



**{ TWO DOLLARS PER YEAR, }**      **NO. 13.**  
Payable in Advance.

Jay, my son of 1960 was a tall, dark, handsome young man.



Written for the Banner of Light.

## ANCIENT GLIMPSES OF THE SPIRIT-LAND.

NUMBER ONE.

The realms of mystery appear ever to have been in that odyssey or spiritual aura which skirts the horizon of the senses, and marks the boundaries of the mundane and transmundane worlds. We propose to sketch in outline its mode of being as manifest among the ancient of days. There was a basis of truth within the veil of those old mysteries, though overlaid in outgrowth with weeds of rank luxuriance, where craft and ignorance took refuge, and wrought their grosser superstitions.

The ancients had their double-faced religions—Esoteric, or inner, for the initiated—Exoteric, or outer, for the people. The inner culminated in one undivided Supreme Spiritual Principle, or God, in whom we live, move, and have our being—the outer, in all that flows of surface-worship which marks the status of the uninitiated mind. We shall deal only with that ancient phase that finds its counterpart in the present day. We shall sketch those symptoms of the magnetic or spiritual aura whose current is fast flowing into the domain of science and theology, despite all their efforts to avoid its course. To know the law and condition of these things, it were well to be acquainted with the earlier and later days of animal magnetism. The researches of the late Dr. Gregory, of Edinburgh, in this direction, are probably as good as any, where direct facilities for examination cannot be had. Sooner or later we arrive, through the search of these secret phenomena, to the spirit-world, which has dominated the religions of all time—whether manifest in the Ark of the Covenant, the Mysteries of Eleusis, or in modern revivals.

In modern spiritual philosophy, we also have the clue to the sacrificial offerings of the ancients. Blood, freshly shed, is in that esoteric state that brings it in rapport with the substrata spirit-world. Hence, too, the clue to so much of successful augury by fresh entrails. Here is the origin of all the "blood theologies" which wrought with libations of wine, the blood of bulls, and the fat of rams—nor in the earlier ages were human victims spared from immolation in these horrid rites.

The Phenicians who flanked the Jews in contiguity of neighborhood, were homicide sacrificers to Moloch; and a spirit, in the name of the Lord, did tempt Abraham to cut his son Isaac's throat, but relented, and took a ram instead; but no vicarious ram was present to save Jephthah's daughter from her father's vow.

This belief in the efficacy of bloody sacrifices was common to Jew and Gentile of cotemporary times, and there is analogy in much that Homer sings with the earlier Bible record:

"Up rose Achilles ardent, and began:  
But haste, consult me quick, some prophet here,  
Or priest, or o'en interpreter of dreams,  
(For dreams are also of Jove) that we may learn  
By what crime we have thus incensed Apollo.  
What broken vow, what broken sacrifice,  
He charges on us, and if soothed with steam  
Of lamb or goat unblemished, he may yet  
Be won to spare us, and avert the plague."

"Then to Apollo, on the shore, they slew  
Whole hecatombs of bulls and goats, whose steam  
Slowly in smoke volumes climbed the skies."

"The priest burned incense, and libations poured  
Large on the hissing brands."

And much more so nearly like the sacrifices offered to the tutelary God of Israel.

Homer also renders the ancient faith of the Greeks in a vision of Achilles, who sees the spirit of his friend Patroclus in view, according to the modern light:

"The soul came to him of his hapless friend,  
In bulk resembling, in expressive eyes,  
And voice Patroclus, and so clad as he."

"Achilles stood  
With large libations soaking deep the soil,  
And calling on the spirit of his friend."

Jove is also made to say of Hector—

"Mine altar never missed from him  
Libation, or the steam of sacrifice,  
The mood allotted to us from of old."

"In no city," (says Grote,) "of historical Greece did there prevail other human sacrifices, or deliberate mutilation—such as cutting off the nose, ears, hands, feet, etc.—or castration, or selling of children into slavery, or polygamy, or the feeling of unlimited obedience toward one man; all customs which might be pointed out as existing among the contemporary Carthaginians, Egyptians, Persians, Thracians, etc."

The dreams and visions of the Gentile world were no less divine than those recorded in our Bible. We shall see that the mesmeric trances and ecstasies were not shut from the heathen, and given as an exclusive heritage to a chosen people; yet our various ecclesiasticalisms have so narrowed the general mind as to make it readily receive that the Supreme God of the Universe was manifest to the Hebrews in a way not permitted to the Gentiles. It is time this ridiculous falsity and narrowness were set aside and truth be received.

"Wherever found—  
On Heathen as on Christian ground."

"The Progress of Religious Ideas," a work in three volumes, by Mrs. Lydia Maria Child, is a beautiful exemplification of this larger charity for the equal claims of the ancient religions—all measured by what they were, and not by the assumption of a—"Thus saith the Lord."

We propose to travel another road, whose guide-posts can be read in the light of modern spiritual discoveries. We shall endeavor to measure Hebrew and Gentile phenomena by a common rule, impartial in its bearing, where only the besotted mind will be able to see divine revelation in the one phase, and legends and stories in the other. Each one, with a Bible at hand, may trace the parallel of Hebrew and Gentile traditions; and when we see how dreams and visions make a part of the word of Israel's tutelary God, let us also see if, in this respect as in others, the nations outside the Hebrew pale, were also visited by these glimpses of a spirit-world.

Herodotus relates that Cressus "saw in his sleep a vision, menacing the calamity which afterwards deprived him of his son." Why is not this as credible as if related of Abram, Abimelech, or Pharaoh?

Cressus also sent messengers to consult the medium-priestesses at Delphi, and got a test, impossible upon the narrow basis of received formulas, but easily acceptable upon the clairvoyant or spiritual plane—nor does it differ from the word of God which has a Hebrew sanction, where it is declared that to inquire of God was to consult the seer. In the case of Cressus and the Delphian oracle, Rawlinson, in foot-note to his Herodotus, is in a strait whether to set it down as belonging to the category of money-getting or evil spirits, such as St. Paul cast out of the pythonesse, or to place it among the phenomena of mesmerism; but the law and condition of these manifestations are alike with Jew and Gentile race. Both Josephus and Philo-Judaeus regard the mode of being as the same, and speak of the possessions as of divine inspiration, and as of their tutelary God, in the same way as the Gentiles spoke of their gods. The names of lords and gods were not the exclusive names of invisible beings, but were applied to incarnate human beings, and to inanimate personifications. It is wholly unworthy of scientific research to ascribe similar phenomena to diverse causation. Evil spirits and mesmerism are as applicable to Jewish as to Gentile manifestations. In the great spiritual ocean, animal magnetism and spiritualism are parallel currents, whose mediocrity boundaries between are fluxed from either side in action correspondent to endosmosis; and the manifestations in physical, moral and intellectual scope, will be of the measure of mediocrity capabilities, and the status of the ages in which they are made, and modified by all the various educational trainings. It was reserved for this day to take these things from the domain of mystery, and reduce them to the law and order of the universe. These are the fruits of animal magnetism and spiritualism. Hereafter the priest can only traffic in the mysteries of ignorant and imbecile minds; and, though he cries Lord, Lord! he must show fruits of well-doing as the only genuine passport to salvation. The mysteries of all ages are fathomed in the researches of the imponderable world, and a "Thus saith the Lord" is worth nothing as authority; and when not in harmony with the spirit of universal love, is simply the arbitrary dictum of the spirit-giving utterance. Swedenborg, while yet in the flesh, had a considerable range of the spirit-world,

and in some of his intrusions he claims to have met the spirits who declared to him that they had engineered or inspired Moses and the prophets in the name of Jehovah, God and Lord. So, also, were the Gentile oracles in the names of their tutelary gods. Thus Hesiod—

The golden race of spirits—  
Chaste, holy and heavenward they become,  
Expelling evil, guardians of mankind."

Though this was written about a thousand years before Jesus of Nazareth, it is equivalent to St. Paul's "innumerable company of angels of the heavenly Jerusalem," and is quite a pretty counterpart of our Orthodox nursery rhymes, wherein "holy angels" are invoked to guard our beds. As early as Hesiod, Homer had written—

"In similitude of strangers, oft,  
The gods, who can with ease all shapes assume,  
Repair to populous cities."

In likewise we read how Jesus, worshipped as a God, appeared and vanished to the view of his disciples; while some, less opened in their spiritual sight, failed in the recognition and doubted of his presence.

The two worlds so infold each other, that frequently the bounds of each are passed without consciousness of change. The poet, prophet, seer, so kindred to both modes of being, find more of fancy in the things of heaven and earth not dreamt of in the formulas. In the ocean of all being—magnetic, spiritual—heaven and earth flow to each other and embrace; and the seer has visions of the Elysian Fields, the New Jerusalem, and their substrata realms. St. Paul knew not whether he was in the body or out, when he saw things transcending the power of utterance; and Epimenides, contemporary with Solon, and reckoned one of the seven wise men, was worshipped not only as a sage and spiritual purifier, but also as a poet and as a God. "Both Plato and Cicero," says Grote, "considered Epimenides in the same light in which he was regarded by his contemporaries—as a prophet divinely inspired, and foretelling the future under fits of temporary ecstasy."

"The Heathens," said Spence, "in general believed that there was but one God; but they believed in a multitude of ministers, deputies, or inferior gods, as acting under this supreme." This is the general testimony, and is equivalent to St. Paul's "ministering spirits," or angels.

That Gods, Angels, Spirits—by whatsoever names transmundane souls may be called—did often appear in human shape to the open vision of old time, was freely admitted by the ancient creeds, that all along the ages denied by some of the philosophers. The skeptical Thucydides, almost as early as Herodotus, is incredulous of the spirit history of his own and preceding time. Still, the broader current of the human mind ran to the belief, and not to the denial, of these things—doubtless powerfully aided by ignorance, priestcraft and superstition. We only claim that the Gentile Spiritual phenomena were under the same law and conditions as those which had their growth in Palestine. When Jacob sees a ghost, he claims to have seen God face to face. When Gideon sees a spirit, he exclaims to him, "Alas, oh Lord God." And when Manoah and his wife see an apparition, they too exclaim, "We shall surely die, because we have seen God;" though other parts of the same Bible declare that no man ever has, or can, see his face and live.

We shall not cite the numberless cases of prophecy and fulfillment so abundant in the Gentile records. We give but the simplest outline, that the growing mind may seize its bearings for the structure of a broader church than that which confines itself to a "Thus saith the Lord" of a single people—a people says Grote, in his History of Greece, "of that strenuous ferocity of character which marks so many people of the Semitic race—Jews, Phenicians and Carthaginians, enslaved by childish caprices and antipathies, and endless frivolities of ceremonial detail, they stand distinguished as well from the Egyptian life as from the flexible, many-sided, and self-organizing Greek; not only capable of opening both for himself and for the human race the highest walks of intellect, and the free, creative agency of art; but also gentler by far in his private sympathies and dealings than his contemporaries on the Euphrates, the Jordan, or the Nile."

The earliest Grecian colony in Italy, some 700 years B. C. was that of the Campanian Cumae, contiguous to the Bay of Naples. "In the hollow rock," (says Grote,) "under the very walls of the town, was situated the cavern of the prophetic Sibyl—a parallel and reproduction of the Gergithian Sibyl, near Kyme in Æolis; in the immediate neighborhood, too, stood the wild woods and dark lake of Avernus, consecrated to the subterranean gods, and offering an establishment of priests with ceremonies evoking the dead, for purposes of prophecy, or for solving doubts and mysteries."

In the seventh century B. C., says the same author, the rich and holy temple of Apollo was purely oracular, established for the purpose of communicating to pious inquirers "the counsels of the tumuluous." He relates, too, how Polykrates lost his life in not heeding "the warnings of his prophets and the agony of his terrified daughter, to whom his approaching fate had been revealed in a dream."

Herodotus informs us that "the Greeks," besides other ways, "learnt divination by means of victims from the Egyptians." Again, "The art of divination, as now practiced in our temples; is derived from Egypt; at least, the Egyptians were the first who introduced the sacred festivals, processions and supplications, and from them the Greeks were instructed."

When Moses went out of Egypt, he was learned in all this wisdom of the Egyptians, and according to Josephus, he had a table made after the pattern of that in the Delphic temple—if so, he may have practiced this mystery of divination, and may have received raps, and tips, or writings by "the finger of God." But Moses forbade all such practices to his people. This was in accordance with the esoteric or secret mode of withholding all such mysteries from the people. By thus keeping them in ignorance, they would be easily molded by the priesthood to external devotion, in rites and symbols. It was death to divulge the Mysteries of Eleusis, and Moses was equally severe as regards the mysteries that he learnt of the Egyptian priesthood. Nor were the Jewish priesthood less tolerant of those who would too curiously know of the Ark and its appurtenances. Even Plato would not have the inner phenomena made common to the people, denouncing as worthy of death those who should practice the "bindings"—which would seem to correspond with the modern Mesmeric manipulations. Thus the initiated and the priesthood have ever been the dark lanterns of civilization, letting only so much light be seen as could be easily submerged in superstitious rites—hence the abnormal flow of those magnetic or spiritual currents which have dominated all miracles and oracular responses—currents which sweep the religious organs in the "divine fury" of the ancient Scars, Prophets, Corybantes, and in the "outpouring of the spirit" through modern "Mediums" and religious assemblies—all from the same great spiritual ocean whose tidal laws and inhabitable modes of being embrace in order the incarnate spheres. C. B. P.

Written for the Banner of Light.

## CHRIST AND THE CHILDREN.

The soul that has not deeply loved a child, has never known the highest and purest love known to man.

Christ's blessing on the children is the severest comment ever passed on poor humanity. "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." The hearts of the inhabitants of heaven are like the hearts of little children—loving, trusting, pure. The Protestant world has often wondered that the Catholic artists have so often painted Mary and her divine child. All that was human in Christ was from Mary—was feminine. Raphael, the divine painter, gave the world his noblest effort in Mary and her child. The Madonna of the great artist was simply a beautiful Italian mother, holding in her arms a golden-haired boy. The mother leans her head downward and forward, and is too much absorbed in her divine contemplation to look at the child. She gazes modestly upward, toward the eternal. The divine child droops his head on the cheek of his mother, and clasps his hand over the bosom of Mary. This picture is loved and admired by all great souls, because this grouping is the most perfect to express love—the love of a mother for her child—the purest, holiest love known to mortals.

If the divine can only reach earth, through materiality, then woman—the mother—is the highest, holiest type of the celestial. Did you ever see a young mother at the grave, burying the body of her first-born from her sight? Then, reader, you have witnessed the

sublimest, purest exhibition of all sorrow. Can a mother forget her sucking child? then will I forget thee, says the great Teacher.

In this delightful figure Christ embodies his love for his friends. I love you as a mother loves her child! How deep and gushing is that expression! But, unless you become as little children, you cannot enter the kingdom of heaven. Then how can man ever reach the "regions of the blest"? Selfish, hateful, murderous, full of lies and deceit; and this poor mortal must travel back to childhood, innocence, before he can reach the outer portal of the heavenly home. This world is to be reduced to the innocence of the child, or Christ cannot save it.

Reader, did you ever study the character of a little child? How pure is its love, and how sublime is its trust. Tell a little child that you love him, or her, and the eye grows brighter, and the smile on their faces becomes richer and deeper—their souls glow with celestial fires.

I love all children—love the strange child as I love my own; and I know that mothers will laugh at me and deny that such a love can exist. I stop often by the way side, by the school-house, by the brook, by the flower-bed, by the play-house built of broken china, to converse with the child, and warm my own chilled and sorrowing spirit by the celestial fires on their sunny faces. Give a little child a roll of sugar, say not a word, and he knows you love him; he knows you are his friend. And when you have thus blessed him, with something sweet, how perfectly his pure little heart trusts you; he knows you are his friend—you need not reason or persuade him. Children are the gems set in the crown of life to teach us the good and the beautiful. When will this defiled world become like little children—innocent, pure, loving, trusting, like Christ's Kingdom? It cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven unless it becomes as a little child.

The mother's love for her young child flashes a deeper light into her heart than the rays of a diamond can give to the crown of a queen.

I have seen children playing by the grave of the dead, the loved, whose tombs were gemmed with flowers, and fully did I feel that our love for the dead was very holy. The child and the flowers by the grave of the loved ones! Who will paint that assemblage that we may see it, that we may love them? The eloquent preacher said: "When a child, I painted heaven as a great city filled with palaces, glittering with domes and spires, and my little brother was there." His first love in heaven was for a child, a little brother. And now he is gray, he remembers the lambs of his flock, and counts up their names, and the memory stirs a deep tone among his heart-strings, and he says, my love for you flashes bright rays in my heart, and the diamond's rays are not so brilliant. I love you all, I shall never forget you. I remember when we worshipped in the old meeting-house, and I kindled the fires, and the bell made no music, for we had none. The sweet Sabbath bell! how it rings on the night air, sweet as the voice of a laughing child—sweet as the smile of the first born to the eye of its mother. George Sand's divinest picture in her Consuelo is a fatherless child, lovely as the opening flower. Goethe's Mignon is the central figure in his greatest book—a lost, stolen, unknown child, longing for Italy, for the citron and orange groves, and the flowers and birds in that elysium. Hawthorne paints a beautiful child in his Scarlet Letter, and Little Eva and Topsy are the divinest images of light that shine in Uncle Tom's clouded sky. These are pure touches of art—Mary, by Raphael, with the smiling Jesus clasped to her heaving bosom. The Kingdom of Heaven is like the smiling infant. R.

## MAN AND HIS RELATIONS.

BY S. B. BRITTON.

## SECOND SERIES.

## CHAPTER V.

## MAGNETISM AS A THERAPEUTIC AGENT.—(CONTINUED.)

As the writer does not belong to any school in medicine, and is not otherwise employed in the practice of the healing art, he may reasonably expect the suspicion of writing to advertise his claims as a practitioner. Other motives and objects demand a further reference to my own experiments. I am reminded that when one undertakes the advocacy of new views, calculated to unsettle the general confidence in existing systems, the public has a right to demand the best evidence the case will admit of, and may justly withhold so much as even an implied endorsement in the absence of all tangible proofs. Mere theorists and philosophical speculators, who support their improbable and fanciful notions by no substantial evidence, cannot reasonably expect to inspire confidence, either in the value or the correctness of their peculiar ideas. Moreover, no intelligent, fair-minded man will be disposed to cling to his preconceived opinions when once they are plainly disproved by the discovered laws of Nature and the results of scientific experiment.

It was only after suffering for years the painful consequence of my error—the very common and often fatal mistake of supposing that health is to be sought in nostrums and purchased of apothecaries, rather than found in an intelligent perception of, and a strict obedience to, the laws of vital harmony—that the fallacies of the profession were fairly uncovered and comprehended, and the use of medicine—as ordinarily administered—was perceived to be the trial of doubtful expedients, rather than a truly scientific adaptation of means to ends. I cannot be unjust toward others without impoverishing myself; and I have certainly nothing to gain by undervaluing the learned professions. I am well aware that the medical profession has already furnished a long list of illustrious names of men, whose discoveries occupy a large space in the scientific records of our country and the world. Perhaps no profession is now dignified by a greater number of free, enlightened and noble minds; and it is precisely for this reason that I shall not be accused of treating the subject unfairly. It will doubtless be conceded that science properly comprehends not merely a classification of particular facts, but likewise an explanation of the essential laws on which such facts depend. Wherever this definition is accepted, it will be perceived that Medicine does not answer the description. It is readily granted that we are supplied with the necessary classification of the phenomenal effects of disease and the superficial aspects of disease; but we wait for the discovery of the essential laws under which all physiological, pathological, and therapeutic effects occur, and until these laws are clearly recognized and duly respected, the practice of medicine at best is but a cause of doubtful experiment which may destroy the constitution with the disease.

The remedial agents employed with success in one case may totally fail in another—and even prove to be injurious—owing to the endless diversity among men, in respect to physical organization, combination of temperaments, states of the mind, and varying degrees of susceptibility to physical, mental and moral influences. Hence the same medical treatment in all cases—for the same general type of disease—without such modifications as the individual constitution may require, can never be uniformly successful. Much less can a routine practice, founded on ancient medical authorities, be pursued at this day with any reasonable hope of beneficial results. The constitutions of men; our manner of life; our pursuits and habits of thought; and even the earth and atmosphere, have all changed. We are becoming sublimated by the progress of civilization, the influence of Literature, Art, Science and Commerce, and the development of the mental and spiritual faculties and forces of human nature.

Moreover, the same kinds of food that once were readily digested and assimilated—thus freely contributing to augment the vital energies—are now burdensome to the stomach, and wholly unsuited to promote either physical health or mental activity. Similar changes have occurred in the specific forms of disease. All these should be carefully observed, and their relations to the fundamental laws of being comprehended. The wisest physicians already perceive the necessity for corresponding changes and modifications in the professional modes of practice; and hence they administer medicine with caution, in alternative doses and sublimated forms. Some centuries ago, when men were less human, and far more gross and animal than now, they survived the action of powerful drugs and a thorough course of depletion, such as would now be followed by a complete and hopeless prostration of the system. It is barely possible that the inhabitants of Central Africa and the South Sea Islands might still be benefited by such treatment, but it is absolutely certain that the more refined nations of Europe and America require it no longer.

Before entering on a course of practical experiment, I was led, by reading, observation and reflection, to the conclusion that all forms of disease commence in the nervous system, by a disturbance or unequal distribution of vital electricity; and that the organic, functional and symptomatic effects all resulted from this derangement of the electro-motive power of the organization. Having satisfied myself on this point, it was but natural to conjecture that the specific effects of all remedial agents occur under the action of the electro-nervous forces, and agreeably to the laws of vital electricity. I had observed the surprising results produced by magnetic manipulations—had often produced those effects. Acute pains were readily removed; extreme nervous irritability was rapidly subdued; sarcomatous and encysted tumors, rheumatic and other swellings, had mysteriously disappeared under the hands of the operator. I had also marked the salutary results of the Hydropathic treatment in fevers, and the beneficial effects of poultices and other moist applications in subduing local inflammations. I had no doubt that these and all similar effects occurred agreeably to an electro-vital principle. Regarding inflammation as proceeding from a highly electrical state of the parts affected, it could only be necessary—provided I had really discovered the fundamental electrical law—to adapt the treatment to that law in its relations to the human system, and the conditions would be rapidly changed; so that in every case where no destruction of the organs or tissues had occurred, a normal state would necessarily be almost instantly supervene. I will here introduce one example from among a number of similar cases designed to subject my theory to the ordeal of a practical experiment. The surprising results that followed the application of the principle, in the treatment of external inflammations, more than realized my previous expectations.

Some years since a gentleman who lived in Newark, N. J., and had there listened to several lectures on the electrical theory of the vital functions, called on the writer and described the case of a young woman, eighteen years old, who belonged to his circle of acquaintance. The patient was vitally strong and ordinarily enjoyed the most vigorous health; but at the time she was represented as suffering intensely from acute inflammation in one leg. Her friend was extremely anxious that I should personally attend to her case; but as my sphere of action was the platform rather than the sick room, and especially as my time was much occupied, I personally declined the responsibility. Several times in the course of one week the gentleman came to me and urged the peculiar claims of the case, until at last I reluctantly yielded to his repeated solicitations, and called on the patient. I found her suffering from a rheumatic fever and intense inflammation of one lower limb, extending from the extremity to the hip, and affecting the joints, tendons, and all the fibrous textures. The limb was stretched at full length and in a horizontal position. It rested on a pillow placed in one chair while the patient was seated in another, which she had constantly occupied during the preceding seven days and nights, without one hour's sleep or a single moment's freedom from pain. The leg was swelled to an amazing size, and about the joints the venous congestion gave the entire surface a dark purple appearance.

On inquiry I learned that the physician—in his attempt to reduce the inflammation—had depended chiefly on the application of a liniment, that appeared to be composed of origanum and other vegetable oils. Feeling assured that the application of such an oleaginous compound must of necessity check the insensible perspiration—which always facilitates the escape of vital electricity from the body—render the cuticle a non-conductor, and thus increase the inflammation—I did not hesitate to express this conviction—without the slightest intimation respecting the actual facts in the case—that the inflammation had greatly increased since the first application of the liniment. My observation was instantly confirmed by the concurrent testimony of the whole family, though all had attributed the aggravated symptoms to other causes than the doctor's prescription. The case afforded an excellent opportunity to test the reality of the supposed discovery, to which reference has already been made. If a cure could be effected agreeably to the electrical law involved in the theory, developed in this treatise, I had no doubt of its speedy as well as its certain accomplishment. It was only necessary to render the cuticle a good conductor of vital electricity, and then—by the proper application of an electrically negative body—the rapid diffusion of the concentrated agent would at once occur on the inductive principle.

I will here give the simple treatment and the surprising result. Adding an ounce of Spirits of Ammonia to a pint of cold water, I sponged the limb thoroughly, and until the oily substance was entirely removed from the surface. Then relaxing the muscles of my own arms and hands, by withdrawing the nervous forces as much as possible—thus rendering the extremities electrically negative—I commenced manipulating lightly—making the negative passes from the highest point to which the inflammation extended, to the ends of the toes. As often as the surface of the patient's limb became dry by the rapid process of evaporation, occasioned by the unusual heat, the wet sponge was again passed lightly over the surface, thus restoring and increasing the conducting capacity of the cuticle—which is always suspended in proportion as the skin is deprived of its natural humidity. Thus the manipulations over the moist surface were continued without interruption for forty minutes. The inflammation was greatly reduced, and after the first operation the patient could move her limb and had the partial use of all the joints, not one of which had been moved in the least during the seven or eight days next preceding the application of this treatment. At the expiration of twelve hours I repeated the operation, occupying some forty minutes, when the patient was relieved of all pain, and could support the weight of her body on that limb. Once more, after an interval of twelve hours, the same treatment was applied for half an hour, whereupon the patient ran up and down stairs without the least pain or inconvenience. On the evening of the next day she walked to Library Hall, a distance of half a mile, to attend a lecture delivered by the writer—walked home again—and from that time had not the slightest symptom of inflammation.

The reader's attention is now invited to a case of a wholly different nature. MISS SARAH ELIZABETH LOCKWOOD, of Stamford, Conn., a young lady some twenty years of age, had suffered long and fearfully (according to the physicians who had treated her case for several years) from a spinal disease, which had resulted in a suspension of the peristaltic motion of the intestines; suppression of the catamenia; a total paralysis of the lower limbs, and complete loss of the voice. The treatment had been tropical bleeding, blisters, setons in the back, etc.; and every inch of the cuticle, from the medulla oblongata to the lower extremity of the spinal column, gave evidence of the faithful application of the professional treatment which of course had subserved no good purpose. Indeed, the poor girl—like the woman whose case is reported in the practice of Jesus—had suffered many things of many physicians, . . . and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse.—Mark v. 26.

When the writer first called to see Miss Lockwood, she was in many respects more helpless than an infant. She had no power to move her lower limbs at all, or to hold up her head, and she had not spoken above a whisper in eight months.

I have not space to detail the precise process adopted in this particular case. Suffice it to say, the application of the treatment was in strict accordance with the principles involved in the writer's theory. Concerning the result, the patient may very properly be permitted to speak for herself. The following introduction to the statement of Miss L. is from the pen of Mr. Hoyt, the intelligent and gentlemanly editor of the *Advocate*, in whose paper the letter was originally published, in July, 1860:—

[From the Stamford Advocate.]

"Mr. Britton has not only been successful in explaining the philosophy of his subject, but eminently so in the practical application of the principles to the treatment and cure of some of the most aggravated forms of disease. By permission of the parties, we publish the following communication from Miss Lockwood. It is a strong case; the facts are generally known in this community, and may be said to have occurred within the sphere of our own observation:—

"It is well known that when the insensible perspiration is arrested by cold, or from any other cause, leaving the surface dry, it occasions fever; the electro-thermal, chemical, and organic action, are all rapidly increased; and this derangement of the vital forces may result in an acute inflammation of some internal organ or membrane. When the natural process, whereby animal electricity is deranged or set free, is thus suddenly suspended, the vital motive power inevitably accumulates, and it is but natural that the molecular and organic motion should be correspondingly accelerated.



Dear brothers there, with naught of guile,  
And slayers yet more true—  
A mother's love, a father's smile,  
Like angels, close the view!  
Sweet visions! all than gems more dear,  
Of wintry Age the leaven,  
To come with Evening shadows dear,  
Like herald dreams of Heaven!

New London, Ct., Dec. 5th, 1859. J. C. W.

December 11, 1859.

and our life without.

If I should undertake to give a name to some of the points suggested by the verses which I have selected for my text, I should say that they appear to be the result of a soul assurance, its progress, and its victory. We all feel at times that the entire meaning and significance of this little Psalm is utterly inexpressible. As I said just now, the deeper a man goes into the realities of his own inward life, the richer will be his Psalm because to him; the more appropriate will find it to be, and the more meaning will be found in it. And yet, I think, the epiphiths I have used, and which I propose to touch as I pass along this morning, if not entirely accurate, are sufficiently so for the occasion.

directly, "good causes," and "good deeds," and that we have communion with God, and you have none. What I thank God I am not as the publican yonder: "When anything of me is feeling gets into religion, then you have got that derogatory conception of God; that he have got a man's soul and not to another man's soul; that he has an exclusive favoritism for one man, an exclusive dislike for another. The moment you introduce partiality into the kingdom of God, and that the relations of God to man, that moment you introduce partialism in God, there is no respect of persons with him, there is no exclusive favoritism with him. He is not with your soul and absent from mine; he is not with your soul and with my soul. And, therefore, just

cent, perhaps, with a garden and a simple hut, in his early life, now, standing with all the panoply of the world's glory about him—with all its crowns on his head, and all its benefits at his feet—still has that unappeasable want pressing upon him. And see how it is with men seeking for wealth. You have known men in dreadful poverty, struggling hard to support themselves and their families, and yet they were then ten times as generous as they were when they had become rich; they gave more, and were more responsive to the touch of charity when they were hardly worth a dollar, than when they had become worth their hundreds of thousands of dollars. And so with the appetites. They increase the more they are gratified.

deep in a mountainous country are kept in the beaten path, away from the tangling briars on the one side, and from the deep abyss on the other. Though such a man may, sometimes, go a little out of the way, he never fully gets out of the sight of the true path.

And here is all true growth and all true advancement. Because, my friends, what we gain outwardly is, with the individual as with society, no proof of progress. As I said just now, all the accumulation of outward facilities does not prove really a progress of humanity at large. With the money you gain come increased cares; all the distinctions that are thrust upon you do not prove that you are living as a true man—they may prove quite the contrary; they may be

their comfort me." "Such, my friends, are some of the suggestions of this Psalm: all the more suggestive, I say, as you are more the sons of the devil than of the devil. This inward life is your consolation. Go into your own soul, and whether at Psalm meets you, finds you; whether it expresses your experience of your own. Oh! is it not indeed, a glorious song to sing in the night, to sing as we march through, with the beauty of its imagery, with the clearness of its language, fully harmonious with the truth? Oh! is it not a great thing, if, lingering over its sweet words, we find that it corresponds to the fact of the reality in our own souls? "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want. He leadeth me to lie down in green pastures; he leadeth me beside the still waters. He restoreth my soul; he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me. Thy goodness, God's music; beautiful imagery; better still the deep fact which they represent. Better still if we can sing that song in our night, in our darkness, in our valley of the shadow of death, and show thereby our full assurance, its progress and its victory.

Dear brothers there, with naught of guile,  
And slayers yet more true—  
A mother's love, a father's smile,  
Like angels, close the view!  
Sweet visions! all than gems more dear,  
Of wintry Age the loaves,  
To come with Evening shadows dear,  
Like herald dreams of Heaven!

*New London, Ct., Dec. 5th, 1859.* J. C. W.



## BANNER OF LIGHT IN ENGLAND.

This paper will be mailed from London to any part of Europe, one year for £2.12s; six months, £1.4s; three months, 10s. Address J. T. BERRY, LONDON, until further notice.

## Working Farmer and Banner of Light for \$2.25 per Year.

Persons who may wish to take a first class Agricultural paper with the BANNER, will do well to subscribe for the WORKING FARMER, a monthly paper, edited by PROF. J. J. MARRAS, which we can cheerfully recommend.

Subscriptions may be sent to this office, when the names will be forwarded to the office of the WORKING FARMER, from whence that paper will be mailed.

A saving of seventy-five cents will be made to those who subscribe under this arrangement. If preferred, orders may be sent for both papers to the office of the WORKING FARMER.

## Agents.

Mrs. H. F. M. Brown, editors of the Agitator, of Cleveland, Ohio, is authorized agent of the BANNER, and will receive subscriptions for us. J. V. Mansfield, ditto.

## Banner of Light.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 24, 1859.

Berry, Colby & Co., Publishers.  
WILLIAM BERRY, LUTHER COLBY, J. ROLLIN M. SQUIRE.

## PUBLICATION OFFICES:

31-2 Brattle St., Boston: 143 Fulton St., New York.

## EDITORS:

WILLIAM BERRY, Boston. S. B. BRITTON, New York.  
LUTHER COLBY, " J. R. M. SQUIRE, London.

## TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:

Single copies per year, \$2.00  
Six months, \$1.00  
Three months, 60c

When mailed from London to any part of Europe: One year, £2.12s; six months, £1.4s; three months, 10s.

All subscriptions must be paid in advance, and the paper will be discontinued at the expiration of the time paid for, of which due notice will be given.

Class Rates.—Clubs of four and upwards will be furnished at the following rates: One year, \$1.50; six months, 75c; three months, 50c.

Persons sending us clubs, may add to the club at any subsequent time, names either in their draft, or any other place.

Money sent at our risk; but where drafts on New York can be procured, we prefer to have them sent, to avoid loss. Procure drafts on New York, if possible.

Subscribers wishing the direction of their paper changed from one town to another, must always state the name of the town to which it has been sent.

All letters must be addressed, BANNER OF LIGHT, Boston, Mass. Berry, Colby & Co.

## PHYSICAL AND SPIRITUAL.

It is a fact pregnant with meaning, to find that the people themselves are taking up preaching and teaching, and that the press is silently coming to renovate. If not altogether to supersede the pulpit. Not that we entertain any ill-founded prejudice against the method of teaching by the pulpit; but the press reaches a vaster audience, is a mightier power, never rests or tires, and, instead of troubling even an indolent man to go out of doors for instruction, persistently enters his house and declares it will be heard, whether or not. Discussions on the great topics that command public attention are now carried on by the press almost exclusively; and if that press faithfully reflects the liberalism and comprehensiveness of the ideas that engage popular thought or excite popular sentiment, it cannot fail to do the desired work with a rapidity and thoroughness not now to be described.

From time to time, as we thoughtfully run our eyes over our exchanges, especially that large class that goes by the name of "secular,"—as if all expressions of life were not, in truth, religious—we meet with brief essays of a character that would have been scouted, or certainly passed over unread, twenty years ago, but such as go to define with unmistakable precision the tendency and temper of the vast movements everywhere making at the present day. Some of these articles are for, and more of them against, the free exercise of an enlightened reason, when existing systems seem to be put in jeopardy thereby; but still the very fact that such thoughts are expressed at all in public newspapers that used to treat of nothing but trade and travel and party politics—the simple necessity that exists for bringing these new ideas more prominently into a public light, in lieu of the hackneyed themes of other days; is proof enough that there is a popular demand that these very topics shall be discussed, and that journals will somehow spring up that shall not be too timid to advocate the largest truth, and in the largest forms both of conception and expression.

We fell in, not long since, with an article in the editorial column of the Philadelphia Ledger—a paper of wide circulation in the locality in which it is printed—bearing upon the topic suggested by our caption above; and, while it tells some truths without a sign of timid hesitation, it nevertheless indulges in certain flings, (if they were meant to be such,) not merely without basis for themselves in sense or reason, but, what is more, quite inconsistent with the ideas advanced by the Ledger itself. To give our readers the most exact idea of the views entertained by the journal in question, we furnish the article herewith entire:

A LEADING BRANCH OF THE AGE.—The astonishing discoveries in physical science, within the last century, have given such a preponderating impulse to studies of this description, that comparatively no progress has been made in mental science. While the phenomena of electricity have been analyzed; while steam has been subjected to the will of man; and while the rest of the universe of the sea and the winds of heaven, have been explained to the satisfaction of the mariner, little or nothing that is new has been demonstrated in relation to the laws of psychology. The tendency of all this has been to give a materialistic turn to the otherwise advanced nineteenth century. Just as materialism, in consequence of their too exclusive attention to the structure of the human frame, are apt to ignore the existence of the spirit independent of the body, so whenever a generation is principally engrossed in physical science, it has, in the nature of things, a propensity toward materialism, and retrogrades in spirituality and all the loftier studies.

We do not oppose the prosecution of physical science, but only contend that other studies should not be neglected. We would have chemistry, geology, astronomy, meteorology, metallurgy, and every other physical science pursued with even increased assiduity. But while this is being done, let not psychology be forgot. Already the evils of this neglect of the latter science have been made manifest, in a delusion as mad as that of the Salem witchcraft, and immeasurably more extended. While the composition of the real muscle has been analyzed, while the amount of gases which a man breathes daily has been demonstrated, while the nervous matter has been traced in all its thousand ramifications through the human system, no investigations, deserving the name of scientific, have been undertaken, or, if undertaken, properly prosecuted, into the laws of mind, or even of life. Of biology, using that term in its critical sense, we know next to nothing. Hence it is that, in an age of railroads, spinning jennies, magnetic telegraphs, delusions like spirit-rappings have arisen. Hence it is, also, that too many, who are not atheists, are ardent believers in the wildest religious delusions.

The age is rendered materialistic in another way by the preponderant importance attached to physical discoveries. Our civilization has become almost purely material. What we shall eat, what we shall drink, and where we shall live, are the chief things that interest the mind, and absorb nearly all our time. History will describe this outraged nineteenth century as inferior, in many particulars, to the less celebrated, which have gone before. The age of Luther, Xavier and Luther, for example, was an eminently spiritual one. The age of Queen Elizabeth was an eminently heroic one. The age of Voltaire, D'Alembert and the French Encyclopedia, was an eminently intellectual one. All these several ages acted, moreover, on the higher elements of society. But this nineteenth century has done little, so far, except to advance physical science. It has enabled mankind to dress more cheaply, to transmit messages more rapidly, to travel more rapidly; and has, in a hundred ways, in short, increased the material comforts of the civilized races. But it has done nothing absolutely nothing, to teach him, by careful instruction, how to develop the mind, to develop the higher faculties of his nature; and in this it has come short of its duty.

Ministers tell us that religion is declining, and morality is rapidly increasing of lawlessness and crime. What wonder?

We are developing our civilization abnormally, and must expect to pay the penalty. Not that we trust material physical science, but that we must prosecute the higher sciences as the age time, so that knowledge of the body and knowledge of the mind and spirit may advance hand in hand.

Now we venture the assertion, that it is just the spirit betrayed in the fling at "spirit-rappings," and other like phenomena, that frightens away superior minds from a patient and thorough investigation of the entire subject. Surely, the great number and variety of facts upon which the current belief in spirit-communion rests as a basis, may be supposed to carry a vast deal of weight with their statement, when it is known that such facts hold their ground firmly, even in the face of the slurs, vulgar abuse, denunciation, and open ridicule, which the press and the preachers have for ten years heaped upon them. And nothing is more certain than that they will continue steadily to make their way among the people, whether they are subjected to a careful and conscientious analysis, or are ridiculed with the scattering small shot of prejudice, ignorance, and causeless abuse. What is chiefly desired is investigation, by the highest and best disciplined minds of the age. It is well enough to know, however, that whenever minds of such a class have undertaken this labor, in the genuine spirit of philosophy and truth, they have been obliged, from the overwhelming force of the testimony, and after making the largest possible allowance for error and duplicity, to admit that the facts presented are genuine, resting on one indisputable basis, and deserving the patient application of the profoundest philosophy, and the most analytical reasoning to their elucidation. It is this very fact, we fear, that has deterred many of our leading minds from a fair investigation; they lack nothing but the courage to avow what they know beforehand they must be compelled to believe, ignorant that it rests entirely with themselves to strengthen or to overthrow the prejudices that still stand for knowledge and reason.

The writer in the *Ledger* speaks with truth, and we are prepared to believe, with a personal conviction, too, of the truth, when he asserts that biology is a science to which altogether too little attention has been paid. In the flush of the victories already achieved by man over the material world, he has allowed his attention to be engrossed with nothing but the thought of material success; the spiritual has not kept even pace with the physical progress; we have overcome mountains, but of ourselves we are comparatively ignorant. Hence material wealth has been pushed forward into a position of factitious importance, which, without the necessary alliance of corresponding riches of spirit, it cannot be expected for a great while to hold. Money, therefore, has become the golden mark and aim, the touchstone, the social landmark, the general watchword and countersign; and he who was not willing to plunge with the rest into the feverish race to secure it, is publicly voted to be destitute of all ambition, energy, and individual purpose. And the man who, having a rational competence, is satisfied with the spiritual aid and independence that competence brings him, is a *rara avis* indeed, whose professions nobody seems willing to believe. It is an indisputable fact, that the matchless material wealth of the people of this country has operated to make them all lovers of money above all things else; the mischief is, that they are content to rest at that point, instead of pushing on with the accumulated power this very possession should give them.

Even in our literature, whose wider and deeper spiritual tendency is apparent to the most casual observer, the same material manifestations are sadly mixed up. It is even deemed by critics (whatever they may be,) an evidence of a morbid and diseased state of mind on the part of an author, when he deliberately attempts the dissection of the great and terrible passions of the human heart, or the cool and searching analysis of its deep and secret motives. Hawthorne was thought, and still is by some, a kind of literary owl, though nothing could be more radically spiritual than his "Scarlet Letter." He was patronizingly informed by the material critics, who wrote for journals addressed to common and material tastes, that if he would come out of his hiding-place into the light, where people could behold the entire machinery of his thought and sentiment, he might be considered healthy, and so secure something like a respectable audience. And Emerson has received criticism in a similar spirit, these twenty years, but is at last, thank God! coming to be better understood. All our modern fiction tends that same way—toward genuine spiritualism; for that is the tendency of the age itself. Old grumpy preachers lament the decadence of the public morals; but there is no such matter to make themselves melancholy about; the popular mind has become, not less morbid in its tone, but altogether less superstitious. Romantic fiction, and historical fiction, has had its day as a distinct popular teacher; the transition—as through the agency of Dickens and his school—to the domestic and the familiar, was but a natural one to that of the deeply spiritual and individual, which we are very soon to have. But it will fall to be spiritual if it be superstitious; and so, then, must it come short if it be hardened with an element of materiality.

The single, simple fact—and it is a fact that has not yet been overthrown—that spirits do commune with mortals, renders it of the first importance that the laws regulating that intercourse, which of course embrace the whole science of psychology, be studied with the same patience, devotion, and prayerful humility with which La Place and Newton launched their swift-going thoughts on the vast ocean of space on which sails an universe. If this life of ours is indeed life, we demand to know all about it that can be made known to our acutest interior sense; else we do but fractionally exist, denying ourselves to the highest and profoundest truths which it belongs to the limitless destiny of man to know. Nothing is to be set up in the spirit of charlatanism—nothing knocked down by the corresponding spirit of ignorance and ridicule. Truth is to be seized and accepted whenever and wherever it may appear, no matter whether it sustains or overthrows all our previous impressions.

We think the writer of the article above quoted is right, when he seriously advises that more equal development should be made of both physical and spiritual; yet the prejudiced fling he goes out of his way to bestow upon those who are engaged in studying the laws of spirit-communion, which comprise the whole system of biology, convicts him of open inconsistency with his own position. Charity alone forces us to infer that he thus consented to mar the healthy effect of his sentiments in obedience to what he conceives still to be a popular prejudice. But it will not be long ere he, and many more in the same category, awake to find that their meaningless sneers are not in demand; they will be hasty to drop them then, and patient investigation will come in to usurp the place of cheap ridicule and vulgar abuse. Doubtless the writer would be willing to acknowledge that the mysterious laws of spirit were in a fair and proper way to be discovered and reduced to a scientific system, if their study was distinguished by the adjuncts of learned professors and powerful educational institutions; but now, when men of mere popularity are afraid to address themselves to such a study, it is best to laugh and jeer and heap up abuse, because those who investigate do not yet wear stars, ribbons, three-cornered shaven hats, or any of the other paraphernalia that go with well-paid professorships. But let all this pass; time works its own great results, and in its own silent way. When it is discovered that we all have souls, that deserve at least as much attention as the body and material affairs engross, all this will be changed. To this end we shall continue to labor without ceasing. And our most earnest prayer for its approach is, that God may speed the day.

## Gentle Influences.

Austerity and denunciation will not bring the wanderer back or move within him the springs of virtuous action. Cold indifference and neglect are not the means whereby we are to dissolve the congealed fountains of human affection, and win the wandering soul to virtue. The man who employs these as the instruments of reformation will labor in vain. They can no more subdue the stubborn heart than the rude blasts of polar skies can melt the icebergs and dissolve the mountains of eternal snow. Severe coercive measures will not reclaim the driver. Man is so constituted that every attempt to drive him from an error, either of the head or heart, tends to confirm him in his course. If there is aught that will allure the wayward from the haunts of folly, and the selfishness of a misguided ambition, it is the voice of persuasive and friendly admonition. If there be a power in the Universe sufficiently potent to soften the heart, and to draw the victim of dissipation and vice away from the scenes of his dishonor, that power is kindness. It seems to quiet the fears, to subdue the passions, to enlist all the better affections, and thus the victory over wrong is achieved.

The superior power and efficacy of Gentle Influences is beautifully illustrated in the fable of the Sun and the Wind. In their efforts to make a traveler part with his cloak. The Wind commenced a furious attack. From the dark clouds he breathed out his violent spirit in threatened destruction. At his voice the overhanging pinnacles of the mountains did tremble. The tall oaks bowed their lofty heads as he passed, and at the sound of his chariot wheels the wild beasts ran howling from the hills! But it was all in vain. The poor traveler drew his cloak more closely around him. At length the Wind retired, and the thick vapors rolled away. All was still. Then the Sun quietly smiled on the traveler, and he threw off his cloak. Thus mild and gentle means accomplished what all the artillery of the elements could not perform.

MORAL.—If other means have failed, remember that an act of kindness, a word spoken in love, even a tear or a smile, may reclaim the wanderer.

## Mrs. Amanda M. Spence at Ordway Hall.

Mrs. Amanda M. Spence, spoke at Ordway Hall, in Boston, on Sunday, December 11th. We intended to give a full abstract of her two discourses, but from an unavoidable accident, we are obliged to postpone, at least, this publication.

Mrs. Spence chose as her themes, in the morning the Masculine, or Positive Organization, and in the evening the Feminine, or Negative Organization. Everything in nature, she said, from the lowest form of vegetable life, to man, and even to the Deity himself, is dual. The sexes are distinguished in grains and flowers, as well as in man. And the individual, too, is dual; combining in a single organization, a double physical and spiritual nature. And, as in the solar systems, the equilibrium of forces sustains in their orbits the poised orbs, so, in the individual human being, and in all the organizations of society, it is the equilibrium of these positive and negative forces, which creates balance, and harmony, and health. It is the preponderance of one of these in our physical being which causes physiological disease. It is the preponderance of one of these in the social system which gives rise to all our social evils. The positive, masculine minds, have, in all ages, and always must be, the rulers. The negative mind unquestionably receives the doctrines impressed upon it by the vigorous positive nature. To control the negative mind of the race, the masculine element of society, itself analytic and skeptical, imposed upon the people, in the earlier centuries of human existence, the idea of a supernatural power working in the elements, as in the instance of the rainbow, which was made a token of God's promise not again to drown a wicked world. The fear has, taken the place of this supernaturalism, as the engine of the positive mind, in its tyranny over the negative. But as the masculine mind becomes itself more fully enlightened and intelligent, it begets a general doubt of spiritual truths, of the existence of a God, of a future life.

To the scientific analytic intellect, there has never been presented a tangible proof of these things. Now Spiritualism appears, and by its external phenomena affords to this class of mind the proofs which we as hitherto sought in vain. It has taught us, too, not to seek from a vague, unknown Deity, by prayer, the help we need, but to study the just equilibrium of our own powers for ourselves. While engaged in these physiological questions, which are first of all needful for us if we would secure the primary condition of all spiritual health, we have our work before us, and are not to turn away to old forms of prayer and worship which are not within the scope of our immediate and pressing inquiry.

While acknowledging that woman is essentially the negative, and man's the executive mind, the speaker insisted that each organization should be judged by its own laws, irrespective of its sex; that a man of feminine organization should, without being sneered at, assume the duties to which his nature calls him, and that a woman of executive temperament ought, without accusations of masculinism and coarseness, to be permitted to take her due part in the executive business of the world.

## The Parlor Opera.

At length the lovers of elegant and refined amusements are favored with a rare novelty, in the truly artistic and delightful entertainments of Mr. and Mrs. HENRI DRAYTON, in which the attractions of the English Opera and Polite Comedy, are combined with excellent taste and an almost faultless judgment. The whole performance is in a style—as it respects musical and dramatic execution—that at once affords intense pleasure, and invites our highest commendation.

Mrs. Drayton sings well—plays with easy grace and artistic precision, and infuses a genial spirit into every part of her performance. Mr. Drayton is an Apollo in form—is skilled in "the poetry of motion"—has a fine voice admirably managed, and the eye of an eagle. Altogether his performance was all that the most fastidious taste could demand. We are sure the Draytons will be especial favorites, and the Parlor Opera must become "a fixed star" among our public amusements. Señor Oliveira, one of the most skillful violinists in the world, diversifies the entertainment with his truly masterly rendering of some of the finest classic compositions.

We feel assured that those of our numerous city readers, who may be induced by this notice to see and hear the Draytons, will thank us for calling attention to their peculiar claims, and for thus furnishing an incentive to visit one of the most unique, chaste, and delightful entertainments we remember to have enjoyed.

## Miss Emma Hardinge.

The New Orleans Mirror of December 10th, says:—"Miss Hardinge has been in this city for a week past, and on Sunday and Tuesday evenings delivered addresses in the Lecture Room of Odd Fellows' Hall on the subject of Spiritualism. These addresses were remarkable, both in manner and matter, being characterized by a grasp of thought and felicity of expression which are seldom exceeded by the greatest of orators."

Dr. P. B. Randolph lectured to the Bangorians recently, and gave great satisfaction to his hearers. The *Guardian* says:—"The doctor's reputation as a medium and speaker is unsurpassed, and the best comment that can be made upon the discourses which he uttered are their force, beauty, depth, eloquence, and ingenuity."

## Mason's Resolution.

The resolution introduced into the United States Senate by Mr. Mason, of Virginia, and finally passed by that body, amounts to this: It makes it the duty of the committee to inquire into the facts attending the late invasion and seizure of the armory and arsenal at Harper's Ferry, by a band of armed men, and report whether the same was attended by armed resistance to the authorities and public force of the United States, and the murder of any citizens of Virginia, or any troops sent there to protect public property; whether such invasion was made under color of an organization intended to subvert the Government of any of the States of the Union; the character and extent of such organization; whether any citizens of the United States, not present, were implicated therein, or accessory thereto, by contributions of money, arms, ammunition, or otherwise; the character and extent of the military equipments in the hands, or under the control of said armed band; where, how, and when, the same were obtained, and transported to the place invaded. Also: To report what legislation, if any, is necessary by the Government, for the future preservation of the peace of the country, and the safety of public property—the committee to have power to send for persons and papers.

## "The Wife's Secret."

Lovell's charming drama—as rendered at Laura Keane's Theatre—has achieved a decided success; but it is at length withdrawn, to give place to other original entertainments, now in course of preparation and soon to be produced. If "The Wife's Secret," as a composition, does not exhibit the strongest marks of genius, or otherwise exhaust the possibilities of dramatic art; it is, nevertheless, well and beautifully written; marked by no striking defects, and open to no grave objections on moral grounds, or as a stage performance. The plot is free from obscurity or unnecessary complication; the characters are drawn with sufficient distinctness; the incidents and situations are all naturally conceived, agreeably diversified, and skillfully arranged.

Laura Keane's personation of Lady Evelyn, was in good taste, and effective throughout. The more impressive scenes in the last act were rendered with remarkable spirit and dramatic effect. Mr. Jordan, as Sir Walter, played his part with true feeling, and a just discrimination.

We are soon to have at this Theatre [another original American Comedy, with local incidents and bearings, when a fresh interest will be excited among the patrons of Miss Keane's enterprise.

## We Cannot Crush the Soul.

Human beings are worth less than most machines. If a machine of wood, iron or brass gives out, its owner repairs it; but if a machine of flesh and blood falls in health, it is turned aside, and another is hired to supply its place; and why? because human beings are robbed of their right to land, and are thus forced to toil cheap to procure bread.

There is too much truth in the above paragraph from the Investigator. If men would turn to their interior or spiritual nature, and exercise a little more humanity each with the other, such a deplorable state of things would soon cease to exist on the earth.

Let us not be unmindful of the great truth revealed by Spiritualism, viz., that the souls of poor, suffering mortals cannot be injured, degraded or crushed by the cold and cruel hands of the material world.

## The San Juan Difficulty.

The New York Herald affirms that the position of the San Juan question as it has been left by General Scott, is one that cannot but be satisfactory to both governments. He has carried out in an eminent degree the pacific instructions of Mr. Buchanan, and all the American forces have been withdrawn from the Island of San Juan except Capt. Pickett's company, which has been left to act as a police force for the protection of the American residents of the Island. The matter is thus brought back within the scope of diplomacy, and will be treated by Mr. Buchanan in a way that, while it will secure all our rights, will not imperil our relations with England.

## The State Liquor Agent.

Mr. Commissioner Burnham has worked into his annual report, as State Agent for the sale of liquor, quite a savage assault upon certain members of the legislative committee through whose indirect agency he suffered imprisonment, and, what is more, his entire statement must go upon record. It looks as if the Legislature were afraid to meddle with him any further, his twenty-five days in jail having done him no particular harm, nor themselves any particular good. A new Commissioner has been appointed, in whom the Temperance Committee profess to have perfect confidence. But the law itself should be altered.

## Commercial and Nautical Institute.

The original French Commercial and Nautical Institute, 96 Tremont street, Boston, kept by Messrs. Spear & Sawyer, presents inducements to all who wish to secure such an education as can be gained in an institution, which are unsurpassed. Both males and females can avail themselves of the advantages to procure education in penmanship, arithmetic, book-keeping, commercial correspondence, navigation, engineering, Latin, Greek, French, German or Spanish.

The terms for all and each of these courses are moderate.

## Messages Verified.

The message published by request of the spirit of Wm. Armstrong, last week, on our fifth page, is pronounced to be correct by a gentleman of this city.

That of Anderson Rose, published in No. 26, Vol. 5, is also pronounced truthful and characteristic. Several expressions are recognized as those he used to employ. That of Catharine Gage, published in No. 9, Vol. 6, has been pronounced correct by a lady who knew her.

## The Essays of Elia.

Wm. Veasey, No. 64 Cornhill, has recently reprinted, in superior style, the Essays of Charles Lamb. This is just the time for our readers to make up their minds what books to give their friends on the approaching holidays. We know of none we would rather recommend than this, both for its intrinsic literary merits, its high moral tone, and its open spirituality.

## The "Banner" in Kennabunkport, Mo.

Mr. F. S. Bryant keeps a complete assortment of newspapers, magazines, books, music, and fancy articles at his store in the above town. Parties wishing the Banner of Light, with Beecher's and Chapin's sermons, will be promptly supplied by him.

## Henry Ward Beecher's Sermon on Crocods.

Our readers will thank us a thousand times for the sermon we print this week. It is full of fresh independence—more so than any sermon of its most independent preachers we have published for many a day.

## Warren Chase.

Bro. Chase is to lecture at Dodsworth's Hall, New York City, on the 8th, 15th and 22d of January. He is one of our best preachers, and we bespeak for him a warm welcome.

Nathan Maroney, agent of the Adams Express Company at Montgomery, Alabama, has been on trial in New York on the charge of embezzling \$50,000 entrusted to the Company, and put into his hands for transmission. He finally admitted the robbery, but would not tell what disposition he made of the money.

## BROMFIELD STREET CONFERENCE.

Wednesday Evening, Dec. 14th.

Question.—What is the cause of what we call evil, and what is the cure?

Dr. Child—

"Man speculate on right and wrong  
As upon day and night, forgetting both  
Have but one cause, and that the same—God's will."

What is evil? Evil may be defined as being those manifestations of life that are repulsive to the heavenly desires of the human heart. What is the cause of evil? In one word this question may be answered, viz., nature. Without reserve, boldly and fearlessly I solemnly give in my testimony, and swear, that evil is a natural production. The operations of nature give birth to evil, and it rises up from the workings of her mighty machinery, and, like vapor, dissipates. Nature produces everything what we call evil, no less than what we call good.

"God shows his face to us no less in darkness  
Than in the light."

Every cause in the world is a natural cause, and every effect is a natural effect. Every manifestation of life has a cause; it is the same with human life as with all life. A slimmer never did an evil deed without a cause that produced the deed, which deed is the effect of the cause, and every effect of every cause is legal in nature—is in keeping with nature's laws. It would be childish to say that behind the blow that murdered a man there was not a cause, the effect of which was the blow, and the consequence the murder. Nature has hidden springs. There lies a brain of peculiar organization behind the hand that gave the blow, which produced the murder. That brain was made by nature. Unseen currents of vitality run through that brain, and nature gives these currents, and makes them flow. We cannot see them; they stimulate the brain, and the brain acts as servant to these currents, according to its organization, formation and capacity. These currents of life come into the brain and run down through the feet and hands of the murderer; and they are servants, too. They use the feet to carry the murderer to the scene of murder, and the hands to do the deed of murder. And the man we call a free moral agent, kills another man, that we call a free moral agent. This deed we call evil. What is the cause? Nature. What is nature? God. And is nature wrong? Is God, the great moulder of nature, wicked? Is there that in nature which needs remedial agents to be administered by the feeble hand of man? Yes, it may be so, for man is a part of God, or else God is not infinite. Nature holds every atom of human composition obedient, perfectly obedient, to her laws, and in man's nature lies the acting power of Deity. The desires of men, and the inclinations of men, from whence come they? From God, direct and immediate. Every desire of the human heart runs as natural and as true to the laws of God in nature, as the stream of water runs obedient to the laws of God in gravitation—sometimes turbid, in darkness, and in mly places, and sometimes in sunshine and in crystal purity, over clean sand and pebbles. The little rivulet has its origin in nature—it is moved by nature—its windings, and its gurgling, its foamings and its splashing, are all the effects of natural laws. Dam it up, and by the laws of nature it rises above the obstruction and flows on; it mingles with other waters, and still obedient to the laws of nature, it flows on, and is lost in the ocean of its destination.

The human soul is like a stream of time, destined for the great ocean of eternity. It governs itself no more than does the little rivulet of the earth; but like it, it is held perfectly obedient to unseen laws. That kind of it is held by the rivulet, and the hand of destiny holds the souls of men. The stream goes zigzag—man is wayward and goes zigzag. It bears bubbles on its surface and they break; human life has bubbles, and they break. The stream dashes furiously over the precipice, and moves faster on its course in consequence of its foaming, dashing fury; the peaceful course of human life is thus broken by what we call the damning evils; the waters of life are thereby agitated, not injured; stagnation is arrested, and progression is accelerated thereby; it moves more rapidly on to its destination in consequence of moral falls which break its peaceful flow. Then the stream flows calm and tranquil, peacefully and beautifully; so the course of human life is calm and tranquil, peaceful and beautiful. This is "good," we say; this is "holiness and righteousness," we say. But in this peaceful flow the soul moves more slowly on to its destination of eternal beauty; its earthly windings are lengthened and its destination is later reached.

Evil is the rapid falls in the stream of time; good is the peaceful flow. Evil shortens our earthly existence; good lengthens it. The stream of life flows on unobdured and ungoverned by man, but in obedience to the laws of God in nature.

What is the cause of what we call evil? Was an evil deed ever committed without a cause of sufficient power to produce the deed? No philosopher can answer yes. Then where lies the cause, and where had it its origin? We have said, in yielding to temptation; in some deed of evil that has preceded. Go back another step—where had that temptation, and the yielding to it, an origin? And keep going back step by step, and at last we must conclude that every cause lies in nature; in the bosom of God.

What is the cure of evil? In answer to this question, I would ask first, is nature sick? Does nature need any remedial agents? We talk of curing evil. Why, do we know that to talk thus is to talk about curing God? Does Infinite Power need a cure? If so, for what? For the manifestations of Infinite Wisdom in the order of creation, which the feeble perception of man cannot see the purpose of? No; we can suggest no cure for the benefit of the already perfect order of Infinite Wisdom and Power.

Mr. Cushing—The argument of Dr. Child is logical, and, if true in any part, is true in the whole. He is to Spiritualism, what Hume was to the age in which he lived. He is the only consistent reasoner I have heard in the ranks of Spiritualism. But his basis is absolute fatalism. His position is, that all matter and all worlds are moved by the same Almighty Power; all life, and all the manifestations of life, may be attributed to one Great Cause. And, consequently, he comes across nothing wrong. From this position, he must conclude that slavery and murder are right, and all crime, and all the curses of the earth; and he has no hand or voice to raise against evil. Ask him what is evil, and he says there is none. Ask him what God is, and he answers, Nature. He says cause is nature, and effect is nature; all is right. His position claims that there is no use in trying to correct men, for there is no power to correct; that man is a part of God, and God is infinite. If this position be true, he might as well blot out his manuscripts as to read them; for there is nothing to reason upon. He has made assertions without the least power to sustain them.

Mr. Emerson—I accept one idea of Dr. Child, viz., that God is infinite; but this, to me, consists in essence rather than in quantity or space. The infinitude of God differs from our ideas of infinitude. Our ideas are finite, measured by matter and space. Human will and divine will are vastly different. A truth of heaven may be told to earth, and to our dark perception become a lie—and thus good appears to us evil.

Dr. Child has stated that "cause is the will of God;" this statement seems to me absurd. I admit that there is not an evil deed without a cause; but I cannot see that evil is the will of God. It is an evil to me when I violate a known law of right. It is the will of God that I should do right; it is not his will that I should do what I know to be wrong.

Most people think that ignorance is the cause of evil. I think this is a mistake. As time goes on, I see differently. My deeds of ignorance are not, to me, evil; but when I transgress a law that I know, that transgression is evil. If I yield to temptations, knowing them to be wrong, my deeds are evil. God has given man knowledge, and from knowledge comes choice; we have the power to choose the good or the evil. We have the animal and the spiritual nature; between these two natures is a strife. It is the will of God that we rise above the animal, and set our affections on the spiritual.

Wm. Wadsworth—I am of Dr. Child's side.

"All nature trembles to the throne of God."  
"All are but parts of one stupendous whole,  
Whose body nature is, and God the soul;  
That changed through all, and yet in all the same,  
Great in the earth as in the ethereal frame."

There are differences in nature; all things are not alike; there is light and darkness, cold and heat good and evil, as we say. There is a necessity for all these things; the wisdom and power of God in nature produces them. To the vegetable world darkness is just as necessary as light. So to the world of intelligence it is just as necessary as good, without evil there could be no progress. Evil has given to us a greater part of our intelligence. In a very limited sense, there is evil in the world; but in a broad and comprehensive sense, what is called evil is an absolute good, necessary and essential to human progress. God is perfect. The perception of evil is external and material; and this evil is as transient to the soul as is the use of material things. The material world is a necessity in the early growth of the







1. The first step is to identify the problem or question that needs to be answered. This involves understanding the context and the specific requirements of the task.



Christian religion. The gospel of Christ is a gospel of love, and a follower of Christ is a disciple of love—not a soldier of war.

"Christ's church militant" on earth, as the Episcopal Church to which I belong calls itself, fights, it is said, all under the banner of love. Lucifer is the leader of all who fight, not Christ. In love there can be no fighting; love gives, and bears the fruit of peace.

Let the graveyards of battle-fields give up their dead; let bleeding soldiers come forth with their mutilated bodies, fresh as on the day of battle, with broken and splintered bones; torn and mangled flesh; some with heads off; some with legs and arms off; some with perforated brains and hearts; and some with bowels torn away by infernal grates. Let these come forth in real, not phantom ranks; and in regiments of legions they will come; let them speak; ask all of them who ever heard about the love of Christ, and his teachings, if the paths of a soldier's life are "ways of peace, and all her paths are paths of peace?" Ask them if war is Christianity. Ask a legion of desolate widows who were soldiers' wives—whose sympathies hover over their awful scenes; and the legion orphans, who were soldiers' sons and daughters—whose destruction, tears, sighs and sufferings, have made angels weep—ask them if war is the fruit of the advent of the blessed Jesus, who is the cornerstone and the foundation of Christianity? And listen to the response bursting from myriads of lips—"Oh, God! we suffer! Where was our Saviour? Where was the love of Christ? Shame on the manna that governed nations; that 'professed,' and rejected Christ, and plunged the people, by force, into the deepest hell of earthly war, by wars and fighting. Where is Christianity? where is the voice of love that calls humanity to happiness and heaven? We have known only the reverse."

Let women hold the reins of nations, and they would set all the soldiers to farming, for the reason that they are better Christians than men are; they are nearer allied to heaven; they have more Christian forgiveness and Christian love. Women would never go to war.

Christians use pruning hooks and plowshares to do the work of life with. Soldiers use swords and guns. The Christian will not, cannot use weapons of war, for his condition is above war. Popular Christianity still clings to swords and guns. Lucifer's men may keep their powder dry and bayonets sharp; it is necessary—but for the men of Christ, wet powder and plowshares are just as good. The true Christian needs, nor owns, nor imagines, no guns, nor arsenals, no navies, no militas. The popular Christian must have all these.

As high as the heaven of peace transcends the hell of contention in power, so high the power of Christian love transcends the power of human resistance, of human force, of human fights. Love invites; war drives. Love leads to the gardens of beauty, where angels are; where Christ would lead us. War runs at us with a pitchfork, and drives us over a precipice into hell-fire. Christianity, by love, leads us to heaven; and war, by hatred, leads us to misery and suffering.

There is not an idea extant more utterly futile, than the idea that Christ rejuvenated and reinforced the laws of vengeance taught in the Old Testament, or that his dispensation of love was promulgated in the Old Testament; his name is not once written in the whole Old Testament record.

But many prophecies are therein written about that sweet and holy dispensation of Love, that centuries of time alone could develop in the progressive growth of humanity, to be utilized and first taught presented to human consciousness in the holy and divine Jesus Christ of Nazareth. In these character, teachings and practical life was no war, no vengeance, no hatred, no antagonism, no recrimination. In him was the government of love first instituted. He buried the weapons of war. He banished the accursed law—"An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth"—and substituted the infinitely more potent law, which is love for hatred. He taught humility, meekness, kindness, charity and forgiveness that have no limits; not one of these elements can exist as a part and parcel in the composition of a good soldier.

A. B. C.

## Toleration.

Freedom and love you manifest, will you permit me to express a few thoughts to your numerous readers?

It is a known fact that some men cannot distinguish certain colors, which are nevertheless plain to other people. Other men cannot see objects plainly at a distance. So of the intellect. Some men cannot see the truth of propositions which are as plain to other minds as the colors which some fail to see. Now, as it would be folly for him who cannot distinguish the difference between two colors—clearly different to the eye of most people—to deny that any difference existed, merely because he could not perceive it, so also it is the manifestation of folly for a man to deny the truth of a proposition which other men say they clearly see, simply because he cannot see what is plain to other minds. Positive experience must always weigh against merely negative experience; as, for instance, if one man tells me he never saw a lion, and another man tells me he has, independent of other testimony, taking each of these men to be sincere, I must believe on the testimony of the latter, that lions exist, although the former has never seen one. So, also, if one man says he has seen the truth of a certain proposition, it seems to me that other men cannot say the proposition is not true, but only, "I have not seen its truth."

Reasoning consists in the finding of one fact by the light of another fact; as, if I have a rule a foot long, and I find a stick of just the length of the rule, I say the stick also must be a foot long. But suppose the rule which I have taken to be a foot long, is really fourteen inches; all my conclusions, based upon my error respecting the rule, must be erroneous, because the rule by which I arrived at these conclusions is false.

Thus it may be true that man has, really, but little, or no absolute knowledge, excepting of his existence and experience; and of that, even, he knows but little; so that a man becomes more modest, and careful to not dogmatize, the more he becomes developed.

It is well known that multitudes of errors prevail on all subjects. Since all men take the opinions they hold, for guides, or lights, in judging what is truth, if their light or guide is false, must not their judgment be false, thus far, also? Hence it appears that, while rejecting to material things, as we know of them, that they affect us through our senses in a certain manner. So of intangible things, presented to the mind; do we absolutely know, or can truthfully say of them, that they affect our minds so and so; as, either producing in us sentiments and emotions of approbation or disapprobation. Hence it is not safe to take, either the experience of others or of ourselves, as a certainly infallible guide, or light; I mean so far as to pronounce it absolute truth, the results of which are never to be modified or corrected by future experience. Although a man may tell me his experience, and I may also have experience similar myself, I will not feel myself infallible while following it; simply because both he and I may have had only a false or partial light in the case, and so all our experience in the premises may have been equally imperfect.

After writing the above, in agreement therewith, I can only say, such is my present mind on the subject of truth; and I will simply add a few, to my mind, important deductions. If the above reasoning be correct, at least while cherishing such views, we ought to be extremely tolerant toward all men. Would it not be the height of folly to censure our neighbor, because he did not agree with us as to the color of a piece of cloth? And since all men differ from all others, can it be expected that opinions or experience will be, in different minds, precisely similar? Is it not probable that no two human minds can perfectly agree, in either sentiment or emotion? How absurd, then, must it be, to use the tongue or pen for a whip, to lash a fellow-being into our traces! The longer I live the more I love toleration, and the more I dislike the least appearance of one man lordling it over another. It is sweet to sit in council, where each acknowledges a full peer in every other one present; where only love and mutual toleration and forbearance prevail; any where every one is listening to every other one, to receive some new light, to aid in expanding and developing the soul. I love you, dear BARNABAS, because, generally, this sweet spirit is breathed by you, and seen in you; although occasionally one, like him of Athol toward Mrs. Spence, manifests a little creaking and tossing of the head. I love the modernist department, and the phenomenal or experimental department, especially. The more experience the better; it is always better than more theory, or philosophy. Such an article as that of Brother Child, about his minister, will make more converts to the blessed truth than an hundred philosophical essays. Personal experience, simply narrated, has qualities which produce the most striking effects upon readers or hearers, as the history of Christianity abundantly testifies. I cannot say with others, "The experience of another is nothing to me." Nay, nay—it is very much to me, every way; and I, and all other men, make it the basis of action every day of life. We are daily in the habit of believing, undoubtedly, what others tell

us they see and hear; and we always do it, unless special reasons induce the contrary. And, while testimony accumulates to support the same class of facts, popular incredulity feels the weight, and is yielding fast. It will not do for the Christian to reject testimony, because the entire Christian structure is based upon faith in human testimony; the Church receiving the Bible record upon the sayings of an hundred part as many persons testify to Spiritualism, and yet reject the modern revelation?

DELAVER.

## Letter from New Brighton, Pa.

DEAR BARNABAS—I send you the accompanying slip from the New Brighton Times, which will apprise you of the journey of J. V. Mansfield among us. The tests that he is giving, of spirit presence and communication, are incontrovertible. No candid person can enter his rooms without being convinced of this fact. The first condition, indeed, essential to the reception of truth, is a spirit of candor and sincerity. The egoistical, the caviling, the bigoted, know the joys that flow from a child-like willingness to accept the truth, come from whatever source it may. The true man or woman will "believe upon truth whenever found."

The world is beginning to see that, if a man would be wise he must not tie up to old landmarks, and continue forever revolving in the same circumscribed orbit, content with the little knowledge thus far evolved; but he will go forth as a tireless explorer after New Worlds of Thought, of Wisdom, and of Light. In the words of Emerson: "He in whom the love of truth predominates, will keep himself aloof from all moorings, and adrift."

We are glad Mr. Mansfield is with us; and, while we cannot expect to bring light to the darkened, bigoted mind, we see his blessed results already manifested in those who have come with a desire to know the truth. Still, even the most skeptical and bigoted are often confounded; but upon such the truth does not descend with its warming and vivifying power. They must gradually emerge from the frozen regions of their own rigid natures.

Mr. Mansfield continues his journey to St. Louis, and probably to New Orleans.

New Brighton, Pa. Yours, for all truth,  
Dec. 8, 1889. MRS. A. TOWNSEND.

We subjoin, in this connection, the articles referred to above:

J. V. MANSFIELD.

Mrs. Emerson—Permit me to present very briefly a statement, involving a strong test of spirit-communication, which was given at Mr. Mansfield's rooms in this place on Monday last.

Talbot Townsend wrote on a slip of paper the following:—"Dear brother David Townsend—Is this present? And if so, please say what was the cause of your death? This was carefully concealed from the medium's sight, and was enclosed in several folds of paper. Instead of receiving a response from his brother David, however, the answer came from his father, Francis Townsend, as will be seen by what follows:

My dear Son—There has for several years past been a great deal of trouble in your mind, and I have been unable to communicate with you. He has not strong communicative power. The manner of the dear one's death tells the whole.

To Talbot Townsend. Thy Father, FRANCIS.

This, it seems to me, Mr. Editor, involves a test which can be accounted for on no other hypothesis than that of the spiritualist. A brother is called for, but the father, who has been in the spirit-land near fifty years, comes instead. This disposes of the theory of mind-reading, of clairvoyance, of telepathy, of electricity, or clairvoyance. Mr. Mansfield was utterly ignorant of the names of Francis, David or Talbot Townsend, or of the relationship they bore to each other. This is a simple fact—and only one of ten thousand. How are these things, Mr. Editor, to be accounted for? Let those, who will, be candid and look them in the face, and if they can be solved on any other principle, than that of direct, palpable spirit communication, let the world know it. The benefit of it, and the benefit of the world, will be great and increasing.

Mr. Mansfield is a very courteous gentlemanly man, and desires to take no advantage in any way whatever. He has given away thousands of communications to those who have been unable to pay, which have produced many a sorrowing and delicate heart. But for his time and labor thus spent in promoting what to millions is a great and sacred truth, it is indispensible that he should receive a recompense. And this he does from all who can afford to aid him in his mission.

New Brighton, Dec. 8, 1889. MRS. A. TOWNSEND.

A REMARKABLE TEST OF SPIRIT-PRESENCE.

On Tuesday afternoon, occurred a remarkable incident, which I beg leave to relate for the benefit of all inquiring minds. There were present on this occasion Talbot Townsend, Edith W. Townsend, Eliza T. Pugh, Amos Hamilton and Miss A. Townsend.

We were conversing upon general topics, when, suddenly, Mr. Mansfield remarked, addressing himself more particularly to Talbot Townsend, "I see, and have seen several times, since I have occupied this room, and especially when you, Mr. Townsend are present, a spirit who presents himself as a little child, and then as a full-grown man. What it means I do not know." In a few moments Mr. M. seemed impelled to sit up to the table, and taking his pencil wrote the following, while we sat wondering what was going to be written:

"My Precious Father—Through the assistance of my precious mother, now with me—long, long have I sought to come to thee, though nearly half a century an inhabitant of spirit-land. Yet I have sought thee early and late, and never before have had the pleasure of coming to thee. Mother Eliza has better control than I have, yet she cannot communicate fully. Oh! Father! thou wilt soon see as we do; thy sands of life have nearly run. Do encourage, my father, and know a beautiful mansion awaits thee. I have desired to say much to thee, but I have no sisters. But my strength fails me now. Mother sends love."

"Excuse the want of 'plain language.' I was not old enough to learn any before I left the earth."

Thy Son, MILTON TOWNSEND.

The above, addressed to Talbot Townsend, purports to come from Milton Townsend, a son of his father who died in 1840, and was about a year old at the time of his father's death. Will those versed in theological or scientific lore give a satisfactory solution to the above facts, independent of the spiritualist hypothesis? If so, they will be the world's benefactors, and will receive the thanks of the undersigned witnesses of this remarkable test of spirit presence and power.

MRS. A. TOWNSEND, TALBOT TOWNSEND, EDITH W. TOWNSEND, ELIZA T. PUGH, AMOS HAMILTON, MISS A. TOWNSEND.

## SECTARIANISM.

BY A CLERGYMAN.

We think it perfectly consistent with what daily experience teaches us, that there is no evil which shows itself more plainly to be detrimental to the moral interests of society, than that of sectarianism, and we cannot consider it to be a necessary evil. It is true that man possesses a number of faculties, independent of each other—as our mental organization indicates—and these have a variety of developments, also an infinite number of combinations, of which, as a consequence, only one can exist in a single individual; and, therefore, a diversity of mind and talent must be the result, and consequently arises. This, of course, will account for the many opinions which may exist in Christendom, but does not sanction every dogma conceived by them as truth.

All religious views, of whatever denominations, are considered by their advocates to be emanations of the divine dictation. The doctrine of Christ seems plain and unmistakable to each Christian, but, as we have just observed, there is such a diversity of mind in the world, that different opinions were formed in regard to it; and those differences arising at the time of Christ, have multiplied, rather than grown less, as present time, and the history of the past abundantly testify.

Zealous leaders have arisen, and each have not only ventured to interpret those doctrines as he might have seen fit, but instituted their various systems of dogmas, which now hold in bondage many minds of the present day.

Calvin, Wesley, Worcester, Fuller, Murray, and many other religious reformers, each maintained their own separate, peculiar views—and no doubt conscientiously—gaining the number of followers, who, in opposition to each other, sought to influence the world by their religious tenets; and even at this present time there exists a variety of denominations of Christians who would deem it contrary to the rules of Christian propriety to admit each other into their pulpits. And so what should prove itself worthy of that Christian principle taught by him whose followers they profess to be, which is to "love thy neighbor as thyself," is converted into a narrow-mindedness—each thanking God, like the self-righteous Pharisee, that he is not as other men are. So much do they fear countervailing influences, that perhaps we might with profit compare their religious opinions, or the leading tenets of their faith, and note the difference; for, as we have before seen, all acknowledge the same great Divine Teacher, and if their tenets are characteristically opposite, one or more of them must be erroneous.

1. They all believe God to be the universal Father of all men. There can be no dispute arising here, of course, and so we pass on to the next step.

2. They all acknowledge that Christ came to save mankind from sin, by the promulgation of his gospel tidings. Whether he will, or will not accomplish this, is not in our present consideration, only the simple fact that he came to do it. No Christian will try to deny this, for this is a freely admitted fact.

3. Virtue is according to, and Vice is opposite to, the teachings of Christ and the dictates of our conscience.

4. Virtue will invariably meet its due reward, and Vice will always receive its due punishment.

Do not all denominations of Christians agree upon these points? And still others might be added which are equally as common.

But, it may be argued, there are many points about which they differ, too. We might then ask if there are any two persons who think exactly alike upon all points? May not two persons walk together, because they may choose to dress differently?

One person may cross a lake, another may travel around the eastern, and still another around the western side; but does not one gain a given point as honorably as the other? If each denomination desire to worship under chosen though variable forms, is not one as acceptable as the other? It is not the difference of the manner of worship which we consider to be an evil, but the "I am holier than thou" characteristic, that we find existing among the several churches. It would be impossible, in any city or town, for all persons to worship in the same house, providing all were of the same religious creed, any more than they do now; and, furthermore, it is well known that all the churches of any sect do not adhere to any prescribed list of forms any more than do the sects themselves, therefore it is not the want of outward forms to which we have reference, but that of the leading principles of the word of God, whom they profess to venerate and address as "Our Father who art in Heaven" that we wish to consider; for if "we are his offspring," and he loves us, we ought also, as the Apostle teaches us, "to love one another."

The teachings of Christ and his apostles are contradictory to such conclusions as this principle carries forward.

The Bible, with great earnestness, (and this they take as their sole guide,) stands a bitter reprover for all such uncharitableness, and voices seem to whisper in our ears, "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. Love the brotherhood. If any man say I love God and hate his brother, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" How can the seeker after truth, in view of this, be justified when he is in direct opposition to the guide which he professes to be his duty to rigidly follow.

Our Saviour says, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, mind and strength, and thy neighbor as thyself," showing that the whole law is included in the two facts of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man; and yet, with all the light which has been shed and revealed in favor of Christianity, these important facts have not been yet learned by many.

But many of them say, "We are willing to unite with the rest; let but the other denominations submit to our opinions, to our rule of faith and ideas of duty, and we will consummate a union. That we have always willing to do."

Thus says one, and thus they all say, none willing to unite with the other, unless they will all embrace their peculiar, one-sided, sectarian views; and for this reason a union does not exist; and while they act upon this principle, it never will; and as long as these ideas remain, unfriendly and therefore unchristianlike feelings will exist among mankind.

But the law of progression will act upon this, as upon other things; and as time by this law has wrought great changes in regard to religion, we firmly believe that still greater are destined to be made; and we look forward to the time, which we believe is not far distant, (if we judge from the change that has been wrought in the past,) when such religious notions will be done away, and all shall seek, in the language of the Apostle, "to be of one mind, comforting one another."

Written for the Banner of Light.

## "HAVE YOU FAITH IN GOD?"

BY MRS. L. M. WILLIS.

"Have you faith in God?"  
I have faith in God, but my heart grows chill  
As I turn to the battle and die,  
For the victor that wins, and the conqueror's will  
Is for wrong, oppression and sin.  
"Have you faith in God?"  
I have faith in God, but I see not the light  
That shines from his luminous day;  
I have faith in his promise, and trust in his might,  
But my vision is shut from the way.  
"Have you faith in God?"  
Oh, ask me no more; I can trust in His love,  
But the faith that gives all to Him,  
That says on the earth, as in heaven above,  
His will is ever supreme.  
That faith in God, oh, would it might come  
To all who wait and who pray,  
That with steadfast eye, mid the din and alarm,  
They might trust His eternal day.

From the Natick (Mass.) Observer.

## It is a Humbug!

Mr. Editor—Seeing a notice of the wonderful doings of one of our citizens in the way of delineating character from handwriting, I called on the person, Mr. H. L. Bowker, with a letter of John Quincy Adams, and received the following, which I took down at the time. It is proper to say that the letter is dated Nov. 16, 1842, and was written to me as Secretary of the Natick Lyceum, in answer to an invitation to lecture, which Mr. Adams accepted, and also that Mr. Bowker did not know of my having such a letter, and I did not allow him to see the writing until after he had given the delineation, but gave him the letter folded. He took the letter in one hand, held it for an instant to his forehead, and said:

"A man of strong vital powers—strong power of endurance—round, plump build, well made, full, hard muscles, and possessed of great endurance, physical and mental; a consistent, reliable, and true man—in every systematic—fond of debate, argument and contention—takes hold of subjects with great force and comprehension—prefers to attack an antagonist by strategy, but will not shrink from an open assault when strategy won't avail. Is lively in conversation, and has a ready and apt—can plan well—in very systematic—fond of friends and enemies to face—has a great many enemies, who are such from interest or prejudice, and not from any injury he has done them. Is not very vain, and devotes but little time to money making—has much work to do, and does it, but has no time to do the world—has operated on a wide and extensive field—I have the impression of vastness, breadth and extensiveness, connected with his operations."

The above was given off by Mr. Bowker without hesitation, while pacing the room, the letter lying on the desk before me, folded, and it being utterly impossible for him to know by whom it was penned.

I send it to you as a curious exhibition of mental phenomena, and your readers can judge of its application to the character of Mr. Adams.

Yours, J. B. MARX.

## Only a Tinge of Purity.

Messrs. Editors—A noted clergyman in your city was unexpectedly called upon, at the close of his Thanksgiving day's discourse, to perform the marriage ceremony. A leading Boston paper, in speaking of the affair, says:

"The ceremony was performed in a very graceful manner by Rev. . . who imparted a fresh interest to this familiar but always interesting rite, by the eloquent remarks with which he prefaced it. 'The marriage tie,' said he, 'is the holiest of all human relations. The first union in the garden of Eden was between him who was pure as an angel, and the first Eve, a virgin of this purity has clustered around and clung to the nuptial band.'"

The above nonsensical twaddle—not to say insult to humanity—hardly requires comment. It was doubtless very gratifying to the parties concerned, to be informed "in a graceful and eloquent manner," that the union they thus sought publicly to solemnize, had in it a tinge—just a tinge—of the purity of their first parents! Comforting assurance, indeed! Very presidential! that the Fall of Man left even a reflection of a moral tinge!

But will the reverend gentleman explain how the marriage tie "is the holiest of all human relations," and yet "only a tinge of the purity of our primitive parents clusters around it?" If we have so far fallen below them as to have only a tinge of the original purity of this "holiest of human relations," then, indeed, the sooner we have done with that relation the better.

The idea that such clerical nonsense as that quoted above should "impart a fresh interest to the marriage rite," is altogether too fresh to be palatable. The audience must have

dispered well nattered morally, and if delicately organized must have sat down to their "Thanksgiving dinners" with even their gastronomic powers in a somewhat unsettled condition.

Lawrence, Mass.

W. T. L.

## Back Numbers of the Banner of Light.

Containing HENRY WARD BARNES' and EDWIN H. CHAMBERLAIN'S, may be procured at this office. Mail orders promptly attended to.

Upon matters which are affected by feeling and sentiment, the judgment of woman surpasses that of man; her more sensitive nature carries her to heights which his coarser nature cannot reach.

## MOVEMENTS OF LECTURERS.

Two lines, under this head, will be inserted free of charge. All over two lines must be paid for at the rate of six cents per line for each insertion wanted.

Lecturers will please remit, after the first insertion, at the above rate. The increasing demand upon us in this department renders this step necessary. Changes in our department will be made free of charge, at any time.

Mrs. AMANDA M. SPENCE will lecture in Boston, 4 Sundays of Dec.—Norwich, 4 Sundays of March. Taunton, 2 Sundays of Jan.—Williamsville, 2 Sundays of April. Foxboro, 3 Sundays of Jan.—Philadelphia, 4 Sundays of May. Providence, 4 Sundays of Feb.

Mrs. AMANDA M. SPENCE will lecture in New York City. Address, above places, or Station A, New York City. WARDEN CHAS. LORRICK will lecture in Waltham, Dec. 27th, 28th and 29th; in Windsor, Ct.; Jan. 1st, in Hartford, Ct.; Jan. 8th, 4th and 10th, in Winsted, Ct.; Jan. 8th, 15th, and 22d, in Dordrecht, N. Y.; Jan. 29th, Newark, N. J.; four Sundays of Feb. in Philadelphia. Address for January, at all offices, 145 Fulton street, New York.

Mrs. ELIZA HARRISON will lecture in New Orleans, La. For Southern cities address care of N. O. Folger, Esq., New Orleans. In January and February, Miss Harding speaks in Memphis and Cincinnati, and in March in Philadelphia and the East. Postoffice address generally 8 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

JOHN MARSHALL, M. D., will visit Grand Haven, Grand Rapids, Lyons, Iowa, and other places in Northern Michigan where his services may be desired. Friends on this route will address him before the end of this month at Grand Haven. This will probably be his last journey in Michigan. From the middle of January to March 1st, he will labor in Indiana, and from thence, to April 30th, in Illinois, and the eastern part of Iowa. Letters from the three last named States may be directed, if before the end of the year, to the care of S. Brotherton, Pontiac, Mich.

F. L. WADSWORTH speaks Dec. 25th, in Attica; Jan. 1st, in Delphi; 8th, in Elkhart; 16th, in Sturgis, Mich.; 22d, in Adrian. He can be addressed as above.

Mrs. M. M. MINNENBROOK will lecture in Providence, Dec. 25th, and from thence, to April 30th, in Illinois, and the eastern part of Iowa. Letters from the three last named States may be directed, if before the end of the year, to the care of S. Brotherton, Pontiac, Mich.

Dr. P. B. RANDOLPH's address, till further notice, will be Boston, care of Banner of Light. Enclose stamp for return letter.

Mrs. CHARLOTTE M. TUTTLE's address will be at West Windsor, Ct., during the winter, and the time of her present absence, which is very delicate, and any message from friends to be to her, will be to her mother, Mrs. C. Tuttle, West Windsor, Ct.

Mrs. ELIZABETH LOW, trance speaker, of Leon, Catawagus Co., New York, lectures at Ellington and Rugg's Corners, (Catawagus Co., N. Y.) every fourth Sabbath. She will answer calls to lecture in Chautauque and Catawagus Counties.

Mrs. A. W. SPRAGUE will speak in St. Louis, Missouri, during the month of Dec. Her address for week openings will be care of James H. Blood, Box 3891, where those who wish her to call, as she returns eastward, can address her accordingly.

Mrs. M. S. TOWNSEND will speak in Marlboro, December 25th.

LINDSEY M. ANDREWS, superior lecturer, will visit the South and West this fall and winter. Address him, either at Yellow Springs, Ohio, or at Mendota, Ill.

Dr. F. SPRAGUE will speak in New Bedford, Mass., Sunday, Dec. 25th, and from thence, to April 30th, in Illinois, and the eastern part of Iowa. Letters from the three last named States may be directed, if before the end of the year, to the care of S. Brotherton, Pontiac, Mich.

Mrs. M. S. TOWNSEND will speak in Marlboro, December 25th.

Mrs. J. W. CURRIER will lecture in Lawrence, Dec. 25th and Jan. 1st; in Huntington, 8th; in Modus, Ct., evenings of the 10th and 12th; in Chicago, 15th, 22d and 29th; in Putnam, Ct., Feb. 6th; in Foxboro, 12th and 19th; in Marlboro, 25th. Applications for the Spring should be sent in as early as possible. Address Box 516, Lowell, Mass.

Mrs. S. M. MURPHY, trance speaker, may be addressed at Clinton street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mrs. M. MURPHY, San Francisco, Cal. Mrs. SARAH M. THOMPSON, Toledo, Ohio. A. B. FRENCH, Clyde, Sandusky Co., Ohio. F. T. LANE, Lawrence, Mass.

Mrs. J. W. CURRIER, Lowell, Mass., Box 816. CHARLES H. CROWELL, Waterbury, Mass. Address, BARNER OF LIGHT OFFICE.

WILLIAM E. HIGGS, 142 Harrison Avenue, Boston. Mrs. H. FRASER's address will be New York City, till further notice.

Mrs. ELA E. GIBSON, Barre, Mass. Mrs. H. M. BROWN, "Agitator" office, Cleveland, Ohio. J. H. CORRIER, Lawrence, Mass. Dr. JAMES COOPER, Bellefontaine, Ohio. CHAS. H. CROWELL, Inspirational Speaker. Box 22, West Killingly, Conn.

Rev. JOHN PIENPOZ, West Modford, Mass. Mrs. SARAH A. MAQUON, No. 35 Winter street, East Cambridge, Mass.

Mrs. S. M. MURPHY, Plymouth, Mass. H. L. BOWKER, Natick, Mass., or 7 Davis street, Boston. BENJ. DAWSON, Boston, Mass. ELIZABETH WOODWARD, Lowell, Mich. C. T. IRISH, Taunton, Mass., care of John Eddy, Esq. Dr. B. WHITE, Providence, R. I.

Mrs. BERTHA B. CHASE, West Hartford, Mass. Mrs. B. MARIA BLISS, Springfield, Mass. Prof. E. G. CHURCHILL, No. 202 Franklin street, near Rao, Philadelphia.

Mrs. J. B. SMITH, Manchester, N. H. Dr. C. O. YORK, Boston, Mass. J. O. HALL, Buffalo, N. Y. CHARLES F. RICHES, Lowell, Mass.

A. C. BARNES, Fall River, Mass. LORING MOODY, Malden, Mass. Mrs. J. R. STRATTON, Crown Point, Ind. N. S. GREENLEAF, Lowell, Mass. Mrs. SUSAN M. JOHNSON, North Abington, Mass.

Mrs. A. P. THOMAS, Raleigh, N. C. Mrs. FRANCES O. HYATT, Newell, Vt. Mrs. M. H. COLLE, care of Bela Marsh, 14 Bromfield street, Boston.

Mrs. A. TUCKER, Foxboro, Mass. GEORGE ATKINS, Boston, Mass. Dr. H. P. BARNES, 48 Essex street, Boston, Mass. LEWIS B. MONROE, No. 14 Bromfield street, Boston. DANIEL W. SNELL, No. 6 Prince st., Providence, R. I. CHRISTIAN LINDY, care of Deni, Teasdale, box 221, Alton, Illinois.

Dr. DANIEL DANA, East Boston, Mass. JOHN C. OLIVER, Residences, No. 5 Bay street, Boston. J. J. LOCKE, Greenwood, Mass.

MRS. GRACE L. BEAN, WASHINGTON STREET, (in Fine Street Church, up one flight of stairs, Room No. 2) Boston. Assisted by Mrs. G. L. the celebrated Psychometrical Clairvoyant.



## HENRY WARD BEECHER

PLYMOUTH CHURCH, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Sunday Evening, Dec. 11th, 1859.

REPORTED FOR THE BANNER OF LIGHT, BY T. J. ELLIOTT, D.D.

Text.—"These words spake his parents, because they feared the Jews; for the Jews had agreed already, that if any man said he was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue. Therefore said his parents, He is not our son; ask him."—John 10, 24, 25.

What were the words that, for fear of the Jews, these parents spake? They consisted of two truths, one, and a device. The case was as follows: A blind man had been healed by Christ's miraculous power. It was a very remarkable instance. The man had been blind from his birth. It was therefore a hopeless case. It was not, then, a medical relief. Of course natural remedies could not cure him. That which did cure him was a thing which they could not afford to have take place.

It seems that the neighbors first took the matter in hand.

"The neighbors therefore, and they which had seen him that he was blind, said, Is not this he that sat and begged? Some said, This is he: others said, He is like him"—they were cautious; they did not mean to commit themselves—but he said, I am he. Therefore said they unto him, How were thine eyes opened?"

A gaping, staring, curious crowd they were, that questioned him thus.

He answered and said, A man that is called Jesus, made clay, and anointed mine eyes, and said unto me, Go to the pool of Siloam; and wash; and I went and washed; and I received my sight. Then said they unto him, Where is he? He said, I know not."

Now the thing was so curious, was so remarkable, and was exciting so much attention, so much thought, so much feeling, so much speculation, that it could not be allowed to pass. The man was therefore brought to the Pharisees who had in charge the religion of the times.

"They brought to the Pharisees him that aforetime was blind." And it was the Sabbath day when Jesus made the clay and opened his eyes. Then again the Pharisees also asked him how he had received his sight. He said unto them, He put clay upon mine eyes, and I washed, and do see."

He began to be a little stirred up, and therefore he made his reply a little more curt and brief than when the neighbors asked him.

"Therefore said some of the Pharisees, This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath day. Others said, How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles? And there was a division among them."

But next witnesses were called.

"The Jews did not believe concerning him that he had been blind, and received his sight, until they called the parents of him that had received his sight. And they asked them, saying, Is this your son, who you say was blind? How then doth he now see?" His parents answered and said, Now you have an opportunity of worldly wisdom; now you will see how a man can lie, and yet speak the truth all the while; now you can see how men will dodge and evade, for fear of responsibility, a very small matter.—His parents answered them and said, We know that this is our son, and that he was born blind; but by what means he now seeth, we know not; or who hath opened his eyes, we know not: he is of age; ask him; he shall speak for himself."

So it slipped off, and they got out. And it is added: "These words spake his parents, because they feared the Jews; for the Jews had agreed already"—for the purity of the faith, you know; for the maintenance of sound belief and good order in the church; for the vindication of the authority of ecclesiastical affairs.—"for the Jews had agreed already, that if any man did confess that he was Christ"—no matter what the evidence might be—"he should be put out of the synagogue."

In those days a man had to go out of the synagogue to be an honest man!

"Therefore said his parents, He is of age; ask him." Then the questioning was renewed.

"Again they called the man that was blind, and said unto him,—with remarkable pity; because you know that often when selfish, obstinate, headstrong men are determined to do wrong, they fall into most profound moods of pity; nothing is so pious as worldly men are."

"—that was blind, and said unto him, Give God the praise; we know that this man is a sinner."

Now they could not have said anything more wounding to the heart of this grateful, truth-telling, fearless man, and he strongly resented it. He said:

"One thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see. Then said they to him again,—for that rather opened the controversy once more.—"What did he do to thee?"—anyhow, as it were,—how opened he thine eyes?"

His patience had quite failed. He could not stand this catechizing any longer.

"He answered them, I have told you already, and ye did not hear: wherefore would ye hear it again?"—as much as to say, Are you so curious because you are going to be his disciples?—will ye be his disciples? Then they reviled him, and said, Thou art his disciple; but we are Moses's disciples. We know that God spake unto Moses; as for this fellow, we know not from whence he is."

The man, having got his temper up, was not disposed to let the matter rest there, and replied to them. He said:

"Herein is a marvelous thing, that ye know not from whence he is, and yet he hath opened mine eyes?—as much as to say, It is strange that you, who are religious teachers, and know so much, do not know from whence he is, that has done such a wonderful thing as to open my eyes.—"Now we know that God heareth not sinners; but if any man be a worshiper of God, and doeth his will, he heareth him."

The man had considerable knowledge, when they got him down to it.

"Since the world began, it was not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind. If this man were not of God, he could do nothing."

Well, there did not seem to be any very good answer for them to make, so they replied as follows:

"Thou wast altogether born in sin, and dost thou teach us? And they cast him out."

And that—the casting out—was an irrefragable argument!

There is but one pleasant scene in the whole case, and that is the simple fidelity of this grateful man to the truth, and the unflinching witness borne to Christ, to his own damage. There is no question that at the time the event under consideration took place, this man cut the worst figure of all who had to do with it. The synagogue stood, all the officers and the parents were in good favor, everybody smiled, and everything was pleasant and brotherly, except so far as this one man was concerned. He, poor, miserable fellow, ran his head against authority recklessly, and was kicked out of the synagogue, and stood all alone! And that is the whole history of what occurred at that time. But there is another part of the history which we must read.

"Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and when he had found him,—for it seems that he went out to hunt for him—"he said unto him, Dost thou believe on the Son of God? He answered and said,—and with the same simplicity and unpretending truthfulness which had characterized his replies to the other questions that had been put to him.—"And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both seen him, and it is he that talked with thee."

And there was some Divine power in those words of Christ, for the narrative goes on to say:—

"He"—the man—"said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him."

Happy man! Blessed explosion, that put him out of the synagogue that he might go into the arms of God! It was a day in which not only his eyes were opened, but his heart likewise, so that everlasting life entered in.

Let me look, however, a little more at large at this case, now that we have gone through it by the text.

I, Christ, in the exercise of Divine sovereignty in mercy, had opened the blind man's eyes in a way not expected, not authorized, and not likely to reflect credit upon the Jewish church. It was an entirely uncanonical, irregular act. This council of the Pharisees resented it. We believe now, what they did not then believe—that God was a Sovereign, and had a right to administer his mercy in any way which pleased him best. God administers his mercy yet in the same way. He reveals himself to men under all church administrations. There are good men to be found in every organization, and there are good men to be found outside of all organizations. Men are Christian men under all creeds, and out of churches, and away from all creeds. There are some men in every sect that are found of God, and saved by the power of Christ's love; and yet every sect is very apt to arrogate to itself the only way of salvation, and to doubt the genuineness of any work of grace performed without its permission or privacy. Those of each sect think, or are apt to think, that God loves them chiefly, as being the purest repository of the best truths, and that he loves others, if at all, only remotely. We are

apt to suppose that God bestows his promised mercies upon that part of Zion to which we ourselves belong, and that only his unconvinced members come to other parts. The sun for us, and only the moon for those that disagree with us;—that spirit is a much alive to that degree which we are blind to; for it is not a Jew spirit; it is a human nature. In the Pageant of the human mind, the stream of grace is not limited to certain channels. It flows in them, and outside of them; it overflows them.

The spirit of sect, of party, of ecclesiasticism, is not simply selfish; it is audacious, and clouds and degrades the grandeur of the Divine sovereignty—the freedom with which God dispenses his mercies over all the earth, saying, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and whom I will, I will harden," reserving to himself, and not entrusting to the care of any organized body of men, the right to do as it pleaseth him.

II. The Jewish priests had fallen into the following mistakes:

They had made their own minds the measure of all truth; in other words, they had assumed that the truth which they had at that time was to be the measure of all truth.

They had come to consider the synagogue as the indispensable means of truth. All things were to be judged, therefore, as true or not true, by the simple circumstance of their agreement or disagreement with, their favorable or unfavorable influence upon, the welfare of the synagogue. Whatever tended to promote its peace was presumptively good and true; and whatever tended to lessen or destroy its peace, was presumptively mischievous and false. They had come to believe that it was more important to maintain the authority and dignity of the synagogue, than it was to ascertain truths that had not been known or felt.

To do this they thought themselves justifiable in refusing to receive evident truth—to receive what men not so committed perceived to be true. They would not receive anything which had not already been believed. They attempted to pervert an ingenious and honest man, and to persuade the man to be false to his own moral convictions, for the sake of agreement with the establishment; and they did not consider the mischief of making a man dishonest to his own conscience, and treacherous to his own understanding for the sake of preventing disagreement with the ecclesiasticism of the synagogue.

But one of the most striking exhibitions of moral obliquity is here made, when they deliberately held up a mere canon or artificial observance, in comparison with a great humanity. For instance, Christ had healed this man who was born blind. He had shown the power of God in himself, not merely in the miracle of curing him, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of it. But in their judgment the moral nature of this deed was nothing when weighed against the fact that he did it on Sunday. It was done on the Sabbath day, and they put this fact in the balance against the fundamental principle of humanity; and they esteemed the violated canon more than that principle. Their moral sense was so undeveloped, or so perverted, that they could not see the superiority of this great moral fact over a mere instrumental arrangement. They attempted by all intimidations and persuasions to make this man bear false witness. They expelled him from the church, finally, simply because he was true to his convictions; not because he was a disturber—he had made no disturbance; not because he was bad—there was every evidence that he was good; not because there was anything in him whatsoever, except this: that he was a living witness to the grace and power of God upon him, body and soul, in such a way that he would be a rebuke to their synagogical procedures.

Now in all this the Jews were not wrong in trying new things by the standard of old things; but they were wrong in trying them in a blind and obstinate spirit. We are obliged to learn new things by a comparison of them with old things. The new must be tested by the old, but in this more remarkable thing—the Divine kindness of