

NEW-ENGLAND SPIRITUALIST.

A JOURNAL OF THE METHODS AND PHILOSOPHY OF SPIRIT-MANIFESTATION, AND ITS USES TO MANKIND.

PUBLISHED AT 15 FRANKLIN STREET, BOSTON.

"LIGHT! MORE LIGHT STILL!" — GOETHE.

TERMS, TWO DOLLARS A YEAR IN ADVANCE.

Vol. II.

FOR THE WEEK ENDING SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1856.

No. 33.

Illustrations of Spiritualism.

THE FLIGHT INTO EGYPT.

We select as a pleasing illustration of Spiritualism, the following, from Mrs. Stowe's "Dred." In a former extract from that work we have shown that Dred was a medium; and a recognition of that fact makes the subjoined episode at once more interesting, rational and philosophical. The simple-hearted Tiff, too, gives evidence that he was susceptible to spiritual influences. Viewing the matter from the stand-point of a Spiritualist, we should say that Tiff, by his holy aspiration and prayerfulness of spirit, had brought himself in rapport with the angels really and truly, as he believed, and that they impressed him with the vision which was the answer to his prayer. And further, these same ministering angels, knowing Dred's impressibility, made him their unconscious servant, and led him with an invisible cord to bear material refreshment to the weary, sleeping objects of their love and care.

In order to a better understanding of the story, we will premise that Tiff was the slave of a dissipated white man whose first wife had died, leaving two children, Fanny and Teddy. These children were the dearest objects upon earth to Tiff, but were so ill-treated by their step-mother that he resolved to escape with them in the night. Our extract begins just as the trio have started on their perilous journey.

"Yes," said Tiff, "all right. Now de angel of de Lord 'll go with us into de wilderness!"

"There's plenty of angels there, an' t'ere?" said Teddy, victoriously, as he lifted the little bundle, with undoubting faith.

"Laws, yes!" said Tiff. "I don't know why dere shouldn't be in our days. Any rate, de Lord 'peared to me in a dream, and says he, 'Tiff, rise and take de chill'en and go in de land of Egypt, and be dere till de time I tell dee.' Dem is de bery words. And 'twas 'tween de cock-crow and daylight dey come to me, when I'd been lying dar praying, like a hail-storm, all night, not gibing de Lord no rest! Says I to him, says I; 'Lord, I don't know nothing what to do; and now, if you was por as I be, and I was great king, like you, I'd help you! And now, Lord,' says I, 'you must help us, 'cause we an't got no place else to go; 'cause, you know, Miss Nina she's dead, and Mr. John Gordon, too! And dis yer woman will ruin dese yer chill'en, ef you don't help us! And now I hope you won't be angry! But I has to be very bold, 'cause tings have got so dat we can't bar 'em no longer!' Dem, yer see, I dropped 'sleep; and I hadn't no more 'n got to sleep, jist after cock-crow, when de voice came!"

"And is dis de land of Egypt?" said Teddy, "dat we're going to?"

"I spects so," said Tiff. "Don't you know de story Miss Nina read to you once, how de angel of de Lord 'peared to Hagar in de wilderness, when she was sitting down under de bush? Den dere was another one come to 'Lijah when he was under de juniper-tree, when he was wandering up and down, and got hungry, and woke up; and dere, sure 'nough, was a corn-cake baking for him on de coals! Don't you mind Miss Nina was reading dat ar de bery last Sunday she come to our place? Bress de Lord for sending her to us! I's got heaps o' good through dem readings."

"Do you think we really shall see any?" said Fanny, with a little shade of apprehension in her voice. "I don't know as I shall know how to speak to them."

"O, angels is pleasant-spoken, well-meaning folks, allers," said Tiff, "and an't take no 'fence at us. Of course, dey knows we ain't fetched up in der ways, and dey don't 'spect it of us. It's my 'pinion," said Tiff, "dat when folks is honest, and does de bery best dey can, dey don't need to be 'fraid to speak to angels, nor nobody else; 'cause, you see, we speaks to de Lord himself when we prays, and, bress de Lord, he don't take it ill of us, no ways. And now it's borne in strong on my mind, dat de Lord is going to lead us through de wilderness, and bring us to good luck. Now, you see, I's going to follow de star, like de wise men did."

While they were talking, they were making their way through dense woods in the direction of the swamp, every moment taking them deeper and deeper into the tangled brush and underwood. The children were accustomed to wander for hours through the wood; and, animated by the idea of having escaped their persecutors, followed Tiff with alacrity, as he went before them, clearing away the brambles and vines with his long arms, every once in a while wading with them across a bit of morass, or climbing his way through the branches of some uprooted tree. It was after ten o'clock at night when they started. It was now after midnight. Tiff had held on his course in the swamp, where he knew many fugitives were concealed; and he was not without hopes of coming upon some camp or settlement of them.

About one o'clock they emerged from the more tangled brush-wood, and stood on a slight little clearing, where a grape-vine, depending in natural festoons from a sweet gum-tree, made a kind of arbor. The moon was shining very full and calm, and the little breeze fluttered the grape leaves, casting the shadow of some on the transparent greenness of others. The dew had fallen so heavily in that moist region, that every once in a while, as a slight wind agitated the leaves, it might be heard pattering from one to another, like rain-drops. Teddy had long been complaining bitterly of fatigue. Tiff now sat down under this arbor, and took him fondly into his arms.

"Sit down, Miss Fanny. And is Tiff's brave little man got tired? Well, he shall go to sleep, dat he shall! We's got out a good bit now. I reckon dey won't find us. We's out here wid de good Lord's works, and dey won't none on 'em tell on us. So, now, hush, my por little man; shut up your eyes!" And Tiff quavered the immortal cradle hymn,

"Hush, my dear, lie still and slumber!
Holy angels guard thy bed."

In a few moments Teddy was sound asleep, and Tiff,

wrapping him in his white great-coat, laid him down at the root of a tree.

"Bress de Lord, dere an't no whiskey here," he said, "nor no drunken critturs to wake him up. And now, Miss Fanny, por chile, your eyes is a falling. Here 's dis yer old shawl I put up in de pocket of my coat. Wrap it round you, whilst I scrape up a heap of dem pine-leaves, yonder. Dem is reckoned mighty good for sleeping on, 'cause dey 's so healthy, kinder. Dar, you see, I's got a desput big heap of 'em."

"I am tired, but I'm not sleepy," said Fanny. "But, Tiff, what are you going to do?"

"Do," said Tiff laughing, with somewhat of his old, joyous laugh. "Ho! ho! ho! I's going to sit up for to meditate—a 'sidering on de fowls of de air and de lilies of de field, and all dem dar Miss Nina used to read 'bout."

When Fanny and Teddy were both asleep, Old Tiff knelt down and addressed himself to his prayers; and, though he had neither prayer-book, nor cushion, nor formula, his words went right to the mark, in the best English he could command for any occasion; and, so near as we could collect from the sound of his words, Tiff's prayer ran as follows:

"O, good Lord, now please do look down on dese yer chill'en. I started 'em out, as ye telled me; and now whar we is to go, and whar we is to get any breakfast, I's sure I don't know. But, O good Lord, you has got everything in de world in yer hands, and it's mighty easy for you to be helping on us; and I has faith to believe dat you will. O, blessed Lord Jesus, dat was carried off into Egypt for fear of de King Herod, do, pray, look down on dese yer por chill'en, for I's sure dat ar woman is as bad as Herod, any day. Good Lord, you's seen how she's been treating on 'em; and now pray do open a way for us through de wilderness to de promised land. Everlasting—Amen."

The last two words Tiff always added to his prayers, from a sort of sense of propriety, feeling as if they rounded off the prayer, and made it, as he would have phrased it, more like a white prayer. We have only to say, to those who question concerning this manner of prayer, that, if they will examine the supplications of patriarchs of ancient times, they will find that, with the exception of the broken English and bad grammar, they were in substance very much like this of Tiff.

The Bible divides men into two classes; those who trust in themselves and those who trust in God. The one class walk by their own light, trust in their own strength, fight their own battles, and have no confidence otherwise. The other, not neglecting to use the wisdom and strength which God has given them, still trust in his wisdom and his strength to carry out the weakness of theirs. The one class go through life as orphans; the other have a Father.

Tiff's prayer had at least this recommendation, that he felt perfectly sure that something was to come of it. Had he not told the Lord all about it? Certainly he had; and of course he would be helped. And this confidence Tiff took, as Jacob did a stone, for his pillow, as he lay down between his children and slept soundly.

But, though Tiff and the children slept all night, we are under no obligations to keep our eyes shut to the fact, that between three and four o'clock there came crackling through the swamps the dark figure of one whose journeyings were more often by night than by day. Dred had been out on one of his nightly excursions, carrying game, which he disposed of for powder and shot at one of the low stores we have alluded to. He came unexpectedly on the sleepers, while making his way back. His first movement, on seeing them, was that of surprise; then, stooping and examining the group more closely, he appeared to recognize them. Dred had known Old Tiff before; and had occasion to go to him more than once to beg supplies for fugitives in the swamps, or to get some errand performed which he could not himself venture abroad to attend to. Like others of his race, Tiff, on all such subjects, was so habitually and unfathomably secret, that the children, who knew him most intimately, had never received even a suggestion from him of the existence of any such person.

Dred, whose eyes, sharpened by habitual caution, never lost sight of any change in his vicinity, had been observant of that which had taken place in Old Tiff's affairs. When, therefore, he saw him sleeping, as we have described, he understood the whole matter at once. He looked at the children, as they lay nestled at the roots of the tree, with something of a softened expression, muttering to himself,—"They embrace the Rock for shelter."

He opened a pouch which he wore on his side, and took from thence one or two corn-dodgers and half a broiled rabbit, which his wife had put up for hunting provision, the day before, and, laying them down on the leaves, hastened on to a place where he had intended to surprise some game in the morning.

The chorus of birds awakened Old Tiff, accustomed to habits of early rising. He sat up and began rubbing his eyes and stretching himself. He had slept well, for his habits of life had not been such as to make him at all fastidious with regard to his couch.

"Well," he said to himself, "any way, dat ar woman won't get dese yer chill'en, dis yer day!" And he gave one of his old hearty laughs, to think how nicely he had out-witted her.

"Laws," said he to himself, "do n't I hear her now! 'Tiff! 'Tiff! 'Tiff!' she says. Holla away old mist! 'Tiff! 'Tiff! 'Tiff!' no, nor de chill'en eider, por blessed lambs!"

Here, in turning to the children, his eye fell on the provisions. At first he stood petrified, with his hands

lifted in astonishment. Had the angel been there? Sure enough, he thought.

"Well, now, bress de Lord, sure 'nough, here 's de very breakfast I's asking for last night! Well, I knowed de Lord would do something for us; but I really did n't know as 't would come so quick! May be ravens brought it, as dey did 'Lijah—bread and flesh in de morning, and bread and flesh at night. Well, dis yer 's 'ouraging—'t is so. I won't wake up de por little lambs. Let 'em sleep. Dey'd be mighty tickled wher dey comes fur to see de breakfast; and, den, out here it's so sweet and clean! None yer nasty 'baccas-spittins' of folks dat does n't know how to be decent. Bress me, I's rather tired, myself. I spects I'd better camp down again, till de chill'en wakes. Dat ar crittur 's kept me gwine till I's got pretty stiff, wid her contrary ways. Spects she 'll be troubled as King Herod was, and all 'Rusalem wid her!"

And Tiff rolled and laughed quietly, in the security of his heart.

"I say, Tiff, whar are we?" said a little voice at his side.

"Whar is we, puppit?" said Tiff, turning over; "whar, bress yer sweet eyes, how does yer do, dis mornin'? Stretch away, my man! Neber be 'fraid; we's in de Lord's diggins now, all safe. And de angel's got a breakfast ready for us, too!" said Tiff, displaying the provision, which he had arranged on some vine-leaves.

"O, Uncle Tiff, did de angels bring dat?" said Teddy.

"Why did n't you wake me up? I wanted to see them. I never saw an angel in all my life!"

"Nor I neider, honey. Dey comes mostly when we's sleep. But, stay, dere's Miss Fanny, awaking up. How is ye, lamb? Is ye 'fresheed?"

"O, Uncle Tiff, I've slept so sound," said Fanny; "and I dreamed such a beautiful dream!"

"Well, den, tell it right off, 'fore breakfast," said Tiff, "to make it come true."

"Well," said Fanny, "I dreamed I was in a desolate place, whar I could n't get out, all full of rocks and brambles, and Teddy was with me; and while we were trying and trying, our ma came to us. She looked like our ma, only a great deal more beautiful; and she had a strange white dress on, that shone, and hung clear to her feet; and she took hold of our hands, and the rocks opened, and we walked through a path into a beautiful green meadow, full of lilies and wild strawberries; then she was gone."

"Well," said Teddy, "maybe 't was she who brought some breakfast to us. See here, whar we've got!"

"Fanny looked surprised and pleased, but, after some consideration, said:

"I don't believe mamma brought that. I don't believe they have corn-cake and roast meat in heaven. If it had been manna, it would have been more likely."

"Neber mind whar it comes from," said Tiff. "It 's right good, and we bress de Lord for it."

And they sat down accordingly, and ate their breakfast with a good heart.

FACTS AND TESTS.

AUGUST 11, 1856.—Mrs. Beck was visited at home this morning, by John E. F. Clarke, Esq., of 84 West Twenty-sixth street, and while sitting with Mrs. B. at a table, she was entranced by the spirit of Mr. C.'s sister, the late Mrs. Seymour. The spirit said: "Brother John, I want you to appoint a meeting to be held at the house of our parents, 84 West Twenty-sixth street; I want to speak to father and mother through this medium." (Mr. C.'s father is quite an old man, and cannot go from home.) The meeting was accordingly appointed for the next Thursday evening. The spirit said: "Tell my father that it was I that saved him from falling down stairs the other day, when he slipped; and tell sister Maria that she did right in giving that medicine to the young woman; I impressed her to do so;" and to her brother John, she said: "I assisted you in making manipulations and removing the pain from the head of the young woman in so short a time." The tests are these:

1. Neither Mr. Clarke nor the medium knew anything about Mr. C.'s father having had a dangerous slip on the steps, or stairs; nor did Mrs. Beck or Mr. Clarke know anything about any medicine having been given by Mr. C.'s sister, as stated, until Mr. C. went home and made inquiry, and found both to be literally true.

2. Mr. C. had made passes over the head and face of the young woman in his father's house, but had not said one word about it to any one out of the house.

3. The meeting appointed to be held at the house of Mr. C.'s parents on the 14th, was held; but Mrs. Beck was unable to attend the meeting, being quite unwell. She was much troubled about the disappointment that would be felt. Our spirit son, John H. B. Beck, was present with us at home, conversing with us during the evening, when Mrs. B., his mother, said: "John, our friends at Mr. C.'s will feel disappointed at my not being there." He said, "No." She then said, "Will you go there, and if Sister Malone is there, will you write through her hand and tell them I am sick, and can not come?" He said, "Yes."

When the circle had all assembled, except Mrs. Beck, Mrs. Malone being present, and all waiting with anxiety for the arrival of Mrs. B. and regretting her absence, all at once the hand of the medium, Mrs. Malone, was influenced and wrote:

"Friends, you must not feel disappointed at the absence of my mother; she is sick and cannot come."

JOHN BECK.

Now not one of the company up to that time had the smallest idea what had detained Mrs. Beck, but all were looking for her arrival momentarily up to that time.

These facts can be vouched for by Mr. John E. F. Clarke, Mrs. John Malone, Mr. Clarke's parents, sister, and others.—*Correspondent Spiritual Telegraph.*

Discussion.

SPRINGS FROM THE "CEDAR OF THE SOUTH."

We give place to the following remarkable sample of clerical argumentation against Spiritualism, for reasons which we will explain to the reader in our editorial columns. We give it *verbatim et literatim*, from the Reverend gentleman's manuscript, so that its various excellences may be fully appreciated.—EDITOR.

For the New England Spiritualist.

CHAPTER I.

A REVIEW OF "BIBLE TESTIMONY TO SPIRITUALISM."

To the Editor.—The knowledge of the fact of our being some weeks from home, will be a sufficient apology for the Readers of the "Spiritualist," for not attending to the subject in question before; but now, being once more at home, we will endeavor to deal with the subject according to its deserts. However, before we proceed to the subject claiming our special attention, we beg leave to make a few remarks touching the Editor's "Reply" to "The Other Side," as published in the last issue of Oct. 4th, 1856.

He assures us that his "columns are open to any properly written review;" but the opening reminds us of the Saviour's description of a Camel going "through a needle's eye." As it was necessary for the Camel to put off his burden before entering the gate called "needle's eye"—so it is incumbent upon us, to divest ourself of the burden of argument before we can enter his columns. In order that the article may be relevant, he demands that it shall "show simply that the Bible-testimonies which he cited do not have the significance which he attributed to them;" (that which we intend doing,) and yet the munificent (?) condition he lays down is,

1st. That it will be regarded as "wholly irrelevant to launch out into a (proper) discussion of theological opinions."

2d. That it will be "equally so to attempt an array of other Scripture texts to prove an opposite theory."

3d. Notwithstanding we are allowed neither *theology* nor *Scripture texts*, still he demands "that such review shall be respectable in point of 'Scripture' argumentation."

4th. Again he says, "We do not assume the entire consistency of all Bible-writers on this point," hence we infer, that to dissent from the principles laid down by the learned Editor will be, to be either charged with *inconsistency* or *treating the subject irrelevant*. Hence, camel-like, it will be necessary for us to crawl through this "needle's eye," and get the burden in the very best manner we can. Now for the article in question, viz.,

"BIBLE TESTIMONY TO SPIRITUALISM."

It is not our business, at least for the present, to battle with Spiritualism any farther than the "Bible testimony" is concerned. We have no relish for the futile doctrines of psychomanancy; nor have we ever studied five minutes on the "theory of modern Spiritualism." "That human spirits exist after the death of their earthly bodies," we have never denied; nor has any other person, save a Sadducee or an Infidel; but "that they do communicate with those still in the body," we demand positive and indubitable testimony.

The Editor in his exordium to the subject in question makes the following bold and unqualified assertion:—"Spiritualism is fully competent to stand on the basis of its own facts and principles, and independently of any ancient testimony whatever!" That isto say: though our system be dissimilar, it is nevertheless independent of the Bible, or Christianity! Now, if it be "independent of any ancient testimony," what has the Bible or its testimonies to do with it? Why does he not let our Bible and our testimonies alone?

Now, if Spiritualism be competent to stand on the basis of its own facts and principles, as he says it is, it is then a new and independent system; and if so, why does he not, like every other founder of a new system, such as Tom Paine, on Infidelity; Joe Smith, on Mormonism; Mohammed, on Mohammedanism; and Brahma, on Brahmism, have a book of his own, i. e., a book of Spiritual ethics? Why does he not have a Spiritual Credenda to corroborate his deeds and dogmas, independent of our Bible?

Tom Paine had his "Age of Reason;" Joe Smith had his "Sacred Oracles;" Mohammed had his "Koran;" Brahma had his "Samsrit-Shaster;" Zoroaster had his "Zend Avesta;" and every Pope hath his "Bull;" and why does not this philosophical Editor have a book of his own, out of which to propagate his own exalted views? Why does he attempt to rob us of our Bible by making it teach Spiritualism instead of Christianity? Let our Bible alone! Or, if they have such an immediate call, or if they have a new system of ethics, why do they not like Jesus of Nazareth, whose divinity they deny, confirm it by undoubted miracles? A ten-fold woe to the arm that shall ever pluck from our Bible-diamond a single gem! "Let him be Anathema Maranatha!"

"How precious is the book divine,
By inspiration given;
Bright as a lamp its doctrines shine,
To guide our souls to heaven.

This lamp through all the tedious night
Of life shall guide our way,
Till we behold the clearer light
Of an eternal day."

Rippon.

The Editor seems to claim great reverence (?) for the Bible. For the confirmation of his Spiritual theory, "it is," (says he,) "only necessary to show that there is one passage," from the Bible, "which distinctly teaches this belief." How strange! He is the first man that we have ever heard of who would be satisfied to stake his future happiness on "one passage" of Scripture. "One passage"—eh? Really—Just "one passage," is enough to bear up this Spiritual edifice. We always recognized it to be, in every sense of the word—small;

but it verily looks smaller now than before—yes, infinitely smaller! This editor must be a credulous sort of a creature! What theological teacher, in all Christendom, would be satisfied to base his principles on "one passage?" One passage! what of that? what will that teach? We can select one passage here, and another there, irrespective of its Bible-connections, and make the Bible teach just what we please; E. G., "THERE IS NO GOD," is "one passage." But who but a "FOOL" hath ever denied, or even questioned the existence of God?

"There is a God—all nature speaks,
Through earth, and air, and sea, and skies;
See, from the clouds his glory breaks,
When earliest beams of morning rise.

Ye curious minds, who roam abroad,
And trace creation's wonders o'er,
Confess the footsteps of your God;—
Bow down before him—and adore!"

Steele.

The first *premiss* which the logical (?) Editor lays down is false in his face! He supposes, that, because the angels who appeared to Abraham had the "appearance of men," they were *real* men. But is that a *valid* conclusion? In a panoramic exhibition there may be the appearance of a mountain—but would that make it a mountain? *Not at all!* Women dressed in male attire will exhibit the "appearance of men;" but will that make them men? *Not at all!*

Again, he holds that they were men, because "they," (the angels who appeared to Abraham,) *talked with voices like men.* What a wild conclusion! We have heard many females "talk with voices like men," but never dreamed of their being men, because of that fact. Ladies who talk in the hearing of this punctilious Editor, had better be careful how they assume any of the masculine brogue; lest they should be summoned, arrested, arraigned, and incarcerated as impostors—*only* because they "talked with voices like men!"

Satan, in his interview with our Savior, had a "voice like a man;" reasoned like a man, and walked about like a man; but, whoever concluded that he was a man—i. e., a mere man? The Almighty "talked with Moses, face to face;" and with the "voice of a man;" but did that make Him a man? Does Moses say He was a Man? We have known Mocking-birds to whistle "like men," and Parrots to "talk with voices like men;" but, nevertheless, we never thought they were men! No, not for a moment! Though, of course, they must be if our good Editor's logic be correct. The above argument, (as given by the Editor,) in a Syllogistic form, would be logical as:

"Every horse is an animal;
Sheep are not horses;
Therefore they are not animals!" Or—
"All vegetables grow;
An animal grows;
Therefore it is a vegetable!"

The first passage quoted by our opponent is, Gen. xxiii: 1, 2:—(which, by the way, is quoted wrong; it should have been, Gen. xviii: 1, 2.) "And Abraham sat in the tent door in the heat of the day; and he lifted up his eyes, and lo! three men stood by him." That is, three individuals having the external "appearance of men,"—not *real* men. They were angels, now assuming human shapes, that they might be visible to Abraham, and conversable with him.

For the correctness of this statement we refer him to Paul. Paul, who was a "Hebrew of the Hebrews," and "brought up at the feet of Gamaliel," informs his brethren, Heb. xiii: 2, that they were "angels entertained unawares." Should the Editor question the truthfulness of the comment, or the validity of the argument, he will please be so kind, for his own satisfaction and our information, at his next eoterie for

"TABLE-BAPPING."

to summons Paul at his Spiritual-shrine, and gain from him the proper translation. As it is the high prerogative of our opponent to "deal in sacred things," "call up spirits," make them "tangible," and gain essential "communications" at his pleasure, we hold that this is as little as we can ask at his hands. We hope he will, at the earliest possible date, have an interview with the Apostle Paul; and in his next article furnish his readers with the true facts in the case. *This he will do of course!* Again,

He quotes from Gen. xviii: 20—"And the LORD [which everybody knows means JEHOVAH] said, Because the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their cry is very grievous; I will go down now" &c. The learned Editor in commenting upon this verse says: "One of these men was called the Lord; but not the omniscient Being he is now represented to be." "Called the LORD!" Now, this is either superlatively stupid pedantry, or inexcusable trickery; and, supposing the Editor to be a gentleman we cheerfully exculpate him from the latter, but beg leave to suggest to his mind the couplet of school-boy memory:

"A little learning is a dangerous thing,
Drink deep or taste not the Plerian spring;
There shallow draughts intoxicate the brain—
And drinking largely will sober us again."

Fearing our article should be regarded as being of more than "reasonable length," we close for the present; promising our readers to explain this passage in our second chapter; which shall be forthcoming in the next week's paper.

Respectfully,
CEDAR OF THE SOUTH.

Violet Dale, Oct. 11, 1856.

A DECLINE IN PREACHING.—The Rev. Mr. Smith, of the Shawmut Church, on a recent Sabbath, in an attempt to arouse his people to Christian labor, stated as a fact that there are three hundred less members in the Evangelical churches of Boston now than there were ten years ago, notwithstanding the large increase of population.

The Spiritualist.

A. E. NEWTON, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

"I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot hear them now."—Jesus.

BOSTON, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1856.

THE "CEDAR OF THE SOUTH."

Our readers will recollect the proposal from a clergyman of Maryland, printed in our paper a few weeks since, to review our address entitled "Bible Testimony to Spiritualism," published last June; also our expression of willingness to open our columns for such a review, on the simple and proper conditions that it should be "respectable in point of argumentation and expression (of which the position of our correspondent as a clergyman should be a sufficient guaranty)," and that it should be "relevant to the subject, and of reasonable length." We took special pains clearly to define the question, so that we thought no person, even of the most ordinary comprehension, could fail to see what was relevant and what was not.

Our lofty feeling friend, who chooses to write over the high-sounding cognomen of "Cedar of the South," has condescended to enter the lists under these conditions, and has sent us two chapters of his review. But we find that we greatly presumed in supposing his clerical title a sufficient guaranty of qualifications for entering upon such a discussion. We find that so far from being able to frame a respectable argument, with which to rebut ours, he as yet utterly fails even to see its bearing—he lacks the common honesty to state fairly our positions—he boasts of his entire unfitness for the work he has undertaken—and shows an inability to write even respectable school-boy English.

These are severe allegations, we are aware, to bring against a reverend clergyman, especially one who aspires to the distinction of a "Cedar" among common trees; and were it not for the pompous and defiant tone which pervades his writings, and the request to return them if not printed (probably that he may publish them elsewhere), we should be disposed to consign them to the usual receptacle of such rubbish, and spare him the disgrace of their publication. As it is, however, we have concluded to print his first chapter as a sample of clerical argumentation against Spiritualism—presuming that no reader (excepting the Rev. author himself) will ask any further justification of our course in declining to publish the remainder. (See the first page.)

Perhaps a few words of comment may be necessary to enable all to see the truthfulness of the statements made above:

1. The "Cedar" fails to see the bearing of our argument. He mistakes the simple point we were endeavoring to corroborate by "Bible testimony"—namely, that human spirits exist after the death of their mortal bodies, and that they can and do communicate with those still in the body. This is properly the "Theory of Modern Spiritualism," which alone we were laboring to corroborate by Bible-proof. Any body with half an eye ought to see that this does not necessarily involve what are usually termed theological questions of any kind; hence that all discussion of theological opinions is irrelevant to the question at issue.

In consequence of his blunder here, our reviewer blunders everywhere else. He goes on to speak of Spiritualism as "a new system" of "ethics" and of "dogmas," distinct from and "independent of the Bible and Christianity." Had he spent "five minutes" in studying "the theory of modern Spiritualism," he might have known that it is no such thing. It is not a new and peculiar system of ethics or of religious dogmas; it is simply the recognition of the facts relating to spiritual existence and action as stated above—and these facts, like any others, must and can stand on the basis of their own evidences. Modern evidences are sufficient abundantly to substantiate them, it is true; but it is perfectly legitimate and proper to cite any ancient testimonies which may be extant, in corroboration of the modern.

Again, our reviewer professes to understand us as saying that we were willing "to stake our future happiness on one passage of Scripture." We said no such thing. It was merely the question at issue in the debate where our argument was originally given, that we were willing thus to stake. As to our "future happiness," we state that, as we do our present,—not on any or all the passages, in any or all the books extant,—but simply on knowledge of and obedience to the Truth, now and in the future. Any other reliance but this, we are confident, will prove fallacious. If, however, the Bible be the "precious book divine" which our reviewer affirms—if every word of it is "God's word," as is generally held—then why should not "one passage" be sufficient to rely upon for any and all purposes? And why does our "Cedar" speak so contemptuously of "one passage"? If "one passage" is so worthless, how will he show that many passages put together are to be relied upon?

Other mistakes (?) might be pointed out, but we proceed to show that he has done worse than make mistakes:

2. He lacks the common honesty to state fairly our positions and arguments. This is evinced, first in his attempt to state our conditions, where he has contrived to make our language express a meaning not intended by us. But this is more inexcusably evident when he comes to state what he calls our "first premise." Here he represents us as putting forth as "logical" conclusions, what we cited as merely "presumptive evidence." On the capital furnished by this false representation, our truth-loving (?) reviewer proceeds to construct a brace of syllogisms (more correctly *sillygisms*), and make merry at our alleged want of logic! His want of honesty in the matter is too serious a subject for merriment.

3. As to his unfitness for the undertaking, his boastful confession that he has never "studied five minutes on the theory of modern Spiritualism," is sufficient evidence, though he needed not to avow it. Had he at all comprehended what that theory is, he would not probably have sought this exhibition of himself before the public.

The ridiculous alarm which our clerical friend manifests, at our venturing to cite testimonies from the Bible, his frantic outcries of "Let our Bible alone!" and his wrathful though impotent "anathemas" against the arm

that shall "pluck a single gem" from the Bible, suggest that he considers it a very frail and perishable affair! Surely, that must be a singularly "precious" book, whose statements will not bear to be quoted even when they accord with the facts of modern science! If there is any truth in its pages, it is as good for us as for clergymen; and if it has "gems" of any value, that value cannot be injured by any use we make of them.

A word or two relative to his concluding charge of "either superlatively stupid pedantry, or inexcusable trickery" on our part, and we have done with this reviewer. He promises to substantiate this in his second chapter, which we have before us, but which we do not think would either edify the reader or do credit to the writer. It is nearly all devoted to a very learned attempt to show that the word "LORD" in the Bible, when printed in capitals, is always applied to JEHOVAH, and not to men or angels; while the same word in small letters (thus, Lord) is applied to kings, princes, nobles, and even to "a respectable person"! He challenges us "to show a single instance" to the contrary; and hurls at us an indefinite number of Bible-texts, a quotation from Dr. Adam Clarke, and a copy of "Webster's Unabridged Dictionary." All these, however, do not move us in the least from our position—namely, that the "three men" whom the Bible-historian says approached Abraham, are also, by the same historian called "angels," and one of them is called "the LORD." Any reader can see this by reading the xviii and xix chapters of Genesis. So it is understood and rendered by all commentators and expositors we ever consulted. Says the Cottage Bible,—"One of the three [men] is now announced as the LORD JEHOVAH." Says Bagster, on Gen. xix. 1, "these two angels," [i. e. "those mentioned in the preceding chapter and there called 'men']" were sent to Sodom, while the third, who is called the LORD or JEHOVAH, remained with Abraham." Our clerical friend has attempted, to be sure, by a prerogative clergymen often assume, to improve the passage so as to make it suit his purposes. When the Bible says that "three men" stood by Abraham, our critic says—"Ah, no, Moses! you mistake; they were 'not real men—they were angels assuming human shapes!' We see not why we may not take the same liberty, and when Moses declares that JEHOVAH spoke, say, 'Ah, no, Moses! you mistake; it was not the real JEHOVAH—only some angel or human spirit assuming to speak in his name!'" That this was the case seems more than probable in most instances,—this among them.

But our sage reviewer little apprehends the dangers into which his GREAT learning has plunged him. He probably never observed the fact—that of which most Bible readers are wholly ignorant, from mere want of careful observation—that no reliance whatever can be placed on the way the word *Lord* is printed in the Bible; for the simple reason that hardly any two editions of the Bible can be found to agree fully in regard to it! For example, we have now before us a copy of the "Cottage Bible," and one of the American Bible Society's 12th edition, 12mo. In one of these, in the very chapter under consideration (Gen. xviii), we find the word *Lord* printed in capitals in four instances where in the other copy it is in small type. We first made the discovery of this and other discrepancies in the letter of the Bible, several years ago, when, in the pursuit of our vocation as proof-reader for a stereotype foundry, it fell to our lot to read the final proofs of a set of Bibles. Finding frequent verbal differences in the common editions, we were told to take the Bible Society's issues as the standard; but found that different editions even of these did not harmonize. Before our work was completed we became involved in inextricable difficulties in endeavoring to ascertain what were the true readings in some cases; and we became convinced that if the Almighty ever saw fit to give to the world a plenary inspired and verbally infallible revelation of his will, his purpose had been signally defeated for the want of equally inspired and infallible transcribers, type-setters and proof-readers to perpetuate it!

In the light of these facts, we would respectfully suggest to our already very learned correspondent, that possibly one more draught from the "Pierian Spring," especially as it sometimes bubbles up in the work-shop of a practical northern mechanic, might not be wholly unserviceable in imparting soberness to his brain and clearness to his sight.

Leaving the reader to form his own opinion as to where the "superlatively stupid pedantry" in the case is most evident, we lift our hat to this stately "Cedar of the South," and leave him to beat the air in whatever way he chooses, and to his heart's content. "Long may he wave!"

ANOTHER LECTURER IN THE FIELD.

We are pleased to announce, that Rev. HERMAN SNOW, well known in New England as formerly a clergyman of the Unitarian order, but who was among the earliest in his profession to publicly avow a faith in modern spirit-communion, has returned from his western home, with the intention of spending the winter in this vicinity; also, that his physical health is so far re-established that he proposes to devote himself to the lecturing field while he shall remain. He will receive applications to speak on the Facts and Philosophy of Modern Spiritualism, either on Sundays or week evenings, at any place in this vicinity, where his services may be wanted. We can recommend Mr. Snow, to those who may not know him, as a cautious and reliable investigator, fully competent, from his own knowledge, to set forth the evidences and principles of the spiritual movement in a rational and convincing manner. He will not subject the friends to exorbitant charges for his services, but is willing to be compensated according to the ability of those who employ him. We trust he will find constant occupation during his sojourn, as well as suitable pecuniary remuneration. He may be addressed at this office.

NORTH-WESTERN EXCELSIOR.—We have received the first two numbers of a new Spiritualist paper with this title. It is published weekly in the quarto form, at Waukegan, Ill.—Messrs. LEA PORTER & J. C. SMITH, Editors. Surely the harvest is great, and faithful laborers are none too many. We doubt not our new co-worker will gather abundantly into truth's garner from the wide and prolific fields of the West. We wish him God-speed in the good work.—Excelsior!

He who masters his passion, subdues a fearful enemy.

A REMONSTRANCE.

Editor of New England Spiritualist:

I have taken your paper from its commencement, and although I might, possibly, in a more worldly point of view, have used the sum paid therefore more profitably, I wished to do the little my very limited means would permit, to help along the cause of Spiritualism, by helping, by my subscription, to sustain your paper, which, I entertained no doubt, until I saw the last number, was doing much to recommend that cause to the favorable notice of the community. I, however, now feel constrained to say in plain English, that I do not think your article in the last number, on the subject of "free-love" will do. It is true, you do not express your views very plainly—so that we can all understand precisely what you mean—but that you see something radically wrong in the existing forms of marriage among "Christians," which might be amended by the substitution or introduction of a little of the freedom which obtains among *Mormons*, seems very plain; and the small distinction you make in your very fine style of expression, between "free-love" and "free lust," will, I venture to say, appear to the great majority of your readers, merely "a distinction without a difference." No doubt, there is much attraction in "free-love" to some people, and for aught I know to the contrary, it might do very well among "angels," but either the race of live men and women who dwell in this "wicked world" are not fit for "free-love" or "free-love is not fit for them." I shall not attempt to decide which—and I most earnestly beg, pray and entreat, sir, that you will wait until the "millennium" before you endeavor to induce mankind to put your views into practice, rather than seek to "indefinitely postpone" that happy period by persuading them that they can safely be practised before hand.

In this community, the cause of Spiritualism was progressing very rapidly until certain articles appeared in the newspapers charging leading Spiritualists with being *theoretically*, and in many cases *practically*, "free lovers." Many very worthy people, interested in the subject of Spiritualism, felt alarmed lest it might, after all, be the work of the "evil one," and for a while its progress was checked thereby. However, on more thorough investigation, they were convinced that although there might be here and there an advocate of free-love doctrine, who had been converted to a belief in the reality of spirit-intercourse, their free-love doctrine had no necessary connection with Spiritualism, or anything at all to do with it, and Spiritualists were not, in point of fact, any more obnoxious to the charge of entertaining free-love doctrine because there was here and there a free-lover who believed in Spiritualism, than was Christianity because there were many "Christians" who practised free-love. But at this point, just as we had begun to flatter ourselves that we had successfully "met the enemy" on this ground at least, here we have a number of the New England Spiritualist (which we have uniformly recommended as a correct exponent of the sentiments of Spiritualists generally) sent to us containing an editorial article on this very subject, advocating, as it appears to us, as well as those who are against us, this very same free-love; and our "enemies" meet us at the corners of streets, and, holding up your paper, exclaim in tones of the greatest exultation and glee, "Did not we tell you, sir—did not we tell you, madam, that Spiritualists advocated the doctrine of free-love? Here is one of your smartest writers, the Editor of the New England Spiritualist, your favorite organ, who maintains it, and we hope you will never again have the audacity to look any honest person in the face and deny it!" &c., &c., and we must confess that the only reply we can make upon such occasions is to ask them, "what they are going to do about it?"

Now, sir, as a friend, I most earnestly beg that you will permit this very ticklish subject of free-love to slide, at least while you have control of the New England Spiritualist. Those among us who happen to be married in the good old style, feel perfectly well satisfied with our wives, and want no other man's. When we change our sentiments, we will abandon Spiritualism, "experience religion" and "join" some Orthodox Church. Very truly yours, w. c. Stoneham, Nov. 1, 1856.

REMARKS.

We hardly know whether to think our friend in earnest or *ironical*. It seems scarcely credible that one who has the capacity to write thus clearly should so misunderstand and wholly pervert the language of another. In the article referred to we intended to, and did, in the plainest English we can command, express views the very opposite from those our friend seems to attribute to us; and so far as we learn, our readers everywhere, *Stoneham* excepted, have so understood us. What did our correspondent do with his eyes while reading that article? He says we "did not express [our] views very plainly," to the effect which he alleges. Indeed, we did not!—we expressed *nothing of the sort*, and we do not believe he or any one else would have imagined anything of the kind, had his mind been free from prejudice, or a previous belief that we were going to say something very wicked. Where in that article, or anything else we have written, will our friend point out a single word in favor of "the freedom which obtains among the *Mormons*," (that is, polygamy) or the least license to impurity of any kind? The only reason why our language is not plain to him, we must conclude, is because he attempted to extort from it a meaning which is never meant to convey. He confesses he doesn't exactly know what we did mean, but is pretty sure it is something very bad!

We should as soon have thought of our friend's remonstrating against the Sermon on the Mount, or the writings of John the Evangelist, on the ground that they contain exhortations to "Love your enemies," and to "Love one another," as that he should have objected to the article in question.

The main purpose of that article was to define the difference between *love* and *lust*—a difference as wide as that between *heaven* and *hell*, or *purity* and *impurity*. Our friend surely pays himself no very high compliment when he intimates he cannot see this difference! We are confident that the "great majority of our readers" will not thank him for his opinion that they are equally obtuse.

Another purpose was to show that the term "free-love" was *improperly applied* to the base and abominable doctrines of sensualism, which we repudiate and loathe equally with our correspondent. *Love is always free, while lust always enslaves*. Pray tell us, dear sir—ought not parents to love their children, and children their parents, *freely*? Ought not brothers and sisters to love each other *freely*? Ought not friends to love to love each other *freely*, as friends? Ought not husbands to love their own wives, and wives their own husbands, with *perfect freedom*? If not, in heaven's name, what would you have?—universal fear, suspicion, and *free-hate* instead? Yet such are the only kinds of "free-love" we have advocated, and we appeal to the article in question for the proof. We protest now and ever against the prostitution of those pure and holy words, *love* and *freedom*, to the base uses to which they have been applied.

But our correspondent is strangely inconsistent with himself. While professing to consider "free-love" too abominable a thing even to be mentioned in our paper, yet, "for aught [he] knows to the contrary, it might do very well among angels!" Though unfit for the present day, it will be the thing for the "Millennium"! If this does not evince a complete mental *obfuscation*, we know not what could. Surely we could ask no greater commendation of our views than the knowledge that they are approved and practised by celestial beings, and that they will prevail on earth in its coming millennial era, when the will of the Infinite is to be done in earth as it is now done in heaven. If such views are "unfit" for this present "wicked world," it must be because men and women wish to continue "wicked." It would greatly please us to have our friend tell how this world is to become purified, except by men and women becoming *like the angels* in purity and love? Or how the "millennium" is ever to begin, except by individual men and women *beginning to live* as they believe all will and ought to live in that exalted and redeemed condition of Humanity.

We would say, however, in the plainest possible English, that we do not believe what he and some others call "free-love," (i. e. free-lust) is "fit" for either men or angels—either the present time or the millennium; while, on the other hand, *real love*—that which alone we have advocated—is fit for now and all times,—for men, women, and angels,—for God Himself, for it is the pure essence of His Being!

We are free to say, therefore, that if the prosperity of Spiritualism in Stoneham, or anywhere else, depends upon Spiritualists keeping themselves and their neighbors in such a condition of mental obscurity, in relation to the most vital requisites of human advancement and spiritualization, we do not see that it is worth laboring for. If any Spiritualists imagine that mere acquaintance with "rapping" and "table-tipping," or phenomena of any kind, or mere exercise of the privilege of spirit-communion, is going to fit them to become angels of purity, or to carry the world forward to a millennial state of holiness and happiness, they are laboring under a more stupid delusion than is the "orthodox church," and it is time we did something to awaken them from it. *There can be little or no advancement without a knowledge of and conformity to the laws of PURITY in all relations*. The world (and the church too, to a fearful extent) is sunk in the slough of sensualism, and its eyes are blinded and beclouded by lust. If Spiritualism shall not raise the world from this slough, and baptize it in the pure waters of Divine, unselfish love, and purge its eyesight to behold the transcendent beauties of celestial freedom, then its progress can be of little service to mankind, and all its adherents had better "experience religion" in the old-fashioned way, and "join some orthodox church," as our friend suggests.

The question, then, of the difference between love and lust, is one in which every spiritual Spiritualist and every body else who wishes to live a *pure* life—is deeply concerned; and the very fact that any of our readers, either Spiritualists or others, are yet so thoroughly fogged as to mistake a plea in behalf of the highest purity for something exactly opposite, is sufficient proof that something ought to be said on the subject. We therefore kindly advise our friend, and any others who may have so misunderstood the article in question, to lay aside the spectacles of prejudice and misconception, and carefully and candidly study our remarks. We think, if they do not try to twist something out of our language which we did not intend to say, and do not believe, they will find it sufficiently "plain English" to be understood even without a dictionary.

They will find in it no countenance of polygamy, nor of desire after "other men's wives," nor of sensualism in any form or under any conditions; but on the contrary the strongest reprobation of everything of the kind. They will find in it no countenance of trifling with marriage obligations, however imperfect the present institution; on the contrary, we urge that such obligations be assumed *understandingly*, so that they may be fulfilled with purity and fidelity. And if greater explicitness be necessary, for the understanding of such as our correspondent, we would add here our conviction that the cases in which entire separation is advisable, even from most unhappy partnerships, are very rare. In fact, we do not take it upon ourselves to advise it in any case. They who have learned the truest and highest lessons of life know that to bear and forbear, to suffer and be patient, are not without lofty uses and divine compensations. Parties who find themselves in the legal relation of husband and wife, but unable to exercise towards each other the lofty sentiment of conjugal love, can at least, if they be true men and women, cultivate that mutual understanding and confidence, and manifest that magnanimity and nobleness of soul towards each other, which will command esteem and friendship, if not admiration. This would render life under the same roof tolerable, if not happy,—though in such cases, of course, a regard for the higher laws of purity prohibits the procreation of offspring to inherit their inharmonious conditions, as well as the exercise of those functions which pertain exclusively to the conjugal relation,—any exercise of which outside of that relation is lustful and adulterous.

This is a morality, we are aware, loftier than is required by either the State or the Church at the present day; yet nothing short of this can satisfy the requirements of the law of personal purity. We know of more than one couple among Spiritualists who, having discovered the mistake of their earlier years, are conscientiously pursuing this mode of life; and if any Spiritualists have failed to see that the legitimate and proper tendency of Spiritualism is towards a higher purity and truer chastity, they have missed, in our apprehension, its highest, holiest mission. No pure-minded person, understanding the full bearings of this subject, can, as we conceive, desire to "let it slide," or consider it too "ticklish" to be looked fully in the face. Those who are, or desire to be, in true conditions, will not be disturbed by the truth; while those who are not, ought to be disturbed.

The truth in relation to this matter, we apprehend, lies, as in most other cases, between the two extremes. We do not therefore expect the approbation of extremists on either hand, and shall not be disappointed if we do not receive it. Aware of the existence of a singular propensity to misapprehend and pervert the truth on this subject, we had long refrained from any reference to it—until repeatedly urged, by some of the staunchest friends of purity, as well as by our own convictions of duty, to endeavor to place the matter in its true light before our readers—so that important distinctions might be apprehended, and the requirements of true spirituality distinctly perceived. The congratulations we have received from other sources, lead us to hope that we were tolerably successful—Stoneham to the contrary, notwithstanding.

NOW IS THE TIME.

The great political-contest is at length over; and Mr. Some-one is to be the next president. We doubt not every Spiritualist has done his duty in the premises—has thrown his influence and his vote on the side that seemed to him right and true. So far, well done;—that question is at rest for four years to come. We cannot well overrate the importance of sound policy in civil government, and of entrusting the helm of power to such as will guide the ship of state steadily on her course to political and moral grandeur. But after all, there are questions of deeper import than those of a nation and of to-day. There are mighty truths which are not bounded by time nor state lines. There are grand principles which, starting in the central *now*, reach on through the infinite forever, embracing in their scope nations, worlds, universes without, and all the subtle, mysterious things of the soul within.

It is with such questions that Spiritualism has to do. The spirit in man is ever pressing deeper queries than Who is to be the next president, and what is to be his policy? It asks, Who is the great Ruler of all things, and what are his laws? It yearns to know if the strange veil called death is to shut forever from our hearts and eyes, those about whom affection's tendrils have so tenaciously clung. The bereaved heart refuses to be comforted till some answer shall come from the silent land in reply to those queries whose language is choking heart-throbs, whose words are agonizing tears.

"Can those who have loved forget?"

And wrongs unrighted, promised joys unattained, loves unrequited, griefs unassuaged, soul-longings unmet, and sympathies unappreciated, are constantly sending forth a searching voice to know if there be a realm where the weary may find rest, baffled hopes and aspirations meet reparation, and all these starvings of the soul be forgotten in a sweet fruition of its fondest dreams.

Such, we say, is the province of Spiritualism, and it is in such a field that our journal would go forth as an earnest laborer,—we trust "worthy of his hire." But much depends upon you, kind reader, as to our success in this immortal work. If you generously allow that we have the heart and the head to forward the good cause, we must yet be supplied with the *bone and muscle*;—in other words, not only mental and moral, but material capital is essential.

You, yes you, kind sir, you dear madam, that read this paragraph can lend a helping hand. Try it, and see how sweet will be the reflection that you have done something to aid in the promotion and dissemination of immortal truth.

It is true that, did we make the world, we might, in our short-sightedness, be disposed to frame society in such a way that dollars would never be thought of; but as it is, they are indispensable to success even in our department of labor. Unfortunately paper costs money,—we don't like the word—printing, composing, folding, mailing, etc., all cost money,—and they cost us beyond our receipts. Now, kind friend, hold the truths presented in a single number of this paper in one scale, and four paltry coppers in the other, and if—but the question is superfluous.

We close, then, with a practical suggestion. If each one that peruses this will add a single subscriber to our list, we shall be placed on firm footing, and our means of doing good will be such that we humbly trust you and the world will be gainers.

MANIFESTATIONS IN SOUTH AMERICA.

Mr. Henry Sawyer, a personal friend of ours, formerly of Charlestown, Mass., who has for several years resided in Surinam, South America, furnishes us with the subjoined statements. About three years since the residents of a house in Orange street, Surinam, were alarmed by sounds made in some unaccountable manner upon the floors and partitions. The mysterious noises were first produced in a single apartment, but after a few days were heard in every part of the house, to the great consternation of the occupants. The matter created a great excitement in the city, and reaching the ears of the civil authorities, a police force was stationed in the house day and night for some time with the design of detecting and bringing to justice the authors of the mischief. Their efforts, however, availed nothing, for the sounds continued, even about their very ears, in spite of their endeavors to ferret out the cause.

Our informant himself visited the house on one occasion in company with some government officials. They heard the sounds upon the ceiling, walls and floors, in various directions, and at times the air was filled with peculiar snappings and concussive noises; but they were unable to trace the phenomena to its source. After matters had continued thus for some days, an old native who had come to the city from the interior said he knew what caused these things, and if they would allow him, he would drive the spirit away. He was permitted to take his own course; and the same night the sounds ceased, and have not since been heard. These are facts that can be attested by thousands of the citizens of Surinam.

Mr. Sawyer during his present visit to Boston has paid considerable attention to the investigation of the spiritual phenomena, and expresses his conviction that the demonstrations above referred to are analogous in their character to the manifestations he has witnessed through mediums in this vicinity.

MEETINGS LAST SUNDAY.—We were unable, from temporary illness, to attend any of the meetings in this city on Sunday last, and hence cannot present our usual notes. The appointments for the coming Sunday will be found in their usual place.

THE WHOLE WEEK HOLY.—Christians keep Sunday Greeks Monday, Arabians Tuesday, Assyrians Wednesday, Egyptians Thursday, Turks Friday, Jews Saturday.

PATRONIZING HEATHENISM.—In Ceylon the British Government has made a grant of crown lands to the Buddhist temples, for *demon dances*, performed for "her Majesty's service!"

The heroic Sir Charles Napier wrote very beautifully and touchingly to a lady on the eve of his great victory at Mencee.—"If I survive, I shall soon be with those I love; if I fall, I shall be with those I have loved."

Interesting Miscellany.

HYMN TO THE ANGELS. BY HENRY CLAY PERRELL. Air—"Lilla Dale."

When the sun sinks to rest On his couch in the west, And the moon bathes the earth in her beams;

ORIENTAL PEARLS

From the "Poetry of the East." DIRECT INSPIRATION. Take an example from the roses, Who live direct on sun and dew;

THE UNWALLED HOUSE OF GOD. The holy Nanac on the ground, one day, Reclining, with his feet towards Mecca, lay.

THE THREE STAGES OF PIETY. Rabia, sick upon her bed, By two saints was visited, Holy Malik, Hassan wise— Men of mark in Moslem eyes.

THE BEGGAR'S COURAGE. To heaven approached a Sufi saint, From groping in the darkness late, And, tapping timidly and faint, Besought admission at God's gate.

FLORA.—According to the ancient Romans, the goddess of flowers was Flora. They really believed that such a being existed, and they offered her sacrifices,

PROPHECIES.

A subscriber wishes us to place on record the following prophecies, or exposition of prophecies, from a work by Lorenzo Dow, published some twenty-five or thirty years ago.

The following summary is an exhibition by a learned Jew, and elucidates a view of the Israelites prospectively: "We learn from Daniel, that great events in the Religious and Political world are about to take place, in or about the year 1833.

A SPANISH LEGEND.—The Spaniards account by a quaint legend for the constant political disturbances in their country. When St. Iago, their patron, went to heaven, he interceded for blessings on Spain— Brave men, handsome women, a fertile soil, and a fine climate were readily granted.

A POPULAR ERROR.—It is not at all an uncommon thing for even well-informed people to consider one event the cause of another, because the one has immediately preceded the other in the order of time.

THE OLD VS. THE NEW MAN. We copy from a religious cotemporary the following striking illustration of the presence of contending elements in man's mental nature.

THE TEMPTER BUCKED MAMMON, and putting a glass to the deacon's eye, showed him not the kingdoms and glories of this world, but the poorhouse, wretchedness, poverty and rage, and said: "All these things will your master give you in your old age as a reward for your charity."

BANKOK, SIAM.—BUDDHISM.—A correspondent of the Philadelphia Inquirer gives some interesting particulars concerning the city of Bankok, in Siam, and the Buddhist religion.

ABSTRACTION FROM OURSELVES RECOMMENDED.—Men are apt to grow, in the apostolic phrase, too "worldly"; the propensity of our nature, or rather the operation of our state, is to plunge us, the lower orders of the community, in the concerns of the day, and our masters, in the cares of wealth and gain.

FAITH.—A military officer being at sea in a dreadful storm, his lady, who was sitting in the cabin near him, and filled with alarms for the safety of the vessel, was so surprised at his composure and serenity, that she cried out:

"My dear, are you not afraid? How is it possible you can be so calm in such a storm?" He arose from his chair, lashed to the deck, and supporting himself by a pillar of a bed-place, he drew his sword, and pointing it to the breast of his wife, he exclaimed:

A QUOTE.—"Are you not afraid?" "No, certainly not," she replied. "Why?" said the officer. "Because," she replied, "I know the sword is in the hand of my husband, and he loves me too well to hurt me."

PRACTICE.—A man may preach, and preach, and preach, until his tongue is swollen, his lungs worn out, and his throat "bunged up" with bronchitis—or until, like the Scotch parson, he has "pounded two pulpits to pieces and banged the insides out of five Bibles"—and if a corresponding practice doesn't go with his preaching, his volleys of words will produce no more effect on society, than a volley of snow-balls on the side of a barn, which cause a slight concussion, and sometimes stick for a little while, but soon crumble and melt away.

IS VIRTUE HEREDITARY?—Is a love of truth, justice, and goodness, transmitted from parents to children? Facts appear to answer these questions in the affirmative. In England it has been ascertained that, out of one hundred criminal children, sixty were born of dishonest parents; thirty of parents who were profligate, but not criminal; and only ten of parents who were honest and industrious.

THE LITTLE ONE THAT DIED!—Leigh Hunt, the poet, finely says: "Those who have lost an infant, are never, as it were, without an infant child. They are the only persons who in one sense retain it always, and they furnish other parents with the same idea.

UNWRITTEN POETRY.—Far down in the depths of the human heart, there is a fountain of pure and hallowed feeling, from which, at times, swells up a tide of emotion which words are powerless to express— which the soul alone can appreciate. Full many a heart overflowing with sublime thoughts and holy imaginings, needs but the "pen of fire" to hold enraptured thousands in spell. The "thoughts that breathe" are there, but not the "words that burn."

UNWRITTEN POETRY! It is stamped upon the broad blue sky, it twinkles in every star. It mingles in the dew-drop that gems the lily's bell. It glows in the gorgeous colors of the West at the decline of day, and rests in the blackened crest of the gathering storm-cloud. It is on the mountain's heights, and in the cataract's roar—in the towering oak—and in the tiny flower. Where we can see the hand of God, there Beauty finds her dwelling place.

RESTORATIVE SYRUP. For languid and unequal Circulation, Derangement of the Secretions, Sick and Nervous Headaches, Bilious Obstructions, Inactivity of the Liver, and other Disorders arising from an Impure State of the Blood, &c.

MRS. METTLER'S CLAIRVOYANT MEDICINES. We cannot convey through the medium of an advertisement, however extensive, sufficient evidence of the extraordinary success of each of the following Medicines. It is enough to say that they are specific remedies, and have never failed in a single instance when the printed directions have been strictly followed.

NEW ENGLAND SPIRITUALIST.

This paper has for its leading object the presentation before the community of the evidences, both ancient and modern, which go to establish the following propositions:

- I. That man has an organized spiritual nature, to which the physical life is but an outer garment. II. That he has a conscious individualized existence after the death of the physical body. III. That the disembodied can do and communicate sensibly with those still in the flesh. IV. That incalculable good may be derived from such communion, wisely used.

Correspondents are cordially invited to contribute facts bearing on the question of spirit-existence and agency, and thoughts or suggestions, whether their own or from the Higher Life, calculated to throw "more light" on the great problems of Human Life, Duty, and Destiny.

TERMS, as heretofore—\$2.00 a year, or \$1 for six months, always in advance. To clubs, five copies for \$8.00; ten copies \$15.00. To city subscribers, when served by carrier, \$2.25.

A. E. NEWTON, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER, 15 Franklin Street, Boston.

Single copies of the SPIRITUALIST may be procured of BELA MARSH, 15 Franklin Street, Boston. BURNHAM, FREDERICK & Co., 9 Court Street, Boston. FREDRICK & Co., 100 Washington Street, Boston.

THE FOLLOWING PERSONS WILL RECEIVE SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR THE SPIRITUALIST IN THEIR RESPECTIVE LOCALITIES: MAINE—Augusta, W. J. Kilburn; Bangor, A. Bartlett; Camden, A. D. Tyler; Gardiner, J. H. Barnes; Kennebunk, R. W. Hill; P. M.; Mountville, J. M. D.; Portland, M. F. Whittier; Presque Isle, J. B. Hall, P. M.; Rockland, C. Coffin, M. D.

MASSACHUSETTS.—Abington, Wm. R. Washburne; Athol, S. F. Cheney; Chelsea, Thos. Sweetser; Chispeo Falls, John Ordway; Collins Depot, W. Collins; Concord, Jonathan G. Gorton; Danvers, J. H. Gorton; Great Falls, H. H. Brazer; Hampton Falls, J. Gram; Laconia, C. W. Cooke; Manchester, Dr. J. H. Copp; Paper-Mill Village, A. T. Kneeland; Portsmouth, Ira Wiley and W. H. Foster; Sutton, Joseph Harvey; Westchester, S. S. Sibley. MASSACHUSETTS.—Abington, Wm. R. Washburne; Athol, S. F. Cheney; Chelsea, Thos. Sweetser; Chispeo Falls, John Ordway; Collins Depot, W. Collins; Concord, Jonathan G. Gorton; Danvers, J. H. Gorton; Great Falls, H. H. Brazer; Hampton Falls, J. Gram; Laconia, C. W. Cooke; Manchester, Dr. J. H. Copp; Paper-Mill Village, A. T. Kneeland; Portsmouth, Ira Wiley and W. H. Foster; Sutton, Joseph Harvey; Westchester, S. S. Sibley.

Bela Marsh's Advertisements.

THE PENETRALIA; OR HARMONIAL ANSWERS TO IMPORTANT QUESTIONS; A NEW WORK, BY ANDREW JACKSON DAVIS, JUST PUBLISHED BY BELA MARSH, 15 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass.

In the preface Mr. Davis says: "From time to time during the past three years, the Author has been interrogated on almost every topic; frequently by letter, sometimes orally, and naturally by the subjects themselves; and this volume is dedicated as a response to such questions as have appeared to him of the greatest importance to mankind."

CONTENTS. The Philosophy of Questions and Answers, Page 7. The Assembly-Shorter Catechism, Revised and Corrected, 25. Questions on Life, Local and Universal, 31. Questions on the Physical, 37. Questions on the Intellectual, 45. Questions on the Moral, 53. Questions on the Metaphysical, 61. Questions on the Esoteric, 69. Questions on the Occult, 77. Questions on the Mystical, 85. Questions on the Magical, 93. Questions on the Spiritual, 101. Questions on the Divine, 109. Questions on the Human, 117. Questions on the Animal, 125. Questions on the Vegetable, 133. Questions on the Mineral, 141. Questions on the Cosmic, 149. Questions on the Universal, 157. Questions on the Eternal, 165. Questions on the Infinite, 173. Questions on the Absolute, 181. Questions on the Relative, 189. Questions on the Concrete, 197. Questions on the Abstract, 205. Questions on the Particular, 213. Questions on the General, 221. Questions on the Specific, 229. Questions on the Individual, 237. Questions on the Collective, 245. Questions on the Social, 253. Questions on the Political, 261. Questions on the Economic, 269. Questions on the Historical, 277. Questions on the Geographical, 285. Questions on the Chronological, 293. Questions on the Cosmological, 301. Questions on the Astrological, 309. Questions on the Meteorological, 317. Questions on the Zoological, 325. Questions on the Botanical, 333. Questions on the Mineralogical, 341. Questions on the Geological, 349. Questions on the Cosmogonical, 357. Questions on the Cosmographical, 365. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 373. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 381. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 389. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 397. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 405. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 413. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 421. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 429. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 437. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 445. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 453. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 461. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 469. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 477. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 485. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 493. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 501. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 509. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 517. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 525. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 533. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 541. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 549. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 557. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 565. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 573. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 581. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 589. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 597. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 605. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 613. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 621. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 629. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 637. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 645. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 653. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 661. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 669. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 677. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 685. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 693. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 701. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 709. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 717. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 725. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 733. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 741. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 749. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 757. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 765. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 773. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 781. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 789. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 797. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 805. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 813. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 821. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 829. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 837. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 845. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 853. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 861. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 869. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 877. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 885. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 893. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 901. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 909. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 917. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 925. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 933. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 941. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 949. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 957. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 965. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 973. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 981. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 989. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 997. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1005. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1013. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1021. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1029. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1037. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1045. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1053. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1061. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1069. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1077. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1085. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1093. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1101. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1109. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1117. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1125. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1133. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1141. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1149. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1157. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1165. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1173. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1181. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1189. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1197. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1205. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1213. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1221. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1229. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1237. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1245. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1253. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1261. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1269. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1277. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1285. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1293. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1301. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1309. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1317. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1325. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1333. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1341. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1349. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1357. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1365. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1373. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1381. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1389. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1397. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1405. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1413. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1421. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1429. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1437. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1445. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1453. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1461. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1469. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1477. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1485. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1493. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1501. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1509. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1517. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1525. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1533. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1541. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1549. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1557. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1565. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1573. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1581. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1589. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1597. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1605. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1613. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1621. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1629. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1637. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1645. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1653. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1661. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1669. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1677. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1685. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1693. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1701. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1709. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1717. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1725. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1733. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1741. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1749. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1757. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1765. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1773. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1781. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1789. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1797. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1805. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1813. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1821. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1829. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1837. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1845. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1853. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1861. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1869. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1877. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1885. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1893. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1901. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1909. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1917. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1925. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1933. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1941. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1949. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1957. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1965. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 1973. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 1981. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 1989. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 1997. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2005. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2013. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2021. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2029. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2037. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2045. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2053. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2061. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2069. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2077. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2085. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2093. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2101. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2109. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2117. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2125. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2133. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2141. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2149. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2157. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2165. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2173. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2181. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2189. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2197. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2205. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2213. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2221. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2229. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2237. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2245. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2253. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2261. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2269. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2277. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2285. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2293. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2301. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2309. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2317. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2325. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2333. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2341. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2349. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2357. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2365. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2373. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2381. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2389. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2397. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2405. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2413. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2421. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2429. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2437. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2445. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2453. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2461. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2469. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2477. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2485. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2493. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2501. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2509. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2517. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2525. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2533. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2541. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2549. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2557. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2565. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2573. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2581. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2589. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2597. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2605. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2613. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2621. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2629. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2637. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2645. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2653. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2661. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2669. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2677. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2685. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2693. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2701. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2709. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2717. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2725. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2733. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2741. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2749. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2757. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2765. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2773. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2781. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2789. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2797. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2805. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2813. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2821. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2829. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2837. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2845. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2853. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2861. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2869. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2877. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2885. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2893. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2901. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2909. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2917. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2925. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2933. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2941. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2949. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2957. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2965. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 2973. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 2981. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 2989. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 2997. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3005. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3013. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3021. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3029. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3037. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3045. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3053. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3061. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3069. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3077. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3085. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3093. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3101. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3109. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3117. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3125. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3133. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3141. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3149. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3157. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3165. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3173. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3181. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3189. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3197. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3205. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3213. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3221. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3229. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3237. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3245. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3253. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3261. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3269. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3277. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3285. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3293. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3301. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3309. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3317. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3325. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3333. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3341. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3349. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3357. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3365. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3373. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3381. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3389. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3397. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3405. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3413. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3421. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3429. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3437. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3445. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3453. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3461. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3469. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3477. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3485. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3493. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3501. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3509. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3517. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3525. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3533. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3541. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3549. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3557. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3565. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3573. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3581. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3589. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3597. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3605. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3613. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3621. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3629. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3637. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3645. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3653. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3661. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3669. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3677. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3685. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3693. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3701. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3709. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3717. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3725. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3733. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3741. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3749. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3757. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3765. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3773. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3781. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3789. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3797. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3805. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3813. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3821. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3829. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3837. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3845. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3853. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3861. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3869. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3877. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3885. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3893. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3901. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3909. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3917. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3925. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3933. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3941. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3949. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3957. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3965. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 3973. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 3981. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 3989. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 3997. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4005. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4013. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4021. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4029. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4037. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4045. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4053. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4061. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4069. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4077. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4085. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4093. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4101. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4109. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4117. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4125. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4133. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4141. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4149. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4157. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4165. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4173. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4181. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4189. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4197. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4205. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4213. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4221. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4229. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4237. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4245. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4253. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4261. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4269. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4277. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4285. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4293. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4301. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4309. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4317. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4325. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4333. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4341. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4349. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4357. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4365. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4373. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4381. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4389. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4397. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4405. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4413. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4421. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4429. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4437. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4445. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4453. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4461. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4469. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4477. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4485. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4493. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4501. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4509. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4517. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4525. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4533. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4541. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4549. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4557. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4565. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4573. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4581. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4589. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4597. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4605. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4613. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4621. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4629. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4637. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4645. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4653. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4661. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4669. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4677. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4685. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4693. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4701. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4709. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4717. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4725. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4733. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4741. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4749. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4757. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4765. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4773. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4781. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4789. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4797. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4805. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4813. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4821. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4829. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4837. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4845. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4853. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4861. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4869. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4877. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4885. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4893. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4901. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4909. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4917. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4925. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4933. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4941. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4949. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4957. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4965. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 4973. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 4981. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 4989. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 4997. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 5005. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 5013. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 5021. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 5029. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 5037. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 5045. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 5053. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 5061. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 5069. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 5077. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 5085. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 5093. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 5101. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 5109. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 5117. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 5125. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 5133. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 5141. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 5149. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 5157. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 5165. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 5173. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 5181. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 5189. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 5197. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 5205. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 5213. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 5221. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 5229. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 5237. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 5245. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 5253. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 5261. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 5269. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 5277. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 5285. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 5293. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 5301. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 5309. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 5317. Questions on the Cosmoesthetic, 5325. Questions on the Cosmotheological, 5333. Questions on the Cosmochemical, 5341. Questions on the Cosmoethical, 5349. Questions on the Cosmo