<sup>37</sup> But besides the financial problem, Andrews had to cope with a human one.

D. T. Bourdeau left Basel for Southern France during the autumn of 1876. This placed an additional burden upon Andrews, his children, Charles and Mary, and Louis Aufranc. And the task was more difficult than anticipated since Andrews' health was deteriorating. On 13 January 1877, he was seized with pneumonia and obliged to remain in bed for several weeks.<sup>38</sup> He thought he would be able to resume his work by the middle of February, but asked James White if he could find him help from among the brethren in America: "Our time and our utmost strength is consumed in the effort to publish the French paper and tracts."<sup>39</sup> He asked if he could use Louis Aufranc more for the editorial work, for at that time Aufranc was teaching to earn his living and working only part-time for the paper, and no other qualified help was available.<sup>40</sup> Unable to send

the help required, the General Conference Committee suggested that Andrews should work less on translating and writing and publish his paper only four or six times a year, and that D. T. Bourdeau should come back to Basel and help him.<sup>41</sup> In June, Andrews had recovered and he was able to report that the first issue of volume 2 would be at the printer's by the end of the month and that he would go to Italy to visit Dr. Ribton.<sup>42</sup> In the autumn, D. T. Bourdeau returned to Basel and Andrews planned to spend half his time in publishing and half in preaching.<sup>43</sup>

The paper remained a monthly in spite of the difficulties and the suggestion of the General Conference Committee. Andrews explained to James White that he had first intended to publish the paper only occasionally but the Swiss brethren had said that this would lessen its influence. Andrews was prepared to publish every two months or even less frequently if James White advised it, but he clearly stated that it was not possible to reduce the time needed to produce one issue.<sup>44</sup>

From the second issue series of articles began to appear. The first one is "Leçons bibliques," by Louis Aufranc, consisting of 31 articles of one to two columns each, explaining to children and teachers the Bible story from Genesis 1 to Exodus 19.<sup>45</sup> Two months later, there began a shorter series by D. M. Canright, "La Vérité présente."<sup>46</sup> In the next issue there started a very long series of 53 articles on the book of Daniel, by Uriah Smith: "Penseées sur le livre de Daniel,"<sup>47</sup> and a shorter series by James White, expounding Matthew 24.<sup>48</sup> In January 1877, the longest series began to appear, a commentary on Revelation in 56 articles by Uriah Smith.<sup>49</sup> Starting with the next issue, there came a series of Bible studies in twelve sections by H. G. Bell, and these were continued with the series by Louis Aufranc, under the general heading "Ecole du Sabbat," from the following month.<sup>50</sup>

As well as writing some articles, Andrews was anxious to give his readers news of the progress of the Adventist message so, as often as possible, he inserted paragraphs under the title "Progrès de la cause."<sup>51</sup> He wanted also to give them information about the events in the world that could be understood as signs of the time; for this, he asked the aid of American Adventists (as we have seen, he had a poor opinion of Swiss newspapers), and he started a column "Mélanges" in March 1877.<sup>52</sup> By then he was receiving many letters, some of them bringing questions about the articles, or the Adventist understanding of the Bible, or contesting assertions made in the paper. He thus decided to publish his "Réponses aux questions"<sup>53</sup> or his "Discours du Christ. Réponses à des objections de M.W.G."<sup>54</sup> and "Correspondance,"<sup>55</sup> which was for letters giving favorable appreciations or news from readers.

The aim is clearly stated in a letter to James White: the paper must meet the errors that prevail among Christians in Europe about the nature of Christ's return, grace after it, the return of the Jews to Palestine, faith without obedience, and grace without sanctification of the heart.<sup>56</sup> The influence of the paper was good. There were conversions,<sup>57</sup> interests, subscriptions, new addresses given, and the work of public preaching was made much easier in the places where the paper was known.

J. N. Andrews was not satisfied by the work done by the printers. He tried three of the half dozen he knew of in Basel that were equipped to print a paper such as Les Signes des Temps. None gave him satisfaction. The first one (Bonfantini) was "a good worker but without principles," another (Krüsi?) had no interest in being "a first class workman," a third was still worse. He hoped to find a good one.<sup>58</sup> The General Conference



eventually came to his aid. In December 1877, Mr. and Mrs. William Ings and Maud Sisley arrived and in 1878 a composing room was set up in the office of Les Signes at 68 Müllerweg, Basel.<sup>59</sup>

The layout received few changes during this period. From time to time the second or third pages (sometimes both) were set in three columns instead of four, with wider justification: 18.5 ciceros. Starting in February 1878, section headings begin to appear: "Paroles d'avertissement," "Etudes bibliques," "Ecole du Sabbat," "Correspondance." In April and September 1878, "Nécrologie" and "A la jeunesse" made their respective debuts. Thus, little by little, the paper was given a more structured and orderly format.

On 4 October 1878, J. N. Andrews, his sick daughter Mary, and Mr. and Mrs. D. T. Bourdeau arrived at Battle Creek. It was the opening day of the General Conference. He had worked very hard to prepare the next two issues of Les Signes des Temps,<sup>60</sup> but his stay in America was much longer than anticipated: Mary died, and his own health was not good, so he sailed back to Europe only at the end of May 1879 and did not arrive in Basel until August, together with his niece, Miss Edith Andrews, and Miss Anna Oyer.<sup>61</sup>

In his absence the paper continued to make its monthly appearance thanks to William Ings in the composing room and Charles Andrews and Louis Aufranc who did the editing. The editorial work was made easier by the series of articles already begun,<sup>62</sup> and by new ones. In September 1878, under the heading "A la Jeunesse" there began a series entitled "Le mirage de la vie," without any mention of author (was it J. N. Andrews?). These fourteen articles of 2 to 3 columns each were to help young people to ask themselves what was the aim of their life by giving them examples of failure in the lives of several people of modern time with an Anglo-American

background.<sup>63</sup> In October 1878, Andrews started on the editorial page a series of 6 articles of about 2 columns each about Christian virtues.<sup>64</sup> Were they written before his departure to America or did he send them from there?

Two other series begun at that time dealt with the health message: seven articles by Lyman Beecher, "Le remède contre l'intempérance,"<sup>65</sup> and eight articles by J. H. Kellogg about dyspepsia, under the general heading "Hygiène."<sup>66</sup>

Besides these series, the temporary editors continued to publish translations of articles by James and Ellen G. White, D. M. Canright, G. I. Butler, S. N. Haskell, J. H. Waggoner, as well as news from the work in Norway by J. Matteson, in Great Britain by J. N. Loughborough, in Germany by J. Erzberger and in Egypt by H. P. Ribton. The lists of tracts advertized and of churches giving a missionary report grew larger.<sup>67</sup>

Andrews complained, on his return, that "the work of publication has greatly declined during my long absence."<sup>68</sup> It is difficult to determine exactly what he meant.

In this, the final period of Andrews' life, the circulation of Les Signes des Temps grew. In every issue, the readers were asked to send addresses of friends that would accept the paper. Andrews also asked the French-speaking readers of the Review and Herald to send addresses of friends in Europe, and money to help with postage.<sup>69</sup> As a result nearly all of the 2,000 copies of the monthly issue were used, while back issues were also sent.

In May 1880, he was able to report that while the paper was sent mainly to France and Switzerland, it also went to Italy, Austria, Hungary,

Prussia, Saxony, Alsace, Belgium, Holland, Wales, England, Scotland, Sweden, Russia, Sicily, Hindustan, Egypt, Mauritius, Spain, Bermuda, Canada, U.S.A., Costa Rica, Chili and Brazil. His method of obtaining subscriptions was precisely described: when he received an address, he sent an old issue with a letter of introduction; during the following months he sent two other back numbers, and, in the fourth month, the regular issue with a letter appealing to the reader to subscribe. And it worked! He received subscriptions, letters of refusal for lack of money, or for disapproval, but often with acknowledgment of the quality of the articles.<sup>70</sup> In March 1881, he reported that he had 100 new subscribers,<sup>71</sup> and in January 1882, that 3,500 copies were now coming off the press every month, while he was getting fewer refusals and these were more respectful in tone. The renewal of subscriptions also showed that the paper was appreciated.<sup>72</sup> He would have liked to have had 10,000 copies available each month for missionary work and estimated that a subsidy of only \$10 per month would permit him to publish 1,000 more copies of each issue.<sup>73</sup>

By July 1882, the number of regular subscribers had risen from 500 to 800.<sup>74</sup> There were subscribers in 46 of the 56 French départements, but he would have liked to see at least 5,000 subscribers to intensify the work in Europe.<sup>75</sup> However, he was able to report that the 180,000 copies that had been printed since the beginning of the paper had all been distributed except for those kept for binding.<sup>76</sup>

In order to increase circulation still further the Swiss brethren suggested advertising in the press. Within a week of the first advertisement (in early 1883), 50 people had requested a sample copy, and 13 had taken out subscriptions.<sup>77</sup> By 1884 the paper had trebled its original print-run with 6,000 copies every month.<sup>78</sup> It was a considerable achievement.

Gifts and subscriptions increased, and postal expenses were

covered without dipping into the missionary budget.<sup>79</sup> There were no losses, and this was seen as the blessing of God.<sup>80</sup> The only financial help required of American Adventists was \$10 each month in order to publish 1,000 more copies of each issue.<sup>81</sup>

All this was achieved without an expansion of staff. Some church members helped in sending out back issues, but the editorial work remained with Andrews, his son Charles, and Louis Aufranc.<sup>82</sup> Andrews was by now a sick man, however, having contracted tuberculosis.<sup>83</sup> His health was so bad that he worked in bed, dictating or writing a few sentences every day.<sup>84</sup> He got up for the Annual Conference in Tramelan, on 18 November 1881, but was very feeble afterwards and had much trouble preparing the issue for January 1882,<sup>85</sup> and still more for that of August 1882. At that time he stayed half time in bed, and was in great need of a helper.<sup>86</sup> He thought that he was very close to death, and that his three last years were preserved by a miracle. He rejoiced on learning that B. L. Whitney was coming to help him in his editorial work.<sup>87</sup> In a very hard letter, Ellen G. White confirmed that B. L. Whitney would come, but rebuked Andrews for refusing helpers proposed from America for fear that they would disagree with his methods.<sup>88</sup>

The Whitney and Bourdeau families arrived in Basel in July 1883. Andrews immediately gave Whitney the direction of the work, but though remaining in bed all the day long, continued with proof-reading.<sup>89</sup>

Les Signes des Temps retained, during this period, the emphases noted earlier: an urgent eschatological dimension, a strong defense of God's law (particularly the Sabbath), and a strong emphasis on temperance and biblical anthropology. New series included 27 long articles by Andrews in dialogue form on the nature of man, death and the resurrection,<sup>90</sup> 27 by Jacob Abbot on Alexander the Great<sup>91</sup> and 13 discussing the book of Zechariah. The author is not mentioned but the articles are

published in the section of the paper under the title "Articles des rédacteurs." A note from the editor presenting the perspective of the paper for 1883 says that: "Les articles sur le livre de Zacharie seront continués Dieu voulant."<sup>92</sup> We may suppose, therefore, that J. N. Andrews was the author of the series.<sup>93</sup>

Many articles were published to help Catholic readers take a critical look at their church: for instance, five articles borrowed from Harper's Magazine entitled "Comment le Concile du Vatican établit l'infaillibilité pontificale";<sup>94</sup> three on the inquisition in Italy;<sup>95</sup> three about "L'histoire du massacre de la Saint-Bathélemy," by John C. S. Abbott;<sup>96</sup> and four on the papacy and the Church of Rome by Louis Gausсен.<sup>97</sup>

The presentation of the paper remained practically unchanged until June 1880. The only changes were the new general headings that appeared in December 1879: "Articles variés," under which appeared the articles not written by the editors, and "Nouvelles diverses," which seems to replace "Mélanges."<sup>98</sup> In June 1880, an index covering all issues to that date was published. It is obvious from the continuous numbering of the pages that a bound volume ending with this index was planned.

A big change was made in July 1880. The paper reduced its format to 9.5 inches by 14 inches but with 16 pages instead of 8. This meant an increase of space of about 1/8. The change is said to be made for the sake of convenience and to please the readers, and would not be followed by an increase in the price.<sup>99</sup> Gothic letters were now used for the title, but the familiar quotation from Matthew 24:33 remained. The layout would have been familiar to the reader of previous issues though there were improvements: a table of contents was published on the back page and the pages now had three columns with a justification of 13.5 picas, though type remained unchanged. The most frequent general headings were "Articles variés," "Tempérance," "Articles des rédacteurs,"

"A la jeunesse" and "Ecole du Sabbat."

The influence of the paper continued to grow. The editor received letters from all over Europe, and the interest of people without any religious profession was aroused through the articles about health and temperance.<sup>100</sup> Beside the favorable impression that transformed the occasional readers into subscribers, Andrews noticed that the paper was an effective evangelistic tool. People who read it became receptive to the message of tracts or to public evangelism.<sup>101</sup> Among the readers there were people who, thanks to the paper, believed in the second advent, obeyed the commandments, observed the Sabbath and became abstainers.<sup>102</sup>

As founder-editor of Les Signes des Temps, Andrews accomplished much. He gave a good start to a paper that still lives today. He was concerned that every issue be the best possible.<sup>103</sup> "We try to make every number of Les Signes a campaign document, adapted to the existing state of the Old World. This work is done imperfectly, but no pain is spared to make it as perfect as possible."<sup>104</sup> When S. N. Haskell visited Europe, he confirmed that the paper contained good articles, no stories but strong Bible studies.<sup>105</sup>

But in spite of his perfectionism (for which he was rebuked by Ellen G. White,<sup>106</sup> and which is manifested by such useless actions as adding by hand an accent mark that had been omitted on 3,000 copies<sup>107</sup>), the paper was not perfect. We can find misprints such as the omission of a letter in a title on a front page,<sup>108</sup> the absence of space and apostrophe between a verb and its subject,<sup>109</sup> the printing of a capital letter horizontally instead of vertically.<sup>110</sup> Errors of this kind can never be totally eliminated, however, and in Les Signes des Temps there were surprisingly few.<sup>111</sup>

The attentive reader would have seen that the editor was English-speaking from birth: he does not use the proper French idiomatic phrases,<sup>112</sup> he does not convert area measurements,<sup>113</sup> he uses sometimes tenses in a way that reveals his American origin,<sup>114</sup> but more serious are the problems raised by his prophetic interpretations. He often writes about Russia and Turkey, about the war in the Orient, or against the return of the Jews to Palestine. We wonder if by this insistence he did not lead his readers into false opinions and wrong interpretations.

He was also somewhat imprudent in the way he dealt with articles submitted by non-Adventist authors. He accepted for publication many pieces against drinking alcohol by M. de Colleville, but he changed a few things in them and was obliged to publish a corrigendum afterwards.<sup>115</sup> Again, he published two articles by a certain Protestant evangelist whose name he hid, giving only the initials, G.K. This occasioned a controversy with two Protestant papers, one from Geneva, La Semaine Religieuse, and one from Nice, southern France, L'Eglise Libre. While acknowledging the quality of the typesetting, layout and some of the contents of Les Signes, these papers stated that the editors were American in a way that discredited their credibility. Even more damaging was the charge of ignorance regarding the books of Adolf Monod, well known among French-speaking Protestants, and of thus being deceived by G.K. whose article plagiarized some of Monod's work. Andrews could have answered in a humbler manner. He explained the origin of the article that occasioned the controversy but he did not wish to acknowledge his ignorance of the writings of Adolf Monod.<sup>116</sup>

I am not sure that the frequent polemical emphasis of the paper was a good way to break down prejudice against Andrews' movement. There are, in my opinion, too many articles that are "Réponses à . . ." where J. N. Andrews seems to say that he knows all the truth and that he is

there to teach the truth to the others. This gives a sectarian touch to his paper. Furthermore, he uses arguments to sustain his doctrines that are not always gentlemanly. For instance, in a short article under the title "Transubstantiation," he says that the Catholic theory is false because the archbishop of Quito died by drinking the wine of the mass in which strychnine had been put by his murderers.<sup>117</sup>

These criticisms should not prevent us from seeing the vast work accomplished. J. N. Andrews wrote or translated at least 480 articles during the 8 years of his editorship.<sup>118</sup> Johan van Bignoot goes up to 550, probably counting those published without any mention of an author. He gives a list of the subjects he treated with the number of articles concerning these subjects.<sup>119</sup> We reproduce it here:

Tithing	2
Sanctuary	6
The Epistle to the Galatians	6
Baptism	7
Bible History	8
Justification by Faith	11
Zechariah the Prophet	13
The Jews and Palestine	14
The Ten Commandments	23
Doctrinal Bible Studies	28
Sin and the Nature of Man	36
Bibliographies and Reports	52
"Progress of the Cause"	57
Prophetic Studies and Signs of the Times	60
Studies about Sabbath and Sunday	61
Temperance and Hygiene	61
Christian Education and Family Life	105

The impression given by this list and by the reading of Les Signes des Temps is that Andrews wrote mainly for a public with a biblical background, belonging to a Protestant milieu. And unfortunately this public constituted a very limited portion of the French-speaking population of Europe. Could he have written a paper that would have appealed to the vast majority of the population, and answered its real needs? We wonder! Today, we face the same difficulty. Our papers are edited according to what we feel is the aim of our message, but are we sure that we are using



the right words, choosing the right topics and presenting the message in such a way that it touches the millions living in the French-speaking areas of Europe and of the world?

NOTES

<sup>1</sup>The Advent Review and Herald of the Sabbath (hereafter cited as RH), 15 Dec. 1874, p. 196.

<sup>2</sup>In 1866, M. B. Czechowski, with the help of Albert Vuilleumier, published a paper called L'Evangile Eternel, in St. Blaise, near Neuchâtel, Switzerland: RH 19 Apr. 1923, p. 22.

<sup>3</sup>Ellen G. White SDA Research Centre Europe, Newbold College, Bracknell, England (hereafter cited as WRCE), The Letters of J. N. Andrews, 1862-1883 (photocopied transcripts), DF2000-1-g (hereafter cited as Andrews Corresp.), 12 Dec. 1870.

<sup>4</sup>RH 27 Nov. 1874, p. 166.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid. 28 Jan. 1875, p. 36; letter of 8 June 1876 quoted by Johan A. Van Bignoot, "J. N. Andrews, Seventh-day Adventist Missionary--Editor in French-speaking Europe," (M.A. thesis, Andrews University, July 1980), p. 14; RH 17 July 1877, p. 20.

<sup>6</sup>RH 17 Nov. 1874, p. 166.

<sup>7</sup>This notice said: "J. N. Andrews, ministre de l'Evangile, envoyé en Europe par les chrétiens d'Amérique observant le septième jour de la semaine, désire se mettre en communication avec tous les chrétiens observant ce jour ou désirant s'y intéresser, les prie de s'adresser à lui à Neuchâtel (Suisse) 9658N": Journal de Genève, 20 Dec. 1874, p. 3.

<sup>8</sup>RH 28 Jan. 1875, p. 36.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid. 26 Aug. 1875, p. 60.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid. p. 59.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid. 27 Jan. 1876, p. 30.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid. 17 Apr. 1876, p. 132; Ellen G. White pledged \$1,000: ibid. 30 Mar. 1876, p. 100.

<sup>13</sup>Historical Sketches of the Foreign Missions of the Seventh-day Adventists (Basel, 1886), p. 24 (hereafter cited as Hist. Sk.).

<sup>14</sup>RH 20 July 1876, p. 29.

<sup>15</sup>ex. inf. D. Augsburg.

<sup>16</sup>RH 29 June 1876, pp. 4-5 and 20 July 1876, p. 29; Hist. Sk. p. 23.

<sup>17</sup>A similar thing had been done in the SDB Sabbath Memorial: see above, p. 232.

<sup>18</sup>Van Bignoot, p. 31.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid. p. 32.

<sup>21</sup>See below, p. 351.

<sup>22</sup>See p. 8, col. 1.

<sup>23</sup>July 1876, p. 8.

<sup>24</sup>RH 23 Nov. 1876, p. 164.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid.; also 2 Nov. 1876, p. 141 and 12 July 1877, p. 20.

<sup>27</sup>The Bourdeaus were French-speaking Americans converted to the Advent message in 1857. They had translated some tracts into French for their work among French-speaking Americans. See A. W. Spalding, Captains of the Hosts (Washington, D.C., 1949), p. 515.

<sup>28</sup>Andrews Corresp. 19 June 1877.

<sup>29</sup>Virgil E. Robinson, John Nevins Andrews. Flame for the Lord (Washington, D.C., 1975), pp. 99-100.

<sup>30</sup>RH 23 Nov. 1876, p. 164.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid. 12 July 1877, p. 20; 22 Nov. 1877, p. 264.

<sup>33</sup>Les Signes, Sept. 1878, p. 216.

<sup>34</sup>RH 25 Jan. 1877, p. 30; Andrews Corresp. 6 Feb. 1877.

<sup>35</sup>Andrews Corresp. 1 May 1878 (?)--internal evidence suggests 1877 rather than 1878--see above, p. 187, n. 32.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid. 12 July 1877, p. 20.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid. 22 Nov. 1877, p. 164.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid. 6 Feb. 1877; 22 Feb. 1877, p. 60.

<sup>39</sup>Andrews Corresp. 8 Feb. 1877.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid. 6 Feb. 1877; RH 12 July 1877, p. 20.

<sup>41</sup>RH 6 June 1877, pp. 180-181.

<sup>42</sup>Andrews Corresp. 19 June 1877.

<sup>43</sup>RH 22 Nov. 1877, p. 164.

<sup>44</sup>Andrews Corresp. 6 June 1877.

<sup>45</sup>Aug. 1876-May 1879.

<sup>46</sup>Oct. 1876-Jan. 1877 and Nov. 1877 (this piece had been lost).

<sup>47</sup>Nov. 1876-June 1880 and Sept. 1882-Sept. 1883. The interruption from July 1880 to August 1882 seems due to the desire to finish with the other series about the book of Revelation.

<sup>48</sup>Nov. 1876-June 1877, 8 articles of 2-3 columns each.

<sup>49</sup>Jan. 1877-Apr. 1882.

<sup>50</sup>Feb. 1877-Feb. 1882: 43 articles of 1/2 to 1 column each composed of questions with biblical references to find the answers.

The first section had no title but dealt with Gen. 1-Ex. 15. The eleven following sections were entitled: Israel in the Wilderness, The History and Services of the Sanctuary, Historical Recapitulation, The Four Great Kingdoms, The Papacy, The 2300 days, Recapitulation, The Judgement, The First Angel's Message, The Second Angel's Message and The Third Angel's Message.

<sup>51</sup>For instance, Aug. 1876, p. 15; June 1877, p. 96 ("Progrès de notre oeuvre en Amérique).

<sup>52</sup>RH 25 Jan. 1877, p. 30; 20 July 1876, p. 29.

<sup>53</sup>Mar.-June, 1877.

<sup>54</sup>Six articles from Nov. 1877-May 1878.

<sup>55</sup>Feb. 1878, p. 6.

<sup>56</sup>Andrews Corresp. 19 June 1877.

<sup>57</sup>See, for instance, RH 25 Jan. 1877, p. 20; Andrews Corresp. 6 Feb. 1877; RH 22 Nov. 1877, p. 164; Letters in Les Signes, passim.

<sup>58</sup>RH 23 Nov. 1876, p. 164; Andrews Corresp. 1 May 1878(?).

<sup>59</sup>M. E. Olsen, A History of the Origin and Progress of the Seventh-day Adventists (Washington, D.C., 1925), pp. 306-307.

<sup>60</sup>Robinson, p. 110.

<sup>61</sup>Olsen, p. 307.

<sup>62</sup>Those by Uriah Smith on Daniel and Revelation, by Louis Aufranc on Genesis and Exodus, and by H. G. Bell: see above, notes 43 and 45.

<sup>63</sup>"Le mirage de la vie," Sept. 1878-Nov. 1879.

<sup>64</sup>"Pensées pratiques sur des sujets bibliques," Oct. 1878-Apr. 1879.

<sup>65</sup>Nov. 1878-May 1879.

<sup>66</sup>Dec. 1878-July 1879.

<sup>67</sup>Twenty-five tracts were advertised in Nov. 1878 (p. 232); 27 in Aug. 1879 (p. 304); 4 reports in Sept. 1878 (p. 216), 7 in Apr. 1879 (p. 272).

<sup>68</sup>RH 5 Feb. 1880, p. 90.

<sup>69</sup>*Ibid.* 2 Feb. 1880, pp. 90-91.

<sup>70</sup>*Ibid.* 20 May 1880, p. 332.

<sup>71</sup>*Ibid.* 29 Mar. 1881, pp. 200-201.

<sup>72</sup>*Ibid.* 31 Jan. 1882, pp. 72-73.

<sup>73</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>74</sup>*Ibid.* 18 July 1882, pp. 456-457.

<sup>75</sup>*Ibid.* 1 Aug. 1882, pp. 488-489.

<sup>76</sup>*Ibid.* 29 Aug. 1882, p. 552.

77 Ibid. 27 Feb. 1883, p. 139. The advertising was: "Les Signes des Temps, a monthly religious journal published by the society of Seventh-day Adventists. This journal treats of the following subjects; the accomplishment of the prophecies which lead us to the end of time; obedience to the commandments of God and faith in Christ; the second advent of Christ and the signs preceding that event; the nature and final destiny of man; the Judgment of the great day; the future life; the fulfillment of prophecy as shown by ancient history; christian experience. This journal seeks to correct the errors introduced by the Church of Rome, and to re-establish the teachings of the Bible. Les Signes will be sent gratuitously during four months to every person who shall demand it. Address: Bureau des Signes des Temps, Bâle, Suisse."

78 J.-M. Martin, "Les Origines et l'Implantation du Mouvement Adventist du Septième Jour en France. 1876-1925" (Doctoral thesis, Institut Protestant de Théologie, Paris, 1980), p. 76.

79 RH 5 Feb. 1880, p. 90; 20 May 1880, p. 332.

80 Ibid. 29 Mar. 1882, pp. 200-201.

81 Ibid. 31 Jan. 1882, pp. 72-73; 1 Aug. 1882, pp. 488-489.

82 Ibid. 5 Feb. 1880, p. 90.

83 Ibid. 20 May 1880, p. 332.

84 Ibid. 29 Mar. 1881, pp. 200-201.

85 Ibid. 31 Feb. 1882, pp. 72-73.

86 Ibid. 29 Aug. 1882, p. 552.

87 Ibid. 27 Feb. 1883, p. 139. The decision to send B. L. Whitney was taken by the General Conference held in Rome, New York, on 7 Dec. 1882: Olsen, p. 308.

88 WRCE, The Letters of Ellen G. White, 1847-1915 (hereafter cited as White Corresp.), 29 Mar. 1883.

89 Olsen, p. 308; Andrews Corresp. 9 Sept. 1883.

90 Jan. 1881-Mar. 1883.

91 July 1880-Nov. 1882.

92 Dec. 1882, p. 96.

93 "Zacharie le prophète," July 1882-July 1883.

94 July-Nov. 1880.

95 Jan.-Mar. 1881.

96 Apr.-June 1881.

97 July-Oct. 1882.

- <sup>98</sup>Dec. 1879, pp. 329, 336.
- <sup>99</sup>June 1880, p. 384; July 1880, p. 16.
- <sup>100</sup>RH 5 Feb. 1880, p. 90.
- <sup>101</sup>Ibid. 20 May 1880, p. 332; 31 Jan. 1882, pp. 72-73; 18 July 1882, pp. 456-457.
- <sup>102</sup>Ibid. 27 Feb. 1883, p. 139.
- <sup>103</sup>Ibid. 29 Mar. 1881, pp. 200-201.
- <sup>104</sup>Ibid. 31 Jan. 1882, pp. 72-73.
- <sup>105</sup>Ibid. 1 Aug. 1882, pp. 488-489.
- <sup>106</sup>White Corresp. 29 Mar. 1883.
- <sup>107</sup>Robinson, p. 99.
- <sup>108</sup>"La Saint-Barthélemy" instead of "La Saint-Barthélémy": Apr. 1880, p. 145.
- <sup>109</sup>"javais" instead of "j'avais": July 1876, p. 76, col. 4.
- <sup>110</sup>"Ze faites pas . . ." instead of "Ne faites pas . . .": June 1882, p. 383, col. 4.
- <sup>111</sup>It should be noticed here that a few words were printed in Hebrew characters (for instance, Aug. 1876, p. 9, col. 1) and in Greek characters (for instance, Oct. 1876, p. 27, col. 3).
- <sup>112</sup>For instance, he writes: "La population totale du globe ascende au chiffre de . . ." instead of "s'élève au chiffre de . . .": Oct. 1876, p. 27, col. 4; he translates a title by "Ne mettez pas de sable sur les axes" instead of "Ne mettez pas de sable dans les rouages": July 1880, p. 4, col. 2.
- <sup>113</sup>For instance, he writes: "28 âmes de population par mille carré" instead of giving the figure in square kilometres: Feb. 1877, p. 64, col. 4.
- <sup>114</sup>For instance: "Quand nous avons fait cela, notre devoir est accompli." In French it is possible to use the different future tenses after conjunctions of time, so it would have sounded better if he had written: "Quand nous aurons fait cela, notre devoir sera accompli": July 1876, p. 8, col. 1.
- <sup>115</sup>See Nov. 1876, p. 40, col. 1.
- <sup>116</sup>Mar. 1881, pp. 132-133; Apr. 1881, pp. 148-149; Apr. 1882, p. 352; May 1882, p. 368.
- <sup>117</sup>June 1877, p. 96.
- <sup>118</sup>E. N. Dick, Founders of the Message (Washington, D.C., 1939) p. 321.
- <sup>119</sup>van Bignoot, p. 36.

SOME FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF ANDREWS'  
MISSION TO EUROPE

Pietro E. Copiz

The initial motivation for this research was based on the assumption that J. N. Andrews' account book--with which we will partly deal--provided detailed information on his daily expenses: a systematic study of this document would have shed light on his life as a missionary in Europe. But, as we will see later, the nature of the book is rather different.

Why should we want to deal with finances in studying Andrews' life? It has been said that, much more than newspaper files, private letters, reports, diaries or statements by relatives and friends, "the most reliable source for a person's biography is his financial records. These casually written documents are a true index of character. They disclose the real man."<sup>1</sup> For this reason, a daily and detailed expense account would have proved invaluable for a thorough study of Andrews' life in the Old World.

In the absence of such a document, we have decided to present an analysis of Andrews' account book in the more general context of other financial aspects of his mission in Europe.

It is not our purpose to try to present a reconstructed treasurer's report made up of all the information which could be gathered. Furthermore, not all the documents were at our disposal for this research. It is very likely that additional financial statements are kept in the archives of the General Conference in Andrews' folder.<sup>2</sup> More records are likely to be found in other historical sources.

We simply plan to make a general assessment of Andrews' financial

situation until 1876, when his account book was started. We will then analyze the book itself. Finally, we will examine--for the whole period of his stay in Europe--financial information gathered from all sources. Obviously, this can only represent a preliminary study.

#### 1. Some Financial Records until 1876

When Andrews began his European work, his salary was \$14.93 per month.<sup>3</sup> Although the figure may have corresponded to a kind of minimum wage, it only represented--according to one member of the committee which prepared the appeal published by the Review and Herald--a reasonable estimate, which could inspire the average donor. In reality, Andrews was not paid a regular salary during the time he spent in Europe. In view of his hesitations in using the mission's funds, this fact may have contributed to some of his personal financial struggles. Since he had been one of the main proponents of the "Scriptural plan for the support of the ministry" called then "Systematic Benevolence,"<sup>4</sup> he may have found his situation in Europe somewhat ironic.

Andrews had some funds of his own, since he had sold his house in Rochester before his departure and had transferred at least part of the money obtained from the sale to a bank in Switzerland.<sup>5</sup> Scarcely three years after arriving in Europe, he made this comment: "I have used more than half of what money I sold for in Rochester."<sup>6</sup> His commitment to the cause involved all he had.

In order to understand the value of money during Andrews' stay in Europe, we will provide some elements of comparison, always in Swiss francs. First of all, the value of the gold dollar during that time remained stable, around fr. 5.10. The "greenback" climbed from fr. 4.40 in 1876 to the value of the gold dollar by the end of 1882. The economic value of every man's work was estimated to reach a minimum of fr. 2 per day in 1883.<sup>7</sup> A modest board (three meals) cost fr. 1.50 per day in 1880.<sup>8</sup>



What were the giving habits around 1875 among the Swiss in general? A pastor shared with Andrews information about the conditions in Geneva.

Custom in this country requires each person on leaving church to put something into the treasury, or at least to seem to do so . . . to his [the pastor's] personal knowledge the offerings of a congregation of 2,000 persons do not exceed four francs or eighty cents, and often are less. Nearly every one puts in something, but those who contribute money put in a centime (the fifth part of an American cent), and many put in buttons.<sup>9</sup>

It is evident that the first Adventists in Switzerland needed patient and gradual education in giving if the European mission was to make progress.

A report to the General Conference by J. Erzberger shows that, for 1872, 74 members in four Swiss churches had a record of \$250 in gold, equivalent to fr. 1,250, for Systematic Benevolence. The amount corresponded very likely to a pledge for the following year.

In November of 1874, a few weeks after Andrews' arrival, the Swiss members "voted to raise 2000 francs to commence the work of publishing. Of this sum 1800 francs were raised at once, and others not present will more than make up the remainder."<sup>10</sup> Progress was therefore being made, although Andrews could say, one year later:

The real missionary spirit is certainly lacking. They will give of their means, but I fear they have not yet learned but in part to give themselves to God. It seems to me that they do not understand what it is to be a living sacrifice themselves.<sup>11</sup>

Andrews was unconsciously comparing them to himself, and they still had a long way to go; but they were growing in their commitment. Andrews also reveals that "None among them are wealthy . . . but none are in distressing poverty, and none are so helpless as to be entirely dependent upon others."<sup>12</sup> The pledges made in December 1875 for the following year "amounted to 2300 francs, or about \$460. There were at this time seventy-five Sabbath-keepers, besides a considerable number of Sabbath-keeping children."<sup>13</sup> By 1882, the members, who had increased very little in number, were pledging fr. 2,000 per month. The financial report presented

during the meetings held at the time of Andrews' death "showed that the various contributions for the support of the cause during the year [1883] were more than double those of any preceding year."<sup>14</sup> Andrews' example and appeals, as well as those of other brethren, especially S. N. Haskell, brought a relatively important change in giving in a very short time.

A short summary of Andrews' "Expenses before commencing in Bâle," covering the period of 16 October 1874 to 10 April 1876, may be found in a report kept in the General Conference archives.<sup>15</sup> The total expenses, which do not include Andrews' board and the portion of his travelling paid by the Swiss members, reaches only fr. 3,815. The "Board of my children, our clothes, our school at Neuchâtel, etc." mentioned in the report correspond to an average of less than fr. 3.70 per day, which is little indeed. Andrews had to supply the difference between the expenses and what he received from Battle Creek by using some of his own funds from America. In addition, he personally paid for the advertising in Swiss papers,<sup>16</sup> for the travel of his children from the United States, for visiting the Seventh Day Baptists in England, for the transportation of his library to Neuchâtel and for countless other items, including some expenses for other workers, and pledges to assume personal financial responsibility in case some decisions did not meet the approval of the brethren in America.

Inevitably, the difficulties of the mission in Europe and the strict economy practiced by Andrews were mentioned in his letters, articles and reports. This brought remarks from James White, who felt that Andrews was free to ask and he would receive.<sup>17</sup> But the latter explained his attitude, going to the heart of the matter:

If we have sometimes lacked with respect to our personal wants it has not been because much money has not been sent us, but it has been because we did not feel free to use the money for ourselves when it was so greatly needed to sustain the work in general.<sup>18</sup>

Andrews' attitude toward money is also beautifully revealed by an anonymous paragraph which follows one of the articles in Les Signes des Temps.

Among the clergy . . . luxury is wrong . . . An opulent priest is a nonsense. The priest should stay close to the poor. Now, is it possible to touch unceasingly, night and day, all distresses, all misfortunes, all indigences, without having on oneself some of this holy poverty, like the dust of the work?<sup>19</sup>

For Andrews, poverty was more than a little dust which one may easily brush off: it was the choice of a life totally identified with the needs of God's work.

## 2. Insights from the "Grand-Livre à J. N. Andrews"

### History of J. N. Andrews' Account Book

According to the Euro-Africa Division Quarterly Review, Andrews' account book was discovered accidentally in Berne, at the Division's office, shortly before the 100th anniversary of his arrival in Europe.<sup>20</sup> On 22 October 1979, at the Sesquicentennial Conference held at Andrews University to commemorate the birth of J. N. Andrews, Jean Zurcher, Secretary of the Euro-Africa Division, presented the book to Joseph G. Smoot, president of Andrews University. The book is now in the Heritage Room of the James White Library. Special Xerox copy editions of the book have been prepared. One copy was given to the Euro-Africa Division office. The present research is based on a study of this copy.

### Description of the Book

The title on the first page is "Grand-Livre à J. N. Andrews Bâle." The preposition "à" to indicate possession is colloquial in this case. The meaning of the word "grand livre" is "book of excerpts where the articles [entries] of the livre journal [daily book or journal] are recorded and classified."<sup>21</sup> In other words, the book is a ledger.

According to information provided by Mrs. Louise Dederen, curator of the Heritage Room, the ledger has the following size: cover, 30 cm x 21 cm; pages, 29 cm x 19 cm. There are 241 numbered sheets, generally with the left side for income and the right one for expenditures, as it is

normal for a ledger. The two sides, bearing the same number, constitute a folio. More than 50 numbered sheets, between folio (f.) 18 and f. 240, are missing in the Euro-Africa Division copy, but they are present in the original. With the exception of f. 159 (a small account concerning the "Société Missionnaire de Bâle"), all but two of the mission folios are either blank (19, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 42, 44, 45, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 72, 75, 78, 80, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 92, 93, 95, 96, 97, 107, 112, 119, 121, 137, 138, 148, 174, 182, 183, 218, 229) or bear only the title of an account, without any entries (199, 201, 203, 209, 211, 213, 219, 222, 226, 232, 234, 235, 238, 240). The other missing folios (115, 228) are very likely the result of a clerical error in numbering. Wrong numbers were given to f. 179 and 180 (an inversion of figures on two sides, corrected because the order of pages, the accounts and two symmetrical ink spots give the right sequence) as well as 241 (the right side has 242, by mistake). Two rather incomplete indexes--consecutive order of titles in the ledger and alphabetical order, written by two different persons--are provided at the end, but they do not go beyond f. 99. On some folios, the transactions are not recorded in chronological order. All the entries refer to the folio numbers of the journal, where more detailed information may have been available. From f. 99 on (16 October 1879)--where the entries in the index end--the transactions give also the number of the corresponding folio in the ledger itself.

The ledger starts on 10 April 1876 when Andrews and his family moved to Basel. The last entries concerning the time he was still alive are for 1 September 1882. They mainly give reports of previous balances in order to start a new year. The ledger may have been terminated at that time both because the fiscal year ended on 31 August and because S. N. Haskell, present at the Swiss Conference meetings held at Tramelan, 8-11 September 1882,<sup>22</sup> may have suggested a different organization of the

mission's bookkeeping. No transactions for Andrews' last year of life are therefore recorded.

From f. 196 on, there are empty folios bearing the town names of many missionary societies. These were used, in 1902 and briefly in 1903, for alphabetical lists of subscribers (probably to Les Signes des Temps), with different abbreviations ("P." for "Paid," for example) and the corresponding date. Some spaces were used by someone for handwriting exercises, almost certainly one of those who compiled the lists.

The most detailed portion of the ledger covers the years 1876-1880. Some transactions of the last years are "centralizations," i.e. grouped information of a less definite nature.

"My books are kept in French," writes Andrews at the beginning of 1878.<sup>23</sup> The whole ledger is written in French, with very few minor mistakes in the first folios. ("Je donne de ma [the last letter is not very clear] argent," 30 June 1876, f. 3; "Payé pour 2 famille," 16 April 1876, f. 3; "Tore Pelici," 13 August 1877, f. 10; "Dépense personnel pr famille," 18 September 1877, f. 10; "Compte personnelle" [with correction], index. Also, "Haske," 17 August [1877], f. 10; "Batle Creeck," title, 1876, f. 7.)

#### Authors or Bookkeepers

It is probable that the ledger was written by Andrews himself, at least as long as his health allowed. This would be confirmed by entries like "Je donne de ma (sic) argent" (30 June 1876, f. 3); "Dépenses pour ma famille" (15 June 1876, f. 3); "Habits pour Charles et moi" (1 January 1877, f. 7), "moi" being John, since there is an entry "Souliers pr. Marie" on the same page; "Voyage pour Mary et moi" (21 August 1878, f. 17) "Recu de mon fonds d'Amérique" (15 December 1877 [?], f. 31); "Vetements pour moi" (3 September 1878, f. 40); etc. But there is also "f. [frère] Andrews" at the third person already on the first folio and elsewhere.

After October 1879, Andrews is always mentioned in the third person.

The handwriting of one person, probably not a native French speaker--in spite of mistakes like "Haskel" and "Batle Creeck" mentioned above--covers most items until around September 1877. The figures and almost all the handwriting are surely not those of Andrews. Could Mary have written these pages? Or Charles?

A different, more elegant, handwriting appears in September 1877. It covers also the period of Andrews' long visit to the United States. Since, on f. 94, there is a title "Mon Compte Personnel pour E. Gabert," which appears also in the index, and keeping in mind the statement of Mrs. Ings, "Sr. Gabert that has recently come . . . does the business for Bro. Andrews in French, at least keeps his books, etc.,"<sup>24</sup> it would seem clear that she took care of the ledger from that time on. It is true that she does not seem to have started working in September 1877, but the transfer of entries could have been made some time after the transactions were recorded in the journal.

In 1880, maybe already in October 1879, a new handwriting can be noticed. Other handwritings may be present here and there.

In conclusion, the information of the first years comes from a journal which may have been written by Andrews, but he has not written in the ledger itself, with the possibility of a few exceptions. After 1877, when the mission involved more persons in Basel, a French-speaking person--most likely E. Gabert--was in charge of the ledger, at least until October 1879, when a person familiar with bookkeeping continued writing for most of the period ending in September 1882. The participation of other writers is also evident, but for fewer entries.

#### An Auditor's Analysis

Albert A. Jordan, Euro-Africa Division auditor, graciously agreed to look at the ledger from a professional point of view. He has prepared

a detailed report in French, with a glossary of some key words, for which he has given the English equivalent.<sup>25</sup> Here is a summary of its highlights.

Jordan first describes the document and makes comments similar to those mentioned above. He then remarks that, in the absence of both journal and vouchers, it is not possible to make an audit according to the usual meaning of the word.

He divides the ledger into two distinct periods, corresponding to different levels of professional bookkeeping: 10 April 1876 to 16 October 1879 and 16 October 1879 to 1 September 1882.

During the first period, the ledger was kept by someone having an elementary knowledge of bookkeeping, but not mastering its technique. The Cash account is missing and the original entries are posted on the wrong sides of the folios (the entries concerning "credits" are recorded under "debits" and vice versa).

In the beginning, only three accounts had been opened (house-keeping for the Andrews and Bourdeau families, a Bourdeau account, and Swiss "cotisations" (dues: today, tithes and offerings). In the next three months, accounts for the General Conference, publications and Missionary Fund in Battle Creek were added. The account for L. Aufranc's lessons, opened later, is not closed out. Seven accounts had been opened in the first fiscal year ending 20 September 1877. During this period, the single-entry method of bookkeeping is used. This method is rather similar to household bookkeeping. There are errors for the Bourdeau and publications accounts. For the latter, the amount is important (fr. 2,717.70).

The fiscal years 1877-1878 and 1878-1879 present similar characteristics, but the number of accounts goes from 7 to 27. The posting continues to be made in reverse order, except for three personal accounts. Random checking of totals suggests fewer adding mistakes than in the first

fiscal year. The accounts of the first period are found in folios 1 to 99.

The second period (1879-1882) is characterized by double-entry bookkeeping. It should be noted that the ledger's title page has the words "journal double" (double-entry bookkeeping) added in the right upper corner. New accounts are opened during the fiscal year 1879-1880 (Cash, Capital and several income and expenditure accounts). The manner in which the transactions are posted demonstrates that the person in charge has a better mastery of bookkeeping technique, but a few weak points are still evident. During the fiscal year 1880-1881, the Cash account transactions begin to be "centralized," i.e. grouped. For the last fiscal year, 1881-1882, this procedure is intensified (with a resulting lack of detailed information for researchers).

Jordan has prepared a balance sheet for the fiscal year 1879-1880, the first one for which the bookkeeping process is sufficiently complete. Here are some of his most striking observations.

There are neither reserves nor debts. The stock of periodicals is too high. Clothes for the Andrews and Bourdeau families are classified as fixed assets, which would imply that the mission remained their owner. The generosity of some church members for the mission is exceptional. Andrews himself is among the leading donors. The contributions recorded for some members deserve to be mentioned. For the "Cotisations" account, Bro. Dietschy, one of the leaders of the church, gave fr. 400 in 1876-1877, fr. 1,352.70 (63% of the total) in 1877-1878, and fr. 200 in 1878-1879. Bro. Schild, another leader, contributed fr. 1,000 (67% of the total) in 1876-1877. Regular contributions came also from the Hohwald group in Alsace: fr. 66.75, 58.90 and 22.75 during the same fiscal years. The gifts for the publishing work represented 64% of the total. They came mainly from the United States, but the European members did their part.



Contributions decreased considerably during Andrews' visit to the United States (1878-1879). There is a loss of fr. 2,756 for the 1879-1880 fiscal year, almost totally covered by appropriations from the General Conference. The percentage of the working capital--a key figure in today's bookkeeping--is impressive: 1,729.25%. Liquidity is also very high.

In summary, it is clear that Andrews' return from the United States marked a turning point in the bookkeeping of the mission. Jordan would have presented a disclaimer of opinion for the first three fiscal years. For 1879-1880, he would have had a reservation for the large stock, but he thinks that, according to the norms of that time, an auditor's report would have expressed an unqualified opinion (no reservations). Jordan's general impression is that, in the ledger, conscientious and faithful persons did their best, according to their knowledge of bookkeeping. They kept improving and, from 1879 on, they did an excellent job. Many 1983 administrators would envy the percentage of working capital and the cash flow of the year most fully analyzed.

In closing, Jordan expresses his admiration for the work performed by Andrews and his associates under difficult conditions. He feels that the figures of the "grand livre" testify that the work was accomplished with inspired zeal and great sacrifices.

#### Items Gleaned from an Initial Reading

A rapid analysis of the most important and detailed pages during the first years shows that Andrews, his family and his fellow-workers lived very parsimoniously. Unfortunately, in spite of some mention of food, groceries, vegetables (rarely), cheese, flour--even Graham flour--fuel, dishes, as well as some furniture and occasionally clothes--which were very expensive in comparison with salaries--there are too many indefinite transactions which are recorded as "family expenses," "personal expense" or "household expense." Totals may be established for months and

years, but many important details are missing.

Very evidently in certain cases, less clearly in others, Andrews entered as personal expenses items which could have been put on the mission's account. When it comes to clothes or other personal items, there are more entries for Charles and Mary than for their father. Lessons of French and German are taken regularly in the beginning, in spite of their cost. In 1879, there are many transactions for Charles, as he is the only member of the family in Europe. From October 1879, the family slowly fades away in the ledger and the mission dominates. The ledger is transformed from a family-in an institutional-account.

#### Future Usefulness of the Ledger

What may one hope to obtain from the "grand livre," in addition to what has already been mentioned?

Although detailed information is not present too often, the researcher looking for something specific during a certain period will not be necessarily disappointed. Of course, there is also the thrill of following Andrews and other pioneers in their work, guessing their struggles from the cold figures. There is the encouragement of enormous gifts, when one considers the life style and means of most church members of that time. For those able to read between the lines and behind the figures, some pages are as fascinating as a fully narrated adventure. Patience and attention are required, but one may come back to the ledger and go from discovery to discovery, even on pages already carefully read, especially if they are analyzed in conjunction with information available from other sources.

Interesting details are easily discovered here and there. For example, on 6 May 1878, fr. 997 (\$200) are received from Sister White, then in California, and fr. 500 (\$100) from Mrs. Hall on 5 June 1878 (f. 38). The general expenses for certain periods may be calculated with

considerable precision. The expenditure for some persons (L. Aufranc, D. T. Bourdeau, Dr. Ribton, etc.) may also be obtained, at least for some years. (Of course, for persons like Aufranc, the value of rent, which he received free for his translations, should also be included.) For Charles M. Andrews, the figures are very clear for 1881-1882: he received fr. 25 per month (about \$5), in addition to room and board, for "main d'oeuvre" (labor) (f. 191).

If the dates of some particular expenditures or income, with their amount, are important, the details concerning trips--dates, costs--may also prove useful to historians. In some entries, the exact number of tracts, with their titles, is indicated. This may lead, together with other available information, to a better knowledge of the role played by the printed page and its cost--material, work, printing, postage--in comparison with other aspects of the mission. In case of need, these pages of bookkeeping could confirm or correct information until now uncertain. To facilitate the task of researchers, a new and more complete index would be desirable.

On the whole, Andrews' ledger is a precious research tool, although it does not contain all the detailed daily transactions eager historians may have wished. It will have to be consulted by all scholars working on Andrews' biography or on the beginning of the Seventh-day Adventist work in Europe. It is safe to predict that the "grand livre" will become a regularly quoted source of information.

### 3. Information from Letters, Reports and J. Vuilleumier's Diary

Andrews' reports, articles and letters, as well as statements by others, complete the information concerning his life and financial situation in Europe.

Much has been said concerning the poor diet of his family during the first years in Europe. But Mrs. Ings' statement of December 1877 is

worth reporting again:

Owing partially to Brother Andrews' severe poverty, he and his family were compelled to live on such bread [white bread] and nothing else for months and I wonder the man is as well as he is.<sup>26</sup>

A few months later, she wrote: "Brother Andrews has not a dollar. I am paying the running expenses for the family . . . We live as plain as we dare to."<sup>27</sup>

A report sent by Andrews, shortly after these lines were written by the wife of his American associate, mentions the Adventist printers in Basel working without wages and discloses his general attitude toward the mission's funds:

Yet the living expenses of those who do this work must be met. This means house-rent, fuel, food, and clothes, and whatever may be really necessary. We must take from the funds of the mission the greater part of this expense, but beyond this we are not willing to take anything. We study to make our living expenses as small as possible, and to practice the strictest economy. We know that the money raised for this mission is given by many who must deny themselves in order to give. We therefore seek to use it so that every dollar shall count . . . we promise them [the donors] that not a dollar shall be wasted.<sup>28</sup>

This attitude is fully shared by other co-workers. Mrs. Ings states, at the end of 1878, during Andrews' visit to the United States, "We could do more to make home attractive, but we do not think it right to use money except for the bare necessities of life."<sup>29</sup> She also reveals that Andrews and his daughter were not too comfortably "fitted out" when they left for America:

it took all the money we could gather up among us to pay traveling expenses. I will not take time to explain about Brother A's shirts. I felt bad to have such looking things go.<sup>30</sup>

Things did not change too much when Andrews returned to Switzerland. Jean Vuilleumier notes in his diary that, by April 1880 (eight months after being again in Basel), Andrews had bought only a tie. He was finally going to have a suit made for him.<sup>31</sup> Three months before, the young man had recorded another revealing incident. "Brother Andrews is stricken with terror, as we all are, in seeing that our expenses for the last three months

amount to 3,000 francs. We take the resolution to spare more on food."<sup>32</sup> No wonder Andrews rejoices so much about "a quantity of choice dried fruit" received shortly afterwards from California. ". . . this . . . gift came to us as a blessing direct from heaven," is his sincerely enthusiastic comment.<sup>33</sup>

Thrift is evident in all activities of the group in Basel. Andrews himself mentions one of the routine tasks: "We have to take the white paper and the pages of type on a hand-cart the distance of half a mile or more to the press."<sup>34</sup> But not all workers manage to live so inexpensively. Shortly after returning from the United States, Andrews discovers that Dr. Ribton's family (four persons) has spent fr. 6,300 during the preceding months. During the same period of time, the ten persons at the mission in Basel had spent, for rent, taxes, furniture and general household expenses, only fr. 3,400.<sup>35</sup> He is distressed over the excessive cost of Dr. Ribton's mission in Alexandria, Egypt. Because of this, he expresses anxiety, especially in view of the visit of two brethren who will come to examine the financial aspects of the work.<sup>36</sup> Considering this heavy expense, he decides that "The responsibility for this devolves upon me and I have esteemed it a pleasure to make such arrangements as shall save the cause from all loss."<sup>37</sup> He has already helped Dr. Ribton from his own funds. A few months after this crisis, he writes again. This time Ribton is blamed for ignoring Andrews' advice and for the resulting costly mistakes.<sup>38</sup> However, when Dr. Ribton is murdered in 1882, Andrews starts a fund to aid his family with fr. 100, to which he adds fr. 25 a few months later.<sup>39</sup>

Because of the sickness of his wife, D. T. Bourdeau's family also drained considerably the mission's finances. No worker received a regular salary; "we only use what absolutely must be used for expenses THAT CANNOT be avoided," declares Andrews.<sup>40</sup> Exceptionally, someone like Bro. Gabert

is not happy with the situation and feels that he receives less than the others;<sup>41</sup> but the contrary is more often true. For example, Andrews decides, in 1883, to give the young Jean Vuilleumier fr. 30 per month, in addition to room and board. Jean finds the amount too high for the first month and gives back fr. 5.<sup>42</sup> New converts catch the same spirit. Andrews mentions the case of a Methodist brother who preaches publicly in German "without inquiring what remuneration shall be made him. He supports himself with his own labor . . ."<sup>43</sup>

Andrews is eager to help those whose large family and related charges make difficult their entrance into the ministry. He pledges to give, from his own means, fr. 500 to Albert Vuilleumier toward helping him enter the work.<sup>44</sup>

Ideally, the mission should become self-supporting. It is Andrews' wish, and it corresponds to the counsel he receives from the brethren in Battle Creek. Events move in the right direction when the work starts in Germany. "The brethren here will sustain the expenses of the work from this point . . ." Andrews reports.<sup>45</sup> They even reimburse the travel expenses of J. N. Andrews and J. Erzberger to Germany which had been advanced by the Swiss brethren. Andrews predicts, "Our work in Germany . . . bids fair to be self-sustaining at once."<sup>46</sup>

Things, however, do not go as smoothly for the mission as a whole. Andrews agrees that "European laborers should be sustained by funds raised in Europe."<sup>47</sup> But the members have limited means and Les Signes des Temps represents a huge recurring expense. Without the paper, the mission might have been self-sustaining, but at what cost for the potential growth of the mission in this part of Europe?

Five years after his arrival in Switzerland, Andrews makes "an earnest appeal to the brethren with respect to the duty of making our work self-sustaining." This is the first duty. But he goes further.

"Our next duty will be to repay the money received from America, in rendering equal assistance to some other mission where this will be needed. I hope to see this accomplished at no distant day."<sup>48</sup> If he could only have seen how this prediction has been fulfilled in our times!

A few months later, his hopes are unabated. "We shall not need to ask for much more money from Battle Creek, and as soon as we can sustain ourselves, we shall begin to send back to America the money which we have received."<sup>49</sup> But shortly before writing this letter, his financial situation was as precarious as usual. He asked a Swiss brother to return him some money so that he might put it back in the funds received from America, otherwise he would have to take it out from what he had reserved for the support of his old mother.<sup>50</sup> His task was never easy!

Before closing, a few remarks concerning financial aspects in his correspondence with Mrs. White while in Europe seem in order. First of all, it should be said that both E. G. White and her husband gave generously for the European mission. Andrews received reproofs, but he always humbled himself, accepted them and repeatedly asked for counsel.

We should add that we are not familiar with the correspondence between Andrews and Mrs. White in its totality. We will deal only with some statements she made in 1883. There may have been a gradual progression in language and thought. Counsel not followed by a change could put some words in a different perspective. It is the whole context which would need to be presented as a background before mentioning what she had to say in 1883. This is only a preliminary attempt to deal, as briefly as possible, with a painful aspect of a message Andrews received less than seven months before his death.

There are two long letters written by Mrs. White to Andrews in March 1883 from Healdsburg, California.<sup>51</sup> The first one is dated 17 March. We will call it letter A. The second one is dated 29 March. We will refer

to it as letter B. Because of the strong similarity between the two letters, with less than two weeks separating them, and because letter A appears incomplete, it was almost certainly never mailed, as can also be implied from the introduction of letter B ("I have heretofore written you several letters and never sent them"). It was a message difficult to deliver, and several attempts had been necessary.

In letter A, Mrs. White reminds Andrews that he has, in practice, taught the European believers to rely on their American brethren. Andrews has been afraid that some would regret their gifts and offerings. He has also been too generous with his means, which have been given to people less needy than himself. He does not have the qualities of a successful financier. It has been no virtue for him to endure unnecessary privation.

Similar ideas are expressed also in letter B. Andrews' liberality with his own means has had hard consequences which could have been avoided. He has neglected the education of the new believers, being fearful that someone would think that he wanted their means. At the same time, he had felt neglected by those in America, although he had not clearly expressed his needs and wants. It was not God's design that Andrews should walk a lonely path and suffer privations amid plenty. He is not a domestic man. He has felt he was a martyr missionary, but it was not so. His one-sided views and independence also played a negative role in the development of the work in Europe.

Some of the expressions Mrs. White used seem unnecessarily harsh to us who, with the benefit of hindsight, know that he was so near to death. But her frank counsel needs to be placed in a wider context--the relationship of the two people concerned, their normal mode of communication and their previous correspondence. Looked at objectively, Mrs. White's statements correspond with some of the known facts. In a volume in which we honor the first Seventh-day Adventist missionary, it does no



harm to remember that he had his frailties.<sup>52</sup>

Mrs. White's "testimony of reproof" was read to Andrews "very carefully and very feelingly by Brother Whitney" shortly after his arrival in Europe. In his reply, one month before his death, Andrews states:

. . . I humble myself before God to receive from his hand the severe rebuke which He has given you for me. I most cordially thank you for your faithfulness in writing me so fully on matters that must be very painful to you to write. I have tried to humble myself before God in the dust in view of my sins. I believe that He does accept me . . . if you have still other reproofs to give, do not withhold them, I pray you.<sup>53</sup>

It is evident that Andrews did not look for excuses; he accepted the message in deep humility. He never was greater than in this hour of soul searching, while lying helplessly on his deathbed. His attitude was similar toward other reproofs he received concerning his work in Europe. During his visit in the United States, he wrote to Mrs. White from Battle Creek:

I am very grateful for . . . counsel and reproof. I have had the financial responsibility in the case of Bro. Bourdeau. I have sought to see that his family should be reasonably well cared for. It is true that to do this I have sometimes shortened up our own wants. So I have in the case of others. I have erred, for the Lord has thus shown it to you.

I have myself often feared that I make the service of God so strict that I discourage my hearers. May God forgive me and show me how to tell them the truth and yet encourage them to obey it.<sup>54</sup>

No further comment is necessary.

Until the end, Andrews continued to reserve the most prominent place for God's cause. As a fitting symbol of the sacrificial offerings which characterized his missionary labors, "The last act of his life, performed within three hours of his death, was with trembling hand to assign to the mission the last \$500 of his earthly possessions which had not as yet been otherwise disposed of."<sup>55</sup> The choice gifts of his existence, including the last one, were for the Lord.

J. N. Andrews lived a life entirely committed to the proclamation of the message he loved so dearly. As a missionary, he was willing to

give himself totally to the cause. He considered his personal means as a natural part of the funds needed for the progress of the work. In the spirit of Christian courtesy which characterized his relationships with others, he put their real and supposed needs before those of his family. In this and other aspects of his mission in Europe, his zeal was not temperate and certainly contributed to the shortening of his life.

His financial management shows that he was not a "financier." He used his heart in handling money. A competent treasurer and a regular salary could have relieved him of many unnecessary pains and contributed to an even more efficient ministry. But his faith brought him beyond the daily struggles for economic survival. J. N. Andrews' message of hope, in a letter to Lucinda Hall, lingers in 1983:

The course of truth is onward. Our Lord is coming. Our days of mourning will before long be ended! So we will labor and travail in hope of the life that shall never end and of the everlasting consolation that is promised.<sup>56</sup>

NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Donald E. Mansell, New Every Morning (Washington, D.C., 1981), p. 86.

<sup>2</sup>Andrews told W. C. White that he was planning to "shortly send an exact account of our finances for the year past [1877]. Also I hope for the future to send you at Battle Creek quarterly financial reports": Ellen G. White-SDA Research Centre Europe, Newbold College, Bracknell (hereafter cited as WRCE), The Letters of J. N. Andrews, 1862-1883 (photocopied transcripts) (hereafter cited as Andrews Corresp.), 2 July 1878. If these reports were sent and are still available, they could represent a valuable addition to the generally known sources.

<sup>3</sup>Review and Herald (hereafter cited as RH), 21 Mar. 1968, p. 31.

<sup>4</sup>J. N. Andrews, M.D. [the missionary's grandson], "Elder J. N. Andrews," Ibid. 11 May 1944, p. 11.

<sup>5</sup>Virgil E. Robinson, "J. N. Andrews, Prince of Scholars," Guide, 28 Aug. 1974, p. 22. According to Robinson's account, all the money was transferred but entries in Andrews' account book concerning funds he received from "mon fonds d'Amérique" would suggest that he had money left in the United States, unless it came from other sources.

<sup>6</sup>Andrews Corresp. 2 Jan. 1878.

<sup>7</sup>Les Signes des Temps (hereafter cited as Les Signes), June 1883, p. 191. The exchange rates have been obtained from Swiss newspapers of 1876-1882.

<sup>8</sup>From remarks in Jean Vuilleumier's Diary in 1880 at present in the hands of the Vuilleumier family (hereafter cited as Vuilleumier Diary).

<sup>9</sup>RH 24 June 1875, p. 205.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid. 15 Dec. 1874, p. 196.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid. 14 Oct. 1875, p. 116.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

<sup>13</sup>B. L. Whitney, "The Central European Mission," in Historical Sketches of the Foreign Missions of the Seventh-day Adventists (Basel, 1886), p. 21 (hereafter cited as Hist. Sk.).

<sup>14</sup>Ibid. pp. 37, 39.

<sup>15</sup>Copies of this and other documents were provided by WRCE.

<sup>16</sup>RH 18 Mar. 1875, p. 93.

<sup>17</sup>Robinson, "What Manner of Man," ibid. 19 Sept. 1974, pp. 9-10; Andrews Corresp. 1 May 1877.

- <sup>18</sup> Andrews Corresp. 6 June 1880.
- <sup>19</sup> Les Signes, Sept. 1877, p. 119.
- <sup>20</sup> Quarterly Review, Euro-Africa Division, Sept. 1974, p. 1.
- <sup>21</sup> Paul Robert, Dictionnaire alphabétique & analogique de la langue française (Paris, 1969), s.v. "livre."
- <sup>22</sup> Hist. Sk., p. 37.
- <sup>23</sup> Andrews adds: "These [books] I shall continue to keep for my own use so far as I have anything to do with the work. But I will help Brother Ings to transfer to his set of books all the important facts-- all the money received from America, and all from subscriptions and donations in Europe": Andrews Corresp. 2 Jan. 1878.
- <sup>24</sup> WRCE, The Letters of William and Jenny Ings while in Europe, 1878-1881 (microfiche) (hereafter cited as Ings Corresp.), 13 Apr. 1878. This is confirmed by Andrews himself: "I hire Sister Gabert as an accountant and French secretary, but I pay this bill out of my own means": Andrews Corresp. 2 July 1878. According to the ledger, Sr. Gabert was later paid from the regular funds.
- <sup>25</sup> "Rapport concernant le Grand Livre de J. N. Andrews à Bâle (Suisse), 10 avril 1876 au 1er septembre 1882." Copies have been deposited in the Alfred Vaucher Library, Collonges, Andrews University Library Heritage Room, the Euro-Africa Division Archives, Bern, and WRCE. M. Jordan plans to complete his analysis by providing balance sheets for the fiscal years 1880-1881 and 1881-1882. This work will probably be available by the end of 1985.
- <sup>26</sup> Ings Corresp. 12, 13 Dec. 1877.
- <sup>27</sup> Ibid. 13 Apr. 1878.
- <sup>28</sup> RH 6 June 1878, p. 181.
- <sup>29</sup> Ings Corresp. 28 Dec. 1878.
- <sup>30</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>31</sup> Vuilleumier Diary, 11 Apr. 1880.
- <sup>32</sup> Ibid. 24 Jan. 1880.
- <sup>33</sup> J. N. Andrews, Report from Switzerland (to the General Conference), 27 Feb. 1880.
- <sup>34</sup> RH 4 Jan. 1881, p. 9.
- <sup>35</sup> Vuilleumier Diary, 23 Oct. 1879.
- <sup>36</sup> Andrews Corresp. 23 Dec. 1879; Vuilleumier Diary, 24 Dec. 1879.
- <sup>37</sup> Incomplete letter of J. N. Andrews (to the General Conference?), 29 Dec. 1879.
- <sup>38</sup> Andrews Corresp. 23 May 1880.

- <sup>39</sup> Les Signes, July 1882, p. 16; Nov. 1882, p. 80.
- <sup>40</sup> Andrews Corresp. 2 July 1878.
- <sup>41</sup> Vuilleumier Diary, 11 May 1880.
- <sup>42</sup> *Ibid.* 5 Mar. 1883.
- <sup>43</sup> RH 26 Aug. 1875, p. 60.
- <sup>44</sup> Euro-Africa Division Archives, Bern, J. N. Andrews to (Albert) Vuilleumier, 15 Jan. 1878.
- <sup>45</sup> RH 1 Apr. 1875, p. 109.
- <sup>46</sup> *Ibid.* 8 Apr. 1875, p. 116.
- <sup>47</sup> Andrews Corresp. 4, 12, 18 Mar. 1878.
- <sup>48</sup> RH 1 Jan. 1880, p. 13.
- <sup>49</sup> Andrews Corresp. 15 Aug. 1880.
- <sup>50</sup> Vuilleumier Diary, 17 June 1880.
- <sup>51</sup> WRCE, The Letters of Ellen G. White, 1847-1914 (photocopied transcripts).
- <sup>52</sup> Dr. Smoot pointed out in a symposium discussion that the pioneers dealt in a very open, aggressive way with one another; it was their normal means of settling problems. Cp. Andrews' surprise at the unwillingness of the Swiss believers to take his reproofs when he first arrived; above, p. 266.
- <sup>53</sup> Andrews Corresp. 17 Sept. 1883.
- <sup>54</sup> *Ibid.* 27 Jan. 1879.
- <sup>55</sup> Hist. Sk., p. 41.
- <sup>56</sup> WRCE, photocopied transcripts from Susan Jacquette Collection, DF2000-a-1, 13 Feb. 1878.

THE ADVENTIST COLONY AT BASEL  
DURING THE ANDREWS YEARS

Daniel Augsburg

The diary of Jean Vuilleumier constitutes an extremely interesting source of information on the J. N. Andrews era at Basel.<sup>1</sup> It combines the warmth of an adolescent's admiration for a hero with a very realistic view of the conditions and problems at the headquarters of Adventism in Europe. Through his eyes we can behold the splendor and the frayed edges of a great enterprise of faith. The diary runs from Thursday, 19 February 1880, till Andrews' death but there are some important blanks. The most considerable one is the lapse of three years from February 1881 until January 1883 when Jean had to return home and help the family finances with his work as a watch regulator. On several other occasions we have blanks of weeks and months.

Jean's family had its roots in the Jura. His father Albert had been an early convert to Adventism in Switzerland. The boy, who was born in 1864, was not quite 16 years old when he came to Basel early in 1880, as a student and a helper in the office. He became a regular worker in 1883 when his father's financial condition improved and he was able to return to Basel. When Vuilleumier first came to Basel in 1880, Andrews had already spent five years in Switzerland. Andrews had lost his daughter to tuberculosis in November 1878. The pioneer's health was already seriously damaged and the themes of sickness-health, hope-frustration provide the leitmotiv of Jean's notes. This battle for life is etched against a background of poverty and difficulties. All appear in the first entry of that section of the diary.

Basel, Feb. 19, 1880

Today I start school again. As Miss Gabert said, she is bringing some broth and a little meat to Elder Andrews, but he says that food does not help much, because his headaches cancel the profit from his digestion but, just the same, he trusts in God and hopes for better days. He says that the older ("anciens") brothers in Switzerland cause him much trouble; they do not want to help promote our work. They are caught in the snares of the devil and cannot see what they ought to do. He will start in a new field, perhaps in German Switzerland, and he will leave them to themselves.

In the diary, however, stands out above all the pioneer's unshakable commitment to God's work. His spirit is summarized in the advice he gave Jean Vuilleumier and Edouard Borle on 10 October 1883, shortly before his death: "Be always faithful unto God; that's the main thing!"

Jean's admiration and respect for Elder Andrews suffuses every page. He marvels at Andrews' constant activity. On 28 February 1880, he writes, "He is always at work, whether in bed or when he is up." Shortly afterwards on 7 April Jean describes Andrews personally wrapping and addressing a large number of gift Les Signes des Temps. In October of the same year we find J. N. Andrews sewing the papers with the help of J. Vuilleumier.

He is impressed by Andrews' knowledge and ability as an editor. There are many references to Andrews' editorial work, to the writing of some of his articles. We discover Andrews in the throes of indecision as to what topic he should write upon. During the summer and fall 1883, as Andrews realizes that he will not survive, there is a frenzy of writing. In June Andrews tells his young assistant that he has an unbelievable number of first rate articles in his boxes awaiting publication. The pages of the diary give a moving feeling of that race against death. On 25 July, J. N. Andrews asks Jean to go to the pastry shop and buy "petits pains au sucre" which he hopes will give him strength to complete an article on the secret rapture. He feels strongly his responsibility to finish his answer to a series of articles by a certain Luigi, because some of the readers of Les Signes are impatiently waiting for an

answer and because it is very important for the circles of educated readers. As he tells Jean, the answer was already in his head but nature "gave up." He also wants to pursue his research on the history of the Sabbath and put in writing the results of his four years of study on Zechariah.

The awareness that time is running out on him drives him to write a moving letter to the brethren in America: "I am under an immense burden that I can neither bear nor lay down. Sometimes when I think of it I cry. But I am not sad; I place all things in God's hands" (25 July 1883).

Vuilleumier's diary conveys to us J. N. Andrews' love for his paper. He experiences actual physical aching when he sees his articles mutilated by the careless mistakes of his associates. Only a lackadaisical attitude toward the work can explain such carelessness and we hear his exclamation of shock at such profanity: "How could you do that?" (9 August 1883). The main culprit, according to Vuilleumier is Aufranc, who is too easily satisfied with his work. If he could only remember, Vuilleumier adds, that his words are read by thousands of people! (25 July 1883).

The immense effort of trying to correct the errors in that issue without having to recompose the whole article wore Andrews out so much that it drove him to his bed for three weeks afterwards (28 July 1883). This love for Les Signes is so great that Andrews is all anguish and pain when he hears in January 1881 that the brethren in America are contemplating the possibility of stopping the paper altogether or moving it to England (17 January 1881).

This devotion to the paper, however, cannot overcome his physical weakness. In June and July 1883, the paper is long delayed because of Andrews' failing health. In July there is even the dreaded possibility



of having to put out a paper without any contribution by Andrews. Every line, Vuilleumier writes, is a miracle of faith and prayer (6 May 1883). On 25 April 1883, Vuilleumier tells us how exhausted J. N. Andrews is after every issue. The paper is possible only through God's strength. While he writes, Jean states, "he cries to God to send His angel to raise him up and give him the strength he needs to write his articles. If God does not want to help me, if he does not raise me up as you would raise a sleeping man, I am totally helpless" (25 April 1883). In the entry for 6 May 1883, Vuilleumier recreates for us the groans of pain, the deep sighs and the ardent prayers which surround the writing of every article.

The publication of the paper is a real battle against Satan. In May 1883, for instance, Andrews feels confident because on the very day when he felt very relieved after two hours of prayer, Satan struck Miss Oyer, a worker at the press. This, for him, shows that his health or her health must be considered at the divine level; not purely on the natural level but on that of the Great Controversy--and there God is in control. However, even when Andrews cannot write, he keeps a keen eye on the copy. On 28 August 1883, Vuilleumier records that he had gone ahead and inserted a translation of an article by D. M. Canright on the nature of man. But Andrews struck it out; it taught a twofold human nature, matter and soul, while Andrews supported a threefold nature, body, mind and soul. Andrews said that if it were published it would destroy all he had written in a recent controversy in Les Signes.

Andrews has questions concerning the success of his work. In August 1883 he tells Jean, "I do not know if my articles are liked. Do you know whether our brethren like them and study them? At times I fear that they don't find them interesting." There is no question in Jean's mind. With youthful enthusiasm he replies: "I find your articles admirable. They are for me an inexhaustible source of instruction."

To which Andrews replies: "Well, we will try to be encouraged. We will trust in the Lord!" On several occasions Jean confides in his diary his admiration for Andrews' articles. On 8 September 1883, he says, "The articles of Elder Andrews are inexhaustible treasures, it seems. They are the vital part of the paper. They constitute its substance. They give the paper its liveliness for they are written in the context of immediate needs." Overwhelmed by the fear that Andrews may die, he adds, "I am going to beg God not to allow that light to go out." Earlier that year he had said that J. N. Andrews was a fulfillment of the prophecy of Daniel 12 that knowledge would increase in the last days (18 January 1883).

The diary shows under what pressures Andrews had to work and how it affected his health. As might be expected, there were troubles in the office. We have already mentioned the inexperience and the negligence of the workers which caused delays and extra work. In April 1880 a whole page of galley comes apart because someone does not pay attention. Because of the clutter in the office a letter from a minister has been misplaced and lost (17 February 1881). The suppliers are not always reliable. For instance, the quality of the paper shipped from a factory at Serrières is definitely unsatisfactory (20 August 1880). The girls misbehave. Their scandalous attitude toward the matron, Miss Oyer, compels Andrews to talk to them and explain her duties and authority. The warning is clear: "Shape up or you'll be fired!" (16 April 1880).

There are also problems with the people from whom they rent. In February 1883 difficulties arise with a certain Mr. Theiler, the owner of the house they have vacated. Although he has told them that he did not care when they moved, now he has started a lawsuit asking 150 francs damages because he was not able to rent the house immediately after their departure. There is gloom around the office because it appears he

will win his case. Andrews' editorial work is interrupted by trips to the lawyer and the court. Buying the house might solve the problem but the brethren in America are not about to pay the 40,000 francs which Theiler asks. On 26 February, contrary to all expectation, the court rules in favor of the Adventists and Theiler must pay all the litigation costs. This brings much sunshine into the office.

On 18 September, in the new residence, there are problems again with the owner, Mr. Stauber, who sends the ultimatum, "Buy before tomorrow or get out." Stauber thinks that either there is no clause requiring a previous warning or that the foreigners are so inexperienced that they are not aware of its existence in the contract. When the Adventists point to that requirement, Stauber changes his tune and offers them 800 francs if they move right away so he can sell the house.

The relations with the Swiss brethren are not always pleasant. Already on 19 February 1880 Andrews is very sick with terrible headaches as a result of his troubles with them, especially with those whom he calls the "anciens frères," the earliest converts who are not in full harmony with his methods. The Swiss, however, are not totally negative toward him. The diary records, on 28 January 1881, that Andrews has received a letter from Albert Vuilleumier congratulating him for the "Adresse au Public" that had appeared in Les Signes in December 1880. In that article Andrews had dissociated the Adventists from Czechowski and had emphasized the fact that on the matter of salvation the Adventists were in full agreement with their brethren in the Protestant churches.

Ribton also is creating problems. He is a promising convert from Italy who has gone to Egypt to do missionary work but will soon become a major source of headaches to J. N. Andrews. Andrews receives a letter from him in August 1879. Andrews is shocked by the doctor's assertion that there is no prophecy pertaining to the time that follows the

resurrection. Seeing that, J. Vuilleumier writes, "Elder Andrews has fallen into a frightening anguish. He wants to write him regardless of what happens to himself. His weakness has greatly increased."

Ribton drains the meager finances of the mission. He has taken his whole family to Egypt with him when he was only supposed to go there to evaluate the prospects. His letters glow with beautiful descriptions of opportunities but he provides no account of missionary work. His dramatic stories of illness and close encounters with death always conclude with requests for money. Indeed he spends freely. The diary conveys the shock and the indignation of the Adventist colony at Basel when they become aware of the fact that he has spent 6,300 francs on the four members of the family while all expenses for the group of ten people at Basel for the same period amounted only to 3,400 francs. Jean, in his good Swiss way of speaking, exclaims, "C'est une jolie difference!" (This is quite a difference!: 23 October 1879). Jean has no scruples in saying that the doctor is lazy, is concerned only with himself and is exploiting the mission. Andrews, however, is caught in a terrible emotional dilemma. He realizes that there is something wrong, that Ribton avoids answering his questions, that he deceives him. Yet he cannot bring himself to cut off the funds. The doctor probably needs financial help and although Andrews has practically no money for himself, he still considers seriously sending Ribton some more.

There is a strain with the General Conference leaders because of Andrews' financial management. They are not happy with the way he has given money to Ribton. Andrews is not very good at administrative matters and so there is a mental crisis when he has to submit accounts to the General Conference. In October 1880 there is a shortage and he cannot balance his accounts.

On another occasion (24 January 1881), Vuilleumier writes: "Elder

Andrews was terror-stricken, just as we were also, that the expenses for the last three months amounted to 3,000 francs. This led on the part of everyone to a pledge to save on the food bill." Personally, Andrews practices the strictest economy. On 11 April 1880, he goes to a tailor to be measured for a new suit, and Vuilleumier informs us that until then he had bought only a necktie! Two days later Andrews buys a chest of drawers, a davenport and a rug, all, we are told, "at the lowest cost possible."

The brethren do not approve of the way that he conducts the work in Europe. They want him to do public evangelism and not to restrict himself in an editorial office. Thus at a time when his strength is low, Andrews goes to England to assist Loughborough. There is always the nagging feeling, we have seen, that they might move the paper away from Basel. To make bad matters worse, Andrews is a little suspicious. He feels that Maud Sisley had given an unfavorable report when she returned to America. In February 1881 there is mix-up with America on the date of an assembly that must be held at Basel on the 26th. From comparing reports in the Review and personal correspondence, Andrews has concluded that the date of the meeting has been changed without his knowledge and that leads him into a depression. Eventually, however, he discovers that he had misinterpreted a telegram he had received from Battle Creek.

Unfortunately, the misunderstandings are very real. In a conversation with Jean, Andrews places the blame for the loss of his health upon the brethren in America. On 6 May 1883 he explains to his young associate why he has lost "his restorative power." He had gone to America and had left confident of the support of the General Conference. But the brethren then suggested moving the paper to England. Bitterly, he observes that three of their members were coming to Europe to settle the whole matter by themselves. That was the fatal blow. He saw that he would be "condemned

by the experts." All his efforts, all his sacrifices would be in vain. The death of his own daughter, the material he had prepared with so much effort, all would be wasted and he would be considered a failure. Since then, he concludes, all his vital strength is gone and every line he writes is a miracle of grace. At this pitiful confession, Jean tells us that he hurst into tears.

There is stress also because of Andrews' pessimism and lack of self-image. On 8 September 1883, Vuilleumier records Andrews' words to his sister-in-law, Martha. "Martha, my life has been a total failure. No one among those who have tried to spread the third angel's message has failed as much as I. Almost all my efforts for the advancement of the work have failed and what I have done has not produced the fruit that I was expecting. May God forgive me!" His sister's answer that he had the consolation of knowing that his writing would remain and circulate and enlighten the world, led to the sad reflection, "What I wrote will be quickly forgotten."

Andrews feels that others do not understand his true condition. For instance, in the summer of 1883 the General Conference sent B. L. Whitney to assist Andrews. At first Whitney's presence buoyed him up greatly. Jean notes on 8 September: "Before, (Andrews) felt the crushing weight of the mission bearing on him . . . He is now calm and tranquil. He has placed everything in the hands of Elder Whitney." But soon Andrews realizes that Whitney has no idea how sick he is. He cannot even stand his mother's care. When she comes he must ask her to sit down and not to move. He confides to Jean:

Whitney has no concept of the true state of my health. He is guided by a 'presumptuous utopia.' He wants to call an assembly here and asks me to preside and organize everything. He believes that with a little faith I shall be strong enough to assume that burden. He thinks that I am discouraged and he tries to build up my morale, to have faith for me. You cannot have faith for others. It is all you can do to have faith for yourself" (16 August 1883).

On 5 September 1883, Andrews is very upset when Whitney leaves for Italy when he is so desperately needed at Basel.

One may wonder how far Whitney expressed the views of the leadership at Battle Creek that Andrews' problems were mostly in his mind. While in August 1878 Ellen White had severely rebuked the Swiss for their treatment of Andrews, in March 1883 she scolded Andrews severely:

I have heretofore written you several letters and never sent them, so I attempt to write you again. I know your temperament is peculiar and I have felt that you were not able to bear the truth if it conflicted with your ideas . . . You made a mistake in starting for Europe without a companion . . . You felt that you were a martyr missionary but it was not so. You have magnified your afflictions. You have seemed to take satisfaction in enshrouding yourself in clouds of gloom . . . You crave for sympathy . . . love to be pitied, to be regarded as one suffering privations as a martyr. You follow impressions. You think that your impressions are the voice of God. You have no discernment of character. You worship intellect . . . God did not decree that you should die . . . O, my brother, nine-tenths of all your trials are born of your imagination."<sup>2</sup>

The diary gives some information on how Andrews tries to improve his language proficiency. On 18 August 1880 an entry states: "He had worship with us. To make progress in French he translated every verse word by word." In another entry he complains about the length of evening worship because all the American brethren want to read all the texts aloud. A brief note on 11 October 1880 reveals that J. N. Andrews is reading German with Aufranc. His desire to learn was so great that even when his health was very poor he still talked about additional language study.

In the office with the workers Andrews is very kind. On 11 October 1880 he gives each one a small English hymnal. On a few occasions we see him taking walks with his associates. On 7 October 1883 he gives Jean a copy of a sermon by Gausson. "You have shown me," he explained, "your good will and I want to leave this souvenir with you." This kindness is

bolstered by a feeling of responsibility for their welfare. When Miss Oyer refuses to take a certain medication, Andrews is very upset because he realizes that if she dies, the family will hold him responsible for her death.

Andrews' spiritual leadership appears on many occasions in the diary. His prayers often move the staff very deeply, perhaps more than the sermons that he preaches on Sabbath, which are exceedingly doctrinal. Vuilleumier has recorded some of his topics: the impossibility for the wicked to repent after the judgement (28 July 1880), tithes and offerings (11 October 1880), the sanctuary (10 January 1881), immortality (17 January) and the lake of fire (31 January 1881). The last reference to a talk by Andrews comes on 13 January 1883, when he touches the hearts of everyone by his words on how to prepare for the Lord's Supper. Often, however, we have the sad entry: Elder Andrews is too weak to talk.

The diary identifies some of the visitors to the office. In April 1883 Dr. Kellogg comes to Europe for his wife's health and stay at Basel. He arrives on 12 April. Kellogg's stay is the occasion of a group picture of the staff in front of the building. Another day the doctor invites the whole group to a ride in the country and the city. Vuilleumier mentions his excitement at visiting the historic rooms in the cathedral. Kellogg also practices his medicine. People flock to him, Vuilleumier writes. He diagnoses a serious beginning of tuberculosis for Mathilde Roth (12 and 17 April 1883). He prescribes some massages to improve Andrews' circulation but that only makes the patient feel worse. The happiest moments in the diary is the coming of Andrews' family, sent to Switzerland at the insistence of Ellen White who set aside Andrews' fears that the trip would be too hazardous for his mother (8 June 1883). As a devoted son, Andrews gave his mother his room and moved into a small, dark cubicle across from the stairway. At first the visit cheers him so



much that he feels no more exhaustion, but eventually he confides to Vuilleumier that even his mother's care wearies him (16 August 1883).

The visitors cause extra work for Vuilleumier. He has to teach languages to the daughters of Kellogg and Bourdeau. When a telegram arrives from Paris announcing the arrival of the Bourdeaus, Mrs. Erzberger, who was the matron at that time, is quite upset by the thought of the extra crowd. She also confides, "I am afraid that Elder Bourdeau will kill Elder Andrews by his constant chatter." Aufranc went to the station to meet him and "found him sound asleep and snoring in his railroad car. It took two men to cart nineteen pieces of his luggage" (18 September 1883).

By the spring of 1883 Andrews' health is gone. On 25 April, he says to Vuilleumier that Dr. Kellogg has told him that from the human point of view, he could only expect death. Vuilleumier records:

We see him come to breakfast in the morning, his German Bible under his arm, his tall body half bent down and he drops into a chair. His eyes are reddened by tears, his face is wrinkled, drawn by his suffering, his weakness so great that he cannot think, but he does not want to give up. He dresses and appears at meal-time as if he enjoyed the best of health, although he can swallow practically nothing. The food is choked in his throat. It cannot go through. He feels almost that he is dying of starvation. 'If I could just take some food, I think I could write, but it cannot go down.' And then he puts his forehead on the table and silent tears drown his cheeks hollowed by his labors.

At times, because of sunny days or a long season of prayer he feels better, but by September Andrews is resigned to his fate. As he tells his mother and Jean,

I have reached the point that can be compared to that of ships nearing the harbor. They are no longer in the middle of the ocean, subject to the fury of the storms and the tempests. The cliffs now protect from the wind. The sea is calm, the waves have been stilled. We are nearing home" (18 September 1883).

He talks about the plans for his funeral which must be very simple. He wants Jean's father to come and say a few words and then he can be

buried. Above all, he does not want to become a burden (5 September 1883).

In April, when he has heard Dr. Kellogg's verdict, J. Vuilleumier, torn by the prospect of the death of Andrews, prepares a four-page letter to all the brethren asking for special prayer. Andrews, who has at first approved of the idea, asks for the letter to be postponed because he is feeling better (25 April 1883). But in October his condition worsens dramatically. There are several references to terrible bowel sufferings<sup>s</sup> and diarrhea. On 10 October his relatives are reconciled to the inevitable. Mrs. Andrews allows Jean into her son's room and he sees him as pale as death lying on his bed, exhaling a loud death rattle, twisting his hands and turning around with terrible pains. The suffering is so unbearable that Andrews falls on his knees to ask God for some relief. The prayer expresses such submission to God's will that it brings tears to the eyes of all who are present. One night, shortly afterwards, Andrews is shaken by terrible hiccups. He still has enough strength to express his gratitude and his regret at causing so much extra work. His faith does not flag. "I am satisfied," he repeats three times with increasing strength, "I am satisfied with the religion of Jesus."

There is no entry on the day of Andrews' death. The two previous entries speak of the church at Basel and all the brethren praying for him.

The diary gives us an interesting glimpse into the atmosphere at the office during those years. Jean makes references to many of his co-workers. He is not always flattering about them. On 17 October 1880 he writes,

Since Mrs. Ings' departure, Miss Oyer has taken over the management of the household. Lydie obeyed and worked only grudgingly and half-heartedly and she did as little as possible. I was able to verify what I had suspected before, that Lydie is rather lazy, without character, will or capacities. In her hands everything gets dirty

and disorderly. She can drag out for a whole week what should be done today. She does not have the least idea of how to cook. Her soups are disasters; all her dishes boil over and when you hear her, someone else is to blame. It is certainly a pity that when Elder Andrews' health requires so much care as far as food is concerned, there is no one around who is a good cook and who can fix a few appetizing and nourishing meals.

The diet at the Basel office is certainly not extravagant. In the morning they usually have corn mush and potatoes. At noon, soup and potatoes in a white sauce. There is not always enough. As he says, "Often you see the bottom of your plate when you can still feel the bottom of your stomach" (17 October 1880). On 16 February 1881, Vuilleumier complains that the coffee is cold, worse than water. He bemoans the fact that Andrews gets only potatoes with fish gravy when once in a while he should have roast beef with well-prepared vegetables. At times, Andrews gets cod fish prepared in an odd way. Two days later, though, there is good news. Two barrels of dried fruit have arrived from America: dried apples, pears, peaches and even maple syrup.

The office is terribly crowded. After the Aufrancs have moved to another place, their two rooms are replastered. One will become Edith Gabard's room, but will serve also as a bookkeeping and mailing office. The other will be used as a parlor (12 April 1880).

Jean Vuilleumier and Charles Andrews are often associated in routine tasks. They take the galleys to the printer and the bags of addressed papers to the post office. Often the inexperience and the carelessness of someone create jams and on several occasions Vuilleumier records the rush to meet the mailing deadline.

Whitney's coming not only greatly relieves the work of Andrews, but also brings a much more businesslike atmosphere at the office. Tall, not very talkative but simple enough to accompany the crew to the bath-house

(28 July 1883), he quickly institutes some reforms. He regulates the mealtimes: breakfast at 6:00, morning worship at 6:30, dinner at noon, supper at 6:00 p.m. and evening worship at 6:30. Vuilleumier notes that Whitney has tried a new custom, "étrange et bizarre" (strange and queer), as he says, but profitable: it is the custom of repeating the Lord's Prayer in unison. As there are different versions in French, it is not easy to keep together.

Whitney is obviously a man who informs himself before he acts. As he studies the need for more space for the work, he comes to the conclusion that it will be cheaper to build a new building than to remodel an old one and then he buries himself in building codes to find out exactly what the law requires. Finding that the papers are mailed individually, he studies the postal code and discovers that mass mailings would save a great deal of money. He immediately takes the steps to have a franchise. As the press needs a new press and a new papercutter, he goes to different agencies and travels to Zurich to an equipment fair to see the latest that is available. When he can get a good price on good quality paper, he orders a large quantity.

His personal library has suffered a minor catastrophe during the voyage from America. He has packed maple syrup in a box of books. In the warm hold of the ship the sugar melted and soaked the binding of the books. "Poor Mrs. Whitney," Vuilleumier comments, "she who loves books so much, how sad she must be in spite of the nonchalant air that she assumes" (16 August 1883).

Jean Vuilleumier does not seek the center of attention in his diary but he does give some information on himself. He appears as a

studious young man. The first entry presents him as a student. On 14 April 1880 he takes his examinations. After his return to Basel in January 1883 as a regular worker with pay he is still eager to continue his studies. So he gets up at 5:00 a.m. and studies until breakfast. When he begins his reading of Milton, he is filled with admiration. It is, "the best book after the Bible!" Constantly, we have references to the fact that his responsibilities with the press keep him from opening any book. He expresses the hope that a church school will soon open at Basel, since Elder Whitney has had experience in teaching (3 January 1883).

The departure of Kellogg causes a little crisis for Jean Vuilleumier for, as a token of thankfulness for Jean's assisting his daughter with her French, the doctor offers him forty francs, which to J. Vuilleumier appears to be a "somme colosalle!" He cannot see how he can accept any money for work done in company time but upon the doctor's urging he accepts, sends twenty francs home and pays for a trip through Switzerland (29 June 1883).

Jean is very frugal. On 5 March 1883 he gets formal notice of his pay, thirty francs per month. He protests that it is too much. So he returns five francs to the work and sends five francs home. He is not one to complain. When he does it is always because he is concerned about Andrews. He wishes that the food were better so that his strength could be restored. He would like better workers to relieve the pioneer. For himself he would like to have a better literary and theological preparation to be a more efficient assistant (9 August 1883).

Jean is kept very busy indeed. In the office Andrews entrusts him with important responsibilities, considering his youth. He is soon chief copy reader, responsible for manuscripts, proof, layouts, etc. During the absence of Aufranc, he must translate the first of a series of articles on the return of Jesus. Elder Andrews notes that he has not

found anything about it in our American papers.<sup>3</sup> When Mrs. Erzberger has to devote her attention to the ailing Miss Oyer, she asks him to keep up the subscribers' list and to compile the missionary activities. He also has 1,600 papers to address. He must transcribe a list of one or two thousand names from l'Indicateur Vaudois for gift issues. This compiling of lists of names is a major and not always interesting burden. Jean uses his initiative and develops a better system to keep up the subscription lists (7 July 1883).

Continually he expresses his love and admiration for Elder Andrews. He notes his conversations with the pioneer worker and his walks with him. As time goes by and the likelihood of the separation grows more real, his closeness with Andrews grows. On 18 July 1883 he writes: "I visit Elder Andrews more often now than I did formerly. These visits help me greatly. The sight of this man of God lying on a bed of anguish and suffering fills my thoughts with the seriousness which they often lack and remind me of the solemnity of the task in which I am engaged." Andrews responds to this youthful affection. He opens his heart, confides his feelings with him, asks for his opinion. One day he sees Andrews' pen on a table and writes in his diary: "O precious pen. How I would like to have in my heart and mind all the thoughts and articles that you have put on paper" (15 September 1883). Andrews entrusts Vuilleumier with many tasks. He must write to Serrières, to the paper company, to protest about the quality of the paper which they have shipped (20 August 1879). He asks him to set the books in order, an opportunity for Jean to discover the breadth of learning of his mentor.

On the other hand Vuilleumier has little use for Daniel Bourdeau. He makes several disparaging references to him. He finds him clumsy and cumbersome. The diary relates at length a Sabbath worship after Bourdeau's return to Europe. The Bourdeau family provided the special music. With

heavy voice, Bourdeau completely deafened everyone. Adolphe Keller, Jean's friend, said: "I shall never go to church again if that takes place again." Keller's main objection was to the "theatrical" style of Bourdeau's singing. The sermon that followed was no better. Bourdeau proceeded to read half of one of Andrews' pamphlets on the 2,300 days. At half mark, realizing that the hearers could not follow, he gave a far-from-clear explanation of his own, shifting from English to French, followed by the rereading of the pamphlet (27 September 1883). Vuilleumier comments ironically on another sermon at the Basel Conference: "it was an excellent sermon, full of the perfumes of the Adventist garden in America!" (19 August 1883). When confronted with the criticism Bourdeau shrugged the whole thing off, saying that the Swiss were too afraid of what came from America. His own objective was to give a Swiss-American diet.

Vuilleumier is also troubled by Aufranc, questioning his spiritual experience. After listening to Aufranc teaching the Sabbath School lesson he remarks: "If he only felt what he says" (25 July 1883). Vuilleumier's suspicions are confirmed shortly afterwards at the conference at Basel when Aufranc makes a public confession: "I thought that I was a Christian" (19 August 1883).

With youthful spontaneity, Vuilleumier records many of his emotions. He is excited when a new lithography machine arrives. "Nothing could be more simple. Elder Andrews is delighted" (7 March 1880). He shares his impressions of the visitors: Mrs. Andrews, the most noble of the grandmothers, who shook hands with him; Dr. Kellogg,

. . . a charming, very learned and very capable little doctor. His wife who has poor health right now and who suffers some deafness, is a very friendly woman, and finally, Miss Kellogg, who in spite of her stiff and reserved appearance is, I believe, a charming person" (15 April 1883).

The diary gives much information on the influence of the paper and the growth of the work in Europe. On 24 March 1880 he writes: "Daily we are receiving more letters and subscriptions." A few days later he records the reception of the letter of a minister of Tavannes, "a great foe of our cause." On 18 January 1881 he states, "Now we have many addresses. Every day we send two hundred gift copies." They often get these addresses by inserting advertisements in different papers. After a note in the Revue Lausanne they receive thirty letters and add eight subscribers (12 January 1883). As he says, "Many people, moved by reading our letter, could not help but respond." In March, as a result of the advertisements in the Petit Journal and the Estafette, they get twenty-three requests for the paper (21 March 1883). They have established contacts with many well-known people. They correspond with the daughter of Gaussens<sup>4</sup> (7 October 1883). Plans are made to publish in other languages. In May they print Italian pamphlets. In August 1883 Vuilleumier announces the hope of beginning a German paper next January. In fact, B. L. Whitney travels to Bern to talk with Mrs. Gelpke<sup>5</sup> in that regard. From the beginning, support for the work has come from many places in America, especially a colony of French-speaking Adventists in Illinois (7 March 1880). With that financial assistance they will be able to mail the material that is available, more than fifty thousand pages (14 March 1880).

While Vuilleumier is full of admiration for Andrews, he sees some shortcomings in the paper. On 29 August 1883 he tells us that the style is far too conservative. The appearance of the front page must be changed. When there are no articles by Andrews, the paper lacks its "heart." The awareness awakens in him his destiny as an editor. "Our paper without solid articles and made up of articles written in another language for another country convinces me that I should study the Bible and the truth



to fill that void. I feel that I must study. To live without study is not to live." Yet he praises God for being able to have access in the English language to the best books that men have written" (15 September 1883).

He describes the formal foundation of the Basel church on 18 October 1880 during a Sabbath afternoon meeting. The people pledged to keep God's commandments and recorded their covenant in a notebook. Aufranc was appointed "conducteur de cultes." Vuilleumier adds that some also committed themselves to pay tithes. At that time at Basel, Sabbath School was held in the morning and the regular church service came in the afternoon (28 July 1883).

The problem of drinking that becomes quite prominent in the diary after Andrews' death appears already at the Basel Conference. He saw his relatives, his father included, drinking wine as if it were all right for Adventists to do so. Jean noted that during the afternoon his father's prayer lacked power (19 August 1883). In September Vuilleumier announces that he is convinced that beer has no value as a food. His progress in the path of health reform leads Andrews' mother to confide to her son: "Maybe we can convert Jean to the two meals system" (18 September 1883). In the Health Reformer Andrews had given a glowing account of the benefits of the two-meal system for his own health.<sup>6</sup>

Precious details are given concerning the growth of the work in those early days. Andrews' strategy, if we can believe the advice he gave Gabert,<sup>7</sup> was to begin by going into a village and going from house to house during the day and then holding meetings in the evening (28 October 1880). Andrews also sends men to visit the subscribers to Les Signes. The main news about the work in Basel itself has to do with the public effort of J. Erzberger and the anti-Adventist meetings. When Vuilleumier returns to Basel after his three years absence, Erzberger is holding a series of

meetings. There are one hundred and twenty to one hundred and thirty listeners on 22 January, as he explains the end of Satan. When he discusses the origin of Sunday two days later, they sell twenty-three dollars' worth of tracts and pass out twenty Les Signes but Vuilleumier notes a severe drop in attendance after that lecture. He explains it by the fact that during the carnival they had stopped advertising the meetings. However, several persons who are interested accept an invitation to Sabbath dinner (17 February 1883).

By 8 February, Vuilleumier tells us that he expects an attack by the local pastors, and, indeed, it comes furiously. There is an anti-Sabbath meeting at the Vereinhaus on 19 February. A certain Bauder draws the history of the Sabbath and concludes that in the time of Jesus that day was so loaded with Jewish traditions that a change was needed. A second orator tries to lift up Sunday to heaven and pours out his spleen against the Sabbath, whose modern observers he accuses of being Galatian judaizers. There followed a third speaker who discussed grace and freedom. Although the three were full of fire, they managed to contradict each other a-plenty, Vuilleumier remarks. The great event in February 1883 is Erzberger's public rebuttal at the Casino. Jean Vuilleumier and his young friends, Charles Andrews, Arthur Borle and Edouard Borle, walk there in plenty of time while Elder Andrews and Erzberger come more ceremoniously in a coach. The attendance is estimated at four hundred people by Jean. The speech of Erzberger which Vuilleumier qualifies as calm, tightly logical and triumphant cannot be described as short. He speaks on the perpetuity of the Sabbath and answers questions for one and a half hours at least, so much so that by the time he concludes one-fifth of the attendance has skipped out. His words arouse the rage of two schoolteachers who with threatening gestures and a hail of words follow them all the way back to the mission, shouting, "Fellow workers of the

Antichrist, fellow workers of the Antichrist" (19 February 1883).

On 5 March, Vuilleumier records another anti-Sabbath meeting in the Methodist church. But this speaker amazes his Adventist listeners by showing so clearly the perpetuity and necessity of God's demand for a holy day. There is unfortunately no entry on how he deals the following Sunday with the question, "Why Sunday?" In spite of the excitement, however, the interest is lagging. The last reference to a public meeting comes on 15 April 1883. As he reports that Erzberger has given lectures on the nature of man, he exclaims, "Six months ago the pastors gave no attention to us but now they grit their teeth. They run from home to home spreading calumnies and attacking the truth. What a change! A simple preacher without title or diploma but who has read the Bible!"

Jean Vuilleumier, however, is not a great admirer of Erzberger. He does not seem to have the sense of propriety. In May Erzberger preaches at a funeral. Jean tells us that it was a philosophical dissertation on concepts of death from the Egyptians to the American Indians, "a lecture, not a funeral sermon," and he ends the entry with "and it was very long, naturally!" (24 May 1883). He criticizes Erzberger for his failure to visit interested people sufficiently (21 March 1883). He is not fond of his evangelistic methods. He questions the length of the meetings, the long song service, and the prayer "that is ten times too long." He does not like his sermons, which are endless, poorly organized and ramble all over the place. He finds fault with his delivery, his loud shouting about meaningless points (5 September 1883). People are poorly prepared for baptism. On one occasion, Jean rebukes Elder Erzberger for baptizing people who have never heard anything about the meaning of baptism and when Erzberger recognizes the validity of the criticism, he preaches an endless sermon about it. The examination of the candidates is conducted in an uncouth way. He asks clumsy and often indiscreet questions about the

personal life of the neophytes. Theologically, Vuilleumier feels that the baptism of water should be completed by the laying of hands (3 July 1883).

Jean Vuilleumier appears already in those early days with the character that he will manifest through his long ministry: a forthright person, who is not awed by rank or name, an independent thinker, one whose loyalty to the church could never be questioned. He is a man who loved to study scripture and explain doctrine. His devotional life is fed by the reading of the Testimonies of Ellen G. White, as the diary shows repeatedly. He is a man with a very sensitive conscience who had, for instance, to confess to Miss Oyer that once he had said something unkind about her (24 July 1883), a man whose life can be summarized in these words written on 12 September 1883 on his nineteenth anniversary: "I have the desire to surrender myself fully to God."

NOTES

<sup>1</sup>This study was made possible by the willingness of Miss A. Vuilleumier, the daughter of Jean Vuilleumier, to type the entries relating to Andrews and the printing office from her father's diary. She has now entrusted this valuable document to Dr. Copiz, a member of the staff of the Euro-Africa Division of Seventh-day Adventists at Bern, Switzerland, for further study. The document is eventually to be placed in the Archives at the Library of the Séminaire Adventiste at Collonges-sous-Salève, France. It is unfortunate that at the time this study was prepared only the extracts selected by Miss Vuilleumier were available.

<sup>2</sup>Ellen G. White Estate, Washington, D.C., The Letters of Ellen G. White, 1847-1915, 29 Mar. 1883.

<sup>3</sup>"Frère Aufranc étant allé . . . , on me donna à traduire il y a quelque jours, le premier article de sa série nouvelle sur le sujet du retour de J.C. A son étonnement, il n'en trouve point dans nos journaux américains et s'est mis à en faire un lui-même": 17 February 1883. This is an astonishing assertion. Possibly Andrews meant that there was nothing suitable, or recent, on the subject.

<sup>4</sup>A well-known Genevan pastor and interpreter of the prophecies of Daniel.

<sup>5</sup>So far unidentified.

<sup>6</sup>July 1871, p. 5.

<sup>7</sup>L. A. Gabert was a Darbyist who accepted the Adventist message and became a worker. See his letter in Les Signes, June 1877, p. 94.

