

ADVENT REVIEW & HERALD OF THE SABBATH---EXTRA.

REVIEW & HERALD.--EXTRA.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., APRIL 14, 1874.

TO THE READER.

THE object of this sheet is to expose the dishonest and unjust course which Eld. Miles Grant, editor of the *World's Crisis*, has pursued toward Seventh-day Adventists for a number of years past. Though often corrected in his misstatements, he still persists in repeating them in the most barefaced and reckless manner, as will appear from what is herewith presented. The facts speak for themselves. We regret the necessity for the publication of matter of this kind; but as he has carried on this work to that extent that it is no longer a virtue to forbear, we send forth these statements, commending them to the candid consideration of the reader. As in the first age of the church, it is still necessary to pray that the word of the Lord may have free course, and that "we may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men." 2 Thess. 2:1, 2.

J. N. ANDREWS,
U. SMITH.

ELD. GRANT'S INJUSTICE TOWARD SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTISTS.

We find it to be our duty at the present time to make a plain statement of the injustice which we have suffered at the hands of Eld. Miles Grant, editor of the *World's Crisis*. Several times, as the reader will see by the facts and dates herein given, we have called attention to this matter. And we should not now feel called upon to take up the subject in this manner were it not that Eld. Grant continues his course of injustice under the garb of sanctification, which is calculated to deceive those who have recently come to the faith with us, especially those who have never seen the publication of our statements in the *Review*. He also continues to try to provoke discussions in localities where his only hope is to distract and tear down.

A noteworthy case of this kind has recently come off at Napa City, Cal. Elds. Loughborough and Cornell visited Napa in the summer of 1873, with their large tent, and as the result of their labors a church of Seventh-day Adventists has been raised up of about sixty members. They have built a house of worship, dedicated to the Lord, April 4, 1874.

Eld. Grant's people had no church in Napa. They had no cause in that city to defend. But in the month of March, Eld. Grant visited Napa, as a revivalist, and under the flimsy garb of modern holiness preached several discourses in the court-house, which took well with a few persons. He did not appear in Napa in his second-advent dress; but he labored to conceal his real views. And when he supposed that he had obtained a foothold, he challenged for a discussion upon the Sabbath question. More particulars, and the results, are given in another place.

The church at Santa Rosa, Cal., being ignorant of Eld. Grant's acts of injustice toward Seventh-day Adventists, in response to a request from a first-day Adventist, offered their house of worship to Eld. Grant by vote. This gave rise to an exposure of Eld. Grant's unchristian conduct toward the Seventh-day Adventists as a people, and Eld. J. N. Andrews and Eld. James White and wife in particular, before the quarterly meeting of S. D. Adventists held at Santa Rosa, March 7-9, 1874. The Conference Committee being present at that meeting, gave an expression of their views of this matter in the following

PREAMBLE AND RESOLUTION.

Whereas, Eld. Miles Grant of the *World's Crisis*, Boston, Mass., has, without cause or provocation, treated the Seventh-day Adventists as a people, and in particular, Eld. J. N. Andrews and Eld. James White and wife, in an unchristian manner, therefore,

Resolved, That until Eld. Miles Grant shall make proper confessions of the wrongs alluded to above, our people should regard him unworthy to speak in their places of worship, or to enter into discussions with our ministers.

J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH, { Cal.
J. W. BOND, { Conf.
JOHN JUDSON. { Com.

Santa Rosa, Cal., March 9, 1874.

FACTS IN THE CASE.

In justice to ourselves, and to the cause of truth and righteousness, it becomes our duty to state facts relative to the course of Eld. Grant, which fully justify the action of the California Conference Committee.

In November, 1865, a discussion was held at Portland, Me., between Elds. Cornell and Preble. The question was thus stated: "The seventh-day Sabbath, observed by God's people prior to the crucifixion of Christ, is still binding upon mankind." Eld. C. affirmed; Eld. P. denied. In the early part of the discussion, Eld. P. made a very bitter attack upon "Andrews' History of the Sabbath;" and he had so much to say respecting it that Eld. C. protested

against this course of action as being wholly irrelevant to the question under examination. He declined to follow Eld. P. in this thing, but, at the request of Eld. Andrews, made him this proposition: "The author of the History of the Sabbath will discuss the merits of that work with Eld. P. through the columns of the *ADVENT REVIEW*, the organ of the Seventh-day Adventists, provided that the discussion shall also be published in the *World's Crisis*, the eastern organ of the no-law Adventists."

In reporting the discussion at Portland, the editor of the *ADVENT REVIEW*, Uriah Smith, made the following remarks in reference to the foregoing proposition, in that paper of Jan. 30, 1866: "The door is now open for them to test this matter, if they dare step in and risk their cause in a fair and open encounter."

The *World's Crisis* of Feb. 14, 1866, contained the following response from Eld. Preble:—

"CHALLENGE."

"In the *Review* and *Herald* of Jan. 30, 1866, in referring to J. N. Andrews' History of the Sabbath, the writer says:—

"The door is now open for them to test this matter, if they dare step in and risk their cause in a fair and open encounter."

"To this challenge I reply that I am ready, and 'dare step in and risk' an open encounter with any man in their ranks qualified to defend their cause in testing the merits of J. N. Andrews' History, or any other point connected with their theory of the seventh-day Sabbath, either in oral or written discussion, as soon as arrangements can be agreed upon.

"Will they 'dare' do it? Will they 'risk' their cause' in this manner? We shall see. They may try to shield themselves from this issue by saying they will not debate this question with me unless the *World's Crisis* will also publish the discussion. But I am disposed to 'dare' them to 'risk' their cause' in an open encounter through the columns of this paper. But it is quite doubtful whether they will dare to run such a 'risk' as this. But we shall see what we shall see. T. M. PREBLE.
"East Weare, N. H., Feb. 5, 1866."

The *World's Crisis*, having published this defiant challenge to the Seventh-day Adventists to risk an encounter with Eld. P. in the columns of that paper, did, by that act, in the most emphatic manner, commit itself that such discussion should be allowed a place in its columns, if the friends of the seventh-day Sabbath should dare to undertake it. Such being the case, it was proper that our General Conference Committee should take action with reference to this matter. It was not merely Eld. P., but it was really the *World's Crisis*, that thus threw down the gauntlet. And, moreover, this gave promise of an opportunity to reach the no-law Adventists with the argument in behalf of the seventh day. Only one member of the General Conference Committee was at this time in Battle Creek; but the editor of the *ADVENT REVIEW* and the editor of the *Youth's Instructor* united with that member in responding through the *Review* of Feb. 27, 1866, to the defiant language of the *Crisis*. Here is their response:—

"Acting for the other members of the General Conference Committee, we would designate Eld. J. N. Andrews as the one to conduct this discussion in behalf of Seventh-day Adventists. And he is hereby instructed to make such arrangements with Eld. P. and the *Crisis* as shall bring the matter to an early issue.

[Signed] U. SMITH,
G. W. AMADON,
J. M. ALDRICH."

In obedience to this instruction, Eld. Andrews addressed the following note of acceptance to the editor of the *Crisis*:—

"[For the *Crisis*.]"

"NORRIDGEWOCK, Me., March 5, 1866.

"BRO. GRANT: I accept the proposition of Eld. T. M. Preble, in the *Crisis* of Feb. 14, for a discussion of the Sabbath question through the columns of the *Crisis* and of the *ADVENT REVIEW*. He proposes to discuss 'the merits of J. N. Andrews' History, or any other point connected with their theory of the seventh-day Sabbath.'

"In accordance with this offer, I name two points for discussion:—

"1. The Biblical argument for the observance of the seventh day.

"2. The historical argument relating to the seventh and first days of the week, and involving 'the merits of J. N. Andrews' History of the Sabbath.'

"Upon the publication of this acceptance in the *Crisis*, I will open the discussion of the first point.
"J. N. ANDREWS."

As the conductors of the *Crisis* had indorsed Eld. P.'s challenge for a discussion of this subject through its columns by publishing that challenge to the world, they could not, without the most flagrant injustice, refuse to insert in that paper Eld. Andrews' note of acceptance, even though they should decide to shut out the discussion. It would indeed reflect no honor upon them to publish a challenge for a discussion through their columns, and then refuse to allow the discussion to take place; but to go still further and refuse to publish the note of acceptance, or even to let the fact appear that the challenge was accepted, is an act of injustice that can only be justified by proving that the moral law is abolished. And now observe what was done. No notice was taken of this acceptance in the columns of the *Crisis*, but its editor addressed Eld. Andrews a private letter as follows:—

"BOSTON, Mass., March 15, 1866.

"BRO. ANDREWS: Your note of the 5th inst. was put into my hands to-day.

"Our regulations will not allow a discussion in the *Crisis*. I have sent your proposition to Bro. Preble.

"Your brother in Christ, MILES GRANT."

To this letter Bro. Andrews returned the following reply:—

"NORRIDGEWOCK, Me., March 19, 1866.

"BRO. GRANT: Yours of the 15th inst. has just come to hand. I learn with surprise and regret that your 'regulations will not allow a discussion in the *Crisis*.' Your regulations did allow the publication of a challenge in the *Crisis* of Feb. 14, for a discussion of the Sabbath question 'through the columns' of that paper. The proposition was clothed in very defiant language, and being admitted into the *Crisis* by its editor, it did necessarily open that paper to the discussion of this subject. In accepting Eld. P.'s proposition thus indorsed by yourself, I did not act upon my own responsibility. I was duly designated by those who have charge of the Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association to conduct this discussion in behalf of the observers of the seventh day. In shutting the columns of the *Crisis* without one word of explanation, you certainly do us great injustice. I think it would have been no more than just that you should have inserted my brief letter of acceptance, accompanied by such remarks as you deemed proper. My regret would have been no less that the discussion could not be had, but I should have felt that you had not been guilty of injustice. We stand before the world 'dared' to risk an encounter through the columns of the *Crisis*, and yet not allowed even to accept such challenge through its columns.

"You say that you have sent my letter to Eld. P. With Eld. P. privately I have nothing to do. An oral discussion is of very little consequence; I have other and more important duties to perform. But a written discussion that should bring the subject before the whole body of Adventists, I would deem really important. In good faith I accepted the proposition for such a discussion; if this cannot take place, the fault is certainly not on the side of Seventh-day Adventists. Will you not do us the justice to make a fair statement of the fact that we did accept the proposition of Eld. P. for a discussion through the columns of the *Crisis* and of the *ADVENT REVIEW*?"

"Yours in Christ, J. N. ANDREWS."

To this appeal the editor and the conductors of the *Crisis* paid not the slightest attention. Yet to refuse such a demand is so manifestly unjust that we venture to assert that no man dare to defend it. Eld. P.'s challenge was promptly accepted. Yet the *Crisis* having published that challenge refused to allow the fact of its acceptance to appear in its columns. The readers of the *Crisis* are left to believe, 1. That that paper is open to a fair discussion of the Sabbath question. 2. That the observers of the Bible Sabbath dare not meet the subject in a fair, open encounter, through the columns of the *Crisis* and the *Review*.

These impressions prevail extensively among the readers of the *Crisis*, as we are informed by competent authorities. And it really looks as if those who proposed the debate, and then shut out from the columns of the *Crisis* all mention of the fact that it was promptly accepted, did design by this unworthy conduct to make capital for the no-Sabbath or Sunday-Sabbath cause. It has given opportunity for not a little boasting, and Eld. P., to whom the editor of the *Crisis* says he sent the letter of acceptance, has had neither the principles of justice nor of honor strong enough to correct the false impression which has thus been fastened upon the readers of that paper.

Nor can it be said that the editor of the *Crisis* may never have received the second letter, and that he may therefore be blameless. He did receive the first on his own acknowledgment; and that first letter should have needed no second to awaken him to justice. But there is another fact to be noticed. After waiting some twenty days for a response to his second letter, Eld. A. sent the entire correspondence to the *ADVENT REVIEW*, in which paper of April 24, 1866 it was published to the world. As this failed to cause the *Crisis* to correct its injustice, the subject came up for consideration in the ensuing General Conference, May 17, 1866. The following resolution was unanimously adopted and published in the *ADVENT REVIEW* of May 22, 1866:—

"SABBATH DISCUSSION."

"Whereas, There appeared in the *World's Crisis*, of Feb. 14, 1866, a very defiant challenge to S. D. Adventists for the discussion of the Sabbath question, particularly the 'History of the Sabbath,' through the columns of that paper, and

"Whereas, This challenge was promptly and unqualifiedly accepted, with the offer on our part that it should also appear in the *Review* and

"Whereas, The *Crisis* thereupon refused to allow the discussion to appear in its columns; and further refused to publish the brief note of acceptance from J. N. Andrews, who was designated to conduct the discussion on the part of our people; and further, when courteously requested to let the fact appear that the challenge had been accepted, would not even grant us that favor, therefore,

"Resolved, That we express our surprise at such a course on the part of the *Crisis*, and our inability to reconcile it with the principles of honor, of justice, and of Christianity."

This failed to call out, either from the *Crisis* or from Eld. P., any correction of the wrong with which they stood connected. They could not complain of the language used as harsh or unbecoming, and they certainly were not ignorant of the injustice which we had suffered.

With the action of the General Conference, May, 1866, all effort on our part to obtain justice in this case ceased.

And yet we did not entirely cease to call attention to these things, but gave them abundant opportunity

to do us justice if they had had the disposition. In the latter part of 1870, a correspondent of the *Crisis* made a bitter attack upon us in that paper, wherein were many false accusations. In reviewing this article, Eld. Waggoner republished the facts above set forth in the *Review* and *Herald* of Feb. 21, 1871.

And again, in August of the same year, 1871, Eld. Andrews, in noticing some positions taken by Eld. Preble, published the whole matter, from the challenge of Eld. Preble to the action of the General Conference. Thus, from Feb., 1866, to Aug., 1871, these things have been repeatedly made public; but all this never had the effect to call out Eld. Grant, or lead him to correct the wrong which had been done to us in the paper of which he was editor. It being impossible to vindicate his course, he chose to remain silent.

And thus it went on until the latter part of 1872, when Eld. James White met Eld. Grant in California, and he there rehearsed these facts before Eld. Grant and some of his friends. Being thus called out in a manner which he could not evade, he promised that justice should be done to us in the *Crisis*. Accordingly, in that paper of April 16, 1873, appeared the following:—

"AN APOLOGY."

"A short time since, we met in San Francisco Elder James White, of Battle Creek, Mich., who thought we ought to make an apology for not publishing Eld. J. N. Andrews' acceptance of Eld. T. M. Preble's challenge, published in the *Crisis* in 1866. After listening to Eld. White's remarks, we became satisfied that an apology was due to Elder Andrews and his friends. The facts are as follows: Eld. Preble published a strong challenge in the *Crisis* inviting any one who felt competent to defend the Seventh-day Sabbath, to debate the question with him orally, or by writing. Eld. Andrews sent an acceptance of the challenge, proposing to discuss the question in the columns of the *Crisis*. On the receipt of his acceptance, we wrote Eld. Andrews as follows:—

"BOSTON, Mass., March 15, 1866.

"BRO. ANDREWS:—Your note of the 5th inst. was put into my hands to-day. Our regulations will not allow a discussion in the *Crisis*. I have sent your proposition to Bro. Preble.

"Your brother in Christ, MILES GRANT."

"We thought this was sufficient, at the time' supposing that they would make arrangements for an oral debate. We now think it would have been better to have published Eld. Andrews' letter in the *Crisis*, instead of sending it to Eld. Preble, then all would have known that he accepted the challenge for a written discussion."

With all confidence we appeal to all who have read the foregoing documentary evidence in this case, that this "Apology" does not remove the wrong of which Eld. Grant has been guilty.

1. He says that "after listening to Eld. White's remarks we [he] became satisfied that an apology was due to Eld. Andrews and his friends." But all the facts that Eld. White there presented had been well known by Eld. Grant for nearly seven years, and during all that time he knew that he was bound by every principle of honor and of Christianity to make reparation for the grievous wrong he had committed.

2. He says that Eld. Preble challenged any one "to discuss the question with him orally or by writing," leaving out the material point that Eld. Preble's challenge contained the proposal to discuss through the columns of the *Crisis*. To suppress this truth was to mislead the minds of his readers.

3. He says, "Eld. Andrews sent an acceptance of the challenge, proposing to discuss the question in the columns of the *Crisis*." This is not true. Eld. Grant well knew that Eld. Andrews' letter of acceptance contained no such proposal; he accepted a challenge which contained the proposal to discuss through the *Crisis*. Eld. Preble's challenge to discuss through the *Crisis* was published in the *Crisis* before Eld. Andrews wrote to Eld. Grant.

4. By admitting the challenge into the *Crisis* to discuss through the *Crisis*, he deprived himself of the right to refuse to publish the acceptance of that challenge on the supposition that they would get up an oral debate; for he had bound himself by every principle of honor to admit the discussion, or at least to admit the letter of acceptance.

Had not the proposal to discuss through the *Crisis* been published in the *Crisis* before Eld. Andrews wrote to Eld. Grant, he might have refused without sacrificing his honor. But Eld. Grant, being the editor, was himself the responsible party for the publication of that proposal. And thus it appears that this "Apology" is only a lame excuse, giving an entirely wrong view of the case, leaving the readers, especially those on the Pacific coast who knew nothing of the facts, to infer that we had no great cause of complaint, and that he had done nothing very dishonorable. Such a perverted statement of the case, instead of doing us justice, is really an aggravation of the offense.

His statement should have been full, honest, and truthful; and even then he could never do full justice to all concerned. For he must have known that many who read the challenge in the *Crisis* seven years before would never see his "Apology," and they could never have the benefit of any restitution he might make. After thus letting it stand for about seven years before his readers, it is but a poor "apology" for justice that he published an account so erroneous, and so directly calculated to mislead.

VILE SLANDER.

And Eld. Grant has not only been content to do us this great injustice and to let the wrong stand uncorrected for years, but he has suffered articles to appear in the *Crisis* charging us with being hypocrites and deceivers of the people. And moreover he has taken part in these assertions, especially in

speaking evil of sister White, whom he has openly and publicly accused of being influenced by the spirit of a demon.

In the *World's Crisis*, of July 5, 1871, in an article on "The Shakers," he goes far out of his way to visit upon sister White terms of the severest denunciation. After noticing many of the false theories and foolish positions of the Shakers, and the silly pretenses, blasphemous claims, and disgusting exercises of Ann Lee, whom they styled their "spiritual mother," Eld. G. says:—

"It will be seen from the foregoing testimony that her 'revelations,' 'visions,' 'tongues,' and 'prophecies,' evidently proceeded from the same source as those given to Swedenborg, the spiritualists, the Mormons, and Ellen White, the oracle of the Seventh-day Adventists. If one is from demons, they all are. To our mind this is a clear case."

He then goes on to speak of "seducing spirits," and their dark and diabolical character, after which he says:—

"In order to get an influence over the professed children of the Lord, they will pretend to great sanctity, and require their followers to practice much self-denial," &c.

Whether this refers to the "Shaker mother," to the "oracle of the Seventh-day Adventists," or to the "seducing spirits," the ambiguity of the language renders it impossible to determine. But a few lines farther on, he speaks in a manner clearly to be understood. He says:—

"It is a sad fact that these seducers very often get the confidence of some of the most sincere men and women; just as a counterfeiter or a seducer has best success among honest and virtuous people, who are unsuspecting. This is true in relation to the systems we have previously named in this article."

Here Seventh-day Adventism is placed on a level with Shakerism and spiritualism, and compared to a counterfeiter and seducer. Verily Seventh-day Adventism must have some very damnable features to stir Eld. G.'s spirit to the depth here exhibited. If its character is such as that of spiritualism, Eld. G.'s zeal in this matter may pass as righteous indignation; but if it is not, such bitterness of spirit can be excused by no system less lax than that which advocates the abolition of the moral law of God.

How, then, does Seventh-day Adventism differ from that particular type of Adventism with which Eld. G. is identified? It differs chiefly in two particulars: 1. It advocates the observance of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, on the ground of the perpetuity of the moral law, while Eld. G. refuses to keep it because he holds that the commandments have been abolished: and 2. It has that which it claims to be the promised spirit of prophecy in the church. Heartily as Eld. G. may dislike the Sabbath, we do not apprehend that it is this feature which has called forth this bitter invective; for we have never known him thus to speak of the Seventh-day Baptists, whose Sabbath theory and practice is identical with ours, nor to compare their system to a counterfeiter and seducer. The chief trouble, then, is with the visions of sister White. Let us see, therefore, if they can be justly placed in the same category with the views and claims of Ann Lee and the unhallowed teachings of spiritualism.

Ann Lee claimed that Jesus appeared to her in person and baptized her into and with the Christ Spirit as John had baptized him. Does sister White put forth any such foolish claim? Eld. G. knows that she does not.

Ann Lee claimed to be a "spiritual mother" to the Shakers. Does sister White make any such claim in reference to S. D. Adventists? He knows that she does not.

Ann Lee claimed that God is dual, male and female, that Christ is in like manner dual, and that the second appearing of Christ was manifested through her; that she was baptized with what they call the "Christ Spirit," and became the female counterpart of Christ. Does sister White put forth any such disgusting and blasphemous claims? He knows that she does not.

Does she countenance the immorality, the licentiousness, the atheism, the infidelity, or any of the other corruptions and follies of spiritualism? Eld. G., if he has had the candor, before thus passing judgment upon her, to acquaint himself with her writings, knows that with all her energy she labors to expose and condemn these evils from first to last, from the greatest to the least. Is it then just to rank her writings and her work with Shakerism and with spiritualism? If it is just to rank a person with drunkards who never partakes of intoxicating liquor, if it is just to assign a place among libertines to a person who maintains the strictest chastity of character, if it is just to confound with thieves a person who sorely regards the rights and property of others, in short, if it is just to put no distinction between the innocent and the guilty in any practice of immorality and wrong, then it is just to class the works of sister White with Shakerism and spiritualism, and the course Eld. G. has taken can be justified, but not otherwise.

To the visions as given and used among S. D. Adventists, Eld. G. cannot object on the score of their leading to fanaticism, immorality, or any evil; for their tendency is just the reverse. They aim invariably and persistently to lead to a higher type of morality, to a greater nearness to God, and to a preparation in heart and life, full and complete, for the soon coming of our Lord and Saviour. Yet Eld. G. compares them to a counterfeiter and a seducer, cold-blooded and heartless villains, the first of whom goes deliberately to work to rob honest people of their property, the second laboring to compass the ruin of innocent victims, both for time and for eternity, by robbing them of their virtue. To accuse the visions of thus seeking, designedly and maliciously, under a garb of piety, and a cloak of religion, to lead souls to utter and irretrievable ruin, is a terrible charge; and a man should have the very clearest evidence to sustain their diabolical character, before blistering his lips with curses thus hissing hot against them.

Says Eld. G., "We have known these 'seducing spirits' to secure the confidence of their victims for weeks, months, and even years, before they were detected in the deception." But was the devil ever known to continue the inculcation of all good principles and warning against all evil for twenty-nine years, as in the case of these visions, among those he had in his snare? Hundreds have already died in the belief of these visions, who, so far as they were influenced by them, were led to godliness and purity of life, and no effort was made, from first to last, by this means to instill evil into their minds and

lead them away from holiness and God. Is this the way the devil treats people? If so, his kingdom is divided against itself.

About twenty-six years spiritualism has been in the land. It began at first in a very pious manner, but it could not retain the mask for any length of time; and, behold, what a monster of iniquity it appears to-day! But here is a work dating back three years previous to the rise of spiritualism, and going forward at the same time, of an exactly opposite character, denouncing spiritualism at every step, exposing its evils, and warning people against its corruptions.

And these apply not to the present only, but to the future, when it is predicted that spiritualism will manifest greatly increased power, and we are warned now to prepare to be able to stand against its influence then. Both these works, says Eld. G., are alike the work of the devil. Does the devil thus work against his own interests?

Those who know the irreproachable life of sister White, and the purity of her teachings, will not be slow to determine by what spirit Eld. G. is moved to make such declarations against her.

Springfield Camp-meeting.

It is proper here to make a statement of the treatment which Eld. White and his wife received from Eld. Grant and others at the Springfield Camp-meeting in 1869. We would first state that the first time that Eld. White and Eld. Grant met was on a western train, at which time Eld. Grant stated that his greatest objection to Seventh-day Adventists was their exclusiveness. Eld. Grant there stated to Eld. White, "I can worship with you, but your views will not let you worship with me."

Eld. White cherishing views of Eld. Grant's honesty, which he has since been forced to abandon, took Eld. Grant at his word and in a few weeks addressed a note to him relative to pitching a family tent upon the Springfield camp-ground, to be occupied by himself and some half dozen others. Eld. White stated that neither himself nor any one of his company would say anything publicly that was out of harmony with the general sentiments of the meeting, neither would they sell any of their books.

This note receiving a favorable response from Eld. Grant, Eld. White, sister White, Mrs. Dr. Chamberlain, and Elds. Waggoner and Cornell came upon the ground and took up tent life. Several other S. D. A. brethren were occasionally with them. Eld. White always has a quantity of our publications with him. And when his friends called upon him at his tent or when he met them upon the grounds he usually gave them some of his publications. He did not scatter them upon the seats, neither did he distribute in the tents, he simply in the most quiet manner handed them to personal friends and those who came to his tent and asked for them.

It was not long, however, before Eld. White was summoned to meet the camp-meeting committee in the rear of the speakers' stand. So accompanied by Elds. Waggoner and Cornell he appeared before that committee to answer to the charge of a violation of promise in giving away, in the manner afore stated, some of his publications. Eld. White very soon made it appear that he had made no promise relative to giving away his publications, and that he had strictly kept his word. And as opposition publications from the office of the *World's Crisis* had only a few weeks before been scattered broadcast in the Seventh-day Adventist tent in Chelsea, Mass., where Eld. Cornell was preaching, Eld. White did not expect that any one would object to his handing out some of his publications in the manner afore stated.

Eld. White and his friends received permission to retire, with the promise that in a few minutes, at a given place, the decision of the committee would be made known to them, which proved to be that Eld. White must hand out no more of his publications, to which he consented. But before he got back to his tent, a keen, shrewd appearing lady, doubtless selected for the purpose, came to his tent and in the most urgent manner wished to purchase a couple of pamphlets. Dr. Chamberlain not knowing the decision of the committee, and Eld. White's consent to it, gave the lady the two pamphlets, but refused to take her money, stating that Eld. White had promised to sell no publications on the ground. And in less than five minutes, Eld. Matthewson, accompanied by Eld. Himes, came to Eld. White's tent in a rage with the two pamphlets in his hands, which he had received of the afore-mentioned lady, demanding him to take down his tent and leave the grounds immediately. Eld. White attempted an explanation, which was at first denied by Eld. Matthewson, but in consequence of the pacific words of Eld. Himes, was permitted. Eld. White asked his wife and Dr. Chamberlain to explain the matter, which was done by Dr. Chamberlain, in a clear and calm manner, stating, at the same time, that she was acquainted with both Eld. Matthewson and Eld. Himes, and that they had frequently been guests at her house in Middletown, Conn., before the death of her husband.

And yet Eld. Matthewson persisted that Eld. White should immediately take down his tent and leave the grounds. Eld. White then stated that he should not be driven off from the grounds in any such way, that he had done nothing worthy of such treatment, that he demanded the right to make a full explanation, and that if Eld. Matthewson pressed the matter he would find that in this case he had been making history that would afterward prove unpleasant to him. Said Eld. Matthewson, "Do you mean that you will publish it in your paper?" "I do," replied Eld. White, and continued, "my appointment in Lancaster makes it necessary that I should leave to-morrow, which I shall do." This ended the matter, and the next day Eld. White quietly left the grounds.

One other circumstance in which Eld. Grant acted a part should here be mentioned. Bro. and sister W. were walking around the grounds near the stand about eight o'clock in the morning. The time for social service was at nine. Before the stand, where the prayer-meetings were held, were two of Eld. Grant's brethren. The breakfast hour had passed, and hundreds were moving in different directions on the grounds. One of the two brethren before the stand said to the other, "Let us start a prayer-meeting; there is nearly an hour before the regular appointment which will be lost unless we do. The people had better be here in prayer-meeting than to be strolling around the grounds." They sung, which gathered a few. And while one of them prayed, more came; and when about fifty were gathered, sister White arose and began to speak. Her clear, full voice reached the ears of those who were walking about the grounds, and they flocked to the stand, and when more than one thousand were quietly seated, and were listening to sister White with the greatest attention as she was speaking upon practical godliness, and not one word out of harmony with

the doctrines or spirit of the meeting, Eld. Grant arose and said:—

"Sister, this is no place for preaching! This is no place for preaching!"

As sister White had been speaking only five or six minutes she did not think it proper to sit down at once, and continued her remarks for a moment, when Eld. Grant vehemently repeated again the same words. The reader will bear in mind that this did not occur at the time of any regular service. Moreover Eld. Grant had no occasion to interrupt sister White on the ground that she was advocating views contrary to those taught at that meeting. And even admitting that the hour had arrived for social service, no Christian gentleman would treat a woman, whose position demanded respect as a public speaker, as Eld. Grant treated sister White.

By this time the reader may inquire, What did Eld. Grant mean when he said to Eld. White, on the occasion of their first meeting on the railroad train, that his greatest objection to Seventh-day Adventists was their exclusiveness, and that he could worship with them, but they could not worship with him? The matter can be explained only on the ground that the man will, when it serves his policy best, say one thing when he means another.

And why fear to have Mrs. White speak upon the Springfield camp-ground? This was virtually answered by one of their ministers, who was in favor of driving them from the ground, who said, "We don't want the influence of their presence on the ground, even if they should not say a word."

This course of conduct shows their lack of confidence in their own positions, and their inability to sustain them from the word of God. This was also manifested in a request from Eld. Grant that our list of publications should be left off from the cover of that portion of the Discussion between Eld. Cornell and himself which he proposed to keep for sale at the *Crisis* office. He feared even to have the list of our works on the Law and Sabbath fall into the hands of his patrons, lest they should know that such works were in existence, and should obtain them, read them, and believe what they teach. So we humored Eld. Grant, both in relation to the Discussion and also Eld. Waggoner's triumphant refutation of the doctrine of the non-resurrection of the unjust, and sent the books to the *Crisis* office with blank covers.

Eld. Grant and his associates have done all in their power to hide from their people the evidence of the Sabbath truth. And the reader can now form an opinion of the unrighteous means they have been willing to resort to in accomplishing this. But the most powerful weapon in their hands has been prejudice, which they have labored to stir up in the hearts of their people. Are any of their people in danger of embracing the Sabbath, a few slanderous statements about sister White and her visions are immediately set forth to intimidate them. Their course in this respect reminds one of the mother who would frighten her child to obedience by threatening to shut him up with the "bugbears in the dark." It is astonishing what an influence these men have over their followers. It is well illustrated by the influence of the priest over Roman Catholics. The confidence of their followers in their slanderous reports reminds us of the Roman Catholic school-master, who said in the honesty of his soul that Martin Luther was a drunkard and put forth his writings against Rome by the power of the devil in his fits of delirium tremens.

Eld. Grant's followers in San Francisco were so thoroughly scared into obedience by his outcry about sister White and her visions, that when Bro. and sister White visited San Francisco for the first time, in 1873, they would not consent to have them speak in their place of worship, though Eld. Fassett and wife, their regular speakers, were absent. Bro. Diggins, who attended their meetings on Sunday, and was one of their supporters, went to the leading men with the pledge that nothing should be said by Bro. and sister White contrary to the views of that people. But, notwithstanding this pledge, and the fact that their regular speakers were absent, Bro. Diggins was denied.

Their Stronghold.

Men who are hard pressed upon any religious topic will use the best arguments they have. And no class of men can appreciate the importance of this more than Eld. Grant and his law-abolished friends. Seventh-day Adventists have pressed them hard upon the Sabbath question. This has driven them to misrepresentations of our real views and positions, as their present stronghold. By putting our people in positions which they know we do not occupy, and resorting to smut and blacking, they hope to raise prejudice in the minds of the people, and thus cut off our influence. But in doing this, they not only commit the high crime of deliberately bearing false witness against a God-fearing people, but they expose the fact that with them is a want of Bible evidence.

Those who have the truth of God can afford to be fair. They are sustained in their labors, not only by the happy fact that they have embraced sacred truth, but with the clear and harmonious evidences by which it is sustained. They can afford to state the positions of their opponents truthfully and correctly, and then refute them in the spirit of candor and honesty. But judging from the general conduct of not a few of our opponents, they cannot afford to be fair. They speak of our views, and of us as a people, as though they could not afford to rightly represent us, lest some of their adherents should hear us, and embrace our views.

The following from the Review of July 25, 1871, is a striking illustration of the course of some of our opponents, in the person of Eld. Miles Grant, who seems willing to sacrifice truth and honesty for the sake of abusing Seventh-day Adventists:—

The *World's Crisis* of July 5, 1871, has an editorial headed, "San Francisco," in which the editor does Seventh-day Adventists great injustice. He first gives the notice, from the San Francisco *Daily Chronicle*, of the tent-meeting held in that city by Elds. Loughborough and Cornell. The notice came from an unprejudiced pen, and was therefore candid. It follows:—

"ANOTHER SERIES OF TENT-MEETINGS.

"A sect styling themselves Second Adventists have determined to hold a series of meetings under canvas, with the view of advancing their peculiar theory of religion. A commodious tent has been erected on a vacant lot on the south side of Market street, between Fifth and Sixth, in which place their doctrines, setting forth the theme of man's nature and destiny, and the tendency of modern spiritualism, will be expounded. Elds. J. N. Loughborough and M. E. Cornell of Michigan, as well as other well-known Second Advent preachers, will address the

meetings, which will commence this evening at 7:45 o'clock, and will continue every evening, and the usual Sunday services, for several weeks."

If Eld. Grant feared that the people he represents might be confounded, in the minds of his friends in California, with Seventh-day Adventists, he could have made a fair statement of the facts in the case without any attempt whatever to misrepresent the Seventh-day Adventists. But his effort reaches beyond this. We are grieved that a religious editor, who holds in common with us very many points of important, unpopular Bible truth, should stoop to the gross misrepresentation in the following words. Eld. Grant says:—

"It will be noticed that these meetings are to be conducted by those who hold that Saturday—the Jewish Sabbath—should be observed now as a rest-day; and that those who keep the first day of the week as a Sabbath have taken upon them 'the mark of the beast,' referred to in Rev. 14:9-11. If this position were correct, then all Christians, who do not keep Saturday for a Sabbath, 'shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb.'"

We do not deny that we observe the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath of the Lord our God. But we do deny that we observe a "Jewish Sabbath" any more than we worship a Jewish God. We reject the terms "Jewish Sabbath" and "Christian Sabbath" as not only out of the line of Scripture phraseology, but as conveying untruthful ideas. We are content with the Scripture terms, "the Sabbath," or "the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," without any false or odious qualifying word.

In reply to the statement that we hold "that those who keep the first day of the week as a Sabbath have taken upon them the mark of the beast," and that "all Christians who do not keep Saturday for the Sabbath shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God," we have to say that the statement is false. This is evident from the following facts:—

1. The third message is a warning to men not to receive the mark of the beast. Seventh-day Adventists are giving that warning. And the editor of the *World's Crisis* is presuming marvelously upon the credulity of his readers in supposing that he can make them believe that such men as White, Waggoner, Loughborough, Cornell, Cottrell, Littlejohn, Butler, Canright, Van Horn, and others, are guilty of such stupid inconsistency as to devote their lives to a proclamation that warns the people not to receive what they already have!

2. Our works show that we believe no such thing. We are earnestly and tenderly teaching the people of every denomination of Sunday-keepers, and warning them of coming danger. We have a world-wide message of merciful warning, which gathers disciples from all the various churches of Sunday-keepers and from the world.

3. The people have not received Sunday from enlightened choice. It has come to them as a matter of course, handed down from their parents, taken for granted, without close investigation, that it was really the Sabbath of the New Testament. The people have not received the mark of the beast in the sense of the warning message that mentions it. But when the warning message shall be fully given, the claims of the fourth commandment are understood, and the rival Sabbath of the papacy shall be enforced by law, then it will become a matter of fearful choice. It will be then, and not till then, that persons can receive the mark of the beast in the sense of the third message.

But what makes Eld. Grant's statement appear still worse is the following evidence that he knew when he penned it that it was false. No Seventh-day Adventist has ever taught that all men "who do not keep Saturday for the Sabbath" have the mark of the beast, and are consequently doomed to the wrath of God. Thirty-seven volumes of the ADVENT REVIEW AND HERALD OF THE SABBATH have been completed, and in not one of them has this position been taken. Neither can it be found in one of our numerous publications. It would be very remarkable if all our brethren, public and private, had always in all they have said and written upon the subject of the mark of the beast, clearly stated that the solemn warning of the third message had reference to a future test, when men would accept of the papal Sunday as a matter of choice. But of this we are certain, that no one has ever stated the matter as reported by the editor of the *Crisis*.

As early as the spring of 1855, J. N. Andrews wrote a work entitled, "The Three Messages." Several editions of this work have been published and sold, to the amount of twenty thousand copies. This has been regarded by our people as a standard work, well representing the views of Seventh-day Adventists. From it we take the following, written nineteen years ago the present month:—

"Notwithstanding the fourth commandment in the plainest terms enjoins the observance of the sanctified rest-day of the Lord, almost all the world now wonder after the beast, and observe the pagan festival of Sunday, which the great apostasy has substituted for the holy Sabbath. By the observance of the Sabbath, men acknowledge the great Creator as their God. But when they *understandingly* choose in its stead the Sabbath of the man of sin, they acknowledge him as above all that is called God, or that is worshiped, and as able to change the times and laws of God. *There is no evading this point.* If we observe the Sabbath of the Lord and that of the apostasy also, we only make the man of sin equal with God. But when we profane the Lord's Sabbath, and observe in its stead the Romish festival of Sunday, we acknowledge the papacy above God, and able to change his times and laws. We speak of those who have the light of truth and act contrary to it. *Those who have never yet understood that the observance of Sunday is a tradition of the fathers which makes void the fourth commandment are not referred to. It is the bringing of this sabbath of the apostasy to the test that will constitute it the mark of that power that should think to change times and laws.* There is no other papal institution that directly sets aside one of the ten commandments, that the whole Protestant world observes. This mark is very conspicuous in the forehead or hand, and signifies not a literal mark, but a public profession, or act, that all may see or know."

"It is proper that we should speak with carefulness of that which relates to the events of the future. That the scene described in the conclusion of Rev. 13 pertains to the time of trouble before us, such as never was, we have no doubt. It is also evident that, in the providence of God, the line of separation between the worshipers of the beast and his image on the one hand, and those who keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus on the other, will be most distinct and visible. The third angel's procla-

mation will prepare the people of God for the coming crisis; and the formation of the image and the reception of the mark will prepare all the various classes of adherents to the beast to receive the vials of the wrath of God, the seven last plagues."

3. In another standard work of Seventh-day Adventists of 328 pp., entitled, "Thoughts on the Revelation," written by Uriah Smith, when editor of the ADVENT REVIEW, in 1865, we find the following clear statement:—

"It will thus be seen that a person does not have the mark of the beast in the Scripture sense, except by a voluntary obedience to the authority of the beast, with the issue fairly before him. The observance of the first day of the week, under the uncorrected supposition that it is a scriptural requirement, cannot constitute the mark of the beast. God takes into the account the light a person has, and the motives from which he acts. He who was the light of the world once said to the Jews, 'If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin.' John 15: 22. Hence the good of past ages who have died in the observance of this institution, unaware of any connection between it and the enactments of the beast, and supposing, the while, that they were thereby rendering obedience to the requirements of God—can they be said to have had the mark of the beast? By no means. The honesty of purpose with which they lived up to the best light they had will be a guarantee of their acceptance with God. Hence, again, it cannot be said of any at the present time, that they have the mark of the beast. But the true church must not come up to translation encumbered, however unwittingly, with papal errors and institutions; and before we come upon the issue brought to view in chap. 13: 15-27, light must be given upon the mark of the beast, and an effectual warning be uttered against its reception. The third angel's message, now in full process of accomplishment before us, is therefore timely and important. It is a summons to the faithful to make speedy preparations for the coming issue." Pages 238, 239.

The editor of the *Crisis* cannot be held guiltless for his misrepresentations of the views of Seventh-day Adventists on the ground that he may not have read these works. Before making such sweeping statements, calculated to prejudice all who regard him as an intelligent and honest man, he should understand our views. If he does not understand our positions, he should not meddle with them before the people. A candid public will hold a professing Christian editor accountable for abusive statements in reference to a sincere Christian people made in ignorance of the real facts in the case, the same as if he uttered willful falsehood.

But it is a fact that, in the presence of a large audience, in Library Hall, Chelsea, Mass., November, 1869, on the occasion of a discussion on the Sabbath question, between Eld. Miles Grant, editor *World's Crisis*, and Eld. M. E. Cornell, of Battle Creek, Mich., Eld. Cornell did correct Eld. Grant's misrepresentations on this subject in the following words:—

"One thing has been said for mere effect, which I must notice. We do not believe that they who keep Sunday have the mark of the beast; we do not teach so. It is a misrepresentation. But we do believe that when it becomes enforced by law, the warning has been given, and the people become enlightened on the subject, if they then persist in disobedience to God by breaking his holy Sabbath for an institution of another, opposing power, they will be condemned as worshipers of that power."—*Discussion*, p. 107.

This report of the discussion Eld. Grant indorses in the following certificate, printed upon the second page of the "Discussion": "This is to certify that the following report, as taken by Eld. J. H. Waggoner, is impartial and honorable. It does not profess to be a verbatim report, but the points and ideas are well expressed and satisfactory."

"MILES GRANT."

But imagine our surprise, when we saw in an issue of the *Crisis* in July, 1871, only twenty months after Eld. Grant had been corrected in the most unmistakable manner, the same old falsehood repeated from his pen.

With these facts before him, the editor of the *World's Crisis* will find it a difficult matter to free himself from the charge of a deliberate attempt to deceive his readers, in the act of abusively misrepresenting us. Neither will those who read this exposure be able to excuse him, unless it be those of his friends who believe the commandment abolished which says: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

Eld. Grant's Attack

UPON ELD. JAMES WHITE AND WIFE AT NAPA, CAL., MARCH 28, 1874.

WHILE discussing the Sabbath question with Eld. Miles Grant at Napa, Cal., we had an intermission of the debate for three days, including Sabbath and Sunday, during which both parties were to hold religious services. In honor, both parties were bound not to attack the other during the intermission. But Sabbath afternoon we saw the following notice in the *Napa Reporter*:—

"REQUEST.—Elder Grant has been requested by respectable citizens to deliver a lecture, before his departure from our city, on what he knows about Latter-day Prophecies and Visions. Some rich developments may be expected, as the Seventh-day Adventists, his opponents, are said to be adherents to that faith. Mrs. White, from Battle Creek, Michigan, their great medium, is attending the debate, we are told."

It is evident upon the face of it that either Eld. Grant wrote this notice himself or instructed the one who did write it. It was designed to give the impression that we were spiritualists, and that sister White was a spirit medium. By doing this, Eld. Grant hoped to prejudice the people against us, and close their ears to the arguments in the debate. Evidently he was willing to resort to anything, however dishonorable, to gain his end.

I attended his lecture. It was an exposé of modern spiritualism, showing that it was the work of devils, or demons, exactly what we teach. He stated that many persons on the stand were deceived by the demons, because these spirits told them to pray, to believe the Bible, to be holy, &c. Having thus gained their confidence, next the spirits would lead them to doubt this passage, then that; then to reject Christ, and finally to reject the Bible and all. Here he stopped and gave opportunity for questions, several of which were asked. But as no one asked for what he wanted to bring out, he introduced it himself, viz., Mrs. White's visions. In his sanctimonious

cant, he said it was a great cross for him to do it; while the whole affair was evidently of his own getting up for the express purpose of making this attack upon sister White.

He said that Mrs. White was inspired by a demon, the same as all spirit mediums. In proof of this, he said that her visions contradicted facts, contradicted themselves, and contradicted the Bible. He admitted that she was honest, taught good morals, gave good advice, &c. But the object was to divide God's children, to proselyte, to get up a false test as the Sabbath, and thus tear down God's people. He then read a letter from Eld. I. C. Welcome, of Maine, stating that he (Welcome) knew Eld. White and Ellen Harmon (now Mrs. White) in 1844. That they were both wild fanatics, and that he had frequently seen Ellen in vision. He also read a letter from Israel Dammon, of Maine, stating that he had been acquainted with Eld. White and wife when Ellen had her first visions. At first he had confidence in them, but soon renounced them. Also Eld. Grant stated that sister White saw that Saturday was the Sabbath, and thus introduced it among Adventists, and that she saw the Lord would come in June, 1845, &c.

When he was through, I asked the privilege of making a few remarks. This he denied me. So at the close of his meeting I announced to reply to him the next evening at seven o'clock in Assembly Hall, and that Mrs. White would speak at 7:30 p. m. At the time appointed, several hundreds assembled at the Hall.

REPLY.

I replied briefly that Eld. Grant did not produce the facts which he said the visions contradicted; nor did he show that they contradicted themselves. He attempted to show that they contradicted the Bible; but it was only his view of the Bible which they contradicted. As to his witnesses, it is no new thing for the innocent to be condemned by perjured witnesses. Such was the case with Christ, Matt. 26: 59-61; with Stephen, Acts 6: 12-14, and with Naboth, 1 Kings 21: 1-16.

I stated that I was personally acquainted with Eld. Dammon, and knew him to be a notorious fanatic. While preaching, he will halloo, and jump about, even over the desk into the congregation. He was a leader of a band of fanatics in Maine in 1845 who held that the dead had arisen and gone up.

The visions condemned him for this fanaticism, which caused him to turn against them. He was associated with one Simeon Hall, who disturbed my meetings to that degree that I had to have him arrested to keep the peace.

I am also acquainted with Eld. Welcome. He was with Eld. White in meetings only at one time—and that was for less than a week in 1844, at which time Eld. White baptized him. Was Eld. White such a fanatic as he claims? Then what must he have been to have chosen Eld. White to baptize him! But the fact is that Welcome's statement is a base falsehood. He never saw sister White have a vision. She was never acquainted with him. And she had no vision till three months after the only meeting at which sister White and Eld. Welcome were both present. While in New Hampshire in 1868, I read a letter from Eld. Welcome acknowledging that he had never seen Mrs. White in vision, but only learned what he reported by hearsay.

From the very nature of the case it might be expected that falsehoods and slanders would be put in circulation against sister White, not only on account of her having visions, but for her plain testimony, and her cutting reproofs of sins. These have followed her more or less for the past twenty-nine years. And in giving a sketch of her life published in 1860, she states that she had nothing whatever to do with fanaticism in Maine, only to labor to correct it, which labor made the unfortunate subjects of it her enemies. The following testimony, signed by twenty-nine persons scattered in different parts of Maine, was given sixteen years since, and published in 3000 copies of sister White's life. Nineteen of these persons are now living.

FIRST TESTIMONY.

In view of the slanderous reports circulated by a few individuals against Bro. and Sr. White, we feel called upon to testify that we have been personally acquainted with them and their course since 1844, and therefore know that any statements that would represent them as being in any wise connected with, or countenancing in any degree, those fanatical abominations into which some in Maine and elsewhere were drawn during the years 1844-1846, are wicked and malicious falsehoods. We have never known them to be in the least infected with the spirit or works of fanaticism, but on the contrary, as the untiring and unflinching opposers of the same.

| | |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| H. N. Smith, | George Cobb, |
| S. B. Belden, | Lewis B. Stowell, |
| Edward Andrews, | Laura T. Stowell, |
| S. L. Andrews, | Lewis O. Stowell, |
| A. S. Andrews, | Marion C. Stowell, |
| Cyprian Stevens, | Sarah H. Stowell, |
| Paulina Stevens, | N. N. Lunt, |
| Stockbridge Howland, | S. H. Lunt, |
| L. M. Howland, | R. D. Waterman, |
| F. H. Howland, | D. W. Wright, |
| R. D. Howland, | Thomas Worcester, |
| M. A. Aderton, | Lydia Bolton, |
| Almira T. Stevens, | P. A. Gammon, |
| F. J. Stevens, | Ahram Barnes, |
| | S. W. Flanders. |

Here is another testimony, given sixteen years ago, signed by one Methodist, three first-day Adventists, and four S. D. Adventists:—

SECOND TESTIMONY.

PORTLAND, Me., Aug. 10, 1858.

As unfavorable reports are in circulation against Eld. James White and wife, it is a pleasure to us to testify that we have been personally acquainted with them since 1844. They have had no sympathy with the no-work theory, voluntary humility, spiritual second advent and spiritual union not in accordance with the law of marriage, but ever raised their voices against these different forms of fanaticism which prevailed with some in New England.

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| N. N. Lunt, | S. H. Lunt, |
| Jacob Mills, | Thomas Worcester, |
| Dorcas Wright, | Phebe A. Gammon, |
| Elizabeth Haines, | Isaiah Libby. |

Numerous other testimonies to the same effect may be seen in the back part of sister White's book. Not less than ninety names are signed to these, among which are ministers, editors, authors, &c. This book has been widely scattered, and its statements remain uncontradicted.

The statement is not true that sister White did introduce the Sabbath. It is a fact that it was taught and observed by scores of Adventists a year before sis-

ter White embraced it, and that she received it from Bible evidence, and not from a vision. She kept it over one year before she saw anything about it in vision. It is also true that sister White has since 1844 opposed the setting of time for the Lord to come; and so have the S. D. Adventists as a people, as all their publications for a quarter of a century will show.

But Eld. Grant has been a leading spirit among the fanatical timeists, setting and preaching time after time as he had to publicly confess in his meeting above-mentioned, held in this city.

As questions were asked to draw out his true position as an Adventist, it was amusing to see him evade the point, and try to keep back his true colors. In answer to the inquiry whether he were an Adventist, he said he was a Christian. This is only a sample of his evasions. He is evidently a policy man. But about his time-setting, indeed, the false and fanatical time-movement of 1854 gave birth to the *World's Crisis*, which has lived on time-setting much of the time since, and this, too, under the editorship of Eld. Grant. Please notice another of his fanatical vagaries. For years Eld. Grant's hobby was that Louis Napoleon was the "personal anticrist, the destined monarch of the world." But alas, Napoleon must up and die! What fanatical theory he will next hatch up, time will show.

As to dividing and proselyting, if it be true of the visions, it is equally true of Eld. Grant and his work. For years it has been his chief business to write, lecture, and debate, in favor of the doctrine of the sleep of the dead, the destruction of the wicked, and other doctrines. As he preaches these, and members of other churches embrace them, division necessarily follows. It has followed his labors. He makes it his business to proselyte from all other churches. He rejoices in reporting how many out of the Methodist church, and how many from the Baptist, &c., have embraced his views, come out, formed a new church, &c. How unjust, then, for him to raise this cry against sister White when he himself is doing the same thing! But he was not here in his true garb, nor to preach his own doctrine, but to tear us down, if possible. Hence he could use any argument to curry favor with other sects.

I have traveled and preached three years in Maine; have labored where sister White was born and had her first visions; also where Eld. White was raised; and have traveled and lectured where he lectured at the time referred to by Eld. Grant; have conversed with many who knew Bro. and sister White, and were familiar with their early lives and labors, and I found these reports to be malicious slanders without the least foundation in truth.

Furthermore, for most of the time during the twenty-five years past Eld. White has been the editor of our paper, the ADVENT REVIEW AND HERALD OF THE SABBATH, now having a circulation of over thirteen thousand copies; is the editor of our health journal, *The Health Reformer*, one of the highest toned health journals in America; is president of our Publishing Association located at Battle Creek, Mich., with a capital of about \$100,000, running three steam presses, and employing some fifty hands daily; is one of the directors of the Health Institute, Battle Creek, Mich., which has a capital of some \$50,000, and is treating from forty to eighty patients continually. Sister White has stood by her husband and greatly aided him in all this work. Eld. White and wife have lived in Battle Creek for nineteen years. I have lived there, and know that no persons are more highly esteemed there than they are. Any time that sister White will speak, she can have a crowded house, more than any other speaker.

At our annual State camp-meetings where thousands attend, the presence and labors of Bro. and sister White are always earnestly called for, and nowhere more urgently than in Maine. No more devoted, pious, believing people can be found than those who have thus enjoyed the teachings and example of sister White for the last twenty-seven years. If she be a medium of Satan to deceive men and women and lead them away from faith in God, Christ, and the Bible, it is about time such fruits began to appear!! How long does it take those who have begun to sip at the fountain of spiritualism to lose their faith in the Bible and in Christianity? A few weeks, or months, at most. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

At the close of my remarks the spacious hall was crowded, and sister White followed with a discourse which held the large audience in almost breathless silence for more than one hour. Eld. Grant at the same hour had forty hearers at the Disciple chapel.

D. M. CANRIGHT.

Napa City, Cal., April 2, 1874.

The Debate.

HAVING listened to the debate just closed, between Eld. Grant and Eld. Canright, we feel it to be our duty to the public to state some facts concerning it. The question was, "Do the Scriptures teach that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment of the decalogue is now binding on mankind?" Eld. Canright affirmed, and Eld. Grant denied. Bro. C.'s first speech was a clear and able argument from Matt. 28: 19, 20, and chapter 5.

Eld. Grant's first words were a direct appeal, not to the word of God, but to the prejudice of the people. Said he, "If all who work on Saturday are sinners, and are to be damned; if nobody but a few Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists are to be saved, then this is an important question." This statement he made many times, and closed up with it in his last speech. Did he do this because there was really any truth in the statement, or soundness in such reasoning? Certainly not. He knew, as Bro. Canright often stated, that we held no such views.

People will be condemned only when they reject light. We should search the Scriptures for the truth, then teach it, and bring the people up to it as fast as we can. We neither judge nor condemn any one. God is the judge. We believe there are many good Christians who are not now keeping the seventh day. Why then did Eld. G. repeat this statement so often in the debate? Manifestly to place us in a false light before the people, and thus create prejudice against us. No honorable opponent would condescend to such unfair means to accomplish his ends.

Again, Eld. Grant urges that as many had lived and died, and would be saved without keeping all the ten commandments, the Sabbath especially, therefore that law was of no account, and need not be kept. Thus he exactly reverses God's order; for he judges God's law by the actions of the people. But in the Judgment, God will judge the actions of men by his law. Eccl. 12: 13, 14; James 2: 8-12. This same mode of arguing, from the old Pharisees down, has al-

ways been used by time-servers against every reformation. "Our fathers," said they, "believed and practiced thus and so. They were good men and God blessed them. Therefore they were right, and any other doctrine must be false." This was the strong argument of the Roman Catholics against Luther, and of the English priests against Wesley. To these great reformers they said, "If the new doctrines which you are preaching be true, then all before you will be damned, hence your doctrines must be false."

But it is especially astonishing that Eld. Grant should use this same old hackneyed argument against us. The popular churches everywhere he goes use this very argument against him, and his favorite doctrine of the sleep of the dead, and destruction of the wicked. "This is a new doctrine," say they, "and all our pious forefathers believed in the immortality of the soul, and God blessed them in preaching it. Hence Eld. Grant's doctrine must be false." This argument he has answered scores of times, and shown its utter fallacy. But now when it will serve his own purpose, he turns square about, and uses it against us! Thus he blows hot or cold, just as will best suit his purpose, without any apparent regard for the soundness or truthfulness of his argument.

Another fact will illustrate this trait in him. In the early part of the debate, as an objection to keeping the seventh day, he argued that as the world was round it was impossible to keep a definite day of twenty-four hours, and travel around the world. We could not keep the same day here which they had in Asia, as it was noon here when it was midnight there. Neither could we keep a definite day at the north pole where the sun could not be seen for weeks.

Bro. C. easily answered these objections, showing that a definite day could be kept all over the globe. But near the close of the debate, when Eld. Grant came to defend the first day, he said that Sunday was the very day of the week upon which Adam rested in Eden, as near as we can ascertain, the same day upon which Christ arose from the dead, in Palestine, and was a definite day of twenty-four hours, as definite as our seventh day, and begun and ended at the same time of day that ours did. Then Bro. C. turned Eld. Grant's objection upon him, and pressed him to tell how he could keep his definite first day on the round world, and at the north pole. He said that he could keep it just as Eld. Canright had shown that he could keep the seventh day!

Thus he not only contradicted himself, but showed that he had raised an objection where he knew there was no difficulty, his object being to confuse the people by any means, fair or foul.

Frequently he took occasion to tell how holy he was, how honest, how much of the love of Jesus he had, what peace of mind, and what confidence in his secret devotions,—all this, too, said he, while breaking the fourth commandment. From this he argued that the keeping of the Sabbath was of no account, thus using his assumed sanctification as an argument in the debate. It shows the egotism and self-righteousness of the man.

We could mention many contradictions, evasions, and unfair tricks to which he resorted to carry his points, but must leave the reader to judge from the sample given. It was astonishing to see how coolly he would assume and boldly assert, that he had proved important points for which he had not even attempted to produce the least evidence, though called upon and urged to do it.

At the sixth session he run out of talk from the Bible, and said that he should now go to history to prove that the first day of the week was the Lord's day. Eld. Canright objected to his going to history, urging that the question which they had both agreed upon was, "Do the Scriptures teach?" &c., and not what does history teach. This was a Bible question, which they had agreed to settle by the Bible. Bro. C. offered to go with him to history and discuss it to his heart's content, after they had finished the discussion from the Bible. But no; Eld. G. persisted that he must go to history now to prove his position.

Bro. C. appealed to the chairman, who decided that he should not go out of the Bible for proof. So Eld. G. had to give it up for that evening. But at the last session he said that notwithstanding that the chair had decided against him, he should now read his history. Eld. Canright again objected to this as unfair, unjust, and a violation of the rules of honorable debate.

Eld. Grant then instead of allowing the chairman to inquire of the congregation, "Shall the decision of the chair be sustained?" according to parliamentary usages, took the matter into his own hands, and appealed to the congregation whether he should bring in his history. And amid the cheers of that class who usually occupy the back part of the house, Grant led off the mob spirit, and cried out, "All who are opposed to my going to history, raise your hands!" None raised their hands, though we had scores of brethren and friends there. Neither did we ourselves, for we all felt that it was wholly out of order, unjust, and simply an appeal to a mob spirit, with which we would have nothing to do. Grant then called on those to raise their hands who favored his going to secular history. Of course there were those ready to sustain him.

Thus he broke his agreement to debate the question as stated, setting aside the decision of the chairman, and violating the parliamentary rules of honorable discussion. Eld. Grant rode right over the chairman, and put the question to suit himself, calling for the negative first, a thing of itself entirely out of order. The reader can judge from the foregoing of the unprincipled tricks which this man will resort to, when closely pressed, in order to defeat his opponent.

J. N. LOUGHBOROUGH.

Read This,

AND COMPARE IT WITH ELD. GRANT'S COURSE AT THE SPRINGFIELD CAMP-MEETING.

WHILE conducting a tent-meeting in Chelsea, Mass., in 1869, I was several times interrupted while speaking with questions and objections by Eld. Miles Grant, he even claiming the right to argue his points before the people in my meeting. On one occasion, he continued to interrupt until many were wearied and disgusted, and it was not until he was sharply reproved, and we had appealed to the audience for the right to speak under our own canvass without molestation, that he was prevailed upon to keep quiet and allow me to go on with my lecture.

And, because I insisted that he should wait until I had finished my discourse, he very impatiently charged, that I "wanted to gag him down lest he should overthrow my positions." During the same series of lectures, one of their preachers came to the tent and circulated opposition tracts in our congregation. This was done very boldly and defiantly, but we made no objection.

M. E. CORNELL.

The Review and Herald.

Battle Creek, Mich., April 14, 1874.

Our Defense.

SEVENTH-DAY Adventists are for peace. The following words from one of our standard works, published in 1870, express the views and feelings of our people upon this point as they are to-day:—

"It is true that we differ in some respects with other religious bodies of the present time, and with most of them we differ widely. But we do not differ with others from choice. We do not love to differ for the sake of being odd. No, we choose to be in harmony, if possible, with our fellow-men, especially with those who revere God and his word. We believe it to be a sin to differ with others unless there be good reasons why we should differ."

We solemnly believe that God has given to us a message of unpopular truth for the present generation. And we are no less confident that it is the will of God that we should proclaim it in such a manner as not to trample on the precious God-given rights of our fellows. We expect that the discussion of our religious sentiments will bring men and women, not only from the world, but from the ranks of other religious bodies. But while we present our views in a proper manner, and conduct ourselves as Christians, we should not be censured when God-fearing people, under deep convictions of duty, take up the heavy cross of observing the Sabbath of the Bible.

Seventh-day Adventists make sacrifices to teach and to observe the Sabbath, because they regard it as an important truth, and an important duty. He who will teach unpopular religious sentiments, and call persons from other religious bodies out upon a new platform, and form them into a new sect, and then tell the people that his new views and new positions are not essential to salvation, should be either marked as one who causes needless divisions among brethren, or be set down as a hypocrite.

We repeat it, Seventh-day Adventists are for peace. They do not disturb other religious assemblies; and they regard the rights of others. Our ministers do not cultivate the spirit of debate and strife, but avoid discussions as far as possible, on account of the spirit of strife which they gender, which is injurious to the cause of true religion.

Seventh-day Adventists have borne very much from their opponents. And their silence under repeated abuses has doubtless emboldened Eld. Grant to push his wicked, aggressive warfare to that extent to make the exposure in these columns necessary. Our brethren in Napa, Cal., did not provoke the discussion. The Sabbath question had recently been so fully agitated in that city by able men on both sides that there was no real call for a discussion. And at the time when Eld. Grant was pressing the matter, Eld. Cornell addressed him the following note:—

"Bro. GRANT: I am inclined not to accept your 'invitation,' to debate before the public in Napa City, for several reasons.

"1. The Sabbath and Law question has just been quite thoroughly canvassed in lectures pro and con.

"2. The subject of the greatest interest in the public mind here now, is, what the clergy of Napa are pleased to term, 'Materialism,' or 'Soul Sleeping.'

"3. Too many here would rejoice to see two Advent ministers in conflict, they are so bitter against *Adventism* in general. For my part, I do not feel like spending strength and precious time to gratify such motives.

"4. If the clergy here are anxious for debate, and would like to see Eld. Grant measure swords with some one, just let them bring their own men and try it on the *Soul and Spirit* question! They have talked very bold on that subject.

"Trusting that you will agree with me in these reasons and conclusions, they are submitted with due respect. Yours in haste, M. E. CORNELL."

But Eld. Grant pressed on the debate under these circumstances; and in his mad folly undertook to publicly blacken the reputation of a humble Christian woman who lives in the confidence of many thousand Seventh-day Adventists, and all others who know her self-sacrificing, godly life. When it comes to this, that a professed minister of Christ, under the garb of holiness, will deliberately stab the reputation of the innocent before the ungodly who are called out for the very occasion, it is time that the flimsy garb of pretended sanctity be torn off from him, that he may appear before the public in his true character.

With all respect for the inspired words of Paul would we handle such men. "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men." Rom. 12:18. Here is a strong intimation that it is not possible to sustain peaceable relations with some men. They may presume upon your forbearance until it ceases to be a virtue. The common sinner may perhaps be guilty of slander without awakening general indignation. But when men who make high professions of godliness wantonly and persistently commit this great crime, all just men will unite in denouncing the wickedness of such vile conduct.

The intelligent reader, after becoming acquainted with the wicked course pursued by Eld. Grant toward the Seventh-day Adventists, will hardly expect the REVIEW to continue a controversy with him.

The Two Classes.

No doubt the S. D. Adventists on the one hand, and Eld. Miles Grant and some of his law-abolished friends on the other, are both acting a part in reference to the following emphatic declaration of Scripture:—"Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie."

Here are two distinct classes. One are commandment-keepers, the other commandment-breakers. And it is a very natural inference that the latter make and love lies concerning the former. It also appears that while some are manufacturing, others are peddling. But the case of the editor of the *Crisis* seems to be of that incurable sort, or his love for some false and slanderous statement concerning Seventh-day Adventists is so intense, that he will not quit after being repeatedly corrected in a public manner during the period of many years.

Our Views of Spiritual Gifts.

As Eld. Grant charges sister White with being possessed by the spirit of a demon, not because of any wicked thing in her life, or in her teaching, but simply because she has visions which we regard as from the Spirit of God, we here present a brief statement of our reasons, from the Scriptures, for believing in the perpetuity of spiritual gifts.

Once, man walked with God in Eden. With open face he beheld the glory of the Lord, and talked with God, and Christ, and angels, in Paradise, without a dimming veil between. Man fell from his moral rectitude and innocence, and was driven from the garden, from the tree of life, and from the visible presence of the Lord and his holy angels. Moral darkness, like the pall of death, has since cast its shadows everywhere, and everywhere the blight and mildew of sin has been seen. And amid the general gloom and moral wretchedness, man has wandered from the gates of Paradise for nearly six thousand years, subject to sickness, pain, sorrow, tears, and death. He has also been subject to the temptations and wiles of the devil, so much so that it is the sad history of man, throughout the entire period of his fallen state, that Satan has reigned with almost universal sway.

When all was lost in Adam, and the shades of night darkened the moral heavens, there soon appeared the star of hope in Christ, and with it there was established a means of communication between God and man. In his fallen state, man could not converse face to face with God, and with Christ, and with angels, as when in his Eden purity. But through the ministration of holy angels could the great God speak to him in dreams and in visions. "If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream." Num. 12:6.

The manifestation of the spirit of prophecy was designed for all dispensations. The Sacred Record nowhere restricts it to any particular period of time, from the fall to the final restitution. The Bible recognizes its manifestation alike in the patriarchal age, in the Jewish age, and in the Christian age. Through this medium God communed with holy men of old. Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied; and so extensive was the range of his prophetic vision, and so minute, that he could look down over long ages, and describe the coming of the Lord, and the execution of the last Judgment upon the ungodly. Jude, verses 14, 15.

God spake to his prophets in the Jewish dispensation in visions and in dreams, and opened before them the great things of the future, especially those connected with the first advent of Christ to suffer for sinners, and his second appearing in glory to destroy his enemies, and complete the redemption of his people. If the spirit of prophecy nearly disappeared from the Jewish church for a few centuries toward the close of that dispensation, on account of the corruptions in that church, it re-appeared at its close to usher in the Messiah. Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, "was filled with the Holy Spirit, and prophesied." Simeon, a just and devout man, who was "waiting for the consolation of Israel," came by the Spirit into the temple, and prophesied of Jesus as "a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of Israel." And Anna, a prophetess, "spoke of him to all them that look for redemption in Jerusalem." And there was no greater prophet than John, who was chosen of God to introduce to Israel "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world."

The Christian age commenced with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, and the manifestation of various spiritual gifts. Among these was the gift of prophecy. After commissioning his disciples to go into all the world and preach the gospel, Jesus says to them, "And these signs shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." Mark 16:17, 18. On the day of Pentecost, when the Christian dispensation was fully opened, some of these gifts were manifested in a wonderful manner. Acts 2:1-11. Luke, in giving account of his travels with Paul and others, when a quarter of a century of the Christian age had already passed, after speaking of entering into the house of Philip the evangelist, says: "And the same man had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy. And as we tarried there many days, there came down from Judea a certain prophet, named Agabus." Acts 21:9, 10. Again, still later, we see the beloved John, in the Isle of Patmos, imbued with the spirit of prophecy in all its fullness. The wonderful Revelation was given unto him when more than half a century of the Christian age had passed. And here the New-Testament record leaves us without a single intimation that the gifts of the Spirit should cease from the church till the day of glory should be ushered in by the second appearing of Jesus Christ.

Since the great apostasy, these gifts have rarely been manifested; and for this reason, professed Christians generally suppose that they were designed to be limited to the period of the primitive church. But from the time of the primitive Christians to the present, there have been manifestations among the most devoted followers of Jesus, which have been recognized by nearly all of the leading denominations as the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Then should not the errors and the unbelief of the church be assigned as reasons why these manifestations have been so seldom, rather than that God has taken these blessings from the church? When the people of God attain to primitive faith and practice, as they most certainly will under the last message, the latter rain will be poured out, and all the gifts will be revived. The former rain was given at the commencement of the Christian age, in the time of the sowing of the gospel seed, to cause it to germinate and take good root. Then the church enjoyed the gifts. And when the latter rain shall be poured out at the close of the dispensation, to ripen the golden harvest for the garner of God, then will the gifts of the Holy Spirit be manifested in all their fullness.

To this agree the words of the prophet, as quoted by Peter: "And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams. And on my servants, and on my handmaidens, I will pour out in those days of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy. And I will show wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath; blood, and fire, and vapor of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before that great and notable day of the Lord come." Acts 2:17-20. The spirit of prophecy is here seen among the especial signs of the last days. Its revival in the last days was to constitute one of the most noted signs of the approaching end. This is evident from its being classed with the most prominent signs, in the sun, in the moon, and in the stars, and such wonders in the heavens above, and in the earth beneath, as blood, and fire, and vapor of smoke.

Of all the blessings which God has bestowed upon his people, the gift of his Son excepted, none have been so sacred, and so important to their welfare, as the gift of his holy law, and his Holy Spirit. And none have been so well calculated to thwart the plans of Satan, and, consequently, to stir his rage, as these. And when that people should arise in the last generation of men, who should be observing all ten of the precepts of God's holy law, and should recognize the revival of the spirit of prophecy, they might expect to feel that bitterness from their opponents, which can arise only from the direct inspiration of Satan. "And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." Rev. 12:17.

"The testimony of Jesus," said the angel to John, "is the Spirit of prophecy." Rev. 19:10. It is the keeping of the commandments of God, and the recognition of the revival of the spirit of prophecy by the remnant of the church, or the Christians of the last generation, that stirs the ire of the dragon.

The Jewish age, notwithstanding its apostasies, opened and closed with special manifestations of the Spirit of God. And it is not reasonable to suppose that the Christian age, the light of which, compared with the former dispensation, is as the light of the sun to the feeble rays of the moon, should commence in glory, and close in obscurity. And since a special work of the Spirit was necessary to prepare a people for the first advent of Christ, how much more so for his second advent.

God has never manifested his power to his people simply for their gratification; but according to their necessities has he wrought for them. Then we may safely conclude that, as his people are passing the perils of the last days in the final struggle with the aroused powers of darkness, when false prophets shall have power to show great signs and wonders, inasmuch that, if it were possible, they would deceive the very elect, our gracious God will bless and strengthen his fainting people with the gifts, as well as the graces, of the Holy Spirit.

We have seen that the manifestation of the spirit of prophecy in dreams and in visions became necessary in consequence of man's being separated from the visible presence of God. But when the tabernacle of God shall be with men, and he shall dwell with them, and God himself shall be with them, Rev. 21:3; when Christ shall come again with all the holy angels, and receive his people unto himself, that where he shall be, there they may be also, John 14:3; and when man redeemed shall walk and talk with God, and Christ, and angels, in Eden restored; then there will be no further need of the spirit of prophecy.

When man in Eden stood in all the perfection of his manhood, before the blight of sin had touched anything that God had made for him, and with open face beheld the glory of the Lord, he could have no need of the spirit of prophecy. But when Eden was lost in consequence of transgression, and man was doomed to grope his way from the gates of Paradise, enshrouded in the moral gloom that resulted from the curse and the reign of Satan, he needed the light of the spirit of prophecy. And his need in this respect will continue, more or less urgent, until the restitution, when the redeemed shall walk and talk with God, and with Christ, and with the holy angels, in Eden restored.

The apostle to the Corinthians clearly sustains this position. He introduces the subject by stating, "Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant." 1 Cor. 12:1. He deemed the subject of too great importance to leave the church at Corinth in ignorance respecting it. He proposes to instruct them. We shall do well to avail ourselves of the benefit of his teachings.

In this chapter the apostle introduces the human body, with its several members acting in harmony, one dependent upon the other, as an illustration of the Christian church, with its members, and the several gifts God has set in the church. He then makes the application of the figure thus: "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular. And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." Verses 27 and 28.

Let it be borne in mind that God has set prophets, miracles, and gifts of healings, in the Christian church as verily as he has teachers, helps, and governments. And this expression, "God hath set" them in the church, means more than that he would communicate with this people by his Holy Spirit in the Christian age the same as he had in former dispensations. It conveys the idea that God had especially endowed the Christian church with them. He had

established them in the church, to remain until the return of her absent Lord. This was done because the church needed them. Did the primitive church need them? So did the true church need them to light her pathway during the dark period of her persecutions and martyrdom. And much more does the church need the gifts in making her course through the perils of the last days, and in making ready to receive her soon-coming Lord.

The design of the gifts, and also the time of their continuance in the church, are definitely expressed by the apostle to the Ephesians: "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." Chap. 4:11-13.

It cannot be shown that the church did, in the lifetime of Paul, reach the state of unity, knowledge, and perfection, here mentioned. And certainly the church did not enjoy these during her apostasy, 2 Thess. 2:3, and the period of her flight into the wilderness, Rev. 12:6. Nor has she reached this state of unity, knowledge, and perfection, since the labors of Martin Luther. The church to-day is almost infinitely below this state of unity, knowledge, and perfection. And not until the Christians of the last generation of men shall be brought to the enjoyment of it by the last warning message, and all the means God may employ to prepare them to be translated to Heaven without tasting death, will the ultimate design of the gifts be realized.

But Paul, in 1 Cor. 13, has distinctly shown when the gifts would cease. In the first part of this chapter the apostle discourses upon the pre-eminence of love (improperly translated *charity*) over the gift of tongues, gift of prophecy, faith, liberality to the poor, and courage to give one's body to be burned. These, in absence of love are valueless. He then describes the virtues and riches of love, closing with these words: "Charity [love] never faileth; but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away." Verse 8. While love is not only the crowning Christian grace here, but will reach forward to all eternity and be the crowning glory of the redeemed, the gifts will cease with faith and hope. At the glorious appearing of the Lord, faith will be lost in sight, hope in fruition, prophecies will fail to be any longer a light to the church, tongues will cease to be a sign, and the faint knowledge of the present dim night will vanish before the perfect knowledge of the perfect day as the dim rays of the moon vanish before the light of the rising sun.

Next come the forcible words of verses 9 and 10: "For we know in part, and we prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." We still wait for that which is perfect to come. And while we wait, may our dear, absent Lord manifest himself to his waiting people through the gifts. "For," says Paul, speaking of the present imperfect state, "We know in part, and we prophesy in part." How long shall the spirit of prophecy serve the church? When will it be done away? Answer: "But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." This should settle the question of the perpetuity of the gifts in the Christian church.

The popular view, however, is this: The gifts were given to the primitive church, to remain only during the lifetime of Christ's first apostles. At their death, the gifts were to be removed from the church. But let it be remembered that a great change takes place when the gifts are to cease, and that change is from an imperfect state to that which is perfect; from the dimness of night to the glory of perfect day. We need not inquire if such a change took place at the death of the first apostles; for all who have any knowledge of the history of the primitive church, know that whatever changes did take place in the church about the time of the death of the apostles, were not for the better, but decidedly for the worse. Even in Paul's day, the mystery of iniquity already worked in the church. 2 Thess. 2:7. And the apostle, addressing the elders of the church at Milets, says: "For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them." Acts 20:29, 30. But if we apply this great change to the close of the present dispensation, and the introduction of the eternal day of glory, all is plain. Here we have the clearest proof that the gifts were not to be done away until the second appearing of Christ.

Paul continues with an illustration of the present imperfect state, and the future state of perfection and glory: "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things." Verse 11. His childhood represents the present imperfect state; his manhood, the perfection of the immortal state. This is evident. Now suppose we are wrong, and that Paul's childhood represents the church in his day, endowed with the gifts; and that his manhood represents the church after his death, stripped of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, and fast sinking away toward the great apostasy! Absurdity!

And still the apostle continues with another beautiful illustration of the change from the present dispensation, during which the church was to enjoy the comparatively dim light of the gifts, as she walked by faith and hope, to the open glories of the world to come, when the redeemed shall walk with God in Eden restored, and talk face to face with Christ and angels. He says: "For now we see through a glass darkly; but then, face to face." Verse 12. To the view that the gifts were to cease at the death of the first apostles, and that with their death came the glorious change illustrated by these words of the apostle, we need only to repeat, Absurdity!

The truth of God upon this subject is consistent and harmonious with itself, and with all divine truth. The spirit of prophecy, in consequence of the fall and man's separation from the visible presence of God, became a necessity. This necessity has not been obviated by any past change of dispensation. And no dispensation needs the gifts of the Holy Spirit more than the Christian age; and at no time in the long period of man's separation from God's visible presence, have they been so much needed as amid the perils of the raging tempests of the last days. But when the Redeemer shall come, the controversy be ended, the saints' rest given, and they, all immortal, meet around the throne with angels, and face to face behold the glory of God and the Lamb, the spirit of prophecy will be numbered among Heaven's choicest blessings of the past.