

THE  
LIBERAL CHRISTIAN.

---

VOL. II.

DECEMBER, 1855.

No. 12.

---

PROPER GROUND OF CHRISTIAN UNITY.

BY REV. G. PUTNAM, D.D.

It has been generally assumed in all ages of the church, that *uniformity of belief*, a oneness in speculative faith, is the only ground on which Christians can be one in brotherly fellowship and in the bond of peace.

We begin in the present discussion with a direct denial of this principle as unsound, unevangelical, and pernicious. Uniformity of speculative opinion ought not to be regarded as the bond of union and the ground of fellowship among Christians; and men by their speculative differences do not violate the essential oneness of Christianity.

Jesus Christ could not have required or expected unity of speculative opinion with regard to his revelation, for the good and sufficient reason that there cannot be any such unity. The history of opinions and the history of human nature, from the earliest times to the latest, prove that there cannot be any thing like uniformity of opinion on the subjects that admit in any degree of the exercise of reason. Such differences began under the ministry of the Apostles themselves. They sprang up immediately, in

the very churches of their own planting. They have continued ever since, varying continually as to the subjects and modes of difference, yet always differences. Never for a moment have Christians agreed as to what are the true and only speculative doctrines of their religion. Every method that has ever been projected of reconciling such differences, has long ago proved itself chimerical, absurd and impracticable. Every experiment, that has ever been made to produce uniformity, has aggravated the supposed evil, warred against human nature and human liberty, done great mischief, and turned out a miserable failure.

The attempt to produce uniformity of belief has been made in every age, in every form, and by every imaginable means, and all have failed. The church of Rome tried it. They set up a standard of belief; the scholars of Christendom maintained it, the collective wisdom and imposing authority of famous Councils sanctioned it, the successors of St. Peter were set for its defence, the arm of physical power was stretched out in its behalf, and the terrors of earthly and eternal torment were made to beset every by-path of heresy and schism; but it was a failure. The early Protestants tried it. Scarcely had they broken out of the fold of Rome, when they began their measures for uniformity. Synods were convened, and decrees and confessions were published from various quarters, with revilings and persecutions more abundant; but it was a failure. Luther and his coadjutors tried it, and failed. Calvin and his disciples tried it, and failed. The Church of England tried it, and failed. Every act of intolerance seemed to give birth to new heresies, and every blow that was struck for uniformity opened new

seams in the church and broke off more fragments from the mass. The creeds of modern sects, set up with the same view to uniformity, are failures. The manifold exhibitions of intolerance in our own day, and all around us, are indications of the same vain hankering and struggling after uniformity, and they all fail. There is no such thing as uniformity. There is no approach to it. We differ about different things, it is true; but we differ as really and as much, as did our predecessors in any age of the church. Time raises new questions as fast as it settles old ones. The history of the past, and a glance at the present state of things, show it to be the most visionary of all vain imaginations to suppose, that there can ever be, while the Bible and human nature continue to be what they are, that there can ever be a Church Universal, whose bond of union and fellowship shall be a speculative uniformity of belief.

From these considerations we must infer, what we began by saying, that Jesus himself did not require or expect a speculative uniformity amongst his followers. Had he only possessed the sagacity of a worldly-wise man, he must have foreseen that such agreement would be utterly impracticable. And surely the infallible teacher from God, whose title was the Prince of Peace, and who taught that love was the keeping of his commandments, such an one cannot for a moment be supposed to have made the keeping of the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, to consist in a kind of uniformity, the impossibility of which would be proved as soon as he had left the world, and be confirmed stronger and stronger in every succeeding period of his church. He could not have meant to establish a principle, which, the moment it was adopted

and acted upon, would prove itself to be irreconcilably at variance with the first principles of his religion, those of brotherly love and union. There are and always have been differences of opinion, honest and rational differences, between persons having on other subjects equal pretensions to the credit of intelligence and fairness of mind, differences among those who recognise the same inspired teacher, and have before them the same sacred and undisputed records. And men, if they think and reason at all for themselves, and if they are to have any real belief, cannot help thus speculatively differing; and it is a stigma upon the Son of God to say, that he has forbidden such differences either possibly or virtually, that he has given to every sincere believer the right to suppose that he and his sect have alone the mind of Christ and are true to his religion, and the consequent right to disown, excommunicate, and cast out as evil, all who differ from such sect. They who hold that Christ demands uniformity of speculative opinion, must of course regard their own opinions as the standard of that uniformity, and they must in consistency suppose that they are authorized by God to hold every dissenter from that standard as an infidel, an alien, and an outlaw. And those dissenters, and every petty portion of them, and every individual of them, have the same counter authority with respect to their opponents. And thus Jesus himself is made to forbid, absolutely to forbid, all brotherhood and fellowship amongst his disciples, to cast an unquenchable firebrand in the midst of them, and to justify and sanction a spirit of exterminating and eternal war amongst them. But this cannot be so. This cannot be the divine purpose. Speculative uniformity cannot be the requisite bond of

unity among the disciples of Christ. And, though there were as many differing sects in Christendom as there are individuals, this circumstance would not impair the true grounds of their unity one whit.

After taking this position, it is incumbent on us to state what we do regard as constituting the essential oneness of Christianity. What is the broad ground on which those who stand are really one and should regard themselves as one in Christ, having no reason for jealousy or distrust, having no right of mutual recrimination and denunciation, no good plea for contentious division? What is the standard, around which all who rally are one in the sight of God and Christ, one upon the principles of the gospel, and might and should be one in mutual sympathy and fellowship, owning one another and rejoicing together in a common faith and hope? We answer, it is what all serious believers in Christ as the son and messenger of God, propose, desire, and are satisfied with, as the result of Christian faith. It is the keeping of the commandments of Christ. It is piety and moral goodness, it is the cultivation and exercise of Christian affections and Christian principles. "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me, shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him and will manifest myself to him." "If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his," and if he have the spirit of Christ, he is his. This is the ground of unity which we think our Master has marked out. This we all understand and understand alike. There is no dispute about what is the spirit of Christ. We all learn it, and learn it alike, from himself, from his words and his history, from his example of piety and obedience to

God. The result is the same (wherever it exists,) whether accompanied by one set of speculative opinions or another. About the religious affections and the religious character, considered in themselves and purely as a result, there can hardly be any misunderstanding. It is Character that constitutes the one Christianity.

But it may be objected that, though the moral result be the great thing about which the individual should be concerned, yet that is not a proper or convenient or practicable *test*, by which men should judge of each other's claims to Christian fellowship; that such a test is too judicial in its nature, that it would require too much of a system of moral *espionage* and investigation, too much judging of the brethern. We will admit the objection and yield to it. Let it be that a profession, either express or virtual, of some doctrines, together with a decent outward show of Christian virtue, is the most suitable test, the only practicable one, the true ground of visible fellowship and union. Let it be that we are to take cognizance of the doctrines of an individual or sect, and adjudge or withhold the Christian name accordingly. Let it be that this is the gospel test. We have yet something to say, why we still decline taking the popular ground, the battle ground, of speculative uniformity.

We would maintain that the doctrines, the leading and fundamental doctrines of the gospel immediately concern and directly relate to the moral character, to the practical part, the affections of the heart and the conduct of life. The truths of the gospel are moral, and not speculative truths. The doctrines of our religion are chiefly moral.

One eminent exception, however, demands notice in the outset, viz. The great introductory doctrine of the

gospel, it is true, is not strictly of this moral class, though it was a necessary introduction to a system of moral truths. It is a speculative doctrine, we mean the doctrine that "Jesus is the Christ," that he was an inspired and commissioned messenger from God to man. Jesus himself constantly set forth this as the primary speculative truth. He is constantly arguing it and insisting upon it. He made his miracles bear towards the proving it and the bringing it home to the convictions of men. He generally uses the word Faith in reference to this single truth. In the few instances in which he applies it differently, it means confidence in the providence and promises of God. The Apostles, in their subsequent preaching and writing, took the same course. When by the preaching of Peter three thousand were converted on the day of Pentecost, the only speculative doctrine proposed, the only one addressed merely to the understanding, was this same truth, thus summed up in his own words: "Therefore let all the house of Israel assuredly know that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." When, afterwards, by the preaching of the same apostle five thousand believed, the only speculative article recorded in his sermon, was the same, — that God had raised up his son Jesus, and sent him and glorified him. When Philip discoursed with the Eunuch, and converted and baptised him, the only speculative doctrine was this, "I believe that Jesus Christ was the Son of God." In what did the conversion of Paul consist but in the conviction, produced by the miraculous vision on the way to Damascus, that Jesus was from heaven, and was in heaven, was the Christ? as we are told, that, as soon as he recovered his sight, he "straightway preached

Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God." And so on throughout the numerous instances of Apostolic preaching and successes recorded in the Book of the Acts, this great article of speculative faith stands conspicuous and alone;—alone, if we make this one other exception, that in some cases the undisputed Christian doctrine of a future life, of "the resurrection of the dead," is brought forward.

Now we mean not to say, that there are no other speculative doctrines revealed in the New Testament. On the contrary, we and all Christians do believe some others; though from our different modes of interpreting language and weighing evidence we differ somewhat as to what those doctrines are. But we do mean to say that, after the exceptions of speculative truth just considered, which all Christians believe and equally alike, moral truth and moral teaching hold the highest and the largest place in the gospel.

---

### WESLEY ON CALVINISM.\*

CALL it, therefore, by whatever name you please, "Election, Preterition, Predestination, or Reprobation," it comes, in the end, to the same thing. The sense of all is plainly this— "By virtue of an eternal, unchangeable, irresistible decree of God, one part of mankind are infallibly saved, and the rest infallibly damned; it being impossible that any of the former should be damned, or that any of the latter should be saved."

But if this be so, then all preaching is vain. It is needless to them that are elected. For they, whether with

\* See his sermon on Free Grace.



preaching or without, will infallibly be saved. Therefore, the end of preaching, "to save souls," is void with regard to them. And it is useless to them that are not elected, for they cannot possibly be saved. They, whether with preaching or without, will infallibly be damned. The end of preaching is, therefore, void with regard to them likewise; so that, in either case, our preaching is vain, as your hearing is also vain.

This uncomfortable doctrine directly tends to destroy our zeal for good works. And this it does, first, as it naturally tends to destroy our love to the greater part of mankind, viz., the evil and unthankful. For, whatever lessens our love, must so far lessen our desire to do them good. This it does, secondly, as it cuts off one of the strongest motives to all acts of bodily mercy, such as feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, and the like, viz., the hope of saving their souls from death. For what avails it to relieve their temporal wants, who are just dropping into eternal fire? "Well; but run and snatch them as brands out of the fire." Nay, this you suppose impossible. They were appointed thereunto, you say, from eternity, before they had done either good or evil. You believe it is the will of God they should die. And "who hath resisted his will?" But you say — "You do not know whether these are elected or not." What then? if you know they are one or the other, that they are either elected or not elected, all your labour is void and vain. In either case, your advice, reproof, or exhortation, is as needless and useless as your preaching. It is needless to them that are elected; for they will infallibly be saved without it. It is useless to them that are not elected; for with, or without it, they will infallibly be damned. There-

fore you cannot, consistently with your principles, take any pains about their salvation. Consequently, those principles directly tend to destroy your zeal for good works; for all good works; but particularly for the greatest of all, the saving of souls from death.

But this doctrine not only tends to destroy Christian holiness, happiness, and good works, but hath also a direct and manifest tendency to overthrow the whole Christian revelation. The point which the wisest of the modern unbelievers most industriously labour to prove, is, that the Christian revelation is not necessary. They well knew, could they once show this, the conclusion would be too plain to be denied — “If it be not necessary, it is not true.” Now, this fundamental point you give up. For, supposing that eternal, unchangeable decree, one part of mankind must be saved, though the Christian revelation were not in being; and the other part of mankind must be damned, notwithstanding that revelation: and what would an infidel desire more? You allow him all he asks. In making the gospel thus unnecessary to all sorts of men, you give up the whole Christian cause. “O tell it not in Gath! Publish it not in the streets of Askelon; lest the daughters of the uncircumcised rejoice, lest the sons of unbelief triumph!”

And as this doctrine manifestly and directly tends to overthrow the whole Christian revelation, so it does the same thing, by plain consequence, in making that revelation contradict itself. For it is grounded on such an interpretation of some texts, (more or less, it matters not,) as flatly contradicts all the other texts, and indeed the whole scope and tenor of scripture. For instance: the assertors of this doctrine interpret that text of scripture,

“Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated,” as implying that God, in a literal sense, hated Esau, and all the reprobated, from eternity. Now, what can possibly be a more flat contradiction than this, not only to the whole scope and tenor of scripture, but also to all those particular texts which expressly declare “God is love?” Again, they infer from that text, “I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy,” — Rom. ix. 15, that God is love only to some men, viz., the elect, and that he hath mercy for those only; flatly contrary to which is the whole tenor of scripture, as is that express declaration in particular, “The Lord is loving unto *every* man, and his mercy is over all his works,” — Psalm cxlv. 9. Again, they infer from that and the like texts, “It is not of him that willeth, neither of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy,” that he sheweth mercy only to those to whom he had respect from all eternity. *Nay*, but *who replieth against God now?* You now contradict the whole oracles of God, which declare throughout, “God is no respecter of persons,” — Acts x. 34; “There is no respect of persons with him,” — Rom. ii. 11. Again, from that text, “The children being not yet born, neither having done good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth, it was said unto her,” (unto Rebecca,) “The elder shall serve the younger;” you infer, that our being predestinated or elect, no way depends on the foreknowledge of God; flatly contradictory to this are all the scriptures; and those in particular, “elect according to the foreknowledge of God,” — 1 Pet. i. 2.; “Whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate,” — Rom. viii. 29.

The Apostle declares “the same Lord over all is rich

in mercy to all that call upon him," — Rom. x. 12. But you say — "No, he is such only to those for whom Christ died. And those are not all, but only a few, 'whom God hath chosen out of the world;' for he died not for all, but only for those 'who were chosen in him before the foundation of the world,'" — Eph. i. 2. Flatly contrary to your interpretation of these scriptures also is the whole tenor of the New Testament; as are, in particular, those texts, "Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died," — Rom. xiv. 15. A clear proof that Christ died, not only for those that are saved, but also for them that perish. He is "the Saviour of the world," — John iv. 42. He is "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world," — John i. 29. "He is the propitiation, not for our sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world," — 2 John ii. 1. "He," (the living God) "is the Saviour of men," — 1 Tim. iv. 10. "He gave himself a ransom for all," — 2 Tim. ii. 6. "He tasted death for all men," — Heb. ii. 19.

If you ask — "Why then are not all men saved?" The whole law and the testimony answer, first, not because of any decree of God, not because it is his pleasure they should die. For, "as I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth," — Ezek. xviii. 32. Whatever be the cause of their perishing, it cannot be his will, if the Oracles of God are true; for they declare, "He is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance," — 2 Pet. iii. 9. "He willeth that all men should be saved." And they, secondly, declare, what is the cause why all men are not saved; namely, that they will not be saved: so our Lord expressly says, "They will not come unto me that they may have

life," — John v. 40. "The power of the Lord is present to heal them," but they will not be healed. "They reject the counsel," the merciful counsel, of God *against themselves*, as did their stiff-necked forefathers. And therefore are they without excuse, because God would save them, but they will not be saved: this is the condemnation, "How often would I have gathered you together, and ye would not," — Matt. xxiii. 37.

Thus manifestly does this doctrine tend to overthrow the whole Christian revelation, by making it contradict itself; by giving such an interpretation of some texts, as flatly-contradicts all the other texts; and indeed the whole scope and tenor of scripture. An abundant proof that it is not of God: but neither is this all. For it is a doctrine full of blasphemy; of such blasphemy as I should dread to mention, but that the honour of our gracious God, and the cause of his truth, will not suffer me to be silent. In the cause of God, then, and from a sincere concern for the glory of his great name, I will mention a few of the horrible blasphemies contained in this horrible doctrine. But, first, I must warn every one of you that hears, as ye will answer it at the great day, not to charge me, as some have done, with blaspheming, because I mention the blasphemy of others. And the more you are grieved with them that do thus blaspheme, see that ye "confirm your love towards them" the more, and that your heart's desire, and continual prayer to God be — "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

This premised, let it be observed, that this doctrine represents our blessed Lord, "Jesus Christ the righteous, the only begotten Son of the Father, full of grace and

truth," as a hypocrite, a deceiver of the people, a man void of common sincerity: for it cannot be denied, that he every where speaks as if he were willing that all men should be saved. Therefore, to say "he was not willing that all men should be saved," is to represent him as a mere hypocrite and dissembler. It cannot be denied that the gracious words which came out of his mouth, are full of invitations to all sinners. To say then — He did not *intend* to save all sinners, is to represent him as a gross deceiver of the people. You cannot deny that he says — "Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden." If then you say he call those that cannot come, those whom he knows to be unable to come, those whom he can make able to come, but will not; how is it possible to describe greater insincerity? You represent him as mocking his helpless creatures, by offering what he never intends to give. You describe him as saying one thing, and meaning another; as pretending the love which he had not. Him in "whose mouth was no guile," you make full of deceit, void of common sincerity: then especially, when drawing nigh the city, "He wept over it and said, O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together — and ye would not." Now if you say, *they would*, but *he would not*, you represent him (which who could hear?) as weeping crocodile's tears, weeping over the prey which himself had doomed to destruction.

Such blasphemy this, as one would think might make the ears of a Christian to tingle. But there is yet more behind; for just as it honours the Son, so doth this doctrine honour the Father. It destroys all his attributes at

once. It overturns both his justice, mercy, and truth. Yes, it represents the most holy God as worse than the devil: as both more false, more cruel, and more unjust. More false, because the devil, liar as he is, hath never said, "He willeth all men to be saved." More unjust, because the devil cannot, if he would, be guilty of such injustice as you ascribe to God, when you say, that God condemned millions of souls to everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels, for continuing in sin, which, for want of that grace *he will not* give them, they cannot avoid: and more cruel, because that unhappy spirit "seeketh rest and findeth none;" so that his own restless misery is a kind of temptation to him to tempt others. But God "resteth in his high and holy place:" so that to suppose him, out of his mere motion, of his pure will and pleasure happy as he is, to doom his creatures, whether they will or no, to endless misery, is to impute such cruelty to him, as we cannot impute even to the great enemy of God and man. It is to represent the Most High God ("he that hath ears to hear, let him hear!") as more cruel, false, and unjust, than the devil!

This is the blasphemy clearly contained in *the horrible decree* of predestination. And here I fix my foot. On this I join issue with every assertor of it. You represent God as worse than the devil; more false, more cruel, more unjust. But you say you "will prove it by scripture." Hold! What will you prove by scripture? That God is worse than the devil? It cannot be. Whatever that scripture proves, it never can prove this. Whatever be its true meaning, it cannot mean this. Do you ask, "What is its true meaning then?" If I say, "I know not," you have gained nothing; for there are many scrip-

tures, the true sense thereof neither you nor I shall know, till death is swallowed up in victory. But this I know,— better it were to say, it had no sense at all, than to say it had such a sense as this. It cannot mean, whatever it mean besides, that the God of truth is a liar. Let it mean what it will, it cannot mean that the Judge of all the world is unjust. No scripture can mean that God is not love, or that his mercy is not over all his works: that is, whatever it prove beside, no scripture can prove predestination.

---

## THE APOSTLE JOHN.

BY REV. S. OSGOOD, D.D.

Too often the amiability of this apostle has been celebrated at the expense of his manliness, and he has been held up to admiration too exclusively as a character of passive good-will. Sometimes this view becomes almost a caricature, and he who so tempered energy with kindness, the sun of thunder who became the disciple of love, is portrayed almost as an effeminate sentimentalist. His nature was full of warmth, and this was made a genial flame instead of a devouring fire. The longer he dwelt with Jesus, the more effectually his nature was refined, and his heat tempered and exalted into that mild and glowing love of God and man which emanates from his Gospel and Epistles, into that heavenly communion of which the Last Supper was an undying pledge. If ever in maturer years any trace of his early impatience appears, and the harmony of his spirit for a moment yields,



the discordant note may be traced to grief at the blindness and hatred of the world towards Him who came to be its light and life, — never to merely personal considerations. His character is surely far more interesting from his union of high spirit with devoted love. His goodness came not from want of passion or sensibility, but from the power of an engrossing faith and the life of a guiding love. To understand St. John, borrow an illustration from the name given him in his young days by his Master. The Son of Thunder was so impetuous, that, when the Samaritans rejected the Saviour, he wished that fire might come from heaven and destroy their city. Here is an electric spirit unbalanced, lightning within in affinity with the lightning which it would evoke from the clouds. Pass on a few years, and contemplate that same man at the Last Supper, — follow him to Ephesus, to Patmos, nay, to that sacred old age, when all he could say to his people was but to tell them to love. Where was the lightning then, — its power annihilated, or its forces balanced and controlled? Or in other words, does godness weaken the character, or strengthen it? does it consist in the annihilation of natural forces, or their true balance upon principles of everlasting right? Let the element which furnished the name for this loved disciple afford the illustration of the change in his character. When clouds vanish, the winds cease, and lightnings flash no longer, no power is destroyed; the elements that made the storm are balanced, and the fiery bolt was but an irregular action of a force omnipresent, and coexistent with life itself. Yes, in every cup of water given in the name of a disciple, there is enough of latent lightning, or electricity, if let loose, to lay waste a city, and in every dew-drop enough to arm the storm

with a fiery shaft. God in nature should teach us to understand that the balance of power in its serenity and peace is not the annihilation, but the intensity, of its force, and that the moral equilibrium of a true life is the greatest exhibition of moral energy.

He who would once blast the Samaritans with fire, learned a better use of power through a nobler flame. How beautiful the force of his character appears in the incident so often told of his adventure with the banditti, whom, after they had seized him, he asked to lead him to their captain; and this master-robber, at sight of the old man whose instructions he had enjoyed in days of innocence, wept like a child, and returned to the fold which he had so basely deserted. At first the robber-chief fled from the Apostle's sight. "Why flee from me, my child, thy father, an unarmed old man? Fear not, there is still hope for thee. I will be surety for thee to Christ. Believe, he hath sent me." In these words was a power above any despot's word or soldier's steel.

To such a moral combination of spirit with mildness, fervor with humility, St. John added peculiar intellectual traits and practical faculties. He was by eminence an intuitive mind, seeing into things themselves, rather than receiving his conclusions as the results of elaborate reasoning. His imagination also was intuitive as his reason. He looked upon the world of spiritual truths as we look upon the scenes of nature, and these truths, like the scenes of nature, clothed themselves in peculiar imagery, and appeared in expressive combinations whenever sight yielded to fancy, or imagination worked upon the materials gathered by the perceptions. The Apocalypse may consistently be regarded as the work of his intuitive im-

agination, — the Gospel as the work of his intuitive intellect, and the graphic imagery of the one and the clear statement of the other indicate but the various action of the same master mind upon divine truths. For his loving heart, but not for that alone, did Jesus love him. The disciple's mind was congenial with that of Christ, and he was eminently a man of interior vision, and won the blessing promised them who could believe without seeing, through that intuitive faith which is evidence of things not seen.

Would we understand this intellectual trait? Compare it with its opposite, the merely logical mind, which believes only what can be reasoned out, and which without borrowing aid from intuition becomes an absurdity, for how can we reason out any thing unless we start from some principles of reason? How can we reason about causes, rights, truths, without some primal ideas of cause, of right, of truth? A mere logician is an understanding without a soul, — a form of reasoning without reason; although logic is a good servant of intuition, and reasoning in form as an essential of reason in its life. Intuition\* presents the idea immediately, logic represents it mediately. Intuition is spontaneous, logic reflective. Intuition deals with the substance, logic with the forms of things. Intuition unites, logic separates. Intuition seizes general ideas, logic individual cases. Intuition is progressive, ever seeing more of divine truth; logic is fixed, or moves no step unless intuition has shown the way. Logic deals with words, intuition with the Word. The favorite disciple in the school of Christ was fitly an intuitive mind,

\* See a clear development of these distinctions in Morell's *Philosophy of Religion*, Chapter II.

eminent for this power, as Paul for his logical tendency and Peter for his executive talents. All had their place ; but we agree with the master in assigning the most honored place to the mind of St. John. He exhibits Christianity on its best ground. He states its historical facts, and traces out their connections and conclusions indeed, yet even in his historical record he constantly points out to us the moral and spiritual principles that must be received by the soul on their own evidence through experience of their living power. These principles are features, elements of the Divine Word, and that action of the soul which accepts them is the action of faith. Faith, — sacred word ! — sadly abused indeed, confounded with blind credulity and dark superstition, yet itself the very spirit of light. We will abide by the loved disciple's definition, although it may condemn our own worldliness. He that believeth is not condemned. " This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." The interior eye opened to the light, — this is faith.

---

**QUIET WAY OF BUILDING UP CHARACTER.**—You may dazzle men's eyes with large enterprises in philanthropy, but possess nothing of the philanthropic spirit ; and so you may do nothing wonderful in your whole life, yet from your constant inward striving after holiness, the temple of God may at length stand in all its beauty in your heart. The mighty floods you see holden in mid air went not up with great commotion and fearful display, but ascended in invisible drops upon the sunbeams ; and it is but a slow perspiring from the hills that supplies the earth's exhaustless fountains.—*Bartol.*

## THE WOMAN'S RIGHTS MOVEMENT.

BY MRS. C. H. DALL.

*From a Paper read by her at the Woman's Rights Convention held in Boston, 19th September last.*

THIS reform underlies all other reforms. We ought to call it a movement in behalf of *Human* Rights, not *Woman's*, for the most important of *man's* rights is what we seek to secure, namely, the finding of woman in her *right place*, where she may help, not hinder, and set free instead of fettering.

Young men, drawn hither, perhaps, by curiosity, yet not ashamed to dream in your hearts of a wife and a home, would you have a doll to decorate, a toy to play with? If not, you are bound to lend yourselves to our effort to secure a better education for women. Was there ever *one* among you who found a wife *too* capable or *too* well instructed? If not, let none of you fear it. If reformers are found incompetent to household cares or maternal duties, it is not because they are *women*, but because they are imperfect. *Some*, nay *many* of the most distinguished men in the world, would present no better appearance on paper than Mrs. Jellaby, — the great historian Niebuhr, for example. It is the *want* of something, not the *surplus* of any thing, that makes the woman a slattern. Many are the injuries to our cause from those who thoughtlessly advocate it, oblivious, meanwhile, of the small sweet charities of home. I need not tell you what I think of such women. *You* know my opinion; but here in the city, where I was born, where I have grown up, and my word ought to be worth something, I assert, on behalf of the

great women, prominent in this cause; that there never was a body of reformers more free from reproach. Go to their homes, and you will find that they did not become reformers, until they had shown themselves good house-keepers and good wives, above all, perhaps, good mothers. They know, most of them, that he who ruleth his own soul is greater than he who taketh a city, and it is because they have made themselves helps *meet* for man, at his fireside, that they have a claim to your confidence assembled here, or in the wide valleys of the West. No occasional exceptions can invalidate this rule. I would not stand here, if I believed that any of us came, to the neglect of higher duties. I do not believe that man is a Christian, who feeds some distant, starving Ireland, before he has provided for the hunger of his own household. As I encounter often my conservative friends, they ask me, How do you grow, and what does your cause gain? It seems as if their world waited, expecting some sudden and striking result. Let us tell them here, once for all, that *we* have never been deluded into looking for any such thing. From its nature this will be the slowest movement ever undertaken by man. We shall gain surely, but imperceptibly. I am frightened when obvious results crowd upon us, because I feel that they are not granted wisely, nor with a full knowledge of all that they involve. All noble souls must help us, whether they will or not, yet I would have men realize beforehand, so far as they can, the full consequences of every step we take. Every well-educated woman who leads an independent life, refusing to marry for bread, or managing her family interests as a widow, from wise and noble motives, helps us more than all speech-making. Speech-

making is in fact the *lowest* duty in our temple service, — a duty, yet the lowest. It is needed now, it may be forever, but in itself it proves nothing.

A woman like Harriet K. Hunt, who established herself as a physician in this city in spite of bigoted resistance, and now protests against the taxes she is compelled to pay on property which she may neither protect nor represent, — a woman, who like yourself, Mrs. President, entered the field as a lecturer, to teach mothers the meaning of scrofula and the value of health, — a woman who adds, like Elizabeth Browning, the sound learning of a man to the tender feeling of a woman ; — one who like Margaret Fuller, unites a blameless private life to the most thorough scholarship, and the inspiration of a seer, is indeed a noble advocate of woman's true position, whether she ever make a speech or not.

*Life* is what we want. Responsible, earnest life, such as Hatty Hosmer's,\* when she crossed the Alleghanies to get the freedom of the dissecting-room — when she stood by the rough marble block, and with her own energetic hand, broke away the stone, till those who loved her looked upon the dawning of her Hesper. *Life*, such as Florence Nightingale's, when she sailed for the Crimea, and exchanged the Saloons of St. James for the hospitals of a badly managed war ; — when she seized the supplies, refused to her by craven officers, and saved her Majesty's dying soldiers in spite of her Majesty's transport service. *Life*, such as the primary school teacher leads, when day after day she goes up to her pupils, and by patient well-doing, earns her own, perhaps her children's bread. *Life*,

\* A young lady from the vicinity of Boston, whose genius for Sculpture makes her one of the most promising students of the Art now in Rome.—ED. L. C.

such as the faithful servant leads, who, with a tender respect towards those who employ her, keeps also a noble self-respect. Our temple is the temple of humanity, all her servants are our priests.

Let no one, then, misunderstand us. And while I speak for myself, I may speak also for all my friends upon this platform. It is no unworthy thing we contend for. We ask no irreligious souls to join us. We want tender, faithful, and earnest women, steadfast to keep this matter in the public sight. We want redress in matters of education, and before the law. We want the inalienable rights of human beings, reserving it for our own souls to decide whether we will use all the liberties that depend from those rights or not. But above all, we do not so much need, on this platform, eloquent speakers, as we do eloquent livers, by every hearth-stone in this nation; livers, who feeling the high responsibility imposed upon them by God in our emergency, will resolutely do what is demanded of them, without regard to what is sweetest and dearest in life, yet laboring always in a spirit so sweet and dear as ultimately to win the world to themselves.

Do I seem to have too little faith in conventions? If I did not believe that they are for the present necessary, I would not lend myself to them. It seems to me desirable that we should meet, and express ourselves publicly to each other, that we should understand ourselves and all our wants and possibilities. Hitherto we have lived in so narrow a sphere, that like children, we may be surprised, trying to grasp the moon with our hands. Let us come together, then, till we learn so, how broad God's own horizon really is!

Yet in the main, conventions seem to me a masculine



implement. And what have men accomplished by them, in politics or reform? Changed the "vox populi" into the "vox diaboli," mayhap, but never into the "vox Dei." Our work must be done better, and by better tools. "We know not yet, but we shall know hereafter."

And *the Life* of which I spoke!—Women of New England, I demand this life of you. Wrecks of noblest humanity are continually floating by you. A George Sand,\* breaking loose from the ties which bind her to society, only in later years to recognize with profoundest sincerity the strength of those which link her to her God. A Fredrika Bremer, a Charlotte Bronte, full of restless longings, of unsatisfied aspirations, show you the path before you. Why is it that a low wail runs through all the literature that women have given to the world, and that the voice which man uplifts, is often, though far less eloquent, more cheerful and strong? It is because women feel a helplessness that they think without remedy. Show them that it is not so. Show them, each one of you, by living that life, you dare to wish.

"Be sea-captains, if you will,"—but never be profane, drunken incapable sea-captains. Show yourselves in whatever posts you claim, gentle, steadfast, and modest. These are the virtues of men as well. Do not, as women, discard them. Be efficient, brave, and helpful. Seek duty always; perhaps it were better to say, and more modest, be ready for it when it comes, for notoriety never. One lost sister in our ranks would be an argument against us, stronger than any which legions of lawyers could furnish. While we demand of *men*, lives pure as a virgin thought,

\* Most of our readers, but perhaps not all of them, will know that this is the literary name assumed by Madame Dudevant.—ED. L. C.

let us require of ourselves always and everywhere no less. While we interfere with no other's right of private judgment, let us recognize as publicly as possible, the supremacy of God's love and power, and the relations between Him and man. Let us *find* His presence in the worlds of Nature and Art, and demand it in those of Custom and Law. Only so, may we truly serve our sex, our nation, our age. Only so, can we lay our foundations beyond the power of rains that fall, or waves that beat! Only so, shall we be able to confer on humanity, a single privilege worthy of immortal beings!

---

### SEASONS OF PRAYER.

BY H. WARE, JUN., D.D.

To prayer, to prayer! for the morning breaks,  
 And earth in her Maker's smile awakes:  
 His light is on all below and above,  
 The light of gladness, and light, and love:  
 O then, on the breath of this early air,  
 Send upward the incense of grateful prayer.

To prayer! for the glorious sun is gone,  
 And the gathering darkness of night comes on:  
 Like a curtain from God's kind hand it flows,  
 To shade the couch where his children repose:  
 Then kneel, while the watching stars are bright,  
 And give your last thoughts to the Guardian of night.

To prayer! for the day that God has blessed  
 Comes tranquilly on with its welcome rest:  
 It speaks of creation's early bloom;  
 It speaks of the Prince who burst the tomb:  
 Then summon the spirit's exalted powers,  
 And devote to heaven the hallowed hours.

There are smiles and tears in the mother's eyes,  
 For her new-born infant beside her lies :  
 O hour of bliss, when the heart o'erflows  
 With rapture a mother only knows :  
 Let it gush forth in words of fervent prayer ;  
 Let it swell up to heaven for her precious care.

There are smiles and tears in that gathering band,  
 Where the heart is pledged with the trembling hand :  
 What trying thoughts in her bosom swell,  
 As the bride bids parents and home farewell !  
 Kneel down by the side of the tearful fair,  
 And strengthen the perilous hour with prayer.

Kneel down by the dying sinner's side,  
 And pray for his soul through him who died :  
 Large drops of anguish are thick on his brow ;—  
 O what is earth and its pleasures now !  
 And what shall assuage his dark despair,  
 But the penitent cry of humble prayer ?

Kneel down at the couch of departing faith,  
 And hear the last words the believer saith :  
 He has bidden adieu to his earthly friends ;  
 There is peace in his eye that upward bends ;  
 There is peace in his calm, confiding air,  
 For his last thoughts are God's, his last words prayer.

The voice of prayer at the sable bier !  
 A voice to sustain, to soothe, to cheer :  
 It commends the spirit to God who gave ;  
 It lifts the thoughts from the cold, dark grave ;  
 It points to the glory where he shall reign,  
 Who whispered, " Thy brother shall rise again."

The voice of prayer in the world of bliss !  
 But gladder, purer, than rose from this :  
 The ransomed shout to their glorious King,  
 Where no sorrow shades the soul as they sing :  
 But a sinless and joyous song they raise ;  
 And their voice of prayer is eternal praise.

Awake, awake ! and gird up thy strength  
 To join that holy band at length :  
 To him who unceasing love displays,  
 Whom the powers of nature unceasingly praise,  
 To him thy heart and thy hours be given ;  
 For a life of prayer is the life of heaven.

---

### BOOK NOTICES.

**EARLY RELIGIOUS EDUCATION CONSIDERED AS THE DIVINELY APPOINTED WAY TO THE REGENERATE LIFE.**  
 By William G. Eliot, Pastor of the Church of the Messiah,  
 St. Louis. Boston : Crosby, Nichols & Co.

THIS is another admirable Essay by the Rev. Dr. Eliot. It is one which we should desire to see in every parent's hand, and would commend to their careful and devout perusal. The author briefly states the scope of his writing in his first paragraph :—" In the following Essay, I propose to speak of the Religious Education of the Young, considered as the divinely appointed means of Christian Regeneration. My object is to call the attention of parents to duties and responsibilities which are too apt to be neglected, and by neglect of which the spiritual welfare of their children is sometimes sacrificed."

The book may be had of Messrs. H. & G. M. Rose, No. 44 Great St. James Street, Montreal.

**WORDS FOR THE WORKERS.** By Wm. D. Haley. Boston : Crosby, Nichols & Co. For Sale in Montreal at the Office of H. & G. M. Rose, No. 44 Great St. James Street.

THIS book contains a series of lectures addressed to Working men, Mechanics, and Apprentices, by Mr. Haley, Minister of the newly established Unitarian Church in Alton, Illinois. They are well conceived and well expressed, apt and forcible in illustration, and marked by a freshness and vigor of style that can scarcely fail to secure attention. They touch things as they are, and by thus dealing with existing realities, they possess an interest for all, which discourses more profound, or more distant from the facts of common life, could not excite. We congratulate the infant church at Alton on their having a minister of Mr. Haley's stamp, and wish his excellent little volume a wide circulation.