

# ADVENT REVIEW



## AND SABBATH HERALD.

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

VOL. XXV.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, DECEMBER 20, 1864.

No. 4.

### The Advent Review & Sabbath Herald

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY

The Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association.

ELD. JAMES WHITE, PRESIDENT.

TERMS.—Two Dollars a year in advance.

Address ELDER JAMES WHITE, Battle Creek, Michigan.

#### Those that Love His Appearing.

How oft we look up, as we see the day nearing,  
And long for the time when His coming we'll see;  
How the hearts of those thrill who love His appearing,  
When he comes without sin, all His captives to free.

But while in the light of His promise we're basking,  
Rejoicing in hope of the mansions above,  
This heart-searching question each one should be asking,  
In His coming, what is there, I earnestly love?

We had dear cherished forms, to the church-yard we bore them,  
With anguish which none but the mourner can tell;  
When our Lord comes again he says he'll restore them—  
Is this why we love his appearing so well?

We have breasted the waves of life's turbulent river,  
We have gleaned earthly treasures to see them decay,  
We have seen our hopes crumble in ruins forever,  
While time marred our idols and swept them away.

When hopes one by one, by the tempest are riven,  
Our hearts all enshrouded by sorrow and gloom;  
We long to escape to some more quiet haven;  
'Tis then we cry out, "Come, Lord, quickly come!"

But it is not for these we should love his appearing;  
Though rough be our pathway and gloomy the grave,  
There is something beyond, and the thought, oh, how cheering!  
Our Saviour hath died fallen sinners to save.

He died to redeem, view him suffering and bleeding,  
He rose in great majesty, mighty to save;  
At his Father's right hand hear him now interceding,  
Victorious o'er death, o'er hell, and the grave.

With hearts filled with love, let us fall down before him,  
Begin here the harmony never to end;  
And love his appearing, because we adore him,  
And long to be with him, our Saviour and Friend.

C. M. WILLIS.

Charlotte, Mich.

#### Indecision.

NEVER be undecided. Never if you can avoid it, be infirm of purpose. Always make up your mind to follow a certain course, after due deliberation, and then, when you have arrived at a decision, cling to it. Do not permit trifling circumstantial influences to interfere with your just conclusions. As Brutus did when he condemned his son Titus to death, so should you. Consequences are everything. Do right, and the consequences will not, in the end of matters, be disastrous to you. Do right! But strive, every day of your life, to discover wherein right exists, and of what it is constituted. They who yield to accustomed indecision, will ever be unprosperous, and, of course, unhappy.

#### Authenticity of the Scriptures.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN ELD. J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH, OF BATTLE CREEK, MICH., AND E. O. DARLING OF ROCKTON, ILLS.

THE following correspondence was commenced in the winter of 1861, but was stopped after my fourth letter. Mr. Darling never responded to letters three and four. I present this correspondence for the Review, hoping it may do some good. Most of the statements of matters of fact are copied from Horne and others, but are greatly condensed in my letters.

J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

#### Mr. Darling's First Letter.

BROTHER: Although I do not lay any particular claim to your friendship, above the claim that each and every individual has one upon another, I take the liberty to address you at this time, and in this manner, for the following reasons: While your tent meetings were in progress at Lee's Grove (Harrison, Ills.), owing to the distance and poor health, I was unable to attend but two, and heard you preach but one evening; but judging from this and from the testimony of those who heard your course, I infer that you dared not only meet the orthodox opposition on their chosen ground and behind their great Theological "earth-work," the Bible, but if I am correctly informed, even invited their officers into your own tent where they might behold "the sword of the Spirit" brandished with such dexterity that they generally, after a few strategic maneuvers, thought it policy to retire rather than risk a general engagement. Judging from all this, I conclude that you at least think that you believe what you profess to believe. This is a compliment I do not, I can not, accord to preachers generally. Believing you are honest, I am anxious to learn the claims, if any, that your philosophy has upon my reason, and obtain a few of the arguments with which you convince and convert a free thinking reasoner to a belief in the infallibility of the Bible, and that yours is the only rational and truthful exposition of the same. Briefly, then, the request I have to make is, that at your earliest convenience, consistent with your other duties, you will, by correspondence in the form of answers to questions, or otherwise if you choose, sustain what, if I understand you, you would probably term, the claims of the Bible.

Yours for a knowledge of the truth.

E. O. DARLING.

Rockton, Sept. 10, 1861.

#### Response.

MR. E. O. DARLING, Dear Sir: Your letter came duly to hand, being forwarded from Davis, Ill., to Battle Creek. The letter did not reach Davis until we had left with the tent. I hope this will be a sufficient excuse for my apparent delay. I do not know but I shall accept your offer to correspond on the authenticity of the Scriptures for a while, at least, if we can get at it in some fair way, and have some just principles by which to try our reasonings. I know of no other way to reason but from cause to effect, and that we cannot do without some principles from which to reason. Nei-

ther can we do it without some standard by which to try our work. You say, in speaking of my book on the Saint's Inheritance, which you are reading, that you cannot "believe anything that is not affirmed, or at least is not contradicted by my reason." I cannot reason without some groundwork on which to reason. I might say a thing does not agree with facts. But to say it does not agree with reason is folly, for reason cannot work without facts to work upon. As Hume says:—"A wise man proportions his belief to the evidence." I am willing you should ask questions, but in answering, I shall ask some questions too. I shall say no more at present, as I am in great haste, and I hope when I receive some of your questions, to be more at liberty. Please address me at Battle Creek at your earliest convenience.

Yours truly,

J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

Battle Creek, Sept. 30, 1861.

#### Mr. Darling's Second Letter.

BRO.: You say you do not know but you shall accept my invitation to correspond "if we can get at it in some fair way, and have some just principles—some standard by which to try our reasoning." Now, while I think that it would be well enough for us, if we can without consuming too much time, to have a few established principles for a foundation, for our eternal welfare, I cannot see the need of any standard outside and besides that standard or principle that judges of standards, the understanding. Or, to state it another way, for us to correspond as I requested, I cannot see why we need any other standard than this, any more than an audience, when you go before it to speak the same matter, subject to the same questioning; unless it be that in that case, "The Book," principles or no principles, is presumed to be the standard, which I suppose is not strictly the case. But I am not too old, nor unwilling to learn more on this subject. What have you to propose here? Referring to a certain portion of my letter, you make me say that "I believed nothing that is not affirmed, or at least is not contradicted by reason," very near as I said it. And then you say that you were not aware that reason itself ever affirmed anything; that you supposed reasoning was "drawing certain conclusions from certain known or inferred causes and facts." Thank you, this definition is undoubtedly correct, but I think also, that if certain conclusions—children of reason—may affirm and confirm, or contradict assertions, it cannot be so very incorrect as to totally obscure the sense to speak of reason as doing it. Here also you seem to take exceptions to the manner in which I refer to your book. But when I said that it "proved little or nothing to me" &c, I supposed that you would readily understand that the reason of this was because it is impossible for me to take as authority, or standard, the mere assertions of Bible writers, to which you almost invariably, as I presume you intended, refer me. If you can get over that standard question, I have some propositions to offer, and would be pleased to hear any from you. I do not see as I can say any more until that standard question is settled, which I trust will receive your attention at your earliest convenience.

Truly yours,

E. O. DARLING.

Rockton, Nov. 18, 1861.

## Response No. 2.

MR. DARLING, Dear Sir: Your letter of Nov. 18th I received a few days since on returning home from a short trip in Michigan. I embrace this opportunity to answer, although at a late date from the writing of your letter, thinking the old adage true in this case, "Better late than never." You say in regard to my remark about having some standard by which to try our reasoning, "I cannot see that we need any other standard than our own understanding any more than does an audience when you go before it to speak the same matter, subject to the same questioning." I don't know but you are right in this matter. There is, however, a slight difference between this and my preaching to an audience on the same subject. No particular difference between our correspondence and a public discussion on the same subject however. In entering a public discussion, it is necessary for the disputants to understand the source from which their proofs may be derived. But I presume you and I shall have no great difference on that score. I don't know as I just understand your meaning on the subject of standards. You speak of judging all matters by "our understanding." To judge matters by our understanding without any principles or facts, would be equivalent to judging by our impressions. But I will not take advantage of your language, as I suppose you mean we are to judge of matters after getting all the light we can from facts. If you conclude with me, to let the standard question rest for the present as it now stands, we will pass on to the debate. As you first proposed to discuss this matter, saying you wished to ask some questions on the authenticity of the Scriptures, it will be no more than you can expect that I should wait for you to lead out. I trust this will not be construed by you as an unwillingness on my part to try and impart all the light in my power. I of course shall be better prepared to appreciate and help your difficulties when I get your questions, which I suppose, as a matter of course, will involve our points of difference. I trust in the future I shall be able to answer more promptly than heretofore.

I remain yours with respect,

J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

Battle Creek, Dec. 19, 1861.

## Mr. Darling's Third Letter.

MR. LOUGHBOROUGH, My dear Sir: Yours of Dec 19th came duly to hand to which I will now reply. As you evince no disposition to protract preliminaries, I will at once proceed to the subject of this correspondence. Passing with you, then, for the present, over the little debate as to whether there is or ought to be any difference between this correspondence and a public discussion of this matter, I will notice for explanation, the next, where, after quoting my language on standards, you say that you don't know as you just understand my meaning when I say that "I cannot see the need of any standard outside of, and besides, that standard which judges all standards—our understanding," and say that to judge of matters by our understanding without any principles or facts, would be almost equivalent to judging by our impressions! But you generously conclude that I mean we are to judge of matters after getting all the light we can from facts, &c. Yes, if we are wise we shall get all the light we can from facts and principles, and make use of it when forming our judgment. But the idea I wished to convey was and is, that before a standard is comprehended by the mind, that mind cannot know whether that standard is true or false, and hence is to us a last and insufficient guide. After that mind comprehends the standard, what better is the standard, even if discovered to be true, to try mental operations by, than the understanding? This, you will perceive, if true at all, is as true of the comparatively unenlightened, as of the enlightened mind.

I will now introduce a very few of the afore mentioned questions. Some of these I have before asked, and heard asked often, and as often have heard them answered by anything but explanations. Hence, I trust you will not think it all unmitigated egotism, should I speak as though I thought some of them inexplorable. First, then, the Bible, its externals. When, where, and how was it compiled? Were these several

books, now comprising the Bible, in whole or in part, culled from a collection of manuscripts, and if so, by whom, and what authority? And have we any evidence that these compilers, for the time, at least, were by any means made infallible judges of the matters before them? Were these compilations the work of more than one session, and if it was, when and where the others? And of these manuscripts, how, and where, were they preserved previous to these compilations? In other words, were they, at that time, genuine, and have they, since such compilation, been kept beyond the reach of all possible alteration? Were they, in whole or in part, regarded and used by the people as infallible standards by which to try their reasonings, especially on moral subjects, previous to such compilations?

Next, the Bible, its internals. Is it, as a whole, in its matter, essentially different from any and every other book or books of which we have any knowledge? If so, in what does that difference consist? Was it in a more direct manner than any other book composed by an omniscient, omnipotent and all-good Being, so that in its every narration of fact, and every precept enjoined, it can be depended upon as strictly true, so clear, concise, and plain, that to a moderately well-balanced mind, prior to all theological tinkering, it would be a "safe guide to follow?" In a word, is it, as we generally understand that phrase, "plenary inspired?" If you say that is so inspired, I of course, can only ask, what and where the evidence? If it is not thus inspired, and is simply a record of, and for, alleged facts and phenomena, then in what sense is it entitled to the appellation of "God's Word," "Holy Bible," &c., any more than is *Edmund's Spiritualism*, or the Apocraphy to the Old and New Testaments?

These, and similar questions, together with scores of others arising from these, must, I think, of necessity, in every mind, be settled somehow before all doubts can be removed; and all doubts must be removed before a real confiding happiness can be attained. And for that kind of happiness I long and trust and ask prayer of deeds and deep desire of all who wish me well.

Yours with respect,  
Rockton, Ill., Jan. 2, 1862.

E. O. DARLING.

## Response No. 3.

MR. E. O. DARLING, My dear Sir: Your letter of Jan. 2nd is before me, and I hasten to reply. Your preliminaries I have no need to notice, as we have both spoken freely on the subject contained in them.

The first point that arrests my attention is something you say on the standard question again. You say: "The idea I wished to convey was, and is, that before a standard is comprehended by the mind, that mind cannot know whether that standard is true or false; and hence is to us a last and insufficient guide. After that mind comprehends the standard, what better is the standard, even if discovered to be true, to try mental operations by, than the understanding?"

I conceive there is quite a considerable difference. We are dependent for our ideas primarily of everything, on a revelation of some kind: reason itself will never teach us any thing, not even our own name. We must learn it by testimony from others. This becomes more especially the case in reference to events remote from us. Now if I find by carefully trying a book of history, that it records truth on points that I am acquainted with, and succeed in establishing its truthfulness, I take its testimony as true on things which I know nothing about, because I, forsooth, have established it as a true record. It is true, it may take more to convince one man of the truth of a document, than another; but it is not necessary to convince him of the truth of that document, that he should know by actual experience all that is mentioned in the document. If we have established the credibility of a work by the testimony of others writers, whom we may have before proved to be credible, and men of truth, we take the testimony of such men on things of which, by "our own understanding" we know nothing, only what we receive from testimony of others. So, in such a case, that work becomes a standard of facts to us on such subjects as those on which the said work may testify.

But I now come to your question. And I would say,

I am sorry any one should have treated those questions as though they could not be answered. But I know there has been a disposition with some, to meet all such questions with the remark: "Oh, you are an Infidel!" I hope to be able to treat all your questions with candor, and to look them squarely in the face every time. In this letter, I will examine your questions on the externals of the Bible. You ask, "When, where, and how was it compiled? If you mean to ask in this question, when the Old and New Testaments were first bound into one book, I am not prepared to answer your question any further than this, that immediately after this Council of Laodicea (A. D. 364) they were bound into one book. Previous to that time, the New Testament was found in three books, called the *Gospel*, containing the four gospels, *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, and *John the apostle*, containing the Acts, and a part of the epistles we now have. The rest of the books were found in another volume, called the second volume of the apostle, which contained the remaining epistles of our New Testament, and the book of Revelation. Just when they were put into these three divisions, I am not prepared to say now, but as you will see by after testimony, it must have been at a very early date. You are probably aware of the fact that the Ancients had their writings on rolls of parchment, and not in books as we have at the present time, and yet that their writings were always called by them books. See *Herodotus*, book vi, chap. iv. The Old Testament also existed previous to that Council in three books, called *Moses*, *Psalms*, and the *Prophets*.

But I suppose you mean to ask, when were the books of the Old and New Testaments arranged in the order in which we now have them? I conceive your question to have more especial reference to the credibility of the Bible; for if it was not written till two or three hundred years after the days of Christ, it will materially affect its matters of fact stated. As Paine says: "The first question, however, upon the books of the New Testament, as upon those of the Old, is, are they genuine? Were they written by the persons to whom they are ascribed? For it is upon this ground only, that the strange things related therein have been credited." *Age of Reason*, *Mendum's Boston edition*, p. 159. It must have been at a very early date, that the books of the New Testament were arranged. And that early arrangement was the same as that of those which are now regarded as canonical. Eusebius says, that previous to his time, (315) "We find writers giving lists of the books of the New Testament, or rather books which they regarded as sacred." And those lists of books which he refers to, are the same as those now called the New Testament. He says: "These writings were collected and arranged by John the evangelist before his death."

To answer, then, your question, I will commence with the book nearest to our own time, and then take notice of the one more remote. If we show that the New Testament was written in the time of the apostles, and by the apostles, it goes far toward establishing the truth of what we have, professing to be their writings. And especially is this the case if we can get testimony from other writers of the same time, and find that they, instead of contradicting what these books contain, confirm their testimony. Mr. Hobbes, Mr. Chubb, and Lord Bolingbroke, all noted infidels, do not pretend to deny but what Christ lived in the very time in which the New Testament says he lived. As Hobbes says: "The books of the New Testament are as ancient as the times of the apostles; and they were written by persons who lived in those times, some of whom saw the things which they relate." He says still further, that he has "no doubt but the books of the New Testament, as we now have them, are the true registers of those things which were said and done by the apostles and prophets." See *Hobbes' Leviathan*, p. 203. *Chubb's works*, Vol. ii, pp. 41, 43. *Bolingbroke's works*, Vol. v, p. 91. They undertook to get rid of the conclusion we would naturally think they would arrive at, by saying these wonders were done by *Egyptian magic*. To answer fully your first questions, as several of them involve this point, I will put two or three of them together. You say, "Were these several books now composing the Bible in whole or in part, culled from a collection of MSS., and if so, by whom, and by what



authority? And have we any evidence that these compilers for the time at least, were by any means made infallible judges of the matters before them? and were these compilations the work of more than one session, and if so, when and where the others?" Here are several questions, but the answer to the one point before us will answer all these questions. I know the view is taken by some, (as I heard a Spiritualist lecturer say last week), that there were three Councils in the fourth century, to settle the canon of the Scriptures, namely, the Council of Nice, the Council of Kent, and the Council of Laodicea. But I affirm that these Councils were not for the settlement of the canon of the Scriptures, but for altogether a different matter. If you are in any way acquainted with the Councils of the fourth century, you are aware that the great subject before them was the doctrine of the trinity. In the Council Nice, (325) which was the first Council in the fourth century, the Scriptures were referred to as authority on the subject under dispute; and no one is mentioned as raising a question as to the canonical authority of the books quoted. Is it likely that a Council composed of those who held views so at variance with each other, would at once adopt books as authority in the settlement of their disputed points, without the best of evidence that they were the genuine productions of the apostles? Should we not expect if it was a fact, that the matter had not yet been settled as to what books were written by the apostles, that the great dispute would be on that point in the first place, instead of their all readily yielding assent to the documents quoted? Prior to the time of the assembling of the Council of Nice, seven lists of the books of the New Testament were made out which agree exactly with ours. Six others were made out which agree with ours, with the exception that they were not satisfied with the book of Revelation, thinking it contained views which favored too much a sect called the Millenarians. But Eusebius says in his list, which agrees also with the present list, that "the book of Revelation was questioned by some, but was generally received, and is not to be doubted." Lardner Vol. ii, p. 368. Before the close of the second century, early Christian writers had made comments on the New Testament, and referred to every book we now have in the New Testament as genuine productions of the apostles. These commentators have quoted so copiously from the New Testament that their writings contain every verse in the New Testament except 26. But I will admit that at the time of some of the later councils, the excitement had run so high on the subject of the trinity that some had, in order to maintain their favorite tenets, forged epistles, and these epistles were challenged and investigated. But if there had not been as yet a collection of books which were understood to be sacred, there would have been no way for them to determine the question of the authenticity of those books. They could only be guided aright in their decisions by comparing these productions with the New Testament. These forged books were found to teach sentiments which did not agree with the New Testament. They were also shown to be forgeries of the 4th century, and these are the very productions referred to by Mosheim and others, which were written and ascribed to certain of the apostles. If we go to the second century we there find Origen. He was born within less than 100 years of the time of the Apostles. He made out a list of the books of the New Testament in the year 210 A. D. "This list contains no other books than those of our sacred volume, and includes all that are now received except the epistles of James and Jude, which could not have been omitted by design, as in other places in his works he expressly acknowledges them as a part of the sacred canon."—*M. Iluvaine's Evidences*, p. 69.

(To be Continued.)

#### SPANISH PROVERBS.

The sage ere he in debt would rise,  
A supper to himself denies.

What you have time to do to-day,  
Until to-morrow ne'er delay.

The looking-glass will tell to thee  
What friends deny, although they see.

#### Let Me Go.

Let me go where saints are going,  
To the mansions of the blest—  
Let me go where my Redeemer  
Has prepared his people's rest.  
I would gain the realms of brightness,  
Where they dwell forever more;  
I would join the friends that wait me  
Over on the other shore:—

Chorus—Let me go, 'tis Jesus calls me,  
Let me gain the realms of day;  
Bear me o'er, on angel pinions;  
Longs my soul to be away.

Let me go, why should I tarry?  
What has earth to bind me here?  
What but cares and toils and sorrows?  
What but death and pain and fear?  
Let me go for hopes most cherished  
Blasted round me often lie!  
Oh! I've gathered brightest flowers  
But to see them fade and die.

Let me go, &c.

Let me go where tears and sighing  
Are forever more unknown;  
Where the joyous songs of glory,  
Call me to a happier home.  
Let me go, I'd cease this dying,  
I would gain life's fairer plains:  
Let me join the myriad harpers,  
Let me chant their rapturous strains.

Let me go, &c.

Let me go, there is a glory  
That my soul hath longed to know;  
I am thirsting for the waters  
Which from crystal fountains flow;  
There is where the angels tarry,  
There the saved forever throng,  
There the brightness wearies never,  
There I'll sing redemption's song.

Let me go, &c.,

#### The Highlander's Prayer.

ONE can not live in the habit of prayer without acquiring familiarity with the spirit of devotion which indicates to others that he is a praying man. A true Christian can generally infer, both from the language and the manner of nominal prayer, whether the suppliant is in the habit of frequent communion with God. The best illustration of this is given by Hugh Miller, in his great work on the "Headship of Christ:—

A Scotch Highlander, who served in the first disastrous war with the American colonies, was brought before the commanding officer one evening, charged with the capital offense of being in communication with the enemy. The charge could not well be preferred at a more dangerous time. Only a few weeks had elapsed since the execution of Major Andre, and the indignation of the British, exasperated almost to madness by the event, had not yet cooled down. There was, however, no direct proof against the Highlander. He had been seen in the grey of the twilight stealing out from a clump of underwood that bordered on one of the huge forests which at that period covered much the greater part of the United Provinces, and which, in the immediate neighborhood of the British, swarmed with the troops of Washington. All the rest was mere inference and conjecture. The poor man's defense was summed up in a few words. He had stolen away from his fellows, he said, to spend an hour in private prayer.

"Have you been in the habit of spending hours in private prayer?" sternly asked the officer, himself a Scotchman and a Presbyterian.

The Highlander replied in the affirmative.

"Then" said the other, drawing out his watch, "never in all your life had you more need of prayer than now; kneel down, sir, and pray aloud, that we may all hear you."

The Highlander, in the expectation of instant death, knelt down. His prayer was that of one long acquainted with the appropriate language in which the Christian addresses his God. It breathed of imminent peril, and earnestly implored the divine interposition in the threatened danger,—the help of Him who, in times of extremity, is strong to deliver. It exhibited in short, a man who, thoroughly conversant with the scheme of redemption, and fully impressed with the necessity of

a personal interest in the advantages which it secures, had made the business of salvation the work of many a solitary hour, and had in consequence, acquired much fluency in expressing all his various wants as they occurred and his thoughts and wishes as they arose.

"You may go," sir said the officer as he concluded, "you have, I dare say, not been in correspondence with the enemy to-night."

"His statement," he continued, addressing himself to the other officers, is undoubtedly correct. No one could have prayed so without a long apprenticeship; fellows who have never attended drill always get on ill at review."

#### A Secret for Mothers.

Mr. and Mrs. Ashton, with their numerous family of sons and daughters, came to the Lord's table an unbroken circle. I never witnessed the blessed sight without asking myself, "What secret influence has been owned of God by these precious results? One day I said to the youngest daughter, a child of twelve years, "Do you ever forget Jesus?"

"Oh! no," she replied, "we can none of us at home ever forget Him, for mother talks to us of Jesus every day. He is ever with us."

Oh! mothers, take to your heart the precious secret of that family's bliss. The mother, ever abiding in Jesus made his name a household word, his presence ever acknowledged, ever felt. "She speaks to us of Jesus every day!" Mother, is it true of you? Do your lips and life daily, hourly, breathe the knowledge and love of Jesus into the hearts of the little ones at your knee? Is Jesus a name which your baby often hears, and early lisps? Trust not that formal counsels, invitations and prayers will be owned and blessed of God in the salvation of your children. The ever-abiding, ever-pleading, outbreathing, outspeaking love of Jesus, alone shall prevail. Giving yourself, and your little ones, unto God to be saved by the blood of Jesus alone, according to His everlasting covenant to you and to your children, trust him unwaveringly to keep His word. So shall you be sustained in your work of Christian nurture, not alone by hope and faith, but by the blessed assurance that God will make your labors effectual unto salvation, by His converting and saving grace.—*Congregationalist*.

#### Recipe for Pickling Grievances.

TAKE a quarter of an ounce of Grievance. (N. B. —Some say a grain is sufficient, as in this recipe everything depends on the cooking. I have even been told it has been successful without any of the solid ingredient at all, but I only give what I have tried.) Bruise and pound it thoroughly, so that every particle of the fiber is laid bare. Season it with a good sprinkling of your Own Merits. Let it stand some hours, adding from time to time alternately a pinch of the Unrequited Delinquencies of Others, and their Undeserved Blessings. In the evening boil it in water from the Well of Pride, leaving it to simmer all night. The next morning strain from it all remnants of your own Well-deserved Trials, bottle it, and cork it tightly from the fresh air, which is fatal to it, securing the cork with parchment written over with the Generous Commendations of your acquaintances, and the Unjust Attacks of your best friends. This pickle is warranted to keep for years. If it should fail, it must be either from some defect of care in the straining, or because the vessel in which it was boiled had not been previously carefully rinsed from all remains of your own Undeserved Blessings. If it should lose any of its sharpness, you have only to boil the whole carefully over again in water from the same well, and you will find the flavor recover all its first acidity and pungency. Let no cooks attempt this recipe to whom the time is of any value, as all depends on the leisure bestowed on the preparation.—*The Family Treasury*.

THAT man is certainly a hero, whom fortune has dealt with severely, who patiently endures and smother his grief and does his duty with an unruffled brow and a cheerful mien.

## The Review and Herald.

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

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., THIRD-DAY, DECEMBER 20, 1864.

URIAH SMITH, EDITOR.

### Questions and Answers.

We have received the following questions from Wm. P. Stewart, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Question. In the Greek of Matt. xxviii, 1, the word, "Sabbaths," occurs twice. In the first instance it is translated "Sabbath," in the second, "the first day of the week." Do you approve of this translation? If you do, why? If you do not, then how would you translate it?

Answer. We do most heartily approve of the translation "first day of the week" in Matt. xxviii, 1, and its parallel passages. And the reason for this is, because the word *Sabbaton* after a numeral adjective is to be translated, week. And in every instance where the expression first day of the week occurs in the New Testament, this word, *Sabbaton*, does follow a numeral adjective, and in every such instance all authorities say that it is to be translated week, and that the numeral adjective marks the day of the week. See Religious Encyclopedia, Liddell and Scott, Robinson and Greenfield.

Ques. If the first day of the week is not to be kept as a holy rest, why is it invariably called Sabbath in the New Testament, except in Rev. i, 10?

Ans. If the first day of the week is to be kept as a holy rest, why is it not even once called Sabbath? for we have seen in the reply to the first question, that instead of being invariably called Sabbath it is not once so called. Nor does Rev. i, 10, refer to the first day of the week; if it does, and if the term "Lord's day" had become, as some contend, the usual designation for the first day of the week, at that time, why does not John, the writer of the Revelation, in his gospel which was written after the Revelation, call it the Lord's day, instead of simply first day of the week, when contrasting it with the Sabbath? The only day called the Lord's day any where in the Bible, is the seventh day of the week; and this day is in numerous instances emphatically designated in such a way as to show us that it belongs in a peculiar and absolute sense to the Lord. Not only is the first day never so designated; but while no repeal of the original law for the seventh day can be found, and no transfer of the blessing once pronounced upon it to any other day, no record can be produced of any blessing ever having been attached to first-day observance, nor any law for such observance.

Ques. Why is it said that the wicked go into everlasting punishment, Matt. xxv, 46, if your view of their destruction is correct?

Ans. Because everlasting death is everlasting punishment. The misunderstanding that arises on this text is occasioned by confounding the term punishment with conscious misery, whereas it does not necessarily mean such. Death is punishment. It is everlasting punishment if there is to be no release from it. Just as Paul in Heb. vi, 2, speaks of "eternal judgment"; not a judgment which is eternally going on, but one, the decisions of which are final, or eternal.

Question. If the keeping of the first day of the week is the mark of the beast now, why was it not in the days of Luther, or at any time before the sounding of the third angel's message?

Ans. Because they did not keep it as an act of obedience to the beast. Neither do we say that people keep it thus now, hence our theory accuses no one of yet having the mark of the beast in the sense of that message, and of being exposed to its threatening. But that message contemplates a time when the Sunday institution will be enforced in a special manner in opposition to the commandments of God; and enforced in such a way that none can yield to it without becoming worshippers of the beast. Such will then have received the mark, and become exposed to the threatened wrath.

### Still in the Dark.

"DARKNESS covers the earth, and gross darkness the people." If you don't believe it, read the following, which we find in the Voice of the West, of Dec. 6, 1864.

"Br. Himes: I was glad to see in your 'journal' of Oct. 9, the idea you present on the commencement of Sabbath keeping. This truth is very important in its bearings on the time when God made the observance of his rest-day obligatory upon man. The Sabbath advocates stoutly affirm that it was required of man from creation, ever onward, to sanctify that day; but it is positively understood that just seven days previous to the first account we have of its ever being kept, the whole host of Israel commenced their march from Elim, and journeyed to Sin, on the route to Sinai. This Israelitish host numbered 600,000 adults, besides children, who had left Egypt but seventy-five days previous, and also a mixed multitude went with them, and flocks and herds, even very much cattle. Josephus says that Moses led 600,000 fighting men out of Egypt, besides women and children. This number far exceeds any two armies who have met in bloody combat since our national trouble commenced, yet all this vast multitude were tramping, by the direction of their unerring guide, the angel, and the cloud, on the seventh day, as sure as the book. Can it be possible that God would lead his only chosen ones in the wilderness, to march with weary limb and burdened back on that day, after he had bidden all men to keep it holy? Surely, this is too absurd to be credited! Though men may affirm and re-affirm it, the assertion is like "the baseless fabric of a vision," which the light of truth will as surely dispel as the Eastern Sun does the morning dew.

"In conclusion, let me say, that there is neither command, precept, or example, for any man to set apart, or have respect for any set day as sacred, until about twenty-five hundred years from creation.

"Yours for light.

"MARY."

The writer well subscribes herself "Yours for light;" for she is sadly in need of it; yet it would seem from her signature that she prefers to keep herself in the dark.

The article to which reference is made, is the one on which we offered some criticisms under the heading of "No Sabbath," in Review No. 25, last volume. The arguments set forth in the Voice, will be, no doubt, to many, perfectly satisfactory without further examination. Such seem to be unable or unwilling to notice two facts which are to us very apparent at first sight.

The first is, that when Moses in Ex. xvi, speaks of the sixth day, there is absolutely nothing to show that he reckons from the fall of the manna; and when, one month later, we come to the commandment given from Sinai, the proof is absolute that it was the day of the week that was referred to, without reference to the fall of the manna. There is, therefore, no evidence that on the Sabbath preceding the one mentioned in Ex. xvi, the whole congregation of Israel were traveling from Elim. Yet, that they were doing this, "Mary" thinks is "as sure as the book!"

The second fact is, that if the children of Israel were thus marching at the command of God, they were not doing "their own work" which the Sabbath law forbids, but were obeying God; and it would have been no more a violation of the Sabbath law, than was the marching around Jericho, forty years later. Yet she thinks it "too absurd to be credited," that Israel should be marching on the Sabbath. Is the record that Israel marched around Jericho seven days in succession, one of which must have been the Sabbath, too absurd to be credited? Will "Mary" think of this? When she will do this, she will find her argument weaker than the walls of Jericho, and everlastingly buried beneath their ruins.

### Donations for Stock.

DONATIONS already received to purchase stock amount to \$1109.46. The amount of stock for books purchased is \$2500. Those who esteem it a pleasure to donate till this sum is made up, will have an opportunity. The object of this is to enable the Association to furnish books, pamphlets, and tracts at old prices.

We have also put into the cellar, paper for the Review and Herald, to the amount of \$3883. We have not asked for donations to pay for this. We have only asked those who are able and choose so to do, to send three dollars a year instead of the regular price.

The readers of the Review are aware that four dollars will not go further in printing now, than two dollars would before the war. For instance. We pay thirty cents a pound for book paper that we then bought for eleven cents, and twenty-five cents for paper for the Review which, before the war, could have been bought for nine cents a pound.

But the able and the willing are invited to pay only \$3.00 a year for the Review. Most of its readers will choose to do this. Therefore with willing minds and ready hands there will be no lack. Our people are alive, and awake to any reasonable call, and there never has been a time when the business of the Association could be done more efficiently to advance the cause of truth than now. We do not ask for the money of the poor or the stingy. But free will offerings are wanted from the able and the willing to meet present indebtedness.

J. W.

### Report from Bro. Bourdeau.

BRO. WHITE: I would say for the encouragement of those who are interested in the advancement of the cause of truth, that the cause is still onward in this place. The meeting that you and Bro. Loughborough held here, Oct. 29 and 30, was deeply interesting to all the lovers of truth in this vicinity. Your remarks on the subject of temperance, as it relates to health, met the approbation even of out-siders; and we have reason to believe that what you and Sr. W. said on this important subject, laid a good foundation for a reform among Sabbath-keepers in Northern Vermont.

My brother and I are trying to keep up the interest that was raised at that meeting; and I am happy to say that two more individuals have embraced the Sabbath, and that some have decided to fully identify themselves with the people of God, and others are reading our publications, and searching the Scriptures to see if these things are so.

The friends of truth do well to keep pamphlets and tracts by them to hand out to their friends, and to those with whom they may converse on the truth. These printed preachers often reach persons that cannot be reached in any other way.

Nov. 15th, we were called to attend the funeral of Sr. Cross at North Sutton, C. E. My brother gave a comforting discourse for the afflicted, on the occasion, from Rev. xiv, 13. We then spent three days in visiting a few families in Sutton and Dunham, and our hearts were made glad to hear Bro. Buchanan, for the first time, express his determination to keep the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, and to go with the remnant to mount Zion.

Sabbath, Nov. 26th, attended the Quarterly Meeting at East Richford. This church is struggling on for victory. Our hearts reached out after the young, who seemed like lambs bleating around the fold. May God bless them, and help those that are older in the truth to be where they can feed the tender lambs.

A. C. BOURDEAU.

West Enosburgh, Vt., Dec. 6, 1864.

### The Coming of the Lord Draweth Nigh.

It seems to me that it is the imperative duty of every professed Christian, to arouse from their slumber and lethargy and reflect seriously upon the subject of the coming of Christ; for it surely becomes us as individuals, and as members of Christ's glorious body, to be ready, and also to be well posted on the promises of His coming.

The Bible informs us that no one knoweth the day nor the hour. But I believe it to be incumbent on the watchman to admonish his hearers to be prepared; for I believe the time draweth nigh. I believe this, because the signs of the times indicate it. This is my faith; and faith is the evidence of things not seen, and the substance of things hoped for. All the good and great men, that we read of in the Bible had such faith. Noah had it when he built the ark. Think of the good and brave old man, slowly working year after year. How the people must have laughed at him. Why, Noah, that will never swim! But still he worked on, not because he saw any clouds in the deep blue sky, nor because he heard the earthquake begin-



ning to rumble beneath his feet, and the fountains of the great deep breaking up; but because his faith was to him the evidence of things not seen.

J. H. MORRISON.

Caloma, Iowa.

### Popery.

We understand from Rev. xiii, that there will be a spirit of deference manifested on the part of Protestantism toward the Papacy, or rather a spirit of affiliation or coalescence with that power in some of its anti-christian assumptions. The following article which we find in the *Earnest Christian*, published by B. T. Roberts, Rochester, N. Y., contains some startling and significant facts. We chronicle these for the reader's consideration, and wait for further developments in this direction.

The progress of Popery in this country is truly alarming. We can remember when a Roman Catholic—a man who did not eat meat on Friday—was a curiosity. Now Romanism bids fair to be the dominant religion of the country. The titles assumed by their ecclesiastics are significant. Their bishops are styled bishops of the country, and not of the Roman Catholics in it. New York contains some Protestants, but the representative of the Pope calls himself *the bishop of New York*, as though his jurisdiction extended over all its inhabitants. They are not only rapidly increasing in numbers, but their church property is accumulating faster than that of any other denomination. The largest and finest churches in Buffalo belong to them, and notwithstanding the heavy expense of building at the present time, another large edifice is in process of construction. In Philadelphia, a cathedral was consecrated last month, which was eighteen years in building, and cost about half a million of dollars. It is the largest church edifice in the United States. More than seven hundred priests participated in the ceremonies, and eight thousand people were in attendance.

But the power to which Romanism has already attained is strikingly seen by the special favors shown to its ministers by the Government. When Archbishop Hughes—the man who drove the Bible from the public schools—died, the Legislature of New York conferred honors upon his memory which they have never shown to any Protestant Divine, however great his talents or exalted his services. Since our civil war began, many Protestant ministers have been drafted into the army. Some of them were in poor circumstances, with dependent families; whom it was difficult to leave; and congregations to serve that could ill spare them. Those drafted were compelled to go, or procure a substitute. In one case that we know of, a substitute was refused. The Rev. Thomas S. La Due, of the Illinois Conference of the Free Methodist Church, was drafted under the recent call. As he had a family that needed his care, his brother, a single man, offered to go in his place. *The offer was refused*, and Rev. Mr. La Due had to take his place in the ranks.

How has it been in regard to Roman Catholic Priests? In September last, two Catholic priests were drafted in Bardstown, Kentucky. The Secretary of War ordered that they *be not called on to report for service*. A number of priests at St. Louis were drafted, all single men, as Catholic Priests always are. Application was made to the War Department, and they, too, were promptly exempted. What right has the Government to manifest such partiality? Is it to be understood that Romanism is to be thus specially favored by our authorities? The political dominion of the Priesthood in the Old World was gained by slow degrees. Is it to be so in this country? Are our religious and civil liberties to be at the mercy of the Romish hierarchy? It is time for the people to wake up to this subject.

As a specimen of the claims already put forth by Romanists in this country, we give an extract from "The Universe," of Philadelphia, "the oldest Catholic paper in the United States:"

"The pope is the prince of Christendom. He is the Vicar of Christ. All, therefore, that have the true faith, are under his jurisdiction. He is the universal

shepherd. To deny this would be heresy. It would be the contradiction of existing visible fact. Where there is the right of jurisdiction or authority, there is the duty of obedience and loyalty; and where this duty is found, the right to protection is found along with it. The Holy Father, therefore, owes the protection of his sublime office to every member of his flock. This spirit has always animated the Sovereign Pontiffs. They have never lost sight of it. It will distinguish them forever. The allocution against the religious and political tyranny of Russia on Poland, was inspired by it. Rome has always preserved the deposit of faith, and always protected it and its children to the best of its ability."

"What can be objected against this? All Infidelity, all Atheism, all Protestantism, and all Judaism, cry out against it with one common voice. But because they are false, they have no justice in their protests, and it would be a waste of time to consider what they demur."

*The pope the prince of Christendom!* Is not that a bold claim to be put forth in the nineteenth century? Infidelity, Atheism, and Protestantism are ranked together! and "because they are false" their protests must not even be considered!

### Day of the Lord. No. 6.

BY ELD. R. F. COTTRELL.

"THE VOICE OF THE DAY OF THE LORD."

DURING the manifestations of divine wrath, at the commencement of the day of the Lord, "The Lord shall cause his glorious voice to be heard, and shall show the lighting down of his arm, with the indignation of his anger, and with the flame of a devouring fire, with scattering, and tempest, and hail-stones." Isa. xxx, 30. Of the kings and rulers of earth which set themselves in battle array, and take counsel together against the Lord, and against his anointed, it is said that the Lord shall "speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure." Ps. ii.

This voice of the Lord is predicted in many places of scripture, and always in connection with the battle of the great day, or, in other words, the treading of the wine-press of the wrath of God. The prophet Joel gives a description of the assembling of the nations, and the descent of the "mighty ones" from Heaven to the battle, "to judge all the heathen round about." (Comp. Rev. xix, 11, and onward.) The sickle is put in, for the harvest is ripe; the wine-press is full, the vats overflow, "for their wickedness is great." And in this connection it is said, "The Lord also shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall shake." Joel iii, 9-17. Mark the effect of the Lord's voice—the heavens and the earth shall shake. The Zion or Jerusalem from which the Lord utters his voice, is not on earth, but in Heaven. It is what Paul calls, "Jerusalem which is above"—the "heavenly Jerusalem." This will be evident from the quotation which follows.

"The Lord shall roar from on high, and utter his voice from his holy habitation; he shall mightily roar upon his habitation; he shall give a shout, as they that tread the grapes, against all the inhabitants of the earth. A noise shall come to the ends of the earth; for the Lord hath a controversy with the nations; he will plead with all flesh; he will give them that are wicked to the sword, saith the Lord." Jer. xxv, 30. This takes place at the pouring out of the seventh vial. "And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there came a great voice out of the temple of Heaven, from the throne, saying, It is done." And there were voices, and thunders, and lightnings; and there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon earth, so mighty an earthquake and so great." Rev. xvi, 17, 18.

Thus we learn that when the great day of the Lord's wrath begins, the voice of the Almighty comes from his holy habitation on high, from the heavenly Jerusalem, from his temple, and his throne which is between the cherubim, and the effect is, the heavens and the earth shake, mountains and islands are moved out of their places. "And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every

free man, hide themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and say to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth upon the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?" Rev. vi, 12-17. "The powers of the heavens shall be shaken; and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." Matt. xxiv, 29, 30. By comparing the scriptures we discover their harmony and beauty. The shaking of the heavens and the earth immediately precedes the second advent of the Son of man. What causes this shaking? The voice of God, which comes from the throne in Heaven, saying, "It is done." What is done? The seven last judgments of God—the vials of his wrath which are to desolate the earth of all its tribes—have been poured out. But why come these desolating judgments?—why does the curse devour the earth? Because of sin, which is the transgression of God's law—the ten commandments. The question is answered fully and clearly in the twenty-fourth chapter of Isaiah. After foretelling the utter desolation of the earth, the Spirit of truth continues: "The earth mourneth and fadeth away, the world languisheth and fadeth away, the haughty people of the earth do languish. The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant. Therefore the curse hath devoured the earth." &c

Here the reason is plainly given. It is the violation of the laws of God. He has never published but one entire code of moral laws, and that code is the ten commandments. These laws have all been transgressed, but one of them has been changed by men. They have changed the ordinance. This I think is the Sabbath law. It is the law concerning which a change is pleaded in excuse of its violation. All laws are ordinances; though there is a clear distinction between moral laws and the ceremonial ordinances of the church in either dispensation. The "everlasting covenant," which men have broken, and the violation of which brings the curse, consists of those laws of which the Sabbath ordinance is a part. This is proved by the following scriptures.

"And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire; ye heard the voice of the words but saw no similitude; only ye heard a voice. And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone." Deut. iv, 12, 13. This proves what covenant was given to Jacob for a law. Our next testimony will prove that "the same" is the everlasting covenant. "Be ye mindful always of his covenant; the word which he commanded to a thousand generations; even the covenant which he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac; and hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant." 1 Chron. xvi, 15-17. If the Bible can prove a proposition, our proposition is proved. The covenant promises to Abraham related to the new earth. They made him "heir of the world;" and he looked, according to God's promise, for "a city that hath foundations"—the "heavenly Jerusalem." See Rom. iv, 13; Heb. xi, 10; Rev. xxi, 10, 14. This is Abraham's inheritance; and in this inheritance the "everlasting covenant" will be kept by him and all his seed; and the Sabbath commandment will not be excepted. See Eze. xxxvii, 24-26. Isa. lxvi, 22, 23.

The way is now open to understand the language of the apostle: "Whose voice then shook the earth; but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven. And this word, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as things that are made, that those things that cannot be shaken may remain." Heb. xii, 26, 27. See the context. God's voice shook the earth when he confirmed the holy principles of his divine law, speaking the ten commandments to all Israel from the summit of the burning mount. Terror seized the people, and even Moses, who was accustomed to receive communications from Heaven, said, "I exceedingly fear and quake." The great Jehovah has promised to

utter his awful voice again. It comes, this time, from on high—from his holy hill—and all the earth shall hear. He speaks in vindication of those righteous principles which he before promulgated from Sinai. His sore judgments are poured out upon the transgressors of his law, his justice stands approved while his terrific and vindictive voice exclaims, *It is done!* "The earth is moved exceedingly." It reels to and fro like a drunkard. It is moved out of its place like a cottage: and because the transgression thereof is heavy upon it, "it shall fall and not rise again." See Isa. xxiv, 19, 20. O sinner, what will you do in that day? Can you stand before the exceeding terror of that voice, which, when uttered in comparative mildness, made Moses, the man of God, exceedingly fear and quake? Thank God! there *now* is hope. A refuge in Jesus will be a shelter from the storm. His love still pleads. O, forsake your sins and embrace him now. Receive the "kingdom that cannot be moved," and be of those that cannot be shaken, but remain.

False shepherd, beware! You that are flattering yourself and your hearers that God's holy law has been abolished or changed. That voice by which it was uttered will soon convince the world that "God can never lie nor ever change." There will be a howling among the shepherds, those who, professing to be servants of God, have spent their strength in fighting that law which is the truth, and used their influence to people the regions of despair and death. O, professing minister, take timely warning and escape their fate!

### Will the Wicked Dead be Raised?

DOUBTLESS to many of the readers of the Review it may seem almost an absurdity to discuss this question, as much so as to undertake to prove that water will run down hill, or that a body unsupported will fall to the ground. Not that it is a self-evident proposition, for even the doctrine of any resurrection is not wrought out by untutored reason or philosophy; but the teachings of revelation are so plain and direct on this point, that it seems strange that any one could for a moment doubt that there will be a resurrection of both "the just and unjust." Yet it may not seem an unimportant question, when we learn that quite a body of professed second advent believers, are making it a test question, or as one of their preachers expressed it, "the great crowning truth," and that some, even who have professed to receive the third angel's message, are believers in this heresy. Under these circumstances we may be pardoned for occupying any portion of these columns in endeavoring to answer in the affirmative the question which heads this article, although we do not propose to go into an elaborate discussion of the matter, nor answer all of the fancied objections raised against it.

The first step in the investigation of this, as well as all other questions, should be to examine its foundation. If it is a Scripture doctrine, of course it will be founded on the Bible, and will have an abundance of positive texts of scripture in its support. According to well-established principles of logic, we might contend that the burden of proof rested with the negative of the question, yet as we desire to get at the truth, we shall examine the subject in all its bearings; and first, we propose to consider it as a negative doctrine, or in other words, to examine the assertion that the wicked dead *will not* be raised. Upon what is it founded? The advocates of this theory, when pressed to answer, or explain certain texts which bear against it, contend that the doctrine is founded upon *principles*, and that such texts must be construed in harmony with those principles, or at least not be allowed to weigh against them. If they are Bible principles, they are right in this position; for if a doctrine is founded on the immutable principles of God's word, then all scripture must, and will harmonize with it; and if a literal construction of such scriptures is not in unison with those fixed principles, then they must be understood in a figurative sense. Thus a literal interpretation of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus would contradict the plain scripture principle that "the dead know not anything," and for this simple reason, aside from all others, is not allowable.

But if those principles are speculative, and founded upon a course of human reasoning, however philosophical it may seem, or at best but poorly supported by scripture proof, then such texts must be allowed their full force and literal construction, unless it can be proved that they should not for some good reason other than their antagonism to such principles.

Having as we think, established this point, we proceed to examine the principles on which this belief is founded. The leading, or principle argument is, that there is no future life out of Christ; that as He is the "resurrection and the life" no one who is not in Christ will be raised. Placed in the form of a syllogism it would stand thus:

Christ is the resurrection and the life.

Those who are in Christ will be raised.

Therefore, those who are not in Christ, will never be raised.

While this argument has a show of plausibility and might be accepted by some as a fairly demonstrated proposition, yet if we carefully examine it we shall find it faulty. Let us first settle the premises on which it is based, and then see if we are justified in coming to such a conclusion. What are we to understand by the statement that Christ is the resurrection and the life? We shall here take the position that it means a resurrection to *eternal* life, and that when the resurrection is spoken of as the hope of the church, it signifies the resurrection which is attained through a hope in Christ, one in which the wicked have no part, and which is denominated the "first resurrection." Rev. xx, 5, 6. If this be true, then we are not to understand the resurrection of both classes in every case where the term is used.

In the fifth chapter of John the resurrection of both classes is brought to view, and it would seem that verses 28 and 29 might forever settle the question as to whether the wicked dead will be raised; for those "that have done evil" are to be raised "unto the resurrection of damnation." Verse 21 of the same chapter reads thus: "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." We learn from this that a certain portion of the dead are raised in Christ, and that those who are quickened by the Son are not all of "the dead" who are raised, only those "whom he will;" that while the resurrection of the dead may be considered as the peculiar prerogative of the Father, yet a blessed privilege is reserved for the Son as he himself expresses it in John vi, 39; "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing but should raise it up again at the last day." This seems to be conclusive evidence that a portion of the dead are raised by the Father, and another portion by the Son, and that the resurrection in a pre-eminent sense is a resurrection to eternal life.

Perhaps some may take exception to this by quoting 1 Cor. xv, 22, "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive;" but we contend that this entire chapter is addressed to the church and to no one else, and that this resurrection is the one which is the hope of the church. That the *all* here referred to is not universal in its application, is evident from the fact that those who have a part in this resurrection are "in Christ," and "are Christ's at his coming," which cannot be true of the wicked.

We are now prepared to place the premises in their true light, and see what conclusion we shall reach: Christ is the resurrection and the life; Those who are in Christ will be raised to *eternal* life; Therefore, those who are not in Christ will not be raised to eternal life. The most then, that can be adduced from this, is that the wicked will not be raised to eternal life, which is just what we believe, and it does not prove that they will not be raised at all. If then we find a text which positively states that "those that have done evil" will come forth to "the resurrection of damnation," we are in duty bound to give it its full force, and believe it means just what it says.

All Bible principles are harmonious, for the word of God is not yea and nay; therefore if we find a principle well attested by scripture proof, which is antagonistic to that of the non-resurrection of the wicked we must of course reject the latter. This we

contend is the case. The principle of rewards and punishments is as thoroughly established by the Scriptures as almost any doctrine of Christianity, and it is only by the resurrection of the wicked that this can be accomplished; for it would take but little argument to show that the wicked are not punished in this life, as it is often the case that the best men suffer most, and the worst men suffer least all through life, and even in the manner of death. To evade the force of this argument the advocates of this theory contend that death is the penalty of the law, and that when a man dies he has paid the penalty. If this be true, then the righteous suffer the penalty as well as the wicked, and Christ's death was of no avail, for he died to redeem us from the law. Here is a difficulty at once, and how shall it be settled? Admitting that death is the penalty of the law, it does not follow that mere temporal death is meant; for that came "by Adam" and no one can escape it, even were he to keep the law. The fact that death is the penalty of the law does not invalidate the doctrine of future punishment. For example: the civil penalty for murder in some States is hanging; but it does not prevent the authorities from previously punishing the culprit by solitary confinement and imprisonment for months or even years. While it is true that the penalty of God's law is death, it is none the less true that every one will "receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. v, 10.

But it is urged by some, that God is not so cruel as to raise the wicked "just for the sake of punishing them." If sophistry is to settle the question, we might reason that He would not be so cruel as to allow them to remain in their graves, but would raise them to eternal life! But such fallacious reasoning as this, will not hide the naked facts of God's word, nor the immutability of his promises and threatenings. The infallible word of God which says, "the soul that sinneth it shall die" cannot be broken, and to show that it is not fulfilled by temporal death, we would refer the reader to Eze. xviii. By reading the chapter carefully you will see that a portion of it is devoted to proving the equality of God. It would seem that the "house of Israel had complained of inequality in that the wicked who turned from their iniquity were placed on an equal footing with the righteous and their transgressions remembered no more." To prove that His ways are equal, the Lord by the mouth of the prophet, declares that if a righteous man turn from his righteousness and commit iniquity, his righteousness shall not be remembered, and he shall die. And verse 26 tells us that he shall die the second death, not in so many words, but by the most direct implication. "When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness and committeth iniquity and dieth in them, for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die." "How can we avoid the conclusion that two deaths are here implied? The man who dies in his iniquity, must die for his iniquity, and how can this be unless he is raised to life. His temporal death is not dying for his iniquity, but he dies in Adam, and the penalty is yet to be inflicted, and he must die for the iniquity which he died in, which is accomplished in the second death.

Perhaps a few words in regard to the second death may not be amiss, and may possibly throw some light on the subject under consideration. It is our privilege to know in what it consists; for the Scriptures are not silent with regard to it. A promise is made to those who overcome, that they shall not be hurt of the second death. Rev. ii, 11. A conditional negative promise implies a positive threat if the conditions are not complied with; therefore we understand that those who do not overcome *will* be hurt of the second death. Again, the second death has no power over those who have a part in the first resurrection; Rev. xx, 6; implying that it will have power over all who do not have a part therein, but are among the rest of the dead who live not again until the thousand years are finished. The term *second* implies a first, and those who suffer the second death must of course have died once, and in order to die a second time must have a resurrection.

The two resurrections of Rev. xx, with the thous-



and years between them, form a knotty point for non-resurrectionists, and various have been the shifts to evade its force, but all in vain. The thousand years cannot be forced back into the past, nor will they admit of any other construction than the one we hold. During that time Satan is to be bound, and we defy any one to show us a period of a thousand years, or even as many hours, in the history of the world, when the great adversary of souls has been bound, either literally or figuratively, so as to be unable to "deceive the nations." So anxious have been the advocates of this theory, to nullify this powerful testimony, that attempts have been made to prove it an interpolation, but all of no avail. It belongs just where the pen of inspiration placed it, and is the solemn testimony of God's word. Those who would endeavor to remove it on account of its crushing a favorite theory, are referred to Rev. xxii, 19.

Some have asserted that the second death is the destruction of the wicked at the coming of Christ, and that only the wicked who are then alive will be partakers of it, but a careful examination will show a difficulty in this position. The lake of fire is called the second death, so called we understand, because it is the cause of death to those who are overwhelmed by it, and thus die a second time. A period of a thousand years intervenes between the coming of Christ and the destruction of Satan, and he is represented as being destroyed in the lake of fire, which is the *second death*. Does any one suppose that the lake of fire is kept burning for a thousand years? Let those who hold such positions explain this difficulty if they are able. As we have already seen, they endeavor to do so by placing the thousand years in the past. Now as this cannot be done, would it not be better to renounce the false position which compels its defenders to resort to such distortions of scripture? One who is now an advocate of this doctrine, once declared that to adopt such perversions of scripture as are employed in attempting to prove it, would undermine one's confidence in the Scripture, as a guide.

There are many positive texts which directly assert the resurrection of two classes, one of which we have already noticed, John v, 29. Most of them are probably familiar to the reader, and it will be unnecessary to dwell upon them. Attempts are made to answer them, and explain away their meaning; with what success a few instances will show.

Paul states in Acts xxiv, 15; that there is to be a "resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Evidently the only way to evade the force of this text is to make it appear that "just and unjust" does not mean "righteous and wicked," a course which no one would dream of taking unless driven to a desperate extremity. As the advocates of this theory are not agreed among themselves as to the best method of meeting the many difficulties in their way, it would not be surprising if more than one position was taken with regard to this text. And such is the case. We have heard of two distinct positions taken by able disputants, and we know not how many more may be brought. The first of these is that the just are those who have had the light of truth and walked in it, or in other words responsible Christians; while the unjust are those who are not responsible, never having been enlightened, as for instance the moral heathen, whom they assert it would be unjust for God to destroy. If we will take the trouble to go back to the "principle" that there is "no life out of Christ," we shall find a lack of harmony between it and this exposition. To explain a difficulty they will violate one of their "first principles," for the heathen who have never known Christ certainly cannot be "in Christ," and therefore we see that such an explanation is worthy of no confidence whatever. The other position is, that the just are the Gentile or Christian church, and the unjust the Jewish church. Let us look a moment at the Bible meaning of these terms, and we shall see that such a glaring distinction as that should not be made between the two dispensations, for the good of all ages are properly called just. Noah was a just man, Joseph was a just man, and in fact the term occurs more frequently in the Old Testament than in the New. The scriptures inform us that the just are those who have been justified by faith, and

the unjust those who have not. Faith always was an essential part of the plan of salvation, and justification cannot be obtained without it. The "father of the faithful" lived in the former dispensation, and certainly was not an unjust man. Matt. v, 25, informs us that the Lord "sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust," which shows that these two classes must be cotemporary, and indeed they are called in the same verse good and evil. Thus we see that no method of reasoning can do away with the force of this text, and we are compelled to "allow," as did Paul's accusers, that there will be a resurrection "both of the just and unjust," and permit the Bible itself to explain who those two classes are.

Our Saviour, in speaking of the generation which rejected his teachings and sinned against light, declares that it shall be "more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for them, showing that the wicked of all ages are to be brought into judgment, and that their punishment will be according to the light they have received, it being "more tolerable" for some than for others.

Dan. xii, 2, states that some shall awake "to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt." This text needs no comment.

Our limits forbid that we should dwell upon the many other texts which teach the resurrection and future punishment of the wicked, and which cannot be met with fair reasoning, as the samples we have given abundantly prove. But we think sufficient evidence has been presented to fully establish the doctrine that the wicked cannot "escape the damnation of hell," but must be "brought forth to the day of wrath." Job. xxi, 30. May we earnestly desire the influences of the Spirit, to lead us in our investigations, and guide us into all truth, that when the Head of the church appears, we may be among those who will have come into the unity of the faith. WM. C. GAGE.

Manchester, N. H.

## Letters.

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

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

### From Bro. Miller.

BRO. WHITE: It has been some time since my last letter to the Review, which was written from Lima, Ohio; and I conclude to send a word or two that all may know that I still "hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering." I am not always privileged to obey the other injunction of Paul in Heb. x, 25, but occasionally have the privilege of meeting with the brethren. On my way home from Ohio, I stopped at Hillsdale, Mich., and spent the Sabbath with the brethren there. A goodly number were present; nearly all gave in their testimony for the truth. I felt that Jesus was indeed present. I experienced in some measure that peace of mind, that sweet joy, which the glorified saints will experience when, from one month to another, and from one Sabbath to another they shall assemble to worship before the Lord in the new earth. I felt a renewed strength to return home and alone still continue to battle with the world, the flesh and the Devil, for the love of Christ. I have been alone here until a short time since, when Bro. Rust came here. Now the way seems not so lonely. But we are both young in the faith as well as in years, and need to watch, and need that strength and guidance that comes from above, that we do not lead each other astray. There are others here who take the Review, but we have as yet found no Sabbath keepers among them. There is a brother in the Hospital here, a Bro. Stephenson. We visit him on the Sabbath, and read the Review and the Bible to him. He suffers from loss of sight from inflammation of the eyes. Others listen and some seem interested. God grant that some seeds may fall upon good ground, and bring forth much fruit. In a city like this, there ought to be some souls waiting for the "consolation of Israel." But there is so much here to lead the mind away from religion, in the way of care, bustle, gaiety, and business, that even the good words sometimes dropped in the pulpits here, though they may take root and spring up, are yet eventually choked by the cares of life and the desire for gain, and so become unfruitful. But our prayers are that God will yet call out some to serve him even in this wicked place.

I still read the Review and am much profited by its good teachings. It rejoices me greatly to know that our people are becoming awakened upon the subject of

temperance in diet, and are making an effort to break away from the "lusts of the flesh," by which nearly the whole world is drunken. I hope that we, as a people, will not only keep the fourth commandment, but the first, last and all of them, and "whether we eat or drink, or whatever we do, do all to the glory of God." It is a subject that has been uppermost in my mind for the last six years. In consequence of ill health I adopted a vegetable diet, and although I have but imperfectly followed out what I felt was the right course, still in what I have done, I have been blest with a happier state of mind, less ill health, and a great return of strength. As a consequence I can bless God to-day for a large return of good health and happiness, a better temper and a purer mind.

May our people earnestly take hold in this matter, and let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God. If we do this we may rest assured that we shall not be found at his coming with that class who though they have said, "Lord! Lord!" are yet spoken of by the apostle with tears. Phil. iii, 18, 19.

Yours truly.

H. C. MILLER.

Chicago, Ills.

### From Bro. Eldred.

BRO. WHITE: I am still striving with all my heart to live godly in Christ Jesus. I am very thankful that the Lord has shown me the light of the present truth. I have many trials to pass through, in being deprived of the use of my limbs, and having no way of getting around only by my wheeled chair. But I can meet with a few of God's children, at a place only a few rods from here. Bro. Loughborough was the one who persuaded me to keep the Sabbath. While I was talking with him one afternoon about the Sabbath, I found that he was right, and I was wrong. He labored to have me commence to keep the Sabbath then, but I did not promise him. I went home and could think of nothing but the Sabbath; for I had been trying for two years to be a child of God, but I found I was not free from sin unless I kept his rest day. I accordingly made up my mind I would keep his Sabbath, not because I was easily turned, but because it was Bible truth. Since then, it seems as though nothing would make me give it up.

The first paper I ever subscribed for was a religious paper, and that is the Review. I call that and the Bible, my guide. I have been comforted with this text: "Through much tribulation shall ye enter into the kingdom."

I am expecting a time of trouble such as never was on this earth soon, and the great question with me is, Am I ready. Whenever I find there is anything between me and the Saviour, I hasten to put it away, that he may come in and sup with me and I with him.

Oh I am thankful for what God, for Christ's sake, has done for me. I thank the Lord I ever turned unto his testimonies. I have passed through some trying scenes, but I find that his grace is sufficient for me. I never thought of giving up. My trust is in him whose promises are sure.

Dear brethren and sisters, I want your prayers, that I may have grace and be ready when the Saviour comes. I believe the end is near, even at the door.

I think I have advanced more in four months toward attaining what is required of me, than in all my life before. I have read the works called Spiritual Gifts, except Vol. iv, and I believe the Lord has placed them in the church. The word of the Lord is indeed a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path. I cannot find words to express the feelings of my heart. I have a great deal to overcome, to be ready to meet Jesus. I long to be a perfect Christian. I am determined by the assisting grace of God, to devote the remainder of my days to him, that I may at last have room in those mansions which he has gone to prepare for us.

Yours in Christ.

JOHN A. ELDRÉD.

Victor, Ontario Co., N. Y.

### From Sister Smith.

BRO. WHITE:—Ever since I first heard the Sabbath question preached in Manchester, N. H., I have believed in the truth of that preaching. I did not commence to keep the Sabbath of the Lord till after the discussion between Bro. Cornell and Eld. Grant. Since that, I have felt that it was my duty to keep the seventh-day Sabbath, and I am still trying to keep the Sabbath with the other commandments of God. Although I am now where there are no Sabbath keepers, except myself, and I find much to encounter, I know the grace of God is sufficient to keep, and sustain us under the greatest trials. My prayer is for a closer walk with God, and that I may be faithful to the end. Pray for me that I may have the grace of God continually in my heart.

Hartford, Wis.

AGNES W. SMITH.

Where humility is the corner stone, there glory shall be the top-stone.

## The Review and Herald.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1884

Bro. Sanborn writes for the benefit of the brethren in Wisconsin and Illinois, that there are \$150.00 still to be raised to clear Bro. L. G. Bostwick from the draft; so the way is still open for donations. Direct to H. W. Decker, Brodhead, Green Co., Wis.

In the call for preaching from J. E. Wilson, in last Review, the P. O. address should have been Dowaigiac, instead of Pontiac.

If the storm of adversity whistles around you, whistle as bravely yourself; perhaps the two whistles may make melody.

## Appointments.

The second Monthly Meeting for Jeff. Co., N. Y., will be held at Mannsville the two last days (30 and 31) of this month, instead of the second Sabbath and first-day of January. I make the change for the sake of being present.

The Lord willing I will be at the January monthly meeting for Oswego Co., N. Y.

C. O. TAYLOR.

Adams' Center, 12, 1884.

It is expected that Eld. Albert Stone and myself will hold meetings in Vermont and Canada East as follows:

At West Enosburgh, Vt., Dec. 24 and 25.  
Berkshire, Wednesday evening Dec. 28.  
North Sutton, C. E., Dec. 31, and Jan. 1, of 1885.  
Cowansville, Monday evening, Jan. 2.  
Melbourne, Wednesday evening Jan. 4.  
Westbury, Sabbath and first day, Jan. 7 and 8.  
A. C. BOURDEAU.  
West Enosburgh, Vt., Dec. 8, 1884.

PROVIDENCE permitting, we will meet with the brethren as follows:

At Roxbury, Sabbath and first-day Dec. 31 and Jan. 1.  
" Andover, Wednesday evening, " 4.  
" Jamaica, Sabbath, " 7.  
" Vernon, Tuesday and Wednesday evenings Jan. 10 and 11, and the following Sabbath, Jan. 14.  
At Ashfield, Mass., Sabbath, Jan. 21.  
" Clinton, " Tuesday evening, " 24.  
" Peterboro, N. H., Sabbath, " 28.  
" Washington, N. H., Monday and Tuesday evenings, Jan. 30 and 31.  
At Newport, N. H., Sabbath, Feb. 4.

STEPHEN PIERCE.  
D. T. BOURDEAU.

The next Quarterly Meeting of the Waukon and West Union churches will be held at Waukon, commencing Friday evening, Jan. 6, 1885. It is earnestly requested that Bro. Snook or Brinkerhoff will be present. We hope there may be a general attendance of the brethren and sisters. GEORGE I. BUTLER.

The next Quarterly Meeting of the Seventh day Adventist church of Avon, Rock Co., Wis., will be held at Brodhead, Green Co., Wis., commencing with the commencement of the first Sabbath in Jan. 1885, and continue two days.

I will also meet with the Johnstown-Center church in their next Quarterly Meeting commencing with the Sabbath, Jan. 14, and continuing over first-day. As the weather will probably be cold, we hope all coming from a distance to these meetings, will bring robes and bed quilts. We hope to see a general rally especially at Brodhead.

I will also commence a course of lectures in McLean Co., Ills., Jan. 20, as Bro. Slown may arrange and continue as long as the interest may demand. Will Bro. Slown meet me at Elpasso the 19. Hope to meet Bro. R. F. Andrews and Bro. Blanchard at this meeting. ISAAC SANBORN.

Providence permitting, I will hold meetings with churches in Michigan as follows:

Church at Bowne, at the house of Bro. Gardner, Wednesday, Dec. 28, evening. Lowell, house of Bro. Van Deusen, Dec. 29, evening. Quarterly meeting at Fair Plains, Orleans and West Plains unite with them, Dec. 31 and Jan. 1, 1885. Wright, Jan. 7 and 8. Caledonia, Jan. 14 and 15. Monterey, 21 and 22. Allegan, Wednesday, Jan. 25, evening. Otsego, Jan. 28 and 29. JOHN BRINGTON.

## Business Department.

### Business Notes.

M Hutchins: The price of the s. n. Books is 25 cts. each.

W Romine: We mail E J Clarke's Review regularly to Putah. Solana, Co., California.

M G Kellogg: Received.

W C Gage: The letter you refer to has not been received. We credit the amount it contained.

### RECEIPTS.

#### For Review and Herald.

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

E G Rust 26-1, E Wells 25-1, I D Cramer 26-1, S D Hall 27-1, L L Russell 26-1, V Sumerix 26-1, J W Raymond 26-1, Mary Capen 29-1, W E Caviness 26-1, Julia A Williams 26-1, C L Haskins 27-1, Mrs J Porter 27-1, M Thompson 25-1, T J Hillard 27-1, A Bullard 25-1, Geo Booth 27-1, P Allen 26-1, H Jenkins 25-1, Rebecca Whitties 26-1, F Wilson 27-1, C C Collins 26-1, G M Foster 26-14, A C Hudson 26-1, C Lamberton 27-21, Mrs C J Pearce 27-8, Mrs C Taylor 27-8, E B Bronson 26-1, L Wilhite 25-14, Mrs E D Scott 26-1, Es her Adams 27-1, each \$1.

E M Prentiss 28-1, D Smouse 26-5, N H Schooley 27-14, Diantha Fero 27-1, W Jackson 26-15, Mrs A Grimes 27-1, Abigail O Thomson 27-1, H W Holmes 27-1, D Andre 28-1, B Leach 26-16, E Whitties 24-8, Mrs P W Cottrell 29-1, J Barnes 25-1, M A Brown 27-1, A A Farnsworth 27-1, Eliza Mason 27-1, E Stevenson 27-1, S B Mitchell 27-1, N Ward 28-5, Betsey Bryant for S W Chase 27-8, N W Stevens 27-1, P Robinson 27-1, P Markillie 27-1, R R Cochran 27-1, C H Webb 26-13, W Stoddard 27-1, H W Dodge 27-1, each \$2.

Mrs E Allen 26-1, Ruth Pine 25-14, Rachel Curtis 26-11, A Phippey 26-1, O J Richardson 26-1, G Walling 26-1, A Babcock 26-1, W French 26-1, A Foot 26-1, M J Chapin 26-1, each 50c.

A D Tracy \$5.00 28-20, W Romine \$3.00 27-9, David Chase \$1.50 28-1, A Nellis \$5.00 28-7, W Barden \$1.50 26-14, J Striker \$1.50 26-14, Julia E Green \$1.50 26-9, O H Pratt \$2.75 29-14, Amy Ridgway \$1.50 27-1, G Pierce \$0.75 26-1, L Pinch \$1.75 26-1, R Cochran \$2.75 (1 year) 27-1, Elizabeth Rudd \$0.75 26-1.

#### Subscriptions at the Rate of \$3.00 per year.

G Leighton \$3.00, 27-1, J E Patter \$3.00, 27-4, R M Pierce \$3.00, 29-1, J P Flemming \$3.00, 27-9, W E Newcomb \$3.00, 28-1, C G Cramer \$3.00, 27-1, J Ralston \$1.50, 26-1, L S Gregory \$3.00, 28-1, J Dorcas \$3.00, 27-6, F Bryant \$1.00, 26-1, A Aldrich \$3.00, 27-1, W W Guilford \$3.00, 27-1, B F Hicks \$1.50, 26-1, G I Butler \$3.00, 27-9, W W Lockwood \$1.00, 27-1.

#### Books Sent By Mail.

L Newcomb \$2.78, Wm E Newcomb 83c, M G Kellogg \$1.50, P Markillie 83c, Mrs E M Bradley 59c, L A Bramhall 68c, C G Cramer \$2.04, J Dorcas \$1.00, A E Clarke 50c, G W Burnham 30c, M M Nelson 38c, I N Pike 11c, D C H Fowler 92c, H W Holmes 10c.

#### General Conference Missionary Fund.

J P Flemming \$1.50, W E Caviness \$9.75, Lewis Pinch \$3.00, Church at North Jay, Me. \$10.00, Church at Eddington, Me. \$6.25, D Oakes 25c.

#### Donations to Purchase a Stock of Paper.

I D Cramer \$1.00, Esther Doty \$1.00, D C Demarest \$5.00, Jane Demarest \$5.00, A G Smith \$5.00, Margaret Smith \$5.00, E B Lane \$5.00, E M Prentiss \$2.00, Mary Jane Kay \$10.00, W E Caviness \$10.00, Betsey M Osgood \$1.00, E P Osgood \$1.00, D Andre \$25.00, Wm Edgar \$1.00, Harriet Hicks 50c, A Sister \$1.00, E M L Cory 50c, T M Steward \$1.00.

#### Books Sent as Freight.

John Bostwick, Rochester, Minn., \$176.50, W. S. Ingraham, Monroe, Wis., \$87.89.

#### Books sent by Express.

Wm. Carthy, Palmyra, Wis., \$16.67, Wm. Russell, Mauston, Wis., \$24.08, R. F. Andrews, Morrison, Ills., \$37.50, Henry Nicola, Richmond, Iowa, \$21.63, H. A. St. John, Defiance, Ohio, \$6.00, C. H. T. St. Clair, Fairfield, Iowa, \$4.00, L. G. Bostwick, Blue River, Grant Co., Wis., \$47.73.

#### Cash Received on Account.

S Pierce \$5.00, A C Bourdeau \$1.50, G I Butler \$7.00, B F Snook \$25.00.

#### Donations to Purchase a Stock of Paper for Instructor.

C F Lathrop \$1.00, Eliza Carpenter \$1.00, Silas Carpenter 30c, A D Farrar 50c, John Q Foy \$2.10, A S Hutchins \$2.00, A Aldrich 35c, Nettie Kilgore \$1.00, V & S Kilgore \$1.00, C M & E M Markillie 30c, H H Bramhall Jr 50c, A M Gravel \$1.50.

#### For Shares in the Publishing Association.

W E Caviness \$10.00.

#### Soldiers' Tract Fund.

L M B \$1.00, A friend \$1.00.

## PUBLICATIONS.

The law requires the pre-payment of postage on Bound Books, four cents for the first four ounces, or fractional part thereof, and an additional four cents for the next four ounces, or fractional part thereof, and so on. On Pamphlets and Tracts, two cents for each four ounces, or fractional part thereof. Orders, to secure attention, must be accompanied with the cash. Address, ELDER JAMES WHITE, Battle Creek, Michigan.

	PRICE.	WEIGHT.
The Hymn Book, 464 pages, and 122 pieces of music,	80 12	cts. oz.
" " " with Sabbath Lute,	\$1.00 12	
" " " Calf Binding,	1.00 12	
" " " " with Lute,	1.25 12	
History of the Sabbath, Sacred and Secular,	80 12	
" " " in paper covers,	50 10	
Dobney on Future Punishment,	75 16	
Spiritual Gifts, Vol. I, or the Great Controversy between Christ & his angels, and Satan & his angels,	50 8	
Spiritual Gifts, Vol. II. Experience, Views & Incidents in connection with the Third Message,	60 8	
Spiritual Gifts, Vols. I & II, bound in one book,	\$1.00 12	
Spiritual Gifts, Vol. III, Facts of Faith,	75 8	
Spiritual Gifts, Vol. IV, Facts of Faith & Testimonies to the Church, Nos. 1-10,	75 8	
Sabbath Readings, a work of 400 pages of Moral & Religious Lessons for the Young,	60 8	
The same in five Pamphlets,	55	
" " twenty-five Tracts,	50 8	
Appeal to the Youth, Bound,	60 8	
" " " Paper Covers,	10 2	
" " " " without Likeness,	15 2	
The Bible from Heaven,	10 5	
Both Sides. Review of Preble on Sabbath and Law,	20 4	
Three Angels of Rev. xiv, and the Two-horned Beast,	15 4	
Sabbath Tracts, Nos. I, II, III, & IV,	15 4	
Hope of the Gospel, or Immortality the Gift of God, Which? Mortal or Immortal? or an Inquiry into the Present Constitution & Future Condition of Man,	15 4	
Modern Spiritualism: its Nature and Tendency,	15 4	
The Kingdom of God: a Refutation of the Doctrine called, Age to Come,	15 4	
Miraculous Powers,	15 4	
Pauline Theology, on Future Punishment,	15 4	
Appeal to Mothers,	15 2	
Review of Seymour. His Fifty Questions Answered,	10 3	
Prophecy of Daniel—The Sanctuary and 230 Days,	10 3	
The Saints' Inheritance in the New Earth,	10 3	
Signs of the Times. The Coming of Christ at the Door,	10 3	
Law of God. The Testimony of Both Testaments,	10 3	
Validation of the True Sabbath, by J. W. Morton,	10 3	
Review of Springer on the Sabbath and Law of God,	10 3	
Facts for the Times. Extracts from Eminent Authors,	10 3	
Christian Baptism. Its Nature, Subjects, & Design,	10 3	
Key to the Prophetic Chart,	10 2	
The Sanctuary and 2300 Days of Dan. viii, 14,	10 2	
The Fate of the Transgressor,	5 2	
Matthew xxiv. A Brief Exposition of the Chapter,	5 2	
Mark of the Beast, and Seal of the Living God,	5 1	
Sabbatic Institution and the Two Laws,	5 1	
Assistant. The Bible Student's Assistant, or a Compend of Scripture References,	5 1	
Truth Found. A Short Argument for the Sabbath, with an Appendix, "The Sabbath not a Type,"	5 1	
An Appeal for the Restoration of the Bible Sabbath in an Address to the Baptists,	5 1	
Review of Filto. A Reply to a series of Discourses delivered by him in this City against the Sabbath,	5 1	
Milton on the State of the Dead,	5 1	
Brown's Experience. Consecration—Second Advent,	5 1	
Report of General Conference held in Battle Creek, June, 1889. Address on Systematic Benevolence, &c.,	5 1	
Sabbath Poem. False Theories Exposed,	5 1	
Illustrated Review. A Double Number of the Review and Herald Illustrated,	5 1	
The Sabbath, in German,	10 2	
" " " Holland,	5 1	
" " " French,	5 1	
On Daniel II & VII, in French,	5 1	
ONE-CENT TRACTS. The Seven Seals—The Two Laws—Reasons for Sunday-keeping Examined—Personality of God—Wesley on the Law—Judson on Dress—Appeal on Immortality.		
TWO-CENT TRACTS. Institution of the Sabbath—Sabbath by Ethel—Infidelity and Spiritualism—War and Sealing—Who Changed the Sabbath?—Preach the Word—Death and Burial—Much in Little—Truth.		
THREE-CENT TRACTS. Dobney on the Law—Milton on the State of the Dead—Scripture References—The Mark of the Beast and Seal of the Living God—Spiritual Gifts.		
CHARTS, Prophetic and Law of God, the size used by our Preachers. Varnished, a set, with Key,	\$4 00	
A Set on Cloth, with Key,	3.00	
On Cloth, without Rollers, by mail, post-paid,	2.75	
Small Chart. A Pictorial Illustration of the Visions of Daniel and John 23 by 25 inches. Price 15 cents. On Rollers, post-paid, 75 cts.		