

THE CIRCULAR.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.]

DEVOTED TO THE SOVEREIGNTY OF JESUS CHRIST.

[EDITED BY J. H. NOYES.]

VOL. I.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., JUNE 20, 1852.

NO. 32.

TERMS AND MEANS.

The Circular may be obtained WITHOUT MONEY, by application through the mail; or at the office of publication, No. 43 Willow Place, Brooklyn.

Those who choose to pay, may send ONE DOLLAR for a yearly volume.

Price of single copies, when exposed at book-stores, &c., TWO CENTS.

As a FREE press must have other resources than its subscription list, all who are interested in the establishment of such a press, and in the principles of this paper, are invited to co-operate by systematic MONTHLY contributions.

Communications should be addressed to—“THE CIRCULAR, Brooklyn, N. Y.”

S. R. LEONARD & COMPANY, PRINTERS.

The Lord's Supper.

The ordinance which Christ appointed to symbolize the reception of his body and blood, is so interesting to all believers, that it seems natural and quite important to inquire how often it ought to be observed. Great diversity of practice on this point prevails in the various churches. Some have communion seasons once a month; others not more than once or twice a year. The Puseyites, we believe, favor more frequent administration of the sacrament; insisting that it should be received every week, if not every day.

This diversity indicates the obvious but important fact, that the Scriptures have given no rule on the subject. Christ and the apostles have left nothing on record by which we can fix the stated intervals of the observance. Still it is almost universally assumed that they intended to establish a periodical festival. But this assumption is attended with difficulties. If they intended to give the church a solemn specialty, like the passover, or the feast of tabernacles, in the Jewish ritual, how could they fail to specify the regular times of the ceremony?

We may as well re-examine the whole subject in the free light of modern common sense. Perhaps Christ did not intend to establish a periodical ceremony at all. Who knows but that he meant to associate eating and drinking at all times, with a recognition of the virtue of his body and blood? Possibly the best way to fulfil his last words, is to make every meal a Lord's supper. Certainly we ought to partake of his spiritual body and blood in our souls, every day, and as many times a day as possible. Why might not the symbol properly be as frequent as the thing signified? Let us search the New Testament again, and see what will turn up.

The following is the original account of the institution of the Lord's supper: 'As they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it. For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' (Matt. 26: 26-28.) Here is no specification of times and seasons. Every thing indicates that Christ meant to make the breaking of bread, and the effusion of wine, or in general the process of eating and drinking a constant memorial of his sacrifice. In the parallel passage in Luke, Christ says, 'This do in remembrance of me.' The disciples did not ask how often they should do it.—They could not fail to understand that whenever they broke bread and partook of the exhilarating cup, they would please their Lord, and fulfil his intention, by remembering the gift of his body and blood.

Let us look now through the book of Acts, and discover if we can, what was the original practice of the disciples, resulting from this last injunction of the Lord Jesus. Certainly there should be some traces of the regular observance of the Lord's supper in that book, if a periodical festival was really appointed. But to the amazement of our traditional concep-

tions, we find not a hint of any such institution. We do find, however, that the apostles and their followers, on and after the day of Pentecost, 'broke bread from house to house,' [or as the margin more properly has it, at home,] and that they did this daily; and that they did eat their meat [thus broke and blessed at their daily meals,] with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God; as though they were enjoying a true communion season. We cannot but think that these daily meals of the Pentecost Community, were the original observances of the Lord's supper. We find nothing else that answers at all to the Lord's appointment. And we are confirmed in this view, by discovering that after a while, deacons (whose business is understood even now, to be that of administering the elements) were appointed to attend, not to a weekly or monthly ceremony, but to the 'daily ministrations' of necessary food in the church-family. (Acts 6: 1-6.) The original deacons certainly administered the sacrament at every meal, or not at all; for their function was simply that of food distributors in the community household at Jerusalem.

So far the testimony is clear. The original idea of the Lord's supper, was that of a family meal. The church living together as one family, made every meal a memorial of the Lord's sacrifice, and the deacons were appointed to wait on the table, in this observance.

But in process of time, the simplicity of the day of Pentecost was compromised, and the church assumed different external arrangements. Believers, scattered, isolated and world-locked as they were in the subsequent extension of the church, naturally adopted more or less of the fashion of the world in their mode of daily life. They lived apart, and in families of unbelievers, and came together in church communion only at intervals. Of course the practice of partaking of the Lord's supper had to be conformed to this compromise. Ordinary meals could not, in this state of things, continue to be sacramental occasions. Hence the practice naturally arose, of eating and drinking together at the occasional meetings of the church, with special remembrance of the Lord's sacrifice. Such was the state of things when Paul gave his views on the subject of the Lord's supper. Let us look fairly at what he says, and see if he sanctions the modern idea that the Lord's supper should be a periodical ceremony. He says:

'Now in this that I declare unto you, I praise you not, that ye come together, not for the better, but for the worse. For first of all, when ye come together in the church, I hear that there be divisions among you; and I partly believe it. For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you. When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's supper. For in eating, every one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken. What! have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not.—For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, this cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body. For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep.

For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world. Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another. And if any man hunger, let him eat at home; that ye come not together unto condemnation.' (1 Cor., 11: 17-34.)

It is evident from all this, that even in the second stage of practice in regard to the Lord's supper, (i. e., after the departure from original communism, and daily administration of the sacrament,) the practice of the church was to commemorate the Lord's death by eating and drinking every time they came together; and that too, not in the modern ceremonial fashion, eating a crumb, and drinking a sip, but in a substantial, convivial way; inasmuch that the custom became an occasion of excess. They made a feast of it; and some lost sight of the spiritual significance which belonged to it, and turned it into a mere sensual festivity. Paul's criticism amounts to this: 'Snatching, gluttony, and drunkenness are peculiarly out of place, and mischievous at these church entertainments. Let mere hunger be satisfied at home, where you make no pretension of sacred observance; and let the conviviality of the church be conducted soberly, with special attention to the internal meaning of it.' The apostle compromised with the pressure of worldliness and corruption in the church, as best he could. If the original, every-day character of the ordinance could not be preserved, and if the church was so mixed up with the world, that gluttons and drunkards pressed in among believers, all that could be done, was to secure decency and spiritual impressiveness for the occasional feasts of the church, and leave ordinary eating and drinking to its old courses. Such was the dilemma undoubtedly, in which the present custom of periodical communion seasons originated.

But Paul, be it observed, said nothing about stated times. Like Christ he left it to be understood that whenever the church ate and drank at its gatherings, meat and drink should be received as the body and blood of the Lord. His word is, 'As oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death till he come.'

Neither is it to be understood that Paul, in bidding excess and animalism go home, and not intrude upon the festivities of the church, meant to sanction excess and animalism at home. We find in other passages, plenty of evidence that he persistently extended the idea of the Lord's supper to daily eating and drinking. Look for instance, at his talk in the same epistle, about eating things offered to idols, chap. 10: v. 14-31. The question of conscience upon which he was treating, was whether believers should knowingly buy and eat meat which had been offered to idols. His main argument against doing this, is that Christians eat and drink the body and blood of Christ, and therefore should not partake of the devil's sacrifices. 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? . . . Ye cannot drink of the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils.—Ye cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord and the table of devils. . . . Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God.' This is nearly equivalent to saying in so many words, make every meal a Lord's supper. In another place, (Col. 3: 17,) he says, 'Whatever ye do, in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus; giving thanks unto God and the Father by him.' To eat and drink in the name of the Lord Jesus, is certainly to partake of the Lord's supper. Thus we see that Paul did not tolerate mere animal eating and drinking any where; though he specially protested against its intru-

ding upon the special entertainments of the church. He expected and demanded that all spiritual men should make every meal a sacrament.

The fact that Paul attaches special penalties to the profanation of the Lord's supper, as specially administered at the meetings of the church, may seem to militate with our general view. But on examination we find that he attaches the same penalty on another occasion to unbelieving indulgences at ordinary meals.—In Romans 13, speaking of questions of conscience between those who eat all things and those who eat herbs, and of course referring to ordinary meals, he says, 'he that doubteth is damned if he eat; because he eateth not of faith, and whatsoever is not of faith is sin.' This is certainly as strong as what he says about 'not discerning the Lord's body' and 'eating and drinking damnation' at the sacrament. His theory plainly is, that eating and drinking without faith, under any circumstances, special or ordinary, is damnatory and unhealthy—which we take to be sound doctrine in pneumatology and physiology.

As to the special virtue which is supposed to be communicated to the sacred elements by the special blessing uttered on sacramental occasions, one may ask why it is not possible and desirable to have that same virtue present at every meal? Can any food be healthy without it? Christ blessed what he ate, and gave thanks, on all occasions. Was not the sacramental virtue in all bread thus blessed? And if we eat and drink our daily meals as we ought to do, 'in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks unto God and the Father by him,' will not the Lord Jesus bless us with his flesh and blood as well in one place as another—as well at home as in a church—as well on a week day as on Sunday? Paul tells us how to secure the presence of sacramental virtue in all food.—'Every creature of God,' he says, 'is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer.' 1. Tim. 6: 4, 5. Food sanctified by the word of God and prayer, certainly has in it the true virtue of the Lord's supper; and any food not thus sanctified is certainly poisonous.

So the Scriptures lead us, from all starting points, to the conclusion, that according to the intention of Christ and the original practice of his disciples, as well as according to common sense and the nature of things, the Lord's supper was, is, and must be, an institution broad enough to cover and bless all eating and drinking in the Christian Church.

At the same time it is evident that the original fullness of blessing given in this institution, can never be realized, till Christians return to the simplicity of communism. The Lord's supper can be fully enjoyed as a daily ordinance only in a HOME CHURCH.

Bible Faith.

What is faith? It is 'the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.' It is a belief of the heart. 'With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.' Faith is a belief in God and his word, that brings salvation to our souls. The righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise: 'Say not in thine heart, who shall ascend up into heaven, that is, to bring Christ down from above, or who shall descend into the deep, that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead.—But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart; (that is the word of faith which we preach;) that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God

bath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.' (Rom. 10: 6-9.) Here Paul gives us a plain, beautiful definition of faith.

The sincere and honest heart begins by believing that God is, and is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. Faith thus implanted, grows by trial, works by love, purifies the heart, and overcomes the world. It 'subdues kingdoms,' 'works righteousness,' 'obtains promises,' 'out of weakness is made strong,' &c. 'This is the victory, even our faith.' It makes us see all the promises of God sure to them that believe in Christ. Paul says, 'Fight the good fight of faith; lay hold on eternal life.' In order to do this, we must believe God through all the opposing force of unbelief; say in our hearts, 'God is true, if it makes every man a liar. It is faith that brings Christ into our souls, and makes us feed upon him; he is all in all to us; he is the chiefest among ten thousand, and the one altogether lovely. Whoever has true faith, has love; and whoever has love, has Christ, and the promise of this life and the life to come. If 'God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life,' will he not with him freely give us all things? Faith answers, Yes. M. L.

Beauty.

I have been interested in noticing the difference between the writers of the Old and New Testament, in regard to personal beauty. In the Old Testament it appears to hold quite a prominent place, in the estimation of character; while in the New, there is not an allusion to it; I believe the word does not occur in relation to any character that is mentioned. In the old Testament, however, though there is nothing said of our grandmother Eve in relation to beauty, it is early recorded, that the 'sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair;' and from the subsequent account, I think it may fairly be inferred that human nature in respect to physical development and personal beauty, had attained its greatest perfection at the time of the deluge.

Afterward, it is mentioned of Sarah, Rebekah, and Rachel, that they were fair and beautiful; and we infer that it was an index of their minds, and a sort of finish to their character. In the course of the Scripture history, Esther, Abigail, Bathsheba, &c., are spoken of, as possessing great external beauty. Of the daughters of Job it is said, that 'in all the land were no women found so fair as they;' and it is included among the other good things, with which God blessed the latter end of Job, more than at the beginning. But the New Testament writers hold up another standard of excellence. It is said, 'the meek and quiet spirit it is in the sight of God of great price.'—'Blessed are the meek, the merciful, the pure in heart,' is the language of the gospel; and Paul's description of charity, in the 13th of 1 Cor., is but a beautiful reflection of the character of Christ, and of those who partake of his spirit. The influence of love, and the graces that we have enumerated, are the roots on which every thing beautiful and lovely must grow. Can we doubt that where love, joy, peace, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, and temperance, abound in the heart, they must have a beautifying effect upon the external features, so that the more these fruits of the spirit influence our hearts, and conduct, the more we shall be conformed to the original design of Him who created us, and in whose image we were made? Then shall the high aspirations of the Psalmist be realized: 'Let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us.' P.

SUNDAY WORK.—In the National Convention of Printers, held lately at Cincinnati, the subject of Sunday Work came up. Mr. Rogers a delegate from New York city, stated that he had often stood at his case, all Sunday afternoon, setting up a sermon that was delivered in the morning, from the manuscript of the clergyman himself. In one instance, he said, that the manuscript was fresh from the pulpit, the subject of which was the strict observance of the Sabbath day.

We may refer to the happiest moment in our life, and think of it as only a foretaste of the permanent happiness we shall hereafter enjoy.

THE CIRCULAR.

BROOKLYN, JUNE 20, 1852.

The Political Crisis.

To-day, (Thursday,) the Whig National Convention for nominating a Presidential candidate, is in session at Baltimore, and the whole nation of twenty millions, more or less, is waiting with intense interest the result of its action. Within two hours after the unknown man is found, and his name adopted as the candidate of the party, it will thrill the telegraphic nerves, and be announced almost through the broad extent of the Republic.

There is a strange mixture of sublimity and meanness in these great caldron boilings of our National Politics. The sordid scum of human selfishness and diabolism is plainly manifest, and on the other hand there may be seen the controlling majesty of God.—We may be sure that Jesus Christ is present in these Baltimore Conventions, and amidst all the confusion of interests and strife of factions he secretly determines the candidate. Not the most trivial circumstance happens by chance, but was carefully prepared and foreordained in the heavenly caucus. The intrigues of concealed politicians look small when we know that the wires all terminate at last in the hands of the Invisible King. The intriguers and expectants of the Democratic party all failed, and the nomination was given to an obscure and unthought of person. So it may be in the Whig Convention. At any rate, no one knows or can guess with much reason, who will be the candidate; and that very fact is a confession with every sober mind, that 'the heavens do rule' in the domain of earthly politics, as well as in matters of larger providence.

We are further sure that all these things are being directed and controlled for the ultimate nomination of JESUS CHRIST to the throne and honors of the world. This event is more sure in the future, than any other in the range of human calculation; and it hasteth greatly. It seems to us not a difficult or distant thing to reach its consummation. Here is a candidate and a cause that is sure of success. Here is a field of politics that is worthy of ambition. Who is ready for the campaign? G.

The Religious Press.

Some of our readers will remember an article published in the Circular, April 11, showing the weakness of the religious press, as compared with the secular. We found only five per cent. of public attention given to religion; and in the calculation we only took into account the number of journals published in New-York city, by the secular and religious interests respectively, without reference to their comparative circulations, and without going into any estimate of the issues of the country press.

Our conjectures on these latter points were as follows:

"The statistics of the country papers, would still very much reduce the per centage of attention allowed to religion. Every considerable village has its secular Weekly. Many have two or three.—Some have their Semi-weeklies. All incipient cities have their Dailies. But religious papers published in villages, are almost unknown; and in the secondary cities they are few, and far between. We believe there is no religious paper published in Brooklyn except the Circular. We cannot learn that any religious paper is published in Newark, though they have three secular Dailies, and several Weeklies.—In fact religion is too weak an interest to support local papers; and the religious papers of the great cities easily supply all the demands of the country; and even with this monopoly, their constituencies are not half as large as those of the leading secular papers. We have not the statistics necessary to ascertain definitely the proportions of the secular and religious press outside of New York city, but we are confident from the above considerations, that a National, or even a State account, would reduce the religious interest in the press to one or two per cent.

We will not bring into this reckoning the fact that religious papers are partly devoted to secular purposes, because it may be said in reply, that the secular papers give some place to religion. We will call that part of the account even, though we suspect that in this matter worldliness crowds religion more than religion crowds worldliness.

Nor will we attempt to ascertain the balance between the secular and religious papers in respect to talent employed, outlay of enterprise, interest excited, amount of circulation, liberality of support, &c. &c.; though we apprehend that in all these respects the balance would be sadly against religion, and would reduce the percentage of interest we have found in its favor, to a fraction."

These conjectures are more than verified by a statistical account of the New-York religious press, which we find in the Herald of June 15th. That paper says the following table shows the position of the religious papers in this city:—

	Circulation.
Observer, Congregationalist.	18,000
Christian Advocate, Methodist.	29,000
Christian Intelligencer, Reformed Dutch.	6,000
Evangelist, Presbyterian.	12,000
Churchman, Episcopalian.	2,000
Recorder, Baptist.	8,000
Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register.	8,000
True Wesleyan.	1,700
Protestant Churchman, Episcopalian.	4,000
Sabbath Recorder, Baptist.	1,700
Inquirer, Unitarian.	2,500
Independent.	10,000
Christian Ambassador, Universalist.	6,000

Total—13 Journals—weekly circulation, 108,900

On this the Herald remarks:

"The number and influence of religious papers in

this city, is rather a surprising feature, when compared with the number in London, and other European metropolises. In London there are but four or five, and those having but a limited circulation, and exhibiting but little talent or enterprise, and in Paris there are but two or three. In Boston and other of our own towns, their number is similarly and less small, so that New-York has an extent of religious newspaper literature, surpassing that of all other cities, or perhaps, that of all the world put together.

We have thus presented a view of the mass of religious newspaper literature which is weekly issued in this city, the influence of which must be considerable. Surely we ought to be a very exemplary and righteous community."

Our inference from this expose, is the reverse of the Herald's. Surely we must be a very worldly community, with only this feeble offset of religious literature, against the enormous issues of the commercial and political press. The Herald itself, (certainly a worldly paper, and designated by some folks as 'Satanic,') claims a daily circulation of not less than thirty thousand. Seven times thirty thousand, (which must be the weekly circulation of the Herald,) is two hundred and ten thousand—nearly double the weekly circulation of the whole New-York religious press! The rest of the twenty-one dailies in New-York, range in circulation from five to fifty thousand. The Sun, Tribune, Times, and probably several others, have, each of them singly, a larger weekly circulation than that of all the religious papers put together. And then, when we consider that New-York has, as the Herald says, 'an extent of religious newspaper literature, surpassing that of all other cities, or perhaps that of all the world put together,' we may safely say, without any further calculation, that the issues of the universal religious press, are but 'a drop in the bucket' of worldly journalism.

Whence come the Rappings?

Whoever believes the Bible, knows that ANGELS are beings of such a nature that, though ordinarily invisible, they can, when they choose, appear to men in the mortal state. We find in the Old and New Testaments not less than fifty instances of angels presenting themselves in visible form, and conversing with men and women in the ordinary way, i. e., by word of mouth. And in connection with these instances we find plenty of facts showing that angels can deal with material substances (in the way, for instance, of eating food, rolling away stones, &c.) as directly and freely as men in the flesh can.

It is plain that such beings do not need the awkward telegraphic machinery employed by the rapping spirits. They would not thank Dr. Franklin, or any other defunct philosopher, for the invention of a system of communication with this world by electric or magnetic signals. Our cloth manufacturers would as soon go back to the old woman's spinning wheel, as angels would betake themselves to the modern fashion of talking with mortals by the tedious process of hearing the alphabet repeated over and over, and rapping from behind the curtain when the letters they want are hit upon. The rappings then certainly do not come from the angelic world, but from some region more remote from material affinities, the inhabitants of which are imprisoned with reference to access to this world, and can only make difficult signals to their friends on this side the barrier.

By the same reasoning, we can demonstrate that the rappings do not come from the resurrection world, or the sphere of the Primitive church, where human beings have attained the victory over death; for it is written, 'They that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection of the dead, [where marriage and death cease,] are as the angels of God;' from which we conclude surely that the saints in the resurrection, having the nature of angels, are able, like the angels, to appear to mortals personally, and converse with them by word of mouth, when they choose; and of course have no occasion to seek access to this world by hocus-pocus, or such processes as prisoners resort to in communicating with outside friends. Facts, as well as the words of Christ, warrant this conclusion; for Christ himself, though he was invisible while he remained in Hades, began to appear personally to his disciples, with all the freedom of communication that he ever had, as soon as the resurrection claimed him, and he took his place with the angels that waited on him as he emerged. So, when the earth quaked, and the rocks rent, and 'many bodies of the saints that slept arose,' they too, immediately manifested their new relations to the material world by 'appearing unto many.'

It is clear that in the angelic and resurrection worlds (which are one, and may be called together the world of life,) there is a corporeal nature adapted to free, personal communication with the material world. The angels and risen saints can be visible or invisible at pleasure to mortal eyes, which is a privilege of relation to matter altogether superior to the mortal state of fixed visibility. And, on the other hand, it is evident that in the world of the dead, which in the Bible is called Hades, the souls of men have not bodies adapted to free communication with this world, but are virtually in prison with reference to the material half of the universe. Here is just the difference between the world of life and the world

of the dead: the world of life can approach us, if it pleases, freely and directly; while the world of the dead is under the necessity of making its advances by cunningly devised processes of electrical action and dumb show. The rapping manifestations are clearly of this latter indirect, artificial character.—Ergo, the rapping manifestations come not from the world of life above, but from the world of the dead below. Q. E. D.

T. F. MEAGHER, the young Irish revolutionist, who recently escaped from English banishment, meets with an enthusiastic welcome, particularly from his countrymen. He declines the honor of a public reception. It is a little singular that just after England's parade of sympathy for Kossuth, in his escape from Austrian tyranny, we should have an opportunity of manifesting the same towards one of the victims of her oppression. And to complete the case, while we are glorifying these foreign patriots, and airing our self-complacency, as lovers of freedom, our own fugitive slaves are every day crossing to Canada, with a more bitter sense of American oppression, than either Kossuth or Meagher ever experienced in Europe. There is quite enough of this hypocrisy, which exalts revolution abroad, while it persecutes liberty at home.

KOSSUTH is about returning to Europe—having finished the tour of the country, and secured about \$90,000 of material aid. We hope he will improve his present leisure to take a new observation, and see if there is not a better way to relieve Hungary than by plunging her into a hopeless fight with all the standing armies of Europe. He may see that the great issue which is forming is not the liberation of particular nations by brute force, but for the establishment of universal brotherhood in the Kingdom of God.

O. A. BROWNSON delivered a lecture in New-York, Tuesday evening, in which he undertook to prove that "Protestantism [and every thing else except Popery] is incompatible with Liberty." Some wit who takes 'Literary Portraits,' has done good justice to Brownson in the following lines:

He's the Salt River boatman, who always stands willing
To convey friend or foe without charging a shilling,
And so fond of the trip that, when leisure's to spare,
He'll row himself up, if he can't get a fare,
The worst of it is, that his logic's so strong,
That of two sides he commonly chooses the wrong;
If there is only one, why, he'll split it in two,
And first pummel this half, and then that, black and blue,
That white's white needs no proof, but it takes a deep fellow
To prove it jet black, and that jet black is yellow.

THE RAPPING DELUSION.—Almost every day (says the Journal of Commerce) we meet in our exchanges, accounts of the deplorable effects which this strange delusion is producing. The following case in point, is from the St. Louis Despatch of the 26th ult.:

"A gentleman living, we think in Illinois, and known to many in this city, has a family of sons and daughters, grown up men and women, of the highest respectability.

Some years ago, his wife died, and he living in the strong remembrance of her love, as a faithful, good wife, has never married. During her life they were very happy; perhaps less than the usual domestic vexations of married life attended them; not the first blush of a suspicion ever attached to her good name. But this has been swept away by the damnable (excuse the expression, but it is the most applicable, and we write it down in great sincerity) magnetic juggling of a medium, who has borne evidence from some departed spirit, that she, the good wife, the revered in memory, was unfaithful to him through her whole career, and that the children, one and all, were illegitimate. Is not this truly horrible? But the worst has not come. Wholly under the influence of a conviction that spiritual agency is a fixed fact, the gentleman has disinherited his children as common bastards, and driven them from his heart. A wife's memory blasted, children's name dishonored in their life, and made a thing to couple with a scourge to whip their hearts, with a happy home made desolate, and a father's closing eye of life rendered dreadful in its loneliness. On what evidence? On nothing."

The Marshall (Wis.) Democrat has the following, showing that the rappers out West have got into the pulpit:—

"Some of the clergy in the Eastern part of the county, (Clarke,) say that they are inspired by the spirits, and that their sermons delivered out of the pulpits are not their own, but they are the instruments through which the spirits operate upon the mass of the people. We understand that these divines, or the spirits through them, say that the Millennium has commenced, and that in less than five years, the wicked are to be swept from the face of the earth, and the righteous are to inherit it forever. It is reported that one of the divines said on Sunday last, while preaching to a crowded house, that not more than a dozen of his audience would ever pass through the shades of death. It is also said that the spirits have informed the people, through the mediums, that the old way of baptizing is all wrong, and that they should use water instead of wine for sacramental purposes; and we are informed that the people are following the directions to the letter. A new church has been organized, called the church of Christ, and a meeting is now being held, which commenced one week ago, and is to continue until the spirits tell them to stop. We are told that some are so infatuated with this new religion, that they do not do a single thing without first consulting the spirits. The excitement in the neighborhood is great, and some of the best men in the county are strong believers."

[The series of "HOME-TALKS" (continued in this paper from the Oneida Circular.) will be understood to be off-hand conversational lectures, spoken at our evening fireside, and phonographically reported by Wm. A. HINDS.]

Home-Talk by J. H. N.—No. 103.

[REPORTED FOR THE CIRCULAR, JULY 6, 1851.]

FAITH IN DIVINE PROVIDENCE.

Cromwell, in all his expostulations with the people of England, and with his enemies, made great use of one argument, viz.: *that the manifest providence of God was with him.* He constantly appealed to that as authority, and would recognize no inferior authority. He considered all his battles as *appeals to God.* This characteristic came out very clearly in the invasion of Scotland. Before the battle of Dunbar, we find the two opposing armies in a logical argument with each other, sending declarations back and forth, and endeavoring to settle their difficulties in a court-like manner. But finding that impossible, both parties agreed to leave the matter to God, to be decided in battle.—That was regarded as a true appeal—as an appeal to the highest court. They then battled for victory—Cromwell and his men conquered; but Cromwell, instead of taking any glory to himself or his men, declared that the God of heaven had decided for them.

Cromwell firmly believed that God's will and purpose could be as truly understood by his providences, as by the mouth of an angel; and there is deep truth and good sense in this view of things. Without a doubt, I am persuaded that the world will yet return to that method of dealing with one another, and with God. It is in this way that the truth will finally get foothold and power in the world. People will be forced to see that the providence of God favors it.

In order to please God, and do his will, it is not so absolutely necessary as people generally suppose, to perfectly understand long-winded arguments and abstruse questions. There is an easier way to do the will of God. He does not hold persons responsible for thoroughly examining all the theological systems of the day, and deciding themselves which is the best. On the contrary, it is true modesty, in many cases, for persons to assume that they are not qualified to judge for themselves in regard to these things. But God will hold persons responsible for candidly and carefully watching his dealings with them. There is a certain degree of watchfulness and discernment, that results from the fear of the Lord; and the world will be found guilty for not exercising it. To every one who shall stand up in the judgment, justifying his unrighteousness on the ground that he was not qualified to judge between the different theological systems, God will be able to say, 'If you had had proper reverence for me, you would have watched my providences, and found evidences therein of the true way. I did not send a book, or system only, to be a mediator between you and me—I was there myself: why did you not take notice of me?'

There is a spirit which can face any amount of the indications of God's presence and providence, and philosophically dispose of them—make it verily appear that they do not in the least indicate God's will, but are simply fortuitous—a spirit that will read *rhymes* in endless succession, and say they all come by chance.—A spirit that will forget God in this way, refusing to see what he is about, is blasphemous. If any were left without sufficient indications of God's will and providence, such as if thoroughly attended to would lead persons to the knowledge of God, there would be some ground of excusability for the world's neglect of God and the truth. If any can say, we did all we could to discover the true way, but could not, then they have a plausible excuse. But that, I am certain, is not the case. I believe that when the secrets of all hearts are known and read, every mouth will be stopped, and all will be found guilty before God. He has left no one guideless. He is accessible to all. How men can believe the Bible, or have any true respect for it, and yet refer every thing to chance, it is impossible for me to understand.

One objection that may be urged against

noticing the providences of God as they did in Cromwell's time, is that it would be abused by superstitious and fanatical persons. Another objection is, that it would not do to make success or defeat the basis of God's judgment, because in many cases bad men are successful, and good men suffer. That kind of talk is very plausible; but if true, makes the Bible the most foolish book that ever was printed! The Bible, from beginning to end, refers all things to the Lord for decision. Either find some way to justify God's providences, or call the Bible a book of superstition, and put it out of sight. The entire philosophy of the Bible, places mankind in this position: 'Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might; let not the rich man glory in his riches, but let him that glorieth, glory in this: *that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise loving kindness, judgment, and righteousness in the earth.*' (Jer. 9: 23, 24.) God points us, in these words, to his works. And they who do not take notice of his works, are fools—they 'have said in their hearts, there is no God.' The philosophy that ignores the works of God in the world, is the philosophy of fools. Here is the line of distinction between the righteous and the wicked. The righteous love and fear God enough to discover him in his works; but the wicked will not hear nor see—they are wilfully blind and deaf. God speaks plain, but it requires attention to understand him.—We love to have persons around us, whose feelings are refined, and who easily take hints. So God loves to have those around him, that will easily and quickly understand him. The philosophy of fools requires that God shall in every instance where he is recognized, present himself in some very wonderful, miraculous way. They will not understand plain speech, but must have thunder and lightning, or something terrible, to convince them that there is a God. Christ was right in saying, 'If ye believe not Moses and the prophets, neither will ye believe though one rose from the dead.'—For Christ himself rose from the dead, and wrought all manner of miracles before the Jewish nation; yet they hardened their hearts against the truth. They accounted for every thing on philosophical principles, or if they could do no better, they gave the glory to Beelzebub. If persons will not recognize the indications of God's will in such circumstances as continually surround them, no amount of miracles can make them believe. It is a state of spirit that, like Pharaoh, hardens itself against evidence.

A man is called a fool, who cannot read and write, after having had suitable opportunities to learn. The time is coming when it will be considered just as appropriate to call a person a fool who cannot read God's providences.

The same events that to one state of mind are perfectly unintelligible, to another state will be full of rhymes and God's providences. The same principle is involved in reading the Scriptures, that there is in reading a book. The Greek Testament to some of you, is unintelligible, while to others it is full of meaning.—This difference is because some have paid attention to the Greek language, and others have not. When our spirits become well educated, we shall discover beautiful providences in every thing that transpires around us.

HOME-TALK—NO. 104.

REPORTED JUNE 4, 1851.

LABOR—ENTHUSIASM.

The great difficulty concerning *labor* of all kinds is the old difficulty about *ordinances.* It has been always proved that ordinances, which are good and useful at first, in the freshness of novelty, in process of time lose their virtue.—The ordinances of the Jewish dispensation were lively, significant things, and, undoubtedly, helped the spirit of grace in educating that nation, during its early stages; but in Christ's time attachment to them had become a matter of *routine*, and the ordinances themselves had become mere dead formalities. Paul said of the whole system, 'It decayeth, waxeth old,

and is ready to vanish away.' (Heb. 8: 13.) Again, he said, 'Christ hath quickened us together with him; . . . blotting out the handwriting of *ordinances* that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross.' (Col. 2: 13, 14.) In like manner, the ordinances of the Christian dispensation, which had the sanction of Christ and the Primitive church, such as baptism, the Lord's Supper, &c., were once valuable, but they have lost their virtue, in consequence of being reduced to matters of duty and custom. In such cases, it seems as though the spirit of life and truth from God and heaven originates the ordinance, and makes good use of it, till the devil has time to work himself into it, and so gain possession of it; then God drops it, and turns to something else. Thus far, it has been the universal tendency of external ordinances, that were commenced in the spirit, to end in the flesh, and so convert what was a vehicle of God's Spirit into a vehicle of the devil's spirit.

The question now arises whether this tendency of things is *natural* and to be expected, or whether it is a morbid tendency, arising from the reign of the devil in the world, which is to pass away under the reign of God? I should answer, that the time must come when this collapse, or apostacy from spiritual action, and all carnal imitation and routine, will come to an end. At the same time, we shall find that there is in the nature of things a necessity for *variety* in life and action, which is not properly understood, and provided for, in the present state of society. I am satisfied that under the full reign of God's government, there will be no such thing as jogging along day after day in the same rut of action. Such a state is *unnatural*, and the devil takes advantage of it.

As things are, one of the most difficult matters we have to face is the *labor problem*, viz., how to do business prosperously, and not make it a slavish, routine affair. The world maintain their *efficiency* by abandoning themselves, soul and body, to a particular business. We will not do that; we will not sell our souls and bodies for filthy lucre. If we cannot get a living, and at the same time give our attention to God and be spiritually-minded, we will neglect our food and raiment, and follow the example of the birds of the air, in this respect. But I am certain the children of God will at last work into a system that will be far more productive in all its branches than the selfish system of the world, and yet have boundless variety of action and make an end forever of routine. This was long ago our theory, and to some extent our practice. At Putney, we were in the habit of arranging business so that we labored but half a day in one line of things. In true arrangement of society, in which each will contribute to the support of all, half a day's labor of every individual would be amply sufficient to produce all necessary comforts and luxuries. In fact, more would be then accomplished than now is; and there would be no enslaving a part of mankind, and leaving the rest without work. Now one party of men is set apart to do nothing but think and talk, while the remainder do little else but work. Each party is in a false position, and both of them are exclusively devoted to a life that becomes irksome. It would be incomparably better if things were so arranged that all should work part of the day, and devote the remainder of the time to thought, prayer, and exercises of improvement and amusement. This plan furnishes a good substitute for the Sabbath. The substantial Sabbath that is to come, of which our present Sunday is but a shadow, will be a time when the work of men and women is reduced to *sport*, and they will have ample time for meditation, cultivation of taste, improvement of the mind, social pleasures and amusements, right along, day after day, without cessation.

It is very important that we should learn how to make *right mixtures.* The truth is, many things are not good by themselves.—You cannot make a good repast out of flour alone. The art of cooking consists in making true mixtures. So, we should learn how to

cook our daily life right, and not live upon a single thing, like unleavened bread, throughout the day. The world as a whole, are in a similar state of civilization in regard to *labor*, that the barbarians near the north pole are in regard to food. They live on whales' flesh, or blubber, and have no idea of *preparing* food, and making proper mixtures. But civilization is busily at work, and it will teach men, in due time, how to *prepare daily life* with artistic skill.

We come into sympathy with Christ by various forms of *intercourse*—various acts and ordinances: and the thing required to keep up a good flow of enthusiasm, is power of originality in renewing these forms of intercourse with the spirit of Christ, as they lose their life, and become formalities. This power we shall find in Christ. 'If any man lack wisdom, let him ask of God;' and this is *wisdom*, to escape from routine, to leave an ordinance when it has lost its virtue. It is possible for us to discover an infinite variety of methods to renew our fellowship with Christ and with one another. The 'unsearchable riches' of Christ are open to us, and he is full of resources. Barnum keeps the country in a glow of excitement, but a 'greater than Barnum' is accessible to every one of us. We have hardly begun to drink at the fountain of Christ's riches: we may grow in resources of power and originality, eternally. The life of Christ will always bubble up in us fresh as a mountain spring; it is *everlasting* life.

It is very important that persons should realize that with the life of Christ in their hearts, they can commence life anew every day, brush away all past experience, and begin the morning of existence. Our *experience* with reference to any and all things is not the great matter to be considered: *the life of Christ* is what we should look at, and that is always new.

Enthusiasm is the soul of business, the soul of enterprise, and the soul of success in every thing; and *aggregation* is the source of enthusiasm. We may illustrate this principle thus: if you take an ignited piece of coal, and place it by itself, it will turn black and go out; it cannot burn alone. And it is as foolish to expect enthusiasm in isolation, as to expect a single piece of coal will burn by itself. Aggregation with God, heaven, and one another, is the only permanent source of enthusiasm. Something that is called enthusiasm is produced in a carnal state by aggregation; but complete and perpetual enthusiasm—enthusiasm that reaches to the heart of existence, and makes life glow centrally, can only be obtained through Christ's life. Wherever the spirit of God works, it creates enthusiasm. If the spirit of God acts upon single individuals, it will create enthusiasm, but that enthusiasm will be greatly augmented by extending the principle of aggregation, already in action between the individuals and God, to a combination of individuals with each other.

What we need, to give zest and life to every thing, is *enthusiasm.* If you will consider it, enthusiasm and happiness are identical. You are always enthusiastic when you are happy. Without enthusiasm people are dead. Here is properly the dividing line between the dead state and the resurrection state. The Bible does not mark the dividing line between death and life at the point where the body and soul separate. "He that hath the Son [whether in this world or Hades] hath life, and he that hath not the Son hath not life."

Table-Talk, by J. H. N.—No. 20.

February 7, 1852.

Ignatius, in his martyrdom, talked of offering himself as 'pure bread to Christ.' Said he—"Let me be devoured by wild beasts, for by their means I am permitted to go to God. I am food for God's service. Let me be ground by the teeth of wild beasts, that I may be found pure bread unto Christ."

The idea of offering ourselves to Christ as *food* is a true one; it is the duty of every one to offer himself to Christ, to be digested and enjoyed by him, and become part of his body. And I think there is a better way to do this than

Ignatius proposes to himself. If our spiritual nature finds it impossible to subdue the flesh, and thus make a *whole* offering of body and soul to Christ, then it is very desirable to part with our bodies, and offer our *souls* to Christ. Herein consists all the value of death, all the value of martyrdom,—the emancipation of the soul, so that it can offer itself to Christ without the incumbence of a body that will not submit to it. But the victory of Christ in human nature secures to us the power of presenting our bodies as well as our souls to Christ. It is not necessary for our bodies and souls to separate; and we may assure ourselves that Christ will be much better pleased with a complete offering than with a partial one. Our bodies are of some value: they are channels of great happiness to us, and they will as truly be channels of happiness to Christ, if we make an effectual offering of them to him. While I would consent, if necessary, to offer Christ my soul without my body, I should consider it altogether better to offer him body and soul together—to offer him my whole being, and invite him to take possession of me in the midst of enjoyments—to have him enjoy, not only what my soul enjoys, but also what my body enjoys. Nothing short of that is a full offering, and answers the description of Paul: "I beseech you, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a LIVING SACRIFICE [not a dead one,] holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." Rom. 12: 1.

Reprint from The Perfectionist, August 1843.

Clerical Commissions.

In the progress of Christianity three modes of obtaining ministerial authority have been developed, which may be called the *direct*, the *hereditary*, and the *voluntary*. 1. Christ and the apostles received their commissions *directly* from God by the Holy Ghost, and proved them by manifestations of superhuman wisdom and power. 2. The clergy of the Romish, Greek, and English churches, receive their commissions by *hereditary* transmission from one generation of bishops to another, and prove them, by showing that the line of succession from the apostles is unbroken. 3. The dissenting clergy obtain their commissions, either by their own *voluntary* assumption, or (which in the end amounts to the same thing) by the license of clerical associations, or the choice of the churches, without either direct or transmitted orders from the Head of the church, and prove them (if at all) by faithfulness and success.

The voluntary or elective method of the Dissenters, considered as a mode of obtaining special *divine* authority, (which is the common idea of what ministers claim) certainly will not bear examination. Ministers commissioned in this way may indeed claim the general sanction of *Providence*, such as attaches to all offices established or recognized by the 'powers that be.' They may demand the respect due to a useful profession on the same ground with lawyers, doctors, and schoolmasters. But when they go beyond this, and ask (as some of them do) to be regarded as the authoritative representatives of God, occupying the place which the ministers of Christ occupied at the beginning, and which the bishops of the hereditary churches still claim for themselves, having 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' and power to 'bind and loose' for eternity—all which belongs to a special *divine* commission—they find themselves exposed to many troublesome questions, such as the following: 'Can your voluntary assumption of the ministerial office confer upon you *divine* authority? Or if you appeal to your license, where did the ministers that licensed you get their commissions? If you say, from their predecessors in the ministry,—you throw yourself on the hereditary principle, and your line of succession must either terminate in a voluntary assumption of ministerial authority by somebody at the time of the Reformation—which is as fatal to your commission as if you had assumed it yourself—or run back through Popery to the apostles, which makes you dependent on a church which you call Antichrist, and exposes you to all the contumely

which you have heaped on Episcopalians for idolizing 'unbroken succession,' regardless of the corruption of its channel. If you say that the ministers who licensed you got their commissions from the churches, where did the churches get their authority to give *divine* commissions? Are they inspired? Where, in the Bible, are churches, whether inspired or not, authorized to elect and commission the representatives of God? Such questions cannot but cast serious discredit on the commissions of the Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Methodists, &c. In our view, the less Dissenters generally say about their *divine* authority, the better.—So far we agree with the bishops.

But is the *hereditary* mode of obtaining ministerial authority any better than the voluntary? We think not. We will say nothing about the probability, or rather certainty, that 'the succession' has been repeatedly broken since the apostolic age, or about the reprobate wickedness of many who have been links in that succession. This branch of argument has been exhausted. We take the ground that not a whit of evidence can be produced from the Bible or from trust-worthy tradition, that Christ ever intended to institute a hereditary priesthood—or that the apostles and primitive ministers ever transferred their offices and authority to a generation of successors. The only text which the Oxford Tractarians cite with any confidence as evidence that the primitive organization was to be continued beyond the apostolic age, and which they evidently regard as the entire base of their hierarchical temple, is Matt. 28: 19—20—'Go teach all nations, &c.; and lo, I am with you *always, even unto the end of the world.*'

Understanding this according to the literal import of the English translation, as a commission and promise extending to the final destruction of the earth, they insist upon interpolating it thus:—'Go teach all nations, &c., and lo, I am with you [and your successors] *always, even unto the end of the world.*' Now the veriest smatterer in New Testament Greek knows that the word translated *world* in this passage refers not to the earth, but to a period of time, and that the 'end of the world' in the sense that belongs to that expression here, as well as elsewhere in the New Testament, (for instance in 1 Cor. 10: 11, Heb. 9: 26,) took place when Jerusalem was overthrown, and Judaism came to its end. Christ had plainly foretold his disciples in the 24th of Matthew and elsewhere, that the 'end of the world' and his own Second Advent would come to pass within their own lifetime. When therefore he was about to leave them for the 'little while' intervening, he said to them—(certainly not to them and their successors, for the time in view was too short)—'Go teach all nations, &c.: and lo I am with you [in spirit] even unto the end of the [Jewish] world [or age, when I shall come to you again in person.]' This is obviously the whole meaning of the text, and it leaves Puseyism without its base. The Second Advent of Christ at the destruction of Jerusalem, was the *terminus*, so far as this world is concerned, of all the commissions which Christ or his apostles ever gave; and in fact of the visible Church which he and they instituted. Here the true body of Christ passed beyond the veil, and here began the general apostasy on earth. All the ecclesiastical authority which has been claimed and exercised since, (except such as may have come by direct orders from Christ,) has been obtained by voluntary human assumption, the guilt of which has been proportioned to the various degrees of arrogance in the pretensions of the assumers.

We are aware that Dissenters generally will not feel the force of our reasoning on this point, till they give up their own share in the commission supposed to have been given to all generations of ministers in Matt. 28: 20, and embrace our views of the Second Coming. Nevertheless we throw out these suggestions, in hope that the present interest on the subject of ecclesiastical authority, and the increasing pres-

*This text is referred to as the very palladium of Puseyism, not less than twenty times in the 1st vol. of the Oxford Tracts. See pp. 33, 37, 40, 48, 60, 89, 227, 229, 261, 341, 391, 383, 407, 488, &c.

sure of Puseyism and Popery, will turn the attention of some to what we deem the only effectual antidote of Catholic and Episcopal assumption, viz., the doctrine of the Second Advent at the destruction of Jerusalem—which cuts up the succession scheme by the roots.

Two then, of the three modes of obtaining commissions, viz., the voluntary and hereditary, we have found illegitimate, and we are thrown back upon the good old method of direct orders, which was fashionable in the apostolic age. God can give men commissions by his spirit, and enable them to prove them by the necessary signs, now as well as at the beginning. The principal difficulty in the way is the confirmed prevalence of the notion that 'the age of miracles is past.' Many influences, however, are at work to break this spell of unbelief, and we are persuaded that the better part of Christendom will, in due time, return to the faith and ways of the Primitive church, in relation to ministerial commissions, and all kindred subjects.

The Meekness of Christ.

We are seeking the extinction of individuality, the death of egotism—what can we do better than to look at Christ? His spirit is just what we want.

His whole ambition was to seek the glory of another—to do the will of another. 'I came not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.'—'Lo, I come to do thy will, O God.' 'I seek not mine own glory.'

He did not want independence. He came with specific commandments from the Father—he spake the words which the Father gave him, and finished the work which the Father sent him to do. 'I must work the works of him that sent me.' 'I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say and what I should speak, and I know that his commandment is life everlasting; whatsoever I say, therefore, as the Father said unto me so I speak.' 'I can of mine own self do nothing.'

He was not ambitious of originality. 'The word ye hear is not mine but the Father's which sent me.' 'The Son can do nothing of himself but what he seeth the Father do.' 'I speak that which I have seen with my Father.'

He owned nothing only by the Father's gift. His disciples were given him of the Father. 'Thine they were, and thou gavest them me.' 'As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.' When he claimed the power to lay down his life and take it again, he carefully adds—'This commandment have I received of my Father.'

He came not of himself, but was sent of the Father. He did not take any glory to himself for coming—he did not originate the idea—it was his Father's love for the world that gave him to die that it might be saved. And he wanted the world should know the Father. 'I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou hast given me.' 'No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.' He said, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' It was glory enough for him to represent the Father to the world—to personate his love and righteousness.

He was happy in his position. 'My meat is to do the will of him that sent me.' He says that those who learn of him in his meekness and lowliness, and take his yoke upon them, shall find rest unto their souls.

Who will say that he was a man-worshiper, or servile, because he was not independent? Or that he was insipid and unfruitful, because he was not original? Or that he was poor, because he was owned himself by God? Was he less happy and wise and glorious for being the vessel of all the fullness of God?

THE MORMONS.—The seventh general epistle of the Presidency of the church in the valley of the Great Salt Lake, closes with the following good advice.—Lawyers and doctors will please take notice:

"And now, brethren, having given you a brief history of the Church in the valley, which is altogether more prosperous than we could hitherto communicate, we have a word of counsel, which we hope you will give heed to, that you may become partakers of the rich blessings of Ephraim with us; and first, as far as possible, live in peace with all men, even as our last Conference agreed to cease all contentions and lawsuits, one with another; and, if possible, with all men; when you are sick, call for the elders, who will pray for you, anointing with oil and the laying on of hands; and nurse each other with herbs and mild food; and if you do these things in faith, and quit taking poisons and poisonous medicines, which God never ordained for the use of men, you shall be blessed."

Persons imagine they can find happiness in this, that, and the other thing: but they actually find it only by turning to the interior, to the great source and essence of all things—God.

Influence.

BY G. W. BUNGAY.

Drop follows drop, and swells
With rain the sweeping river;
Word follows word, and tells
A truth that lives forever.

Flake follows flake, like spirits
Whose wings the winds dis sever;
Thought follows thought, and lights
The realm of mind forever.

Beam follows beam, to cheer
The cloud the bolt would shiver;
Throb follows throb, and fear
Gives place to joy forever.

The drop, the flake, the beam,
Teach us a lesson ever;
The word, the thought, the dream,
Impress the soul forever.

CORRESPONDENCE.

FROM ONEIDA.

Oneida June 14, 1852.

—We had a call a few days since, from a Shaker, of which I will give you some particulars that interested us. Our visitor was a young man of twenty-five years. He said of himself that he had been a pretty hard boy.—When about twenty years old he enlisted into the United States Army—his friends, however, procured his release on the ground of his minority. He joined the Shakers about five years ago because he was sick of the world. Since that time he has been endeavoring to lead a life of devotion to their principles. He says it is crossing to the flesh to be a Shaker; but he expects to save his soul thereby. He said he had not touched a person of the other sex during his five years stay there—that it was considered out of order for men and women to shake hands with each other. They can talk together, but must not be near enough to touch each other's persons. They have one meeting in a week, which they call a talking meeting. In these meetings the men and women are seated on benches, facing each other. The seats are arranged from three to four feet apart. In this attitude they talk freely with each other on religious subjects only, I believe. He shook hands with two of our women as he was introduced to them. He declined eating at our first table, not on the ground of religious scruples he said, but because he should be odd in his ways somewhat. He said if he reported the particulars of his visit here, that he should be criticised for his freedom. He seemed to appreciate our system of criticism as we explained it, and was delighted with the order he witnessed in every thing around us. It was an astonishment to him how we could preserve such order in our household in connection with the freedom of our principles. He appeared quite intelligent with regard to Shaker doctrines, though he said we must not take him as a fair specimen of the sect, for the reason that he was young in the faith.

I obtained some light from him with regard to their views of the sexual question. I gathered from him that they believed that we were created originally with sexual natures for the purpose of generating our species only; that in consequence of a perverted use of this design, i. e. because it was turned into the channel of sensual pleasure, they were called to abstinence for the purpose of redeeming the world from this state. He said he had heard it remarked among them, that they should sometime gain a state of purity where they could propagate their species. It was quite difficult for him to conceive of our more exalted views of the use of our sexual nature. I gave him our First Annual Report, and talked freely with him about our principles. He remarked that he wished he had known of our society before he joined the Shakers. He was from New Lebanon, and came fifteen miles out of his way to visit us. JONATHAN BURT.

The way to treat old habits is to regard them all as 'vestures' that must be changed; not all at once, but in due time; and expect that God will turn our attention first toward those things that are most necessary to be changed, and that he will gradually bring about a perfect revolution.

When in suffering, remember to wait on God—to feel after him—to believe that he overlooks all things, and will not permit us to be tempted above that we are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that we may be able to bear it.

The high tide of death is about 3 o'clock in the morning. That is the time when there is the least circulation of life—the time when persons are generally in the deepest sleep, and consequently the nearest death; for sleep is half way to death. The most deaths occur about this hour in the day.

Conversion is but one step in regeneration. We should seek continual changes, successive conversions, till we arrive at the perfection of God.

Letters Received.

E. G. Dennis; M. Clark; R. Pratt; H. W. Burnham; G. W. Robinson; S. Field; S. Lea; H. W. Ross.