

INSPIRATION OF THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY AS RELATED TO
THE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE

Friday, Aug. 1, 1919

W. E. HOWELL, Chairman: The topic for this hour, as arranged for on Wednesday, is a continuation, in a measure, of our consideration of the spirit of prophecy, and the subject of inspiration connected with that, as related to the inspiration of the Bible. This hour is not intended to be a formal discourse, occupying the whole period, but Brother Daniells will lead in the topic, and then he has expressed a wish that it might be a kind of round-table in which we will study things together.

A. G. DANIELLS: Brother Chairman, I think there has been a misunderstanding among us. I ~~will have no objection~~ protested against taking such a heavy topic the other day, under the circumstances, and I dismissed it from my mind, and have been thinking along another line, that of pastoral training, and a further discussion of the question we had before us. I would not feel free, under the circumstances, to give a talk on the subject that I understand was looked for.

As you know, there are two views held by eminent men regarding the verbal inspiration of the Bible. You read their views in the books they have put out. One man,--scholarly, devout, earnest, a full believer in the Bible in every sense of the word,--believes that it was a revelation of truth to the writers, and they were allowed to state that truth ~~xxx~~ as best they could. Another man--equally scholarly and pious and earnest in his faith--believes that it was a word-for-word inspiration or revelation, that the actual words were given,--that every word in the original, as it

was written by the prophets down from Moses to Malachi, was given to them by the Lord. These men differ, and differ honestly and sincerely; and they have their followers among us, right here at the conference, both of them; and I see nothing to be gained by a man in my position, with my knowledge of these things, attempting to prove up on this. I do not wish to do it. We would all remain of the same opinion, I think, as we are now; so I want to beg you to allow me to dismiss that part of it, and either go directly into the other question of pastoral training or open the way for further questions and discussion of the matter we had before us. I feel more at home in that, for all these years since the Battle Creek controversy began I have been face to face with this question of the testimonies. I have met all the doubters, the chief ones, and have dealt with it in ministerial institutes, and have talked it over and over until I am thoroughly familiar with it, whether I am straight or not. I do not know that there is a crook or a kink in it that I have not heard brought up by these men that have fallen away from us. I would be willing to hear further questions and further discussion, if it is the wish of the convention.

W. E. HOWELL: I am sure I do not want Brother Daniells to feel that he is disappointing us in any real sense this morning; and if I understand the wishes of the teachers, it has not been that he should discuss so much the rather technical question of the verbal or truth-revealed inspiration of the Bible, but rather that he will give us some further instruction along the line of the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy and its relation ^{that of} to the Bible. I have nothing further to press along that line, but as teachers have expressed themselves to me, I have felt that it might be well to

consider some aspects of that question a little further, particularly the use of unpublished writings, letters, talks, etc, in the light of what was referred to here the other day. Sister White herself said that if we wanted to know what the spirit of prophecy said on a thing, we should read her published writings. That is one question I think the teachers have in mind, Brother Daniells.

F. M. WILCOX: I have enjoyed these discussions very much. I enjoyed the evening of last week when the question of the spirit of prophecy was considered. I enjoyed very much the talk Elder Daniells gave on the question, and I think the view he took of the question very fully agrees with my own view. I have known for long years the way in which Sister White's works were brought together and her books compiled. I have never believed in the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies. I must say, however, that last Wednesday evening ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ and also since then, some remarks have been made without proper safeguarding, and I should question the effect of those statements and positions out in the field. I know that there is considerable talk around Takoma Park over positions that have been taken here, and there will be ~~xxx~~ that same situation out in the field. As Brother Wakeham suggested the other day, I think we have to deal with a very delicate question, and I would hate terribly to see an influence sweep over the field and into any of our schools that the Testimonies were discounted. There is great danger in these times of one extreme following another. There is great danger of a reaction, and I do feel concerned.

I have heard questions raised here that have left the impression on my mind that if the same questions are raised in our classes when we get back to our schools, we are going to have serious diffi-

culty. I believe there are a great many questions that we should hold back, and not discuss. I am not a teacher in a school, although I did teach the Bible 13 years in a nurses' training school, where I had a large number of young people; but I can not conceive that it is necessary for us to answer every question that is put to us by students or others, or be driven into a place where we will take a position that will lessen faith. I think the Testimonies of the Spirit of God are a great asset to this denomination, and I think if we destroy faith in them, we are going to destroy faith in the very foundation of our work. I must say that I do view with a great deal of concern the influence that will go out from this meeting, and from questions that I have seen raised here. And unless these questions can be dealt with most diplomatically, I think we are going to have serious trouble. I surely hope the Lord will give us wisdom so that we shall know what to say and do in meeting these things in the future.

C. L. BENSON: I have felt very much concerned along the same line; and the question that has raised itself in my own mind goes a little further than has been brought up here; but it seems to me it is almost a logical step. That is this: If there are such uncertainties with reference to our historical position, and if the Testimonies are not to be relied on to throw a great deal of light upon our historical positions, and if the same is true with reference to our theological interpretation of texts, then how can we consistently place implicit confidence in the direction that is given with reference to our educational problems, and our medical ^{denominational} school, and even our organization? If there is a definite spiritual leadership in these things, then how can we consistently lay aside or partially lay them aside the Testimonies, when it comes to the prophetic and historic side of

the message? and place these things on the basis of research work? That question is in my mind, and I am confident that it is in the minds of others.

WALDORF: That is in my mind. That is why I brought out that illustration on the blackboard this morning,--those three rivers, history, spirit of prophecy, and the Bible.

J. N. ANDERSON: I thought when we dismissed the subject the other day the main question was how we as teachers should deal with this question when we stand before our student_s. I think we have come to quite a unanimous opinion about this matter among ourselves here, and we stand pretty well together, I should say, as to what position the Testimonies occupy,--their authority and their relation to the Bible, and so on,--but the question in my mind, and in the mind of some others, too, I think, is What shall we as teachers do when we stand before our classes and some historical question comes up, such as we have spoken of here, where, ^{we have decided that} Sister White's writings are not final? We say there are many historical facts that we believe scholarship must decide, that Sister White never claimed to be final on the historical matters that appear in her writings. Are we safe to tell that to our students? Or shall we hold it in abeyance? And can we hold something in the back of our head that we are absolutely sure about, and that most of the brethren stand with us on?--can we hold those things back and be true to ourselves? And furthermore, are we safe in doing it? Is it well to let our people in general go on holding to the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies? When we do that, aren't we preparing for a crisis that will be very serious some day? It seems to me that the best thing for us to do is to cautiously and very carefully educate our

people to see just where we really should stand to be consistent Protestants, to be consistent with the Testimonies themselves, and to be consistent with what we know we must do, as intelligent men, as we have decided in these meetings.

Of course these are not such big questions, because I do not teach along this line. Still, they do sometimes arise in my classes. But personally ~~in~~ I am not concerned about it. I am concerned about the faith of the young men and women that ~~minxin~~ come into our schools. They are to be our leaders, and I think these are the days when they should be given the very best foundation we can give them. We should give them the most sincere and honest beliefs that we have in our own hearts.

I speak with some feeling because it does come close to my convictions that something should be done here in this place,--Here is where it can be done--to safeguard our people, to educate them and to bring them back and cause them to stand upon the only foundation that can ever be secure as we advance and progress.

C. L. TAYLOR: With regard to the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies, I would say that I have heard more about it here in one day than ever before in my life. I think we have made a great big mountain of difficulty to go out and fight against. I do not believe that our people generally believe in the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies. I think that the general idea of our people is that the Testimonies are the writings of a sister who received light from God. As to verbal inspiration, I think they have a very ill-defined idea. I think they believe that in some way God gave her light, and she wrote it down, and they do not know what verbal inspiration means.

But I do see a great deal in the question Professor Benson raised, and that is if we must lay aside what Sister White has said interpreting history, or what we might call the philosophy of history, as unreliable, and also lay aside as unreliable expositions of scripture, the only natural conclusion for me, and probably for a great many others, would be that the same authorship is unreliable regarding organization, regarding pantheism, and every other subject that she ever treated on;--that she may have told the truth, but we had better get all the historical data we can to see whether she told the truth or not. That is something I would like to hear discussed. I do not believe we shall get to the foundation of the question unless we answer Professor Benson's question.

A. G. DANIELLS: Shall we consider some points as settled, and pass on? ~~xxxxxxxx~~ Take the matter of verbal inspiration. I think it is very much as Brother Taylor says, that among the most of our people there is no question. It is not agitated. They do not understand it, and they do not understand the technical features of the inspiration of the Bible, either. And the power of the Bible and its grip on the human race does not depend on a technical point as to their belief in it, whether it is verbally inspired or ~~xxx~~ truth-inspired. The men who hold directly opposite positions have the same faith in the Bible. I will not allow a man who believes in the verbal inspiration of the Bible to depreciate my faith in the Bible because I do not hold with him,--I will not consent to that a moment. I know my own faith in it, I know that I have enough faith in it to get forgiveness of my sins and companionship with my Lord and the hope of heaven. I know that, and a man that holds a different view need not try to depreciate my faith because I do not

hold the same view that he does. I do not depreciate another man's faith or standing with God at all because he holds a different view. I think we could argue about the inspiration of the Bible--I was going to say till doomsday--till the end, and not come to the same view, but all have the same confidence in it, and have the same experience, and all get to the same place at last.

But now with reference to the Testimonies: I think more mischief can be done with the Testimonies by claiming their verbal inspiration than can with the Bible. If you ask for the logic of it, it might take some time to bring it out, and I might not be able to satisfy every mind; but if you ask for practical experience, I can give it to you, plenty of it.

F. M. WILCOX: Because we know how the Testimonies were brought together, and we do not know anything about the Bible.

A. G. DANIELLS: Yes, that is one point. We do know, and it is no kind of use for ~~anybody~~ anybody to stand up and talk about the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies, because everybody who has ever seen the work done knows better, and we might as well dismiss it.

M. E. KERN: I am not so sure that some of the brethren are right in saying that we are all agreed on this question. I came in here the other day for the first time to attend the Conference, and I would hear the same man in the same talk say that we could not depend on this historical data that was given in the spirit of prophecy, and then assert his absolute confidence in the spirit of prophecy and in the Testimonies. And then a little further along there would be something else that he would not agree with. For instance, the positive testimony against butter was ~~not~~ mentioned,

and he explained that there are exceptions to that. Later he would again say, "I have absolute confidence in the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy." The question is, What is the nature of inspiration? How can we feel, and believe and know that there is an inconsistency there,--something that is not right,--and yet believe that the spirit of prophecy is inspired? Do you get the question?

A. G. DANIELLS: Yes, I get your question alright!

M. E. KERN: That is the difficulty we have in explaining this to young people. We may have confidence ourselves, but it is hard to make others believe it if we express this more liberal view. I can see how some might take advantage of this liberal view and go out and eat meat every meal, and say that part of the Testimonies is not reliable.

QUESTION: Can't he do the same thing if he believes in the verbal inspiration?

M. E. KERN: Not quite so consistently. If he believed every word was inspired, he could not consistently ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ sit down and eat meat.

A. G. DANIELLS: But I have seen them do it.

M. E. KERN: But not conscientiously. But now take a man who delves into the Scriptures, and he reads the Hebrew and the Greek, and he goes out and tells the people, If you understood the Greek, you would not get that meaning from the Bible, or If Sister White had understood the Greek, she would not have said that. Such a man can take a lot of license from this liberal view. Now, the question is running in my mind this way: In the very nature of the case, isn't there a human element in inspiration, because God had to speak through human instruments? And can we, either in the Bible or the

Testimonies, play upon a word and lay down the law and bind a man's conscience on a word instead of the general view of the whole scope of interpretation? I do not believe a man can believe in the general inspiration of the spirit of prophecy and still not believe that vegetarianism is the thing for mankind. I can understand how that testimony was written for individuals, and there are exceptions to it, and how Sister White in her human weakness could make a mistake in stating a truth, and still not destroy the inspiration of the spirit of prophecy; but the question is how to present these matters to the people. Brother Taylor may see no difficulty, but I see a lot of difficulty, not only in dealing with our students, but with our people in general.

A. G. DANIELLS: On the question of verbal inspiration?

M. E. KERN: Brother Benson's question is to the point. We had a council here a few weeks ago, and we laid down pretty straight some principles of education, and also some technicalities of education, ~~the~~ and we based our conclusions on the authority of the spirit of prophecy, as it was written. Now we come to those historical questions, and we say, "Well, Sister White was mistaken about that, and that needs to be revised." The individual who did not quite see the points that we made at the educational & council may say, "Well, possibly Sister White is wrong about the influence of universities," and it is hard to convince him that she was right, perhaps. I want, somehow, to get on a consistent basis myself.

Many years ago I ~~was~~ was in a meeting where Dr. Kellogg and others were considering a business matter. Dr. Kellogg there took a position exactly contrary to ~~the~~ something Sister

-11-

White had said. When asked how he explained what she had said, he replied that she had been influenced to say it. He was running down the Testimonies there. A short time after that I read one of his articles in the paper, in which he was laying down the law on the basis of the Testimonies. That made me lose my confidence in Dr. Kellogg. On one point that he did not agree with, he said she had been influenced. Then he took this other thing that pleased him and he said it was from the Lord. Perhaps he thought one was from the Lord and the other was not. But we certainly do have difficulty in showing the people ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ which is human and which is divinely inspired.

G. B. THOMPSON: Wouldn't that be true of the Bible?

W. E. KERN: That is why I ~~may~~ propose that we discuss the nature of inspiration. I have a sort of feeling that Sister White was a prophet just as Jeremiah was, and that in time her work will show up like Jeremiah's. I wonder if Jeremiah, in his day, did not do a lot of talking and perhaps some writing which was, as ~~xx~~ Paul said, on his own authority. I wonder if, in those days, the people did not have difficulty in differentiating between what was from the Lord and what was not. But the people make it more difficult now because all of Sister White's articles and books are with us, and her letters, too, and many think that every word she has ever said or written is from the Lord. We have had sanitariums built on account of letters she has ~~xxxx~~ written from a depot somewhere. And undertakings involving great financial investments have been started because of a letter from her. There is no question but what many young people, and also ministers, have that idea, and it is a real problem with me. I wish we could get down to bed-rock. I do not think we are there yet.

W. W. PRESCOTT: I would like to ask if you think that, after his writings had been published a series of years, Jeremiah changed them because he was convinced that there were historical errors in them?

M. E. KERN: I can not answer that.

W. H. WAKEHAM: There is a real difficulty, and we will have it to meet. We may say that the people do not believe in the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies. Perhaps technically they do not know what it means. But that is not the question at all. They have accepted the Testimonies all over the country, and believe that every identical word that Sister White has written was to be received as infallible truth. We have that thing to meet when we get back, and it will be brought up in our classes just as sure as we stand here, because it has come to me over and over again in every class I have taught. It not only comes out in classes, but in the churches. I know we have a very delicate task before us if we meet the situation and do it in the way the Lord wants it done. I am praying very earnestly for help as ~~as~~ I go back to meet some of the things I know I am going to meet.

W. E. HOWELL: Surely we are getting our difficulties aired well this morning, and that is perfectly proper; but we have only ten minutes left of the period in which to give some attention to the solution of those difficulties. We have invited men of much larger experience than we are to come in and help us and give us their counsel. It seems to me ~~we~~ ~~we~~ ought to give them some time.

G. B. THOMPSON: It seems to me that if we are going to preach the Testimonies and establish confidence in them, it does not depend on whether they are verbally ~~inspired~~ inspired or not. I think we are in this fix because of a wrong education that our people have

had. [Voice: That is true.] If we had always taught the truth on this question, we would not have any trouble or shock in the denomination now. But the shock is because we have not taught the truth, and have put the Testimonies on a plane where she says they do not stand. We have claimed more for them than she did. My thought is this, that the evidence of the inspiration of the Testimonies is not in their verbal inspiration, but in their influence and power in the denomination. Now to illustrate: Brother Daniells and I were in Battle Creek at a special crisis, and word came to us that some special testimonies were on the way to us from Sister White, and for us to stay there until they came. When they came we found they were to be read to the people. They were of a very serious character. They had been written a year before and filed away. Brother Daniells and I prayed about it, and then we sent out the word to the people that a meeting was to be held at a certain time. When the time came, about 3,000 people came into the Tabernacle, and they filled it up, even away back up into the "p-nut gallery." There were unbelievers and skeptics there, and all classes. Brother Daniells stood up there and read that matter to them, and I tell you there was a power went with it that gripped that whole congregation. And after the meeting was over, people came to us and told us that the Testimony described a meeting they had held the night before. I was convinced that there was more than ordinary power in that ~~document~~ document. It was not whether it was verbally inspired or not, but it carried the power of the Spirit of God with it.

I think if we could get at it from that line, we would get along better. They are not verbally inspired,--we know that,-- and what is the use of teaching that they are?

W. E. KERN: I would like to suggest that this question of verbal inspiration does not settle the difficulty.

C. M. SORENSON: Does Sister White use the word "inspiration" concerning her own writings, or is that merely a theory we have worked up ourselves? I ask for information? I have never seen that in her writings.

A. G. DANIELLS: I hardly know where to begin or what to say. I think I must repeat this, that our difficulty lies in two points, especially. One is on infallibility and the other is on verbal inspiration. I think Brother James White foresaw difficulties along this line away back at the beginning. He knew that he took Sister White's testimonies and helped to write them out and make them clear and grammatical and plain. He knew that he was doing that right along. And he knew that the secretaries they employed took them and put them into grammatical condition, transposed sentences, completed sentences, and used words that Sister White did not herself write in her original copy. He saw that, and yet he saw some brethren who did not know this, and who had great confidence in the Testimonies, just believing and teaching that these words were given to Sister White as well as the thought. And he tried to correct that idea. You will find those statements in the Review and Herald, like the one Brother Wilcox read the other day. If that explanation had been accepted and passed on down, we would have been free from a great many perplexities that we have now.

F. W. WILCOX: Articles were published in those early Reviews disclaiming that.

A. G. DANIELLS: Yes, but you know there are some brethren who go in all over. We could mention some old and some young who think they cannot believe the Testimonies without just putting them up as

absolutely infallible and word-inspired, taking the whole thing as given verbally by the Lord. They do not see how to ~~get~~ believe them and how to get good out of them except in that way; and I suppose some people would feel that if they did not believe in the verbal inspiration of the Bible, ~~xxx~~ they could not have confidence in it, and take it as the great Book that they now see it to be. Some men are technical, and can hardly under~~stand~~ it in any other way. Some other men are not so technical in logic, but they have great faith and great confidence, and so they can go through on another line of thought. I am sure there has been advocated an idea of infallibility in Sister White and verbal inspiration in the Testimonies that has led people to expect too much and to make too great claims, and so we have gotten into difficulty.

Now, as I have studied it these years since I was thrown into the controversy at Battle Creek, I have endeavored to ascertain the truth and then be true to the truth. I do not know how to do except that way. It will never help me, or help the people, to make a false claim to evade some trouble. I know we have difficulties here, but let us dispose of some of the main things first. Brethren are we going to evade difficulties or help out the difficulties by taking a false position? [VOICES: NO!] Well, then let us take an honest, true position, and reach our end somehow, because I never will put up a false claim to evade something that will come up a little later on. That is not honest and it is not Christian, and so I take my stand there.

In Australia I saw "The Desire of Ages" being made up, and I saw the rewriting of chapters, some of them written over and over and over again. I saw that, and when I talked with Sister Davis about it, I tell you I had to square up to this thing and begin to

settle things about the spirit of prophecy. If these false positions had never been taken, the thing would be much plainer than it is today. What was charged as plagiarism would all have been simplified, and I believe men would have been saved to the cause if from the start we had understood this thing as it should have been. With those false views held, we face difficulties in straightening up. We will not meet those difficulties by resorting to a false claim. We could meet them just for today by saying, "Brethren, I believe in the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies; I believe in the infallibility of the one through whom they came, and everything that is written there I will take and I will stand on that against all comers."

If we did that, I would just take everything from A to Z, exactly as it was written, without making any explanations to any one; and I would not eat butter or salt or eggs if I believed that the Lord gave the words in those Testimonies to Sister White for the whole body of people in this world. But I do not believe it.

M. E. KERN: You couldn't and keep your conscience clear.

A. G. DANIELLS: No, I couldn't; but I do not believe that; and I can enter upon an explanation of health reform that I think is consistent, and that she endeavored to bring in in later years when she saw people making a bad use of that. I have eaten pounds of butter at her table myself, and dozens of eggs. I could not explain that in her own family if I believed that she believed those were the Lord's own words to the world. But there are people who believe that and do not eat eggs or butter. I do not know that they use salt. I know plenty of people in the early days did not use salt, and it was in our church. I am sure that many children suffered

from it.

1243

There is no use of our claiming anything more on the verbal inspiration of the Testimonies, because she never claimed it, and James White never claimed it, and W. C. White never claimed it; and all the persons who helped to prepare these Testimonies knew they were not verbally inspired. I will say no more along that line.

D. A. PARSONS: She not only did not claim it, but she denied it.

A. G. DANIELLS: Yes, she tried to correct the people.

Now on infallibility. I suppose Sister White used Paul's text, "We have this treasure in earthen vessels," as much as any other scripture. She used to repeat that often, "We have this treasure in earthen vessels," with the idea that she was a poor, feeble woman, a messenger of the Lord trying to do her duty and meet the mind of God in this work. When you take the position that she was not infallible, and that her writings were not verbally inspired, isn't there a chance for the manifestation of the human? If there isn't, then what is infallibility? And should we be surprised when we know that the instrument was fallible, and that the general truths, as she says, were revealed, then aren't we prepared to see mistakes?

M. E. KERN: She was an author and not merely a pen.

A. G. DANIELLS: Yes; and now take that "Life of Paul,"--I suppose you all know about it and know what claims were put up against her, charges made of plagiarism, even by the authors of the book, Conybeare and Howson, and were liable to make the denomination trouble because there was so much of their book put into "The Life of Paul" without any credit or quotation marks. Some people of strict logic might fly the track on that ground, but I am not built that way.

I found it out, and I read it with Brother Palmer when he found it, and we got Conybeare and Howson, and we got Wylie's "History of the Reformation," and we read word for word, page after page, and no quotations, no credit, and really I did not know the difference until I began to compare them. I supposed it was Sister White's own work. The poor sister said, "Why, I didn't know about quotations and credits. My secretary should have looked after that, and the publishing house should have looked after it."

She did not claim that that was all revealed to her and written word for word under the inspiration of the Lord. There I saw the manifestation of the human in these writings. Of course I could have said this, and I did say it, that I wished a different course had been taken in the compilation of the books. If proper care had been exercised, it would have saved a lot of people from being thrown off the track.

MRS. WILLIAMS: The secretary would know that she ought not to quote a thing without using quotation marks.

A. G. DANIELS: You would think so. I do not know who the secretary was. The book was set aside, and I have never learned who had a hand in fixing that up. It may be that some do know.

B. L. HOUSE: May I ask one question about that book? Did Sister White write any of it?

A. G. DANIELS: O, yes!

B. L. HOUSE: But there are some things that are not in Conybeare and Howson that are not in the new book, either. Why are those striking statements not embodied in the new book.

A. G. DANIELS: I cannot tell you. But if her writings were veritally inspired, why should she revise them?

B. L. HOUSE: My difficulty is not with the verbal inspiration. My difficulty is here: You take the nine volumes of the Testimonies and as I understand it, Sister White wrote the original matter from which they were made up, except that they were corrected so far as grammar, capitalization and punctuation are concerned. But such books as "Sketches of the Life of Paul," "Desire of Ages," and "Great Controversy," were composed differently, it seems to me, even by her secretaries than the nine volumes of the Testimonies. Is there not a difference? I have felt that the Testimonies were not produced like those other books.

A. G. DANIELLS: I do not know how much revision she might have made in these personal Testimonies before she put them out.

B. L. HOUSE: Did any one else ever write anything that is found in the nine volumes of the Testimonies?

A. G. DANIELLS: No, I do not know that there are any quotations in the Testimonies.

B. L. HOUSE: Isn't there a difference, then, between the nine volumes of the Testimonies and those other books for which her secretaries were authorized to collect valuable quotations from other books?

A. G. DANIELLS: You admit that she had the right to revise her work?

B. L. HOUSE: O, Yes.

A. G. DANIELLS: Then your question is, Why did she leave out of the revision some striking things that she wrote that it seems should have been put in?

B. L. HOUSE: Yes.

M. F. KERN: In the first volume of the spirit of prophecy there are some details given, if I am not mistaken, as to the

height of Adam. It seems to me that when she went to prepare "Patriarchs and Prophets" for the public, even though that had been shown her, it did not seem wise to put that before the public.

A. C. DANIELLS: And she also left out of our books for the public that scene of Satan playing the game of life.

B. L. HOUSE: In that old edition of "Sketches of the Life of Paul," she is very clear about the ceremonial law. That is not in the new book, and I wondered why that was left out.

D. A. PARSONS: I have an answer to that. I was in California when the book was compiled, and I took the old edition and talked with Brother Will White about this very question. He said the whole book, with the exception of that chapter, had been compiled for some time, and they had held it up until they could arrange that chapter in such a way as to prevent controversy arising. ~~xxxxx~~ They did not desire the book to be used to settle any controversy, and therefore they eliminated most of those statements on the ceremonial law just to prevent a renewal of the great controversy over the ceremonial law in Galatians.

B. L. HOUSE: It is not a repudiation of what was written by her in the first volume, is it?

D. A. PARSONS: No, not at all; but they just put enough in to satisfy the inquiring mind, but eliminated those striking statements to prevent a renewal of the controversy.

F. W. WILCOX: I would like to ask, Brother Daniels, if it could be accepted as a sort of rule that Sister White might be mis-
in taken in details, but the general policy and instruction she was an authority. For instance, I hear a man saying, I can not accept Sister White on this, when perhaps she has devoted pages to the discussion of it. A man said he could not accept what Sister White said

about royalties on books, and yet she devotes pages to that subject, and emphasizes it again and again; and it is the same with policies for our schools and publishing houses and sanitariums. It seems to me I would have to accept what she says on some of those general policies or I would have to sweep away the whole thing. Either ~~that~~ the Lord has spoken through her or He has not spoken through her; and if it is a matter of deciding in my own judgment whether He has or has not, then I regard her books the same as every other book published. I think it is one thing for a man to stultify his conscience, and it is another thing to stultify his judgment. It is one thing for me to lay aside my conscience, and it is another thing for me to change my judgment over some views that I hold.

A. G. DANIELLS: I think Brother Benson's question on historical and theological matters has not been dealt with yet, and I do not know that I am able to give any light. Perhaps some of you may know to what extent Sister White has revised some of her statements and references or quotations from historical writings. Have you ever gone through and made a list of them?

W. W. PRESCOTT: I gave nearly an hour to that the other day, taking the old edition of "Great Controversy" and reading it and then reading the revised edition. But that did not cover all the ground.

A. G. DANIELLS: We did not create that difficulty, did we? We General Conference men did not create it, for we did not make the revision. We did not take any part in it. We had nothing whatever to do with it. It was all done under her supervision. If there is a difficulty there, she created it, did she not?

F. W. WILCOX: She assumed the whole responsibility for it.

M. E. KERN: But we have to meet it.

A. G. DANIELLS: Well, now, which statement shall we take, the original or the revised?

B. L. HOUSE: My real difficulty is just here: Sister White did not write either the old edition or the revised, as I understand it.

A. G. DANIELLS: What do you mean by saying that she did not write either edition?

B. L. HOUSE: As I understand it, Elder J. N. Anderson prepared those historical quotations for the old edition, and Brother Robinson and Brother Crisler, and others furnished the quotations for the new edition. Did she write the historical quotations in there?

A. G. DANIELLS: No.

B. L. HOUSE: Then there is a difference between the Testimonies and those books.

W. W. PRESCOTT: Changes have been made in what was not historical extract at all.

A. G. DANIELLS: Shall we not confine ourselves just now to this question of Brother Benson's and let our way up to the real difficulty, and then deal with it? Do you have a clear conception of the way the difficulty arose?--that in making the first edition of "Great Controversy" those who helped her prepare the copy were allowed to bring forward historical quotations that seemed to fit the case. She may have asked, "Now, what good history do you have for that?" I do not know just how she brought it in, but she never would allow us to claim anything for her as a historian. She did not put herself up as a corrector of history,--not only did not do that, but protested against it. Just how they dealt with in bringing the history along, I could not say, but I suspect that she referred to this as she went along, and then allowed them to

-23-

gather the very best historical statements they could and submit them to her, and she approved of them.

C. L. BENSON: This is my query, and it underlies all of ~~her~~ her writings: How did she determine upon the philosophy of history? If she endorsed our interpretation of history, without any details, do we dare to set that aside? I understand she never studied medical science; but she has laid down certain fundamental principles; ~~that~~ and that she has done the same with education and organization.

A. G. DANIELLS: Sister White never has written anything on the philosophy of history.

C. L. BENSON: No, but she has endorsed our 2300 day proposition, from 538 to 1798.

A. G. DANIELLS: You understand she did that by placing that in her writings?

C. L. BENSON: Yes.

A. G. DANIELLS: Yes, I suppose she did.

C. A. SHULL: I think the book "Education" contains something along the line of the philosophy of history.

W. E. HOWELL: Yes, she outlines general principles.

C. M. SORENSON: Nobody has ever questioned Sister White's philosophy of history, so far as I know,--and I presume I have heard most of the questions raised about it,--along the line of the hand of God in human affairs and the way the hand of God has been manifested. The only question anybody has raised has been about minor details. Take this question as to whether 533 has some significance taken in connection with 538. She never set 533, but if there is a significance attached to it in human affairs, it certainly would not shut us out from using it, and that would not affect the 1260

years. Some people say antichrist is yet to come, and is to last for three and one-half literal years. If you change those positions, you will change the philosophy.

W. W. PRESCOTT: Do I understand Brother Benson's view is that such a statement as that in "Great Controversy," that the 1260 years began in 538 and ended in 1798, settles the matter infallibly?

C. L. BENSON: No, only on the preaching of doctrines in general. If she endorses the prophetic part of our interpretation, irrespective of details, then she endorses it.

W. W. PRESCOTT: Then that settles it as being a part of that philosophy.

C. L. BENSON: Yes, in this way: I do not see how we can do anything else but set up our individual judgment if we say we will discount that, because we have something else that we think is better evidence. It is the same with education and the medical science.

W. W. PRESCOTT: You are touching exactly the experience through which I went, personally, because you all know that I contributed something toward the revision of "Great Controversy." I furnished considerable material bearing upon that question.

A. G. DANIELLS: By request.

W. W. PRESCOTT: Yes, I was asked to do it, and at first I said "No, I will not do it. I know what it means." But I was urged into it. When I had gone over it with W. C. WHITE, then I said, "Here is my difficulty. I have gone over this and suggested changes that ought to be made in order to correct statements. These changes have been accepted. My personal difficulty will be to retain faith on those things that I can not deal with on that basis." But I did not throw up the spirit of prophecy, and have not yet; but I have had to adjust my view of things. I will say to you, as a matter of fact, that the

relation of those writings to this movement and to our work, is clearer and more consistent in my mind than it was then. But still you know what I am charged with. I have gone through the personal experience myself over that very thing that you speak of. If we correct it here and correct it there, how are we going to stand with it in the other places?

F. M. WILCOX: Those things do not involve the general philosophy of the book.

W. W. PRESCOTT: No, but they did involve quite large details. For instance, before "Great Controversy" was revised, I was unorthodox on a certain point, but after it was revised, I was perfectly orthodox.

C. M. SORENSON: On what point?

W. W. PRESCOTT: My interpretation was, (and I taught it for years in The Protestant Magazine) that Babylon stood for the great apostasy against God, which headed up in the papacy, but which included all minor forms, and that before we come to the end, they would all come under one. That was not the teaching of "Great Controversy." "Great Controversy" said that Babylon could not mean the romish church, and I had made it mean that largely and primarily. After the book was revised, although the whole argument remained the same, it said that it could not mean the Roman Church alone, just that one word added.

F. M. WILCOX: That helped you out.

W. W. PRESCOTT: Yes, but I told W. C. White I did not think anybody had any right to do that. And I did not believe anybody had any right to use it against me before or afterward. I simply went right on with my teaching.

J. N. ANDERSON: Would you not claim other portions of the book as on the same basis?

W. W. PRESCOTT: No, I would refuse to do that. I had to deal with A. R. HENRY over that question. He was determined to crush those men that took a wrong course concerning him. I spent hours with that man trying to help him. We were intimate in our work, and I used to go to his house and spend hours with him. He brought up this question about the authority of the spirit of prophecy and wanted me to ~~draw~~ draw the line between what was authoritative and what was not. I said, "Brother Henry, I will not attempt to do it, and I advise you not to do it. There is an authority in that gift here, and we must recognize it."

I have tried to maintain personal confidence in this gift in the church, and I use it and use it. I have gotten great help from those books, but I will tell you frankly that I held to that position on the question of Babylon for years when I knew it was exactly contrary to "Great Controversy," but I went on, and in due time I became orthodox. I did not enjoy that experience at all, and I hope you will not have to go through it. It means something.

C. L. BENSON: That is the pivotal point. You had something that enabled you to take that position. What was it?

W. W. PRESCOTT: I can not lay down any rule for anybody. What settled me to take that ~~an~~ position was the Bible, not any secular authority.

J. N. ANDERSON: Your own findings must be your authority for believing and not believing.

W. W. PRESCOTT: You can upset everything by applying that as a general principle.

C. P. BOLLMAN: Could you tell, in just a few words, how the Bible helped you?

W. W. PRESCOTT: That would involve the whole question of the beast.

VOICE: To your knowledge, has Sister White ever made a difference between her nine volumes and her other books?

W. W. PRESCOTT: I have never talked with her about it. In my mind, there is a difference between the works she largely prepared herself and what was prepared by others for sale to the public.

A. G. DANIELLS: You might as well state that a little fuller, the difference in the way they were produced.

W. W. PRESCOTT: If I should speak my mind frankly, I should say that I have felt for years that great mistakes were made in handling her writings for commercial purposes.

C. M. SORENSON: By whom?

W. W. PRESCOTT: I do not want to charge anybody. But I do think great mistakes were made in that way. That is why I have made a distinction ~~between~~ as I have. When I talked with W. C. White about it (and I do not know that he is an infallible authority), he told me frankly that when they got out "Great Controversy," if they did not find in her writings anything on certain chapters to make the historical connections, they took ~~their~~ other books, like "Daniel and the Revelation," and used portions of them; and sometimes her ~~xxxx~~ secretaries, and sometimes she herself, would prepare a chapter that would fill the gap.

C. A. SHULL: I would like to ask if Brother Prescott wishes to be understood that his attitude is that wherever his own judgment comes in conflict with any statement in the spirit of prophecy, he will follow his judgment rather than the spirit of prophecy?

W. W. PRESCOTT: No, I do not want anybody to get that understanding. That is the very understanding that I do not want anybody to get.

C. A. SHULL: Then that was an exceptional case?

W. W. PRESCOTT: Yes, I was forced to that from my study of the Bible. When I made up my mind to that, I did not parade it before the people and say, "Here is a mistake in 'Great Controversy,' and if you study the Bible you will find it to be so." I did not attack the spirit of prophecy. My attitude has been to avoid anything like opposition to the gift in this church, but I avoid such a misuse of it as to set aside the Bible. I do not want anybody to think for a moment that I set up my judgment against the spirit of prophecy.

A. G. DANIELLS: Let us remember that, brethren, and not say a word that will misrepresent Brother Prescott.

B. L. HOUSE: Did Sister White herself write that statmenet that the term Babylon could not apply to the Catholic Church, or was that copied from some other author?

W. W. PRESCOTT: That was in the written statement.

B. L. HOUSE: Has she ever changed any of the ^{nine} volumes of the Testimonies?

W. W. PRESCOTT: "Great Controversy" is the only book I know of that has been revised.

C. M. SORENSON: Hasn't "Early Writings" been revised? I understand some omissions have been made in the later editions.

W. W. PRESCOTT: Perhaps some thing have been left out, but I do not think the writing itself has been revised.

A. G. DANIELLS: You know there is a statement that the pope changed the Sabbath, and another one, that the papacy was abolished. What do you do with those?

B. L. HOUSE: There is no trouble with that.

A. G. DANIELLS: Why not? The pope did not change the Sabbath?

H. L. HOUSE: But the pope stands for the papacy.

A. G. DANIELLS: There are people that just believe there was a certain pope that changed the Sabbath, because of the way they follow the words. She never meant to say that a certain pope changed the Sabbath; but do you know, I have had that brought up to me a hundred times in ministers' meetings.

B. L. HOUSE: I have never had any trouble on that.

A. G. DANIELLS: But you are only one. There are about 2,000 others. I have had to work with men just gradually and carefully and all the time keep from giving out the idea that I was a doubter of the Testimonies.

I know it is reported around that some of us men here at Washington, in charge of the general administrative work, are very shaky and unbelieving, ~~xxxxxxx~~ but I want to tell you that I know better. I know that my associates have confidence right down on the solid platform of this whole question; and I know that if many of you had gone ~~ask~~ at this thing and experienced what we have, you would have passed through an experience that would have given you solid ground. You would have shaken a bit, and you are beginning to shake now, and some of you do not know where you are going to land. These questions show it. But that is not to say there is not a foundation. It is to say that you have not gone through the toils yet and got your feet on solid ground.

I want to make this suggestion; because with all these questions we can not follow one line of thought logically: We must use good sense in dealing with this whole question, brethren. Do not be careless with your words. Do not be careless in reporting or repre-

senting men's views. I have had this thing to deal with for years and years, as you know, in every ministers' meeting; and I have been called into college classes over and over again, and have had to say things that those ministers and students never heard before about this; and I have prayed for wisdom and for the Spirit of the Lord to direct them and to give faith and to cover up those things that would leave doubt. And I have never had it come back on me that a careful, cautious statement made in the fear of God has upset a single person. It may have done it, but it has never come back to me. You take our ministers: This brother [meaning Brother Waldorf] knows how much this was brought up in our ministers' meetings over in Australia, and we dealt with it plainly. We ^{did} not try to pull the wool over ^{the} people's eyes, and I believe you will find the Australian preachers and churches as firm believers in the Spirit of prophecy as in Sister White's call by the Lord as you will find any place on the face of the earth. Take New Zealand: I brought them up there, and I think it is well known that there is not a place in the world where the people stand truer to this gift than they do there.

I do not believe it is necessary to dissemble a bit, but I do believe, brethren, that we have got to use wisdom that God alone can give us in dealing with this until matters gradually work over. We have made a wonderful change in nineteen years, Brother Prescott. Fifteen years ago we could not have talked what we are talking here today. It would not have been safe. This matter has come along gradually, and yet people are not losing their confidence in the gift. Last year we sold 5,000 sets of the Testimonies, and they cost eight or nine dollars a set. In one year our brethren and sisters, under the influence of the General Conference, and the union

conference and local conference men and our preachers,—under their influence, without any compulsion, our brethren came along and spent forty or fifty thousand dollars for the Testimonies. What would you consider that an indication of?

VOICE: Confidence.

A. G. DANIELLS: Yes, confidence, and a friendly attitude. They did not buy them as critics to tear them to pieces. We must be judged by our fruits. I want to tell you that the clearer view we get on the exact facts in the case, the stronger the position of our people will be in the whole thing.

Now, Brother Benson, I see the whole line running through there that you referred to. We can not correct that in a day. We must use great judgment and caution. I hope you ^{Bible} teachers will be exceedingly careful. I was called up here twice to speak ~~in~~ on the spirit of prophecy to the Bible and pastoral training classes. They brought up this question of history. I simply said, "Now, boys, Sister White never claimed to be a historian nor a corrector of history. She used the best she knew for the matter she was writing on. I have never heard from a teacher that those boys buzzed around them and said, "Brother Daniels does not believe Sister White's writings are reliable." I believe the Lord will help us to take care of this if we will be careful and use good sense. I think that is all I can say in this sort of discussion.

Friday, Aug. 1, 1919, 11:15.

W. E. HOWELL: Now, Brother Daniels, about half of these teachers here have as part of their responsibility the preparation of young men for the ministry. Some of the others assist in that work. They have felt very anxious to have some good counsel and some principles that would help them in their work.

A. G. DANIELLS: I confess, brethren, that my mind is so troubled over what we have been discussing, that I feel in very poor shape to discuss pastoral training. Some of us have gone through the trouble, and have landed all right; but it is a great pain to me to see my brethren getting into this thing, because I know the anxiety that it will give them. Then I know, too, the danger there is when we are trying to work our way through a labyrinth of getting off into those caverns that are all around us, or getting other people into them. Brethren, do use good sense, do be cautious, and do all this with the spirit of prayer and with confidence in God, and ~~not~~ with a great desire to not hurt a single little one of God's flock. I am sure that none of our General Conference men want a sword to fight with in this thing; but we do want to be true, and we want to tell these things as they are, and I believe the Lord will bring us out. Now, if I can dismiss that from my mind, I will say a few things about this making of preachers.

I feel that a great responsibility, a great opportunity, is given our Bible teachers and teachers of pastoral training classes, and it is for you teachers to really change or greatly improve the class of preachers among us.

First of all, I think you should steadily impress upon the minds of prospective ministers and Bible workers a few things. One is hon-

esty, sincerity, to be true to their consciences, to their judgment, to their profession. There are a great many ways in which men may hold theories and live quite differently and do quite differently. That is not honesty, that is not sincerity. So I believe that you should constantly impress upon them that they must be very straight and sincere and live up to their profession.

Then I think you should impress upon their minds the importance of studiousness, both in their contact with books and ⁱⁿ with their contact with men and women,--to be industrious, to be workers. They should be impressed that when they leave the school, they are just beginning then to study and to work, and so lead them to feel that as they go out they go to plunge into books and into service and into a life of toil more severely than they have ever had in the school. ~~And~~ If they ever accomplish what they ought to, they must do that, and you know it.

It will not be necessary for me to go further into that matter of studiousness and the kind of books they should read. Of course you do that. You show them the foolishness of reading light literature and wasting their time on unimportant books, books of little value, when we have so much of value.

Then I suppose you give them some idea of regularity in their habits of study, working and living somewhat to a program. A great deal of time is lost and effort wasted by lack of a program of regularity in the daily life. You will give them instruction with reference to the value of time, the placing of value upon hours and minutes, the importance of carrying with them some good little book that they can get out quickly and use so as not to waste time waiting at stations, traveling on street cars and trains, or whenever there is an opportunity.

But above all, you will impress upon them the importance of Bible study and contact with the Bible as a book that contains great power, that is power, that ~~has a~~ ^{has a} ~~revolutionizing~~ ^{and regenerating} influence upon the mind and on the heart. Make the Bible supreme, but having other literature close at hand, so that they will not be wasting their time.

I do not think that our colleges are doing all that they can do along this line, from my observation. Perhaps it may be because the young men have had a pretty stiff line of study, so that when they first come out they let up a bit. But I watch these young men at the camp-meetings I attend, and I would not think of wasting my time the way I see them wasting theirs. I do not on the camp-ground; tired as I am, and as much work as I have to do, I do not throw away the minutes and the hours that I see those young men waste. ~~xxx~~

~~xxxxxxx~~ I feel that it is not entirely because of the strain they have been under, because I see that it passes over a number of years. ^{If it is that,} ~~and~~ it takes a long time to get rested from the strain of the school work. I query whether they are getting the lesson and the instruction they need as to the value of time and the need of deeper study.

These are general matters that you are all familiar with, of course, and everything I will have to say, you are familiar with; but now I want to touch upon another thing that is of less importance, but it is of importance, and it is of a conspicuous character, and that is the appearance, the manners, the deportment of the minister.

The life of the minister, aside from his sincerity, his piety, and his studiousness and his activity, should be studied. We should

come a little closer to the real life and manner and way of the preacher. There is no question but what a minister's vocation differs from all other vocations. A doctor's vocation and a minister's work are quite different. A banker's way of living is different from that of a preacher. There is the dress, there is the public life that the minister lives, the way he goes at his work, the manner in which he carries himself both in public and private, is different. The banker can be brief and blunt and direct in his way, but the minister must be different. I think, brethren, that among all the vocations in the world, that of the minister is the highest and most sacred, and calls for the greatest care on the part of those who enter it. I think it calls for a delicacy, a gentleness, a genteelness, a good breeding and good form more than any other vocation in the world, because he is so much in public. That involves a number of things.

One thing is his language. It does not take long after a minister begins speaking to determine something about his culture, his education, and his preciseness; and so one of the first things is his language. That is important not only in his public speaking, but also in his private talk as well,--the good use of chaste, select language. That includes more than good grammar and a wide range in his vocabulary; it means a chasteness that would rule out all that is vulgar or rash, and all the popular slang that is used. Some of our ministers do not set out young men a good example in this matter. They resort to the common--well, we will call it slang for convenience's sake. They use many words, ^{and expressions} that are not chaste and dignified and exalted. I do not think our ministers ought to do that. I try not to. I may fail sometimes, but I know this,

it hurts me when I hear a minister using those expressions. It grates on my ears. I hear another minister who preaches a sermon right through, and does not use one of those common slang expressions, and I admire it. It has a good influence on the mind and on the heart, and I appreciate it very much.

I think that in the colleges we should teach our boys not to use these expressions. They do use them when talking to one another, such as "going over the top," "what do you say to this," and many others. I think we ought to try to lift them to a higher plane than that even in school life, because they are pretty liable to use those expressions when they get into public work. I think the boys in the pastoral training class and the Bible classes should be very deeply impressed to steer far away from those expressions.

Then the dress of the minister must be taken into account. I have often said in our ministers' meetings that I think there are two professional classes that ought to be immaculate in their dress and their personal appearance, and that is the doctor and the preacher. ~~and the dentist~~
The doctor comes into direct personal contact with his patients, and it is perfectly clear that those men ought to study to be very clean, physically, and wear very clean linen, and their dress should be beyond criticism; but I think it is just as true of the minister. He stands before the people, and between them and the Lord God of heaven. He represents his Lord. He is His ambassador, and I believe he should study neatness and practice it as carefully as possible,--not to be foppish, not to make it conspicuous; he does not need to do that. I think I heard Professor Salisbury define it as ^{nicely} ~~as~~ as any one I ever heard,--he should dress in a way that would not even call attention to his dress. Then people would not think he was overdressed or foppish, and their minds would never be called to any

slovenliness or bad appearance. If he were dressed so that people never thought of it, he would be rightly dressed.

For instance, take his shoes: He does not need to have shoes that are trimmed, and the leather all cut into fancy figures over the toes and around the tops, and bright tan color; but he certainly should not come onto the platform with worn-out shoes, without blacking and without heels, and in a slovenly appearance. He can go between the two. He can have shoes that are not adorned, but he can have them polished and built up at the heels in good shape, so that nobody will ever think about it.

Br But, brethren, our ministers do not all realize the need of having their clothes properly made and properly adjusted. I was at a camp-meeting some time ago, and was on the stand. A minister got up to read the hymn. He had looked to me as though he had gone to some pawn-shop and got his coat. It came just a little below his suspender buttons, and he had worn the back part of his the heels clear off his shoes, and I do not believe they had ever seen any blacking, at least they didn't look like it; and he certainly must have thrown his trousers down at night, because there was no appearance of straightness. They bowed around to fit bent knees. He got up there to read the hymn on a Sunday afternoon. I did not say anything. I just sat there and studied him and wondered where he came from; and as I stopped looking, the minister next to me said, "A pretty tough proposition, Elder!" I do not think Seventh-day Adventist preachers should dress that way. I think it is wrong. I think it hurts our cause. And yet, when they do it, we must take some little account of it and try to correct it. Perhaps we can not do that with older men, that are out and at it; but I can not understand why any man would do it. He must be color blind

or have something missing in his mentality. I can not understand it.

Not long ago I saw a minister on the platform with one trouser leg all of three inches shorter than the other, pulled up. Why would a man do that? It seems to me his eyes ought to tell him about such things.

Then, again, as to combinations: Some ministers present a very sorry appearance by the combination of colors,--a flaming tie, a coat of one color and trousers of another, and tan shoes,--more fit for a menagerie than for a minister. Our young men ought to be taught those things, I think.

I may be a little bit weak, and may not be able to comprehend the chief things as I should, but really, I was pleased in reading some time ago the ordination sermon of a bishop. He went through the list and told them how they ought to keep the finger nails clean, right in a public talk. He dealt with many other things, but I was pleased that he dealt with the question of cleanliness. I could tell you much that I observe to show that we have preachers who do not realize that at all. They are not cleanly, they do not value the bath. I know it by the odor of their feet. I do not know whether I ought to go into these matters quite so closely, but, ^{one of} our schools has turned out a preacher with whom I was in a committee meeting. The brethren noticed something, and they said, "What is this? There must be a dead fowl around here." We could not make out where it could be. But after the committee meeting two or three of the brethren went to one room, and when one brother took off his shoes it was very apparent where the dead fowl was,--it was in that man's shoes. ~~When I sat near him at the table~~ ^{during that time} I could scarcely eat my food because that man's feet were under the table. I think that

is abominable. I did not hardly have the grit to deal with this man myself, but I did get another man to go and labor with him. And I was in a committee with him the other day, and really I scented around pretty closely and found a great improvement. [Laughter]

You may take that as a bit of pleasantry, but you fancy a man going into a nice parlor to give a Bible reading to a company of ladies, and carrying that small into that room. It would spoil the whole thing. It is not right; and so I believe that we should teach our boys in the schools immaculate cleanliness and neatness in their appearance, so that they will never give offense and never appear foppish or like dudes in public. You can do it. You can hold these things up and set them an example in their classes, and then teach them what to do.

There is another important thing, and that is methods in public. I think a young man should study his attitude from the moment he walks out of ~~xxxxxx~~ his tent in a camp-meeting or out of the little room in the church, to take his place on the platform. He should study just how to act. I read of a man who went once to hear a great preacher in New York, I think it was in Brooklyn, and this man said that it paid him to make the entire trip just to see this speaker come onto the platform, take his seat, announce his hymns, and do his work. I can say that I have felt paid in going to a large church sometimes just to hear the minister make his announcements, and see how he did it. I went to hear Charles Goodell once in New York City, and he certainly was a good example of refinement in every way. But when he came to his announcements, he had them on little cards which he just slipped along one after another, just taking a second or two on each announcement, and the people understood it just as well as though he had spent five minutes. When he came to the offer-

ing, he said simply, "The offering this morning is for foreign missions, and the Lord will be pleased with liberality." When we come to the offering, we elaborate on it, and talk to the people as though they were children and we had to belabor them to give. I think we can make improvements in our methods.

Of course we have different ideas, no doubt, of pulpit manners, and I would not attempt to do more than to lay down some general principles; but I think that when our ministers come from the room to walk across the platform and kneel in prayer, and take their seats, and remain there during the service, they are on public exhibition. They are a spectacle to the audience, and they ought to be exceedingly careful not to do anything that will be offensive to the most refined, and especially not to do anything that will call the attention of any one in the audience from the speaker and the theme that is being presented. How shall we do that? Here is one thing that causes me some trouble, and that is getting to our places on the platform. We are different from other denominations. They do not parade a lot of preachers on their platforms. I have often wished that we would settle down to call up two or three men at the most, and let the rest sit down with the audience. I do not see a bit of need of that whole line of chairs being filled every time a man is going to preach. Personally, when I am going to preach, I would rather most of the other preachers would sit down where I can see them.

C. M. SORENSON: They would get more out of the sermon.

A. G. DANIELLS: Yes, I think this is one of the ways in which we can make a change. In the Fall Council we may take that up and

recommend that only three men go onto the platform, one to speak, one to announce the hymns, and another to pray. That is all we need as a rule.

C. L. TAYLOR: Is it the best form for two ministers on the platform to both kneel facing the audience, one on each side of the desk?

A. G. DANIELLS: I think it is alright to do that. I often just step right to the other side of the desk and kneel there and enter heartily into the prayer, sympathetically.

As to the question of getting onto the platform: I think there is a way of doing that without embarrassment to the first man who steps up, and that is by ^{each} ~~all~~ keeping close step with the one in front. In that way, by the time the first man reaches his chair, the last man reaches his. Suppose one or two lag behind, as they often do, and are just getting around the corner over there when I get to my place: then what? I do not like the idea at all of turning around with my back to the audience and standing there motionless. I like to kneel at once, and that would be possible if all kept close together.

What shall we do if we have to wait? Some ministers make me very nervous by looking up and down the line and maneuvering around. It seems to me the only thing to do is to stand still and not look up and down the line.

After the prayer there is an hour in which men may do a great many foolish things, and there is only one law to fit the case, and that is that he shall keep tab on himself and attend to himself. What can a man do? Well, he can whisper to the man next to him, which is inexcusable, as a rule, and yet when I was out attending

camp-meetings this last time I was annoyed and my mind was taken from the duties of the place more than once by one or two persons especially that would invariably try to get into an extended conversation with me on the platform. I had to tell one of them, "Look here, Brother, I will not visit on the platform. I want to hear this sermon." I think it should be a very rare thing for a minister to whisper to another on the platform. The hymn should be selected and everything understood before going in.

There is another thing a man can do, and that is to yawn. You have seen that. Teach your students they must not yawn on the platform.

Another thing they can do is a lot of head-scratching. I have seen the shoulder of a coat white with dandruff from scratching the hair on the platform while someone was preaching. That is altogether out of place.

Of course only a few pick their teeth; but some are even boorish enough to do that.

I would not hold to the idea that man should never cross his legs, throw one leg over the other. That would be pretty strict. I have watched a good deal, and I know that is not followed in the very best circles. I think it is the rule that a man must sit there with his feet down and not cross them. That is set down as good form, but it is not carried out, and I do not believe it is necessary to insist on that. I do not think it is very bad, if properly done; but there are two ways to do that. One is for a man to put his ankle up on his knee, and put himself in a bad shape on the platform.

Students should be taught to exercise great care in their behaviour and to do everything in such a way that no offense will be given. There are people who judge us altogether by our outward mani-

festations. They have never conversed with us, and they have never been in our homes. They know nothing about us except what they see as we appear before them.

Here is a point that means something. All are standing by their chairs, and one is to offer prayer. Shall he stand there and let the song be completed, and everybody hesitate to know whether there is to be a scripture reading, or whether to stand and have prayer or kneel for prayer? The counsel I give is that before the last stanza of the hymn is completed, the one who is to offer prayer steps forward and stands by the desk, out from the rest; then everybody knows who is to offer the prayer or give the scripture reading. Just as soon as the last sound of the hymn is out, he should either say, "We will have the scripture reading," or "Be seated," or "Let us pray." Then the people know what to do, and are not left in any degree of uncertainty. I have seen some people get down on their knees, and then have to get up again. I have seen others sit down, and then have to get up again when the minister finally got around to tell them to bow in prayer. All that can be avoided by a little forethought. Those boys should be taught that whether they are to read the scripture lesson or offer prayer, they should be at the desk and give the people the word at once so as to leave no doubt in the minds of the people as to what is to come next.

In telling the people that we are going to pray, I have sometimes heard ministers say, "Let us all kneel reverently and look to the Lord in prayer." What is the use of all that verbiage? I think just two or three words are all that are necessary. With a good, clear voice, say, "Let us pray." Everybody knows that we are going to do it with reverence. And they may either kneel or sit, unless we wish them to stand, and then it can be stated,--"Let us remain standing while prayer is offered."

Those seem like very small matters; but you put them all together from first to last, and they really make a great impression on the public.

As to announcing the hymn, I will just speak of what seems to me to be the essential point of hymn announcing. Many times, and with many hymns, the mere announcement of the number is all that is of value. "Let us unite in singing" or "in praising God," or "Let us sing No. 550," and let it go at that. Or, if the hymn is especially suited to the circumstances of the hour, it ~~may be~~ it is eminently proper to read that hymn right through; but read it, and not sing it or mumble it, because there is beautiful expression in many hymns. I like both ways. But I do dislike to hear a hymn read clear through that has nothing to do with the topic. They call it "lining the hymn." If they do not do that, they will say, "We will sing without further lining." And if they read the hymn, or "line it," they do not get the proper expression. You will be surprised if you will listen to men reading that beautiful missionary hymn, "From Greenland's icy mountains," and notice the different ways of reading it. The fact, is, I do not think we are teaching reading and hymn reading in our schools as we ought [VOICE: That's right!], --surely we are not when you hear boys just out of the schools try to read these well-known hymns that are so beautiful in their expression, and hear them just ruin the whole thing by the inflection and lack of inflection they put into that. Of course hymn reading is a great art and accomplishment, but it can be acquired by earnest effort.

In general, I think there are two ways to deal with hymns. One is to announce the number, with possibly the first stanza well read, and say nothing more about "We will sing without further lining." If

you stop they will know there is no further lining, and you do not need to tell them that. But do you know how common that is getting to be among us? I hardly remember an announcement in the camp-meetings I have attended without that little appendage.

C. V. SORENSON: That has always been among us, hasn't it, from the days when the people did not have hymn books?

A. G. DANIELLS: I do not remember that it was. At least, I never learned it.

C. L. TAYLOR: I never heard it till the last ten years.

W. W. PRESCOTT: There is another phrase that I hear in every meeting that I wish we could avoid, and that is, "Let us open the worship by the use of such and such a hymn," or "Let us begin the worship of God by the use of hymn No. so-and-so." Why can't we say "Let us sing hymn No. so-and-so." Another thing that distresses me at times is to see somebody sawing the air before a small audience, not leading the singing, but simply sawing the air. I wish we could avoid that.

F. M. WILCOX: You do not object to beating time properly?

W. W. PRESCOTT: Yes, I do. Why is it necessary for somebody to get up before a small company and wave his arms?

A. G. DANIELLS: The majority of other churches do not allow it.

W. W. PRESCOTT: When you have a large meeting of two or three thousand people, and have a choir of a hundred or so members, I do not object to having a good leader; but I do object to a person getting up before a small company of people and trying to lead. It is more like a circus, absolutely disgusting before a nice audience of people.

M. E. KERN: If our people that play the instruments are properly instructed, it is not necessary.

A. G. DANIELLS: They can lead with the instrument.

M. E. KERN: I never saw the time when Professor Hamer was playing which it was necessary to have a leader of music.

W. K. PRESCOTT: I would rather see a General Conference resolution passed absolutely forbidding any leader appearing before any congregation than to go on as we are going.

A. G. DANIELLS: Really, I have been so tried that I have been thinking that we ought to take General Conference Committee action ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ on this question. I think we could take out nine-tenths of our stick-waving and have just as good music in our churches and our tent-meetings.

You will understand that in conducting a series of ministers' meetings, we begin on the great major problems, and at the end get at these minor matters, because they are minor compared with a man's devotion and sincerity and scholarship and all that, ~~xxxxxxx~~ but I think you wanted me to point out some things where you could go right at them and work up to the point of instructing these boys. These are things that should be kept before their minds day after day. I would go through these things with them: I would have hymn announcing, and I would have platform manners. I would watch them closely and see if my teaching was really gripping them, and whether they were falling into habits as they should.

M. E. KERN: I want to know if, in admitting people into the church or dismissing them after a church committee has considered it, it is necessary to turn the morning service into a parliamentary meeting and wait for a motion.

A. G. DANIELLS: Not a bit.

W. W. PRESCOTT: I have adopted the plan of speaking the name of the individual who is to be added or dropped, and then saying, "If there is no objection, they are received as members of the church," or "they are dropped," as the case may be.

O. M. JOHN: What is the suitable length of time for a service?

A. C. DANIELLS: It depends on the preacher,--30 minutes for some, and an hour and a half for others. I suppose an hour is long enough, including the song, announcements, and sermon. But 30 minutes is plenty for some people, on some occasions. And sometimes people can sit an hour and a half when I give a talk on foreign missions,--at least, they have to.

Adjourned.

THE APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF HISTORIC METHOD
TO OUR OWN TEACHING WORK

By

PROF. C. L. BENSON

I have enjoyed very much the talk that Brother Albertsworth has just given us. I feel that it is well for us to get together as teachers to consider this research work,--the importance of it, and how it can be done. I have thought for a long time that the weakest place in our denomination, if we are attacked, is not in our biblical side,--although some feel that that is not as strong as it should be,--but I feel that if the world should attempt to attack us on our historical side, they would riddle us. We would look worse than some of those buildings over in France. I feel that this is a subject that merits attention. We are training students for leadership in this denomination, and yet how often the examples set before them are anything but complimentary to scholarship. How often in sermons we hear quotations read from newspapers without even the name of the newspaper, nor the contributor, nor the editor. We take it for granted that it is authentic.

I have even heard some speakers read from a work, and when asked who wrote it, reply that it is an anonymous work, but that a Seventh-day Adventist could not have phrased it better than it reads, How much is it worth?--Nothing.

I think that as we are training our young men and women to go out into Bible work and ministerial work, they should know how to carry on investigative work. Here we are with our splendid opportunities for these six weeks: how many of us are getting down to the Congressional Library and getting at the original sources?

I heard a professor in an outside university say that he had attended a series of our lectures once, and he said, "I never heard such a hodgepodge of history in my life," and it made my ears burn with shame. His conclusion was that our entire message was on the same basis as our historical interpretation. But is that the basis upon which our message rests? ~~Exxns~~ simply the historical research? Do we take the tradition of the fathers, or do we get back to the sources? When you study the Bible, you have the sources, haven't you? Those are the words, as near as we can get them, considering the faulty translation, and this historical criticism ~~X~~ is what has placed in our hands the Bible. There is an abundance of other ~~fxm~~ material, but it was placed aside because it could not stand the test of external and internal criticism.

We have been prone to say that this historical method belongs to higher criticism. Are we willing to let them have it just because it may be prostituted or used in wrong lines?

C. M. SORENSON: That term "higher criticism" is such an obnoxious term.

C. L. BENSON: I will simply say this: the popular term, I think, is a misconception. We are prone to consider it as something that is heterodox. I have talked with different ones, and that is their consensus of opinion.

C. M. SORENSON: Some people think it is destructive; but it is a valuable science that has made clear to us our Bible.

C. L. BENSON: We are studying the sources in our Bible class when we base our study of the doctrines upon the word of God. When it comes to history, what a different field we have to use! You can see something of the difficulties from what Brother Albertsworth told us. Is it possible for a man like Redpath to exhaust the

sources?--No, a man cannot do it.

I feel that in our study of history, we should, as far as we can, study the sources. We can not do this to any great extent, and yet we can on certain periods, and I feel that we should do it. I feel that our students should demand it, that we owe it to ourselves and to our denomination.

Ought we not to make more use of our papers and testimonies and biographies of ~~this~~ the beginning of this movement. Recently there fell into my hands a challenge to this denomination on the question of the "shut door." This man gave sufficient evidence to prove to most people that Sister White did preach the shut door. The only way that we can prove that the pioneers of this movement did not preach the shut door after 1844 is to get back into our papers and pamphlets and other material for that time. Those are the sources from which you can prove or disprove these statements that are being put out. We may make assertions, but that does not prove it.

Again, take what was brought up here on the floor the other day, the dark day. We placed in the earlier editions of "Great Controversy" the statement that there were not any clouds in the sky. And then, because a newspaper article was sent in, we flopped over and took another position. Men in the same town advanced different theories. What right have Seventh-day Adventists to go and change a work like "Great Controversy" merely because some one newspaper makes certain assertions, when we have never exhausted the field?

There should be three classes of sources available for that dark day: One is the newspapers. But are we willing to take the newspapers today as reliable? I got a letter from Nebraska which indicates that the newspapers there gave the impression that it was

almost as dangerous here in Washington during the recent race-riots as it was over on the Marne during the war. We have the newspapers and we have the pamphlets. We have the memoirs, and perhaps diaries written at that time. Until we, as a people, have investigated those different sources, we are not in a position to say very much about the dark day. Would it help the consensus of opinion on the king of the north for one man to get up here and give an appraisal of what was said here in this convention on that subject? Would you want to be set forth in his light? I think we owe it to our students to get down to close research work on this.

How long has our headquarters been located here, and how much have we done in placing such matter in the hands of our teachers? I say, we have our general workers here, and how much are we doing to place in the hands of our Bible and history teachers the source material that we emphasize as much as we do?

W. E. HOWELL: May I put that same question the other way, How much have our Bible and history teachers done by way of getting that material located, and sending it to us to be sent out to others?

C. A. SHULL: What source material is available to us teachers out away from the big libraries?

C. L. BENSON: There are sources in the Congressional Library that, outside of one or two universities in the country, do not exist. We must recognize the fact that these bibliographies have been collected at a great deal of expense, and you can see the futility of one of our isolated schools, where we have only a few books, trying to do extensive work along research lines. The first year I went to Union College, we had \$7 for our library appropriation. It is impossible for our school men to do very much work of this kind until we come in contact with the sources. I think there

should be source studies used in our classes. There is an excellent collection on Mediaeval Europe, on the French Revolution, and a collection on English history and American history, where they give from ten to twenty sources where you have a number of witnesses, and you can bring those out and determine the evidence in a way that you can not when dealing with only one man.

~~for years~~
I have wished that we could get to a place where, on the critical periods of denominational history, we could have the source material and have it in the hands of our Bible and history teachers. I believe the money spent in accumulating those documents would be money well spent. We are continually sending out statements that are hard to agree on, and if we would check up by some historians, we would find it very embarrassing. If some people should get hold of these things, it might keep them from accepting the truth.

I have a little work here where I have tried to do this very thing in connection with the persecutions of the first three centuries. I have eighteen sources that I spent years on. I have spent four years in trying to get sources on the dividing up of Alexander's empire. I thought it would be easy to find, but I have found it very difficult. It is difficult to find a bibliography, in the first place; and after you have found it, the difficulty is to get access to the books. Then you want to know where the book was written, when it was written, the critical ability of the writer, his ability to write in an impartial manner, and there are other things that you must take into consideration. I just long for our denomination to do that. I believe it rests in a large way on the history and Bible teachers to do this sort of thing. I think we ought to teach the history method. There are works in English. Of course the method originated in Germany, and France has

done a great deal along this line. A little book that would be very helpful is gotten out by Dr. _____ of the University of Nebraska. He quotes from these sources. It is a work that would be very valuable and beneficial to each one of you. You could get it for fifty cents a short time ago. I do not know whether the price has been changed or not. That tells you how to find sources, how to determine the genuineness of a source by external and internal criticism,--the thing that was done on the books of the Bible before they were put in.

This work requires brain fag, and a great deal of it. We owe it to ourselves and to our students to do it. For the last two years I was at Union I gave, in a very limited way, a course in historical method. We can make a start, at least.

We should assign subjects for papers, and then try to get year by year sources dealing with those subjects,--not scattering all over the world, but getting subjects pertinent to our work. Then we could do some of this historical method research work.

I have longed for quite a time that our Bible and history teachers might have opportunity to do more research work. Each one should take some particular period and then pass on to the others the result of his work. It should be submitted to others. Many of you may have most valuable information that I would be most delighted to get, but you keep it; and what little I have gotten, I have kept. I think we ought to be more brotherly. I wish we could form some sort of a society in order to stimulate ourselves to more good works.

It seems to me that in producing our texts we might make a start on some lines of history. I do not care if you do get a denominational history, you have not exhausted all the material. I hope we may delay the day when we begin on a general history, or on American history.

I think certain history teachers should study certain periods and work up monographs, using all the available material, and then sending these monographs out to the other institutions. If we, as school men, are unable to get into this source study, and real critical work, how can we expect our men out in the field to do it? And many of our men are in the field. I want to ask you, Where is the material that today is flooding our papers coming from? I think it is a shame that our school men are really lying down on the job, and all of our articles on historical lines are written out in the field, and they have had a lot of courage to write as they have. But as Bible and history teachers, how much have we contributed. If we had only one source, why could we not dish that out, and then take source number 2, and then number 3.

I do not think we should present the prophecies in the same old way. I am not trying to cast any stones, but some preach the same sermon, using the same texts and the same illustrations and the same outline that they used twenty years ago. If we go into this historical method, and apply it, we can produce something in the way of books, tracts, and monographs for our schools that will be a real help to our teachers, to our students, and to our brethren in the field.

HISTORICAL METHOD

By

1281

E. F. Albertsworth

I am sorry I do not have this data placed in written form in the way of a paper, but I have not had time to do that, having been away yesterday and Friday afternoon; and then again, the field is so vast that if I commenced to write a paper on it, I suppose I would be writing on it for several weeks, if not months; and of course our time is too limited for that. So I have gathered here some material that I have used myself in working out some research work, and also some that I have received in the course of instruction in graduate work that I have done.

I might say that historical method is really a new subject in this country. We find very few universities in this land that give any courses on historical method. We have some graduate courses in the way of seminars given on what is called historiography, and bibliography. Columbia, Harvard, Chicago, and some of the larger schools have given such courses. They have been imported, so to speak, from France in the last five or ten years. Of course there have been private consultations with heads of history departments who have given their results in historical method, but in the way of giving actual courses on that, very little has been done. Some of my material has been taken from courses I have had in historiography.

I am convinced more and more that we ought to give courses in historical method in our own colleges. I think something has been done here this year by Professor Sorenson, and graduate credit has been given for it. But I believe such a vital topic ought to be given more consideration, especially by our advanced students.

There is a very excellent article in the Revue Critique, of 1887, Vol. I, page 376. This is a French publication on historical subjects. This author says:

"History is not so easy a study as many fondly imagine. It has points of contact with all the sciences, and the historian truly worthy of the name ought to know everything. Historical certitude is unattainable. In order to make the nearest approach to it, it is necessary to know and use the best modern historians, but never to take their word for gospel. That is all."

It seems to me that that pithy little statement sums up, to some extent, the modern attitude on this subject. Historical certitude is unattainable. We must deal with original sources. Frankly, I believe we need some work in historical method from the way I have heard men here quote old out-of-date works like Ridpath and Rollins, and, to some extent, Gibbons, who lived a hundred years ago, who has been surpassed by Findlay on Byzantine history, so I think this topic is timely.

The sources of my topic from which I have drawn this material are found perhaps in these works you may be interested in.

Bernheim, as a pioneer in this work. He wrote "Lehrbuch der Historischen Methode," a work on historical method. All the books in this country that I have been able to see, go back to Bernheim.

Monod, "Sources sur le histoire de France." He has a good deal to say along these lines.

Langlois, "Manuel de Bibliographie Historique," manual of historical Bibliography. This is used as a basis of all the work that is given in universities in this country. It is a two-volume French work published in Paris. I could not find it in the Congressional Library, and had to send over there for it.

There are articles in the "Jahresberichte der Geschichtswissenschaft," the only report of historical knowledge published since 1889. 1283

Each one of these annual reports usually has an article on historiography that has been developed the previous year.

Then the "Grande Encyclopedie," Tome XX, has a very fine article entitled "La Science de l'histoire," by MMS. Ch. and V. Mortet.

Then there are English works that we refer students to:

"Introduction to the Study of History," by Langlois, and "Historical Research," by Vincent. But Vincent also goes back to Bernheim and has additional material. He told me this himself. He is a Johns Hopkins teacher of mediaeval and modern history.

Fling, of Nebraska, wrote "Methods in History." I think he also goes back to Bernheim.

Vincent's "Historical Research" is a nice little work, dealing especially with coins, monuments, diplomatics, and methods of historical research in general.

Another work we use to a great extent is a work by Gooch entitled "History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century." This deals only with the writers of history in the nineteenth century. It surpasses Adams, however, which I have heard quoted here. Adams is an old-time work, 1882, that we do not use any more. It is good as a sort of curio (an elementary sort of production). It does not come up to the later work that has been done on the subject.

A work setting forth the newer tendencies in historical method and research, is that by Robinson, entitled "The New History."

Additional works on historical method in English are appearing occasionally. There is one now being prepared by George L. Burr, of Cornell.

It may be interesting to know that before the 19th century, only two works on historical method as such appeared. These were one by Fresnoy, on "Methode pour etudier l'histoire," Paris, 1713; and the other by Chladenius, *Allgemeine Geschichtswissenschaft*, Leipzig, 1752.

First let me proceed with my first main division of this topic, that is, The History of Historical Writing. I shall have only a few moments to give to this feature, when, as a matter of fact several months could profitably be spent on this phase alone.

We all know that history has had a history, and history writing has had a history. There is an enormous amount of data on that subject. Mr. Huth of Chicago has given some excellent work on the Greek and Roman period. He starts in with the epics, how they were first germs of historical writing. Their evidence was largely genealogical and geographical, concerning themselves with the exploits of the mythical Hercules and other gods. From 850 B. C. to 600, the area of colonization, we have developing the geographical or topographical epics. These describe customs and practices and social institutions. Next we come to the logographoi, who are semi-historians in that they are the first men to break away from the epic; they eliminate the genealogical, they criticize and philosophize on environmental problems. They are prose writers, and systematize and codify knowledge. Of these the greatest was Hecataeus, of Miletus. (If any one would like to go in detail into this feature, he may consult with profit the work by Bury, "The Great Greek Historians." Of course more profound works are in other languages.)

Then we come to what some of us have called a historian, Herodotus, who writes down to 425 B. C., just up to the Peloponnesian War. In fact, there were no real historians before his time, that we have any record of. There were hardly any records kept. If there were any, they were largely political. But after the ~~Ξελαπεκκασιακ~~ Persian wars there came a change and the Greeks took a greater interest in their own past. Herodotus was the first man who wrote under this influence. We find that men wrote under certain influences. Their theories are colored with their environmental influences. Herodotus writes history just at this time, when the Greeks commenced to take an interest in the past. Compared with modern scientific history, Herodotus did not tell the truth; but it is remarkable that in his environment he is of some worth. He is against the genealogical treatises, against the logographoi. He has no prejudices, except a bias for Athens and Helicarnassus. He deals sympathetically with the Persians and their institutions. Later Greek historians are absolutely biased, but Herodotus recognizes the origin of Greek institutions among other races. He seems to have been honest, told credulous tales with great simplicity. A French scholar in late years has shown Herodotus in a more impartial light. As ^{far as} ~~far~~ his personal investigation went, he was a faithful narrator and ~~an~~ empiricist. Herodotus' methods of criticism were, on the whole, fairly commendable. For instance, he tends to believe that account which was nearest to the fact. Again, in case of doubt he will give both views. His philosophy of history is the working out of the principle of Fate, which guides and controls human affairs. This is remarkable, too, because the age in which Herodotus wrote was one largely dominated by the conceptions of evolution and natural law. He uses largely narration, and not the chronographic style. He wrote for pleasure largely, and not for

science. The Greeks called it akouemata, Things to be heard and enjoyed, but not to be taken seriously. That is more or less familiar to us as history teachers and Bible teachers, although it is unfortunate that many persons among us still take Herodotus' account rather than that given by the latest sources that have been unearthed by archaeologists in recent times on those very periods of history with which Herodotus deals. A case in point is the taking of Babylon by Cyrus, but I need not go into that. Historical writing was largely an art till the nineteenth century, and then it became a science.

After Herodotus, the next person of any consequence is Thucydides. Of course he is really a scientific modern historian, to some extent. He has certain principles that have come down to us of judging the value of historical works. He says the criterion must be truth. We cannot believe any one till we get the facts. Further, we must get a contemporary account. Again, we must find the official documents (although von Ranke later decried the extensive use of such material for absolute fact, as even the writers of official documents may have written them for a purpose). We must get at the causes of any historical change or development, and Thucydides says that these are natural ones, and not some metaphysical ones, as Herodotus made them. Contemporary history is largely based on this conception in its philosophy of history. We must not build upon authority, according to Thucydides. A short criticism of Thucydides is in point here. He deals largely with military and political matters, and ignores the economic. He is really a political scientist instead of a historian. He deals largely with the Athenian Empire in international affairs. He shows a lack of appreciation of the past, and only sketches many important events. But

his attitude against tradition and mythology is very valuable. His first book is really a kulturgeschichte, a history of civilization of the Greeks. His accuracy and good faith are not questioned, but he wrote under an antidemocratic bias. He frequently makes use of speeches to enliven the style and to recreate the environment, but sometimes these are not the real speeches themselves, only their substance. He is distinctly under the influence of the Sophists, "Man is the measure of all things." Sometimes his comments are clearly Machiavellian.

Polybius follows Thucydides. His main interests are largely philosophical and rhetorical. History was in the background. His emphasis was largely on form and not on content. He aimed to please instead of to tell the truth.

Not to unduly prolong this division of my topic, I have time only for brief mention of succeeding Greek writers on history. Xenophon is the best known of any Greek historians except Herodotus. (The best translation is that by Daknys.) He deals with the march of the 10,000 Greeks into Persia--some of us who have had to read it in Greek will remember that work--in the Anabasis, and then in the Cyropaedia ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ he gives us an historical novel setting forth Spartan military ideals, certain educational theories, and political philosophy. His work, which comes nearest to history, is Hellenica, which is a continuation of Thucydides. (Loeb is getting out a translation of Latin and Greek and Patristic.) ~~Xen~~ Xenophon's "Memorabilia" is a defence of Socrates' teaching against the charge of immoral criticism. Xenophon also wrote a work entitled "Aeconomica" a sketch of farming and house industry. He also wrote on horseracing, ~~xxxxxxxx~~ riding, raising of hounds, and other related topics,--showing the extent of the work of so-called historians.

Following these better known men, we have a number of lesser lights who endeavored to write on historical topics. Theopompus, who lived up to Alexander's time, wrote a work on the History of Greece after the Peloponnesian War, and also 58 books on Macedonia. He posed as a critical historian, he attempted to get at the motives of men, and he was a great deal interested in biography. It is unfortunate that most of this work is lost, though he is often quoted. Another writer is Ephoros, who writes in the time of Philip and Alexander. He reflects the world-wide Greek activity by endeavoring to write a history of the world; but his ability cannot reach his plan. Most of his work has not come down to us. Aristotle has not much use for history. He liked poetics better, and he political science the best. He could not have written history, because of his strong national and racial feeling. In Aristotle's conception other nations must be subjugated to the Greeks, since they were the best race. This seemed natural to Aristotle when Alexander was building his world empire. Aristotle spent most of his time collecting precedents and laws. He was oligarchical and not at all democratic. Plato also has no use for history. He is too much of a dualistic philosopher, not interested in this changing world of sense experience; but deeply concerned with the unseen realities of the Eidos world.

It would be very profitable to us all if I could give here the work that has been done by modern writers on the Greek and Roman periods. An enormous amount of effort has been expended by these modern scholars. One of the best series that I could refer any one to on this whole ancient field, is the collection by Ivan Mueller, entitled "Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft." This

collection should be supplemented by information obtained from a number of journals dealing with historical topics, such as "Classical Philology," "Jahresbericht," "Historische Vierteljahresschrift," and the "Revue Historique." A large amount of material written on the papyri has been brought to light, and has found its way to the papal chancery and other places in Italy. The best work I know of for history of antiquity is the work by Eduard Meyer, which, unfortunately, has not been translated from the German. I do believe that stronger work of a more research character should be done by us in Greek history concerning the divisions of Alexander's empire.

I must now leave this interesting period of historical writing which I have only touched upon, and proceed to a sketch of historical writing in the Middle Ages. The Christian fathers are the first in the field. These men are concerned more with an interpretation or philosophy of history rather than with the problem of writing history. Eusebius wrote his "Praeparatio Evangelica" which endeavored to maintain the thesis that Roman and previous history was a preparation for Christian thinking. Augustine is influenced (and the Middle Ages is influenced by Augustine) by Eusebius, and of course by environmental conditions. To write his book "de Civitate Dei." Orosius writes under the influence of this same style of thinking in his "Seven Books against the Pagans." The influence of these men with the growth and development of the ecclesio-political organization gave a distinct mold towards ecclesiastical histories. For instance Gregory of Tours in the Merovingian days writes a universal history from a Christian point of view. The chief form of historical writing in the Middle Ages is the annalistic form, records of monks and of missionary activities. These monks peering out through their latticed windows at some battle being waged in the distance, fearing

any moment that the monastery would be subjected to assault and plunder, hastily wrote down, in the excitement of the moment, many accounts which could hardly be called history. They were men living apart from the world of men and affairs, and consequently their intellectual horizon and outlook was considerably limited. There were all sorts of these chronicles, some very ambitious, known as universal chronicles; then there were biographies, acts of the saints, polemic writings, and to some extent verse. (I suggest for more detailed study of mediaeval historical writing, that one consult Fueter, whom I mentioned in my introductory remarks; also Wattenbach, "Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen in Mittelalter;" also "Source Problems in Mediaeval History," published by the University of Wisconsin.) The Crusades stimulated historical writing to a large extent. Then there is a very famous collection called "Acta Sanctorum," compiled by the Benedictine Monks, of St. Mar Maur. It would be interesting for you to find some English account of this collection as given, for example, in the "Catholic Encyclopedia," and you would be surprised at the enormity of their undertaking, some forty or fifty volumes having been gotten out.

But I must leave the Middle Ages and say just a few words about historical work under the influence of humanism and the Renaissance. These men, living in the atmosphere of critical investigation and secularization of church life merit the name of our first modern historians. ~~Petrarch~~ Petrarch and Boccaccio wrote considerable, but their real objects were literary, primarily. Petrarch wrote a work, "Concerning Illustrious Men," in which he imitated Cicero and Virgil in their style, yet it is commendable the way in which he tackles problems alone, and without authority. Boccaccio wrote a work on "Famous Women," following the methods laid down by Petrarch.

The Florentines developed two quite famous historians, namely, Bruni and Bracchio. The former wrote "Twelve Books of Florentine Histories," and the latter wrote on general historical topics. Both of these writers followed Livy's style, bending their subject matter into a certain stylistic mold. Very little attention was given to economics, their chief interest being in wars and politics. These men are important because they write under new and different influences of political currents, notably a growing nationality, a lay organization instead of the state of God theory. There were certain historical schools outside of Florence, within Italy, notably at Venice and Naples. I refer now to Lorenzo Valla, Machiavelli, and Guicciardini. You will recall that Valla exploded the Donation of Constantine, and seriously punctured other pet theories of the Catholic church. And Machiavelli of course is well known to us for his political philosophy, wherein force and intrigue make right. Of course we must judge him from the standpoint of his day, when Italy was torn apart by a number of competing jealous little states, lacking a strong central power. Then there were certain writers on the history of the papacy with whom I cannot deal for lack of time; and there were some historical works outside of Italy.

The upheavals of the Protestant Reformation engendered a large amount of partisan historical writing, notably "The Magdeburg Centuries," edited by the Protestants; and the work in reply by Baronius, namely his "Annals." (Casaubon has shown that Baronius' work is a great stack of cards, having very little worth.) Of course from now on for several hundred years the dominant interest in writing history was ecclesiastical, so that Goethe said, "The Reformation stopped European advance for one hundred years." (You will find this in Gooch, "History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century.")

It may be interesting to know that Fox's "Book of Martyrs" was inspired by the "Magdeburg Centuries." Of course the Council of Trent stimulated further partisan historical outputs on both sides, but all of this I can not enter into here.

I wish I had the time to deal with historical work under the influence of the new discoveries, but this is impossible. I refer you to Fueter and to Bernheim. Likewise, it will be impossible to deal with historical work during the period of the Hundred Years' War, when a vast amount of historical writing took place, especially concerning England, France, Scotland, and the Low Countries; nor will I have time to develop in detail an account of historical writing under the Rationalistic influence, or under the French Revolution, when Romanticism, Nationalism, and Individualism were dominant. Langlois, in his French work, in the second volume, has a good deal to say about this period. It will also be impossible for me at this time to say anything more than brief mention about the German ~~historiographical~~ historiographical development, beginning with Niebuhr, Ranke, Droysen, Sybel, von Treitschke, Schmoller, Lamprecht, and a host of other historians. These men, particularly Ranke, have done the most to create our modern historical method and criticism.

Of course I have neglected entirely to say anything about the ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ important field of English and American history.

I am convinced that the history of historical writing should be carefully studied, in order to see how we have come to be as we are at present, to see the mistakes that men have made, see the difficulties they have undergone, to see the sources on which they built, and so on. We could spend profitably many months on that alone, but those works I have mentioned will give that.

But that is merely a superficial way. We want to get at a more solid basis, so I have here a number of methods by means of which we can find this out. Of course I do not decry these ordinary methods ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ of referring students to these works that I have mentioned. Of course we find many excellent things there; but that is not as scientific, perhaps.

But that is merely a superficial way. We want to get at a more solid basis, so I have here a number of methods by means of which we can find this out. Of course I do not decry these ordinary methods ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ of referring students to these works that I have mentioned. Of course we find many excellent things there; but that is not as scientific, perhaps.

First, there are bibliographies for the original sources, an enormous number of them. They are of various sorts: 1. Archives. For Germany the work by Burkhardt entitled, "Hand und Adressbuch der deutschen Archive im Gebiete des deutschen Reiches, Luxemburgs, Oesterreich-Ungarns, der russischen Ostseeprovinzen und der deutschen Schweiz." For England the work by W. Rye, entitled, "Records and Record Searching. For United States, the work by ~~Ernest~~ Burnett, "A List of Printed Guides to and Descriptions of Archives and Other Repositories of Historical Manuscripts." (You will find this in the 1898 report of the American Historical Association, reporting on the historical manuscripts.) For France, the work by Langlois and Stein, entitled "Les archives de l'histoire de France." I might give similar works for Russia, Italy, and other countries, but time does not permit. 2. Libraries. The book by Gootlieb, "Ueber mittelalterliche Bibliotheken," is a good guide. For the countries of France, the Netherlands, Scandinavia, Spain, and Portugal, one should consult "Le Cabinet Historique." Also an important work is "Le Centralblatt fur Bibliothekswesen." Here again I must abbreviate for lack of time. 3. Museums. For England "Guide to the British Museum." For America, "Catalog of the Congressional Library." For France, the work by Reinach, entitled "Revue internationale des Archives, des Bibliothèques et des Musées." I would refer you to the French work by Langlois for detailed investigation of this topic. 4. Documents. This section deals with collections of books on how to find and where to find the various documents. These may be of a literary and non-literary character, and they may be edited or inedited, and lastly, printed or not printed. I refer you to Oesterley, "Wegweiser durch die Litteratur der Urkundensammlungen." Also a similar volume by Pothast. Wattenbach has a work called

"Deutschland's Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter." Also a similar work by Molinier, entitled ~~xxxs~~ "Les Sources de l'Histoire de France." Now we might multiply works if we gave them according to countries, sections of the country, and periods of history. This would be an ~~enorm~~ enormous task. We might also give them on the Scriptures and the various problems in historical ways connected with them. I ought to mention here that Wachsmuth has written a fine work entitled "Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte," which serves as a guide to the sources of the ancient world. Again, I must refer you for details on this fourth section to Langlois, especially pages 77-115. I should add here by all means, however, the publication of the learned world, entitled "Minerva," of which some 25 volumes have already been published & in as many years. Then there are the publications of the Carnegie Institute, which are valuable for finding material.

Let me restate, together up the train of thought, that we are now dealing with how to find the sources. The second division of this sub-topic is current works on the sources, comments upon them, and their validity. For this we should search the journals published under four general heads. 1. Work done by governments or under public authority in the various countries of the world. I do not have time to mention them, because it is so enormous. 2. There is an enormous amount of work done under academies and learned societies. 3. Universities and schools. 4. Private initiative. Students have difficulty using this material, because it is mostly in foreign languages; and when he uses the references which we do give him in English in the rear of the standard works on history, he finds no comments upon the reliability of the sources there mentioned. But these current works mentioned in this paragraph do have

comments. We have said a good deal about Pachrymenes as a source of Gibbon. Now who was Pachrymenes? It would be interesting to look up this man and see to what extent he is reliable, what means he had of getting at facts, whether he was sincere, whether he had a bias, etc.

Now let me add a few more suggestions in the way of handmaids to historical investigation. There are universal bibliographies published by the Bibliographical Institute of Brussels, which comment upon the various bibliographies in existence. Then there are the universal bibliographies of selected works, and enormous catalogs of libraries and museums, as well as special ~~xxx~~ groups of universal bibliographies; and then these very fine national bibliographies in French, German, Italian and Russian. You can look up different writers in that.

In order to keep in touch with this, you ought to have nearly all these journals on historical writing.

The next point I wish to take up is, how to evaluate a source after we have found it. Here let me say that there is a sort of natural tendency to trust documents. Many think because they find something in print it must be true. We have that always to guard against. Authors may have lied, or they may have been mistaken. The first thing that causes us to distrust a document is its contradiction. Even here, we are inclined to reason something like this, that the author was a witness to the event; he was sincere; he was well informed; he was trustworthy. Hence, even if there are contradictions, we will ignore them. But you must go a little deeper than that. Some historical method writer says we must distrust every statement of an author. But it is difficult to overcome instinct

and separate documents into sheep and goats, good and bad.

Here is a further fact: Authenticity refers only to the origin of a document, not to its content; and yet when we get the origin of a document settled, a great degree of respect is inspired unduly, and so we accept unhesitatingly the statements ^{of} the writer, without discussion. We sometimes trust the ascertained sincerity of a writer rather than his facts. We say he was sincere, therefore we will take his statement.

Again, we are led astray by the superabundance of ~~xxxxxxxx~~ detail. We say, He must know, for he has given all these details. Of course these are all ordinary methods, which must be discounted.

How shall we determine the reliability of a source? Let me divide this into two sections: 1. What are the tests to determine whether the author is sincere? 2. Was he accurate.

First, as to whether he was sincere: a. The author sought to gain a practical advantage for himself, or to persuade or dissuade somebody. In other words, the author had an interest when he wrote, a personal interest or a collective interest, such as religious party or pride, or some similar influence. Even though you get your source, you must find out how it was developed. The author may have had some advantage to serve. b. The author might have been placed in a situation which compelled him to violate truth. Some of the statements of the popes, or some of the histories of the Caesars, might be typical examples. c. He might have had a general bias. He might have been religious, or he might have been philosophical, or he might have been doctrinal. For years we have taken ~~xx~~ D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation." I do not suppose any writer was under a greater bias than D'Aubigne. We do not see him quoted so much any more. d. He was induced by private or collective

vanity to play his great part in popular affairs. e. The author desires to please the public or at least to avoid shocking it. Sometimes the great humility of the popes would be a good example of that. Of course there are all sorts of publics to be pleased, not with varying degrees of morality. F f. If he endeavored to please the public by literary methods, his aesthetic notions embellishing his facts. Rhetorical distortion, or ascribing noble words to his characters. Epic distortion, describing things he never saw or heard of. Giving picturesque details. Dramatic distortion. Of this latter Herodotus and writers on the Renaissance are examples. Lyrical distortion, or exaggerating the intensity of the emotions of the person whom he is writing about.

Here is a good statement in the ~~Maxim~~ Revue Critique: "The more interesting a statement is from the artistic point of view, the more it ought to be suspected from the factual point of view." The works of Aristophanes have been shown by modern scholarship to have lacked good faith.

So much for the principles of determining good faith. Now the second division, distrusting the accuracy of a statement. Since facts are based on observation, we must see what factors influenced the observation. First, the author was in a situation to observe the fact, and supposed he had observed it, but was prevented from doing so by some interior forces of which he was unconscious, as some prejudice. The only way we can be sure to see whether he was influenced by some of these unconscious forces is to search the life of the author and his works, and see whether he had any preconceived ideas on a class of men or kind of facts. That, of course, takes time.

Second, the author was badly situated for observing. He had some practical interest. He had some desire to obtain a particular result, or he had these preconceived ideas about the result. Examples of this would be as when a subordinate presumed to narrate secret deliberations or a council of dignitaries; or when his attention was distracted by necessity, as on the field of battle; or whether he was inattentive because the facts had little interest for him. Again, whether he lacked a special experience or general intelligence necessary for understanding the facts. When a person quotes the early church fathers for history, he is getting into difficulty. You can not take those things as history in many cases because they were biased, influenced by general currents of thought. Whether he analyzed his impressions badly or confused different events. When did he write down what he did? The only exact observation is one that is recorded immediately when it is made. Memoirs written years after are not to be trusted. (I have found that out to my sorrow many times. In my writing on the history of the edict of Nantes, I got hold of scores of memoirs written by men of that time. After I had used them, I found they had been written fifty or sixty years after the events they narrated had taken place. They looked back on those scenes with a great degree of emphasis on many things not of any value.) Memoirs are in many cases second-hand material, though of course not in all.

Third, the author states facts which he should have observed, ^{to} but which he did not take the trouble to attend. ~~And~~ This occurs usually where the author was obliged to procure information in which he took little interest, in order to fill up a blank gap, or in the case of detailed accounts of public functions, etc., just like reporters' accounts of our meetings which they have never at-

So far we have dealt with the supposition that the author witnessed the fact, personally, and have tested his good faith and his accuracy; but most observation is indirect. We should get at the source which the writer used. But then you get into difficulty with anonymous sources. Here is a writer in the 16th century, who writes on the massacre of _____, 1562, which was one small event precipitating the French Huguenot Wars. He wrote at that time, and he described the massacre of _____. He says the ~~Re~~ Protestants violated a legal prohibition against holding meetings in walled towns. Where did he get that information? He was not there. You must find out where he got his information. And the person who supplied him with that knowledge,--how did he get it? Some Protestants say the Huguenots were violating that legal prohibition not to hold meetings in a walled town. _____ was a walled town, and they were holding meetings there. Wherefore, they had a right to punish them. Some Catholics say they were not holding meetings inside the walled town, but in the suburbs, where at that time they had the privilege of holding meetings. Where you have a dispute. There are all sorts of tests for that.

So far we have dealt with the supposition that the author witnessed the fact, personally, and have tested his good faith and his accuracy; but most observation is indirect. We should get at the source which the writer used. But then you get into difficulty with anonymous sources. Here is a writer in the 16th century, who writes on the massacre of _____, 1562, which was one small event precipitating the French Huguenot Wars. He wrote at that time, and he described the massacre of _____. He says the ~~Re~~ Protestants violated a legal prohibition against holding meetings in walled towns. Where did he get that information? He was not there. You must find out where he got his information. And the person who supplied him with that knowledge,--how did he get it? Some Protestants say the Huguenots were violating that legal prohibition not to hold meetings in a walled town. _____ was a walled town, and they were holding meetings there. Wherefore, they had a right to punish them. Some Catholics say they were not holding meetings inside the walled town, but in the suburbs, where at that time they had the privilege of holding meetings. Where you have a dispute. There are all sorts of tests for that.

where is one section that I want to close this study with, and that is, How to find material for current history. There is some very excellent material on that in The Information Quarterly, which is published monthly, and trimonthly, occasionally. I have all the addresses here, in case any one would like to get this material:

The American Year-book, The Public Affairs Information Service, the Index to Dates, The Book Review Digest, the French Bibliography of Foreign-Speaking Journals, bibliographies in the German, American Library Annual, Carnegie publications, learned societies, New York Times Index, the official yearbook of the scientific and learned societies of Great Britain and Ireland (31 annual copies have been published so far), and then there are monographs on all the important periods.

Really, there is enough material here in the way of historical method for a year's course, very profitably; and there is so much that I can not give it to you in the fashion I would like to. I have simply given you a few of these tools and methods that we must use to get at actual sources. It seems to me we face a great many problems which ~~must be solved~~ in order to be solved must be approached from this standpoint,--absolute scientific method, getting at the sources, evaluating, keeping in touch with the new ones as they come out,--and by such measures developing historical research methods.

F. F. HOWELL: ~~As~~ To what extent do you think teachers of history can reach original sources in any subject they are investigating,--reach it themselves,--and to what extent may they safely rely upon others who are still greater specialists in that line for reaching sources in running down some matter?

E. F. ALBERTEWORTH: It seems to me the greatest handicap among all of us is the proper use of historical method. Where are we going to go to find materials? That handicaps me all the time. I have some data that I consult, but it is still hazy in my mind. I can use it only partially. Then the second great handicap is the auxiliary sciences that most of us do not possess, and that is the language equipment. For instance, there is that famous work by _____, and works of the fathers and the popes, all in Latin; and it is not only Latin, but mediaeval Latin, which is worse yet. And here is that fine collection of 21 volumes by _____, ^{mediaeval} on the ancient laws of France; but that is all in French, very very difficult to read. There are two great difficulties, our lack of this language equipment and where to find the material. I believe, Brother Chairman, as our cause grows and as we are continually facing the world, we will have to have some specialists set apart and send them to Europe, where they can get into touch with these great archives, where they can master those things and dig out this material.

W. E. HOWELL: One of the most scholarly works that we have in our denominational publications was worked out in that way. Our first personal missionary to Europe was one of our best investigators in the history of the Sabbath. He got some of his most valuable material after he went across the water. He set a very worthy example to our history teachers.

E. F. ALBERTEWORTH: I think it would be an excellent scheme if our Bible and History teachers could be sent abroad occasionally. I will throw this in as a suggestion. I have talked with different General Conference brethren, and they favor it.

C. M. SORENSON: I move that we let the Chairman prepare to take us the history and Bible teachers on a tour of Rome, Greece, Palestine, and some of those other historic places two years hence.

(This motion was instantly seconded, and was carried unanimously and enthusiastically.)

H. W. ALBERTSWORTH: I think it would be well if we could get out to some of our larger mission fields and get a broader vision. As I look at it, the history and Bible teachers are the most responsible teachers among us. I feel deeply about this matter of sending us men (I do not know that I would be included in it, but might go any way, personally)--sending them over there and letting them get right into contact with these great historic ~~xxxxxxxx~~ records and monuments.

C. M. SORENSON: That is the best kind of a graduate course. That is due us next.

W. E. HOWELL: I feel that even this brief presentation has made a very strong impression on my mind. I think it would help us in many ways to take into consideration some of these principles of investigation. I think our cause has reached a stage where we can do anything--any right and reasonable thing--so far as time and money is concerned, that will really promote the interests of the responsible work we are doing. I have felt for a good while that our teachers,--especially in these two departments, where we have so much to do with the molding of our young people and our future leaders,--have had to do their work too much in a corner, and a pretty small corner, too. Of course I recognize that there are dangers as well as privileges connected with our pursuing learned research, but if we have not learned to avoid the dangers and pursue the legitimate, it is the wrong time now to learn it.