

THE
LIBERAL CHRISTIAN.

VOL. I.

JULY, 1854.

No. 7.

PUBLIC WORSHIP.

BY REV. J. F. CLARKE.

THE subject of Public Worship is too large to be treated here with any fulness. I shall merely venture a few suggestions in relation to the two questions, "What are the reasons for maintaining Public Worship?" and, "How is this Public Worship to be made most interesting and useful?"

Public worship has this great advantage and value,—that it recognizes a public religious sentiment. It is a perpetual denial by the Christian Church of its own doctrine of Total Depravity. It assumes that the whole community, the converted and the unconverted, the regenerate and the unregenerate, *can* pray, *ought* to pray, *wish* to pray. It so far counteracts the pharisaic feeling engendered by these distinctions. It is, moreover, a religious education for the whole community. Who can tell the amount of influence exerted, directly and indirectly, by the fact of Sunday worship pervading the whole

land, of Sunday stillness, cessation from business, of church-bells, and the streets filling with the currents of piety which set toward the house of God? Who can estimate the impression made by the sight of young and old, rich and poor, all classes, all orders, equalized before God in a common worship, — by the great assembly kneeling together, responding together, lifting their voices with one accord in solemn hymns and anthems, moved by a common feeling and conviction in listening to the word read or spoken? It is a humanizing influence, purifying and elevating the community, keeping alive the sense of God's presence in the world and nearness to the human heart, keeping up a Christian standard of duty and responsibility. The power of this institution of public worship as a means of Christian education can only be realized by those who have lived in those outskirts of civilization where it has not gone, and have seen the results of its first introduction. In the Western States of this Union, towns have grown up containing one thousand or fifteen hundred inhabitants, in which there has been no regular public worship. Such communities are without order or peace, — they are the abodes of violence, intemperance, and all forms of brutal vice. At last there comes some preacher of the Gospel, — a travelling Methodist, perhaps, with all his library contained in his saddle-bags, who composes his sermons while riding beneath the shade of the majestic forests of beech and tulip-tree, who finds his congregation of an evening in a country school-house, or in the open woods; who combines in himself the functions of preacher, choir, and sexton, and whose only emolument is his supper and lodging. Such a man comes into the town, finds out and brings together those who are

wishing for a more Christian society, establishes some regular public worship, and thus sets on foot a humanizing influence. A new public opinion is created, favorable to order, civility, and peace. In the course of a few years the aspect of affairs is wholly altered, the rudeness and violence are gone, and are replaced by habits of sobriety and decency. Now, in this case, the Church, with its institution of worship, does not act as a police, restraining the outbreak of crime, but as an educational influence, correcting the tendencies to crime. In this instance we have given the history of what has actually occurred again and again, in numberless instances throughout the Western States, within the last half-century.

But not only does public worship tend to educate the community by awakening and developing religious ideas, but it also cultivates humane feelings, brings the different classes of society near to each other, makes one common platform on which all can stand together, and so counteracts continually the tendencies to separate and isolated life. People who lived all other days apart from each other, whose lives are narrowed to little rounds of domestic duty, who see only small family groups and cliques, come into church on the Lord's day, and feel themselves for an hour at one with all classes of men. This hour, though only bringing them into an external contact, and no intimate communion, does much to emancipate them from a narrow and too individual life. All professions, conditions, characters, are side by side engaged in the same serious occupation. Political opponents here forget their disputes, — rivals in fashion, competitors in business, rich and poor, are here brought into a certain sympathy; and this is no small gain.

We say no more here of the advantages of Public Worship, since this topic needs no special treatment, but pass on to the more important question, How shall it be made most interesting and useful?

The interest of Public Worship depends chiefly on this — that it shall be a *reality*, and not a *form*. If, when we enter the church, we are made to feel that we are among a people who have met only because it is a custom so to meet; if there is no awe, no earnestness, no devotion, no humanity; if we perceive the airs of fashion, display egotism, self-conceit, in the attitudes, looks, and gestures of the assembly, — not only is there no good done, but there is a positively evil influence. We can bear these manifestations elsewhere, but not here; — here they disgust and offend us, and make us doubt the reality of all faith and all religious feeling.

For it is no doubt the fact, that we feel at once what is the spirit of a congregation. Seriousness manifests itself inevitably without effort, in the attitudes, looks, gestures. Frivolity manifests itself as inevitably in careless attitudes and gestures or looks which express indifference to others, satisfaction with self, irreverence toward God. You cannot enter a congregation without feeling at once this spirit, and you unconsciously sympathize with it. The voluntary on the organ tells you that the organist is wishing to show off his technical skill and power over the instrument, — the choir say in their singing, very audibly, “We are paid so much for coming here, and we must do this as a matter of business,” or, “We wish to show you what fine voices we have, and what we are able to execute.” The minister reads or prays, and the sound of his voice says, “I am unprepared to pray, — I have nothing

of the spirit of prayer ; but I am going to assume a solemn tone, so as to convince myself and you that I am quite in earnest." All this worldliness and indifference and languor passes into the congregation. As they repose in the corners of the pews, as they sit and stand and stare in all directions, with empty or supercilious gaze, they declare plainly that they have come to church with no religious interest or aim, and that they will probably leave it with no religious impression. The sermon is, in such cases, the only hope for the service. In *that* the minister is likely to be really interested, since he has written it with thought and care, and therefore he will more or less interest the congregation, and so some good will be done.

When worship is felt to have thus degenerated into a form, empty of meaning and life, serious persons will be revolted by it, and will be tempted to desert public worship altogether. Yet in so doing they will miss the advantages above mentioned, and will feel that they are becoming lonely and morbid in their interior life. Therefore the question is, How shall new life and earnestness be breathed into public worship, so as to make it really interesting and useful ?

There are two ways in which this end may be reached. First, the minister and the congregation may make direct efforts to obtain a new and earnest interest in their worship, and secondly, they may indirectly seek it through the medium of new forms and improved methods. There are these two wants, — the want of New Wine, and the want of New Bottles, — of a new spirit, and of new forms. A new spirit will give novelty and interest to old forms, and new forms will often awaken a new spirit.

Let the minister feel an earnest desire to give new life

to the public worship, — let him never enter the pulpit without mental and moral preparation, — let him never engage in public prayer, until he has privately asked God's aid that he may pray in spirit and in truth, — let him revolve the needs of his congregation, feel a living sympathy with them all, the happy and the sorrowful, the believers and the doubters, the old and the young. Let him pray out of this depth of conviction, out of this fullness of interest, and the congregation will become more or less interested too. The spirit of religion is as contagious as that of indifference, and will pass into their hearts, and a new earnestness will manifest itself outwardly, which will tend to perpetuate, deepen, and extend the spirit. Earnest persons in the congregation will become more in earnest, there will be a real revival of the spirit of piety and faith, and, without changing a single method, every part of the service will be lifted out of deadness into life.

Or, on the other hand, something may be done by introducing new forms. Any kind of a change, which breaks up old habits, which takes the congregation out of the stereotyped ways, may often tend to give new earnestness to the services. Innovations in either direction, whether toward more of Form, or more of Freedom, have produced a deeper life. The churches which have copied Roman Catholic customs, putting candles on the altar, and the like, have usually with their unimportant novelties gained an important increase of real religious interest. So, too, churches which have thrown away forms and simplified worship have been benefited. Not that the change in itself, and absolutely, was necessarily for the better, but by the change they were taken out of the

grooves of form, and thrown upon the help of the spirit. What these changes and method of form shall be, depends much on the character and circumstances of the society. They should not be introduced by a mere majority vote, against the wishes of a respectable minority, since the advantage gained would be more than counterbalanced by the feeling of dissatisfaction introduced into the congregation. Such changes may be made the subjects of interesting and useful discussion in the meetings of the society, and may be gradually introduced, according to their wishes.

We do not mean to say that one mode of worship has *no* absolute advantage over any other. We find something good in all, but some no doubt are really better and others worse. There are vicious extremes of too much of Form, running into formalism, — of too little, passing into disorder. We can conceive of a mode of worship which should combine the advantages of all others, — which should be neither bald in its simplicity, nor loaded with ornament and variety, — in which the congregation should take part orally as well as mentally, by congregational singing and responses, — which should be in part Liturgic and in part Extemporaneous, — in which there should be seasons of silence for mental prayer and contemplation, — and in which choral and instrumental music should be alternated with the hymns of the whole congregation. Such a worship might be aided by the construction of the building and its ornaments. The house should not be gloomy, but pervaded by a cheerful light, coming mostly from above. The seats should be arranged in a circular form, so as to bring the people into each other's view as well as into that of the minister,

and so to make a visible communion. Paintings might be on the walls, representing the Parables of Christ, scenes in his life, and important events in Church history. Thus a truly catholic church architecture might be produced, equally distant from the baldness of Puritanism, and the gloom and closeness of the Roman churches. For we cannot believe that the mediæval architecture, beautiful as it was in its time, was intended for all time. The idea of humanity is lost sight of, the congregation are like ants crawling on the floor ; only the altar and its mass, the priesthood and their ceremonies, are of consequence. The whole of Catholic worship consists in looking at the celebration of the Mass, — the whole of Puritan worship consists in listening to the prayers, hymns, and sermon. This *looking* and *listening* needs to be superseded by a higher worship, in which the church of brethren and sisters shall worship in communion with each other, and not vicariously by priest or preacher. Then the house of worship would not be only a floor beneath a lofty roof, where a congregation stands to see a mass, — nor pews in which they sit to hear a sermon. But the house of worship would be a home, and the worshippers therein a family, — and to make of the church a home is the surest way of making the home a church.

THE state of every kingdom well managed by prudent government, seems to represent a human body guided by the sovereignty of a reasonable soul ; the country and the land representing the one ; the actions and state affairs the other.

RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE.

BY REV. E. H. CHAPIN.

IF the spirit of intolerance is unamiable any where, especially is it when found in connection with the name of Christ. And yet I know of no sphere where it seems rooted so deep, or where it kindles so high, as upon the subject of religion. This excommunication for a difference of opinion, this perfect hatred that *seems*, at least, to exist not only towards *opinions*, but *men*, this dividing of the Church of Jesus into hostile sects — is it like a manifestation of that Teacher, who came to gather men to a knowledge of one Father — to the fold of one Shepherd? And yet, where will you find more bitter warfare than that which is waged for religious doctrines? Where see more ridicule and aspersion than in the columns of the religious newspaper? Where find more coldness or alienation than among christians of different views? Now there must be some cause for this intolerance. And it appears to me that it may arise in part, at least, from a misconception, and this misconception seems founded on the idea that a particular *belief* is essential to christian *character*. Now I wish to be understood upon this point. All must agree that faith in Christ is absolutely necessary to entitle a man to the name of Christian. But within this avowal of christian faith how wide may be the diversity of knowledge, of reasoning power, of disposition! These may all lead to different views of the Saviour's doctrines, and to different perceptions as to what are and what are not his teachings. And yet I affirm that no one can truly see Christ, and drink in the influence of his

character, and not be a christian at heart. And there is no one sect in the ample field of christendom, that has not christian truth enough to kindle christian life in its members. Let me say again by way of explanation, that I do not wish men to be indifferent to doctrines, or to sectarian views. In the glow of generous and truly christian feeling, men will often say — “ Well, it makes no difference about doctrines, provided the heart is right.” It does make a difference — and the difference is just as wide as the gap between truth and error. It makes this difference — that the soul that imbibes an erroneous instead of a true doctrine, is less happy, and less advanced in its true life, than it might be. Still, there is truth at the bottom of the expression — “ It makes no difference what a man believes;” and it lies at the point at which I am now arriving. The meaning of it is this — that the truth is worth but little unless it produces its fruits, and, if it produce its fruits, this is the chief end ; and there is a conviction in saying this, that in all sects there is truth enough to produce good fruits. And I say so too. In every christian denomination, there is enough of vital, kindling christianity to make good hearts. No one can sit at the foot of the cross, as a devoted, earnest disciple, and not feel the light that rays out from it moving upon his soul. No one can take the simple christian law of love to God, and love to man, and go by its guidance, and yet be an immortal man. No one can stand by that cleft rock, and that irradiated tomb, and not believe that religion appeals to something deeper than time and sense, to which we must awake, and for which we must strive. These are indisputable facts, first principles, that are tacitly admitted by all who assume the christian name. But, I

say, this matter is not virtually thus regarded by many sects. A man's variation in christian belief, is looked upon as a token of depreciated moral and religious character. The unworthiness of such a disciple to approach the communion table is asserted upon no other ground, and his probable moral conduct is traced to and linked with his faith — and his faith, often, not as it really is, but as men see it with their eyes, colored as they may be by ignorance and prejudice. This, then, I repeat, would seem to be one cause of the spirit of intolerance that prevails among various christian denominations.

Again :— we may trace this intolerant spirit back to the idea, that a man is actually to blame for being in error — that if he is in error he knows it all the while, and only persists in it from a perverse and wicked disposition. Hence, men are denounced for teaching such and such doctrines, are scolded at and sneered at — but not reasoned with, or pitied. If the gross assumption that I am right and you are wrong be admitted, without entering into the merits of the case, still, I know not why I should *abuse*, or *denounce* you. Surely, you may think you are right, and if it be a delusion to think so, still, it demands a labor of love, an effort of reason — not a display of intolerance. But how men will knit their brows, and vent their bitterness at the name of a *heretic*! A heretic! Why, one would think, from the common sentiment, that a heretic was one who had not only unchristianized but *unmanned* himself — one going forth on purpose to destroy and pollute, laying sacrilegious hands on the holiest things from a spirit of sheer malignity and wickedness, and opposing himself to the received faith from a scornful and sinful spirit. But now it is *possible* that a heretic may be

a very different person from all this. He may be a meek seeker for truth, blinded, perhaps, but sincere; he may be a man who has studied and thought, and who in conscience can not adopt the received ideas; he may be a man who nourishes all the religious affections, who drinks religion with a keener thirst, and from purer springs — or thinks he does — because he has thrown by what seemed to him impediments in the way to the fountain-head — impediments to him, although to you they may be sacred articles of faith. A heretic may be such a man as this, and surely he is not to be denounced and abused for all these peculiarities. And look ye, who, burning with intolerance, would almost call down fire from heaven upon him, he may be, after all, farther advanced in Divine truth and Divine life than *you*, with all your faith, ancient and wide-spread as it is. Such a thing, I say, is *possible*.

But while intolerance like this would seem to fasten more particularly upon the orthodox than upon the heretic sects — upon the Conservative rather than the Reforming Religionist, it may be found with the latter, as well as with the former — and I think it will be found there in our day. The Samaritans in refusing to receive Jesus, exhibited intolerance, but the disciples, in their turn, manifested the very sentiment that excited them. How common this is! The spirit we denounce, we oppose in the very same spirit. The boasting Liberal approaches the village of the Orthodox Samaritan, but he will have none of him, because his face is set in a suspicious direction. “What an intolerant bigot,” exclaims the liberal, “Oh! that I could call down fire from heaven.” Nay, but tell me, my friend, is there not more than *one* of you who is intolerant now? I deprecate persecution for

heresy, then — but I equally deprecate the spirit in which the heretic deals out his accusations of “superstitious,” “bigoted,” “timid,” and “time-serving.” I want no man abused because he rejects the miracles, but I do not want him to abuse me because I hold to them. I affirm that it is unjust for the orthodox professor to un-christianize the Universalist or Unitarian, but I maintain that it is just as wrong for the Universalist or Unitarian to call the orthodox a hypocrite, or a dupe. And, I say, such a spirit as is manifested in the last-named illustration, is too rife in our day.

Such, then, is Religious Intolerance. I would that it was done away with. This is the union of christians that I ask for. Not an identity of doctrine, not an indifference to articles of belief, not a worshipping in one place or one form — but a recognition of the great common humanity, of the right of opinion, of the oneness of the Christ-like Image seen through many human forms. Alas! we shall never have this sentiment, as the tide of thought and feeling runs at present. We shall never have this sentiment, until we rise to more intimate communion with that One who could bless even while men cursed, could heal while they smote, could pray for them when they pierced; and even when turned from their homes and denied their hospitality, could say to those who breathed the bitterness of vengeance in his behalf — “Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of — the Son of Man is not come to destroy men’s lives, but to save them.”

IGNORANCE is the curse of God; knowledge the wing whereby we fly to heaven.

H. J. HUIDEKOPER, ESQ.

THIS rare and excellent man closed his earthly career on the 22d May last, in the 79th year of his age. He was the father and founder of the Meadville Theological School, and as such he commanded our especial respect. The following pages relating to him we take from a more lengthened notice in the Boston *Christian Register* :—

Mr. Huidekoper was educated as a Calvinist, according to the Heidelberg catechism, and at an early age was regularly admitted to the Dutch Reformed Church. An account of his change of views would probably, better than almost anything, give a true idea of the man, for it was an example of the fidelity and thoroughness and good faith which characterized him in all relations. When his children had reached the age at which they must necessarily begin to receive religious impressions and opinions of some sort, he felt that their instruction, in so important a matter, could not be delegated to another. He had never doubted the faith in which he had been reared, but in teaching his children, he felt the need of a more thorough acquaintance with what he was to teach. To prepare himself for this responsible work, he took what he had always regarded as the great doctrines of Christianity, and, with reference to each one, read the New Testament through, writing out every passage which he supposed could have a bearing on it. Besides other doctrines, less open to controversy, he pursued this course with reference to the Trinity, the Atonement, Total Depravity, &c., and after a full collection of whatever he could find in the Scriptures, to illustrate the subject in hand, he sat down to the subject of it, with the purpose

of gaining the best understanding in his power of what Almighty God has seen fit to reveal. To his surprise, instead of being more clearly established in his inherited faith, the doctrines themselves constantly faded away before this thorough examination. Without having read a Unitarian book, he found at length that his opinions had undergone an entire revolution, and it was not till now (and from a general idea that they contained what might have affinities with his present system of thought,) that he sent to the East and procured a collection of Unitarian works. Views thus attained were naturally held with the strongest conviction of their truth. They rested on the careful study of the Scriptures, and his feeling always was that the most convincing of all Unitarian books was the Bible itself. Whatever might be the correctness of his opinions, the way in which they were formed furnished an unmistakable evidence of his reverence for the Scriptures, his Christian regard to truth, and his sense of parental responsibility. When it is remembered that he pursued these persevering studies amidst the engrossments of a business life, and without any encouragement or help from abroad, and with the simple purpose of becoming a proper religious guide to his children, and when it is known that he carried the same spirit of fidelity into all duties, the most common as well as the highest, it will be easily understood how it was that they who had his acquaintance honored him as possessing the highest and rarest moral qualities.

It was characteristic of the man, at once to incorporate his faith into his practice. He never speculated that he might talk, but that he might act. Christian truth he believed to be the most precious of all things to the indi

vidual and to society. Of course, in a community where the views which he entertained had hardly been heard of except to be assailed and stigmatized, it was impossible for him not to express them, and equally impossible that much discussion should not speedily be created. Mr. Huidekoper had nothing of the proselyting spirit or of the dogmatist about him, but he loved frankness, justice and truth as devotedly as many men love money or social distinction. Owing to attacks made on Unitarians, he was drawn into several long controversies on theological questions, in the local newspaper, between himself and leading men in the Presbyterian body. These controversies were conducted with ability and courtesy. They attracted attention to the general subject. Others were led by reading and thought to similar views with himself, till, finally, from a persuasion that it would be useful to the community, he took means to secure Unitarian preaching. A society was formed, and after some years,— in 1835, we think — a church was erected.

Mr. Huidekoper's larger acquaintance with the wants of the West, had impressed him with the profound conviction that nothing was so much needed in its new and forming communities, as a well-instructed and devoted ministry. The Christian body was numerous; his views were in substantial harmony with theirs; he saw that they were exerting a religious influence, which, it might be reasonably hoped, would become wider and more beneficent every day, while he was indifferent under what name truth was diffused, provided it was diffused. But both the Christians and the Unitarians, in order that they might accomplish the work which Providence seemed to have given them to do, were in want of means for

the more thorough instruction of young men who were proposing to enter the ministry. With these general convictions he was prepared to unite with a son who had just completed his theological education, and who, sharing his father's views and feelings, proposed the establishment of such a school at Meadville. With Mr. H., to see a great religious want, was a step towards attempting to supply it. It was in this way, with the purpose and hope, simply, to do something that might promote the highest religious welfare of the West, that the theological school at Meadville was formed, and mainly by his personal exertions. He contributed a large part of the means requisite for trying the experiment—he laid the foundation of a Library—he was instrumental in securing the services of the present able and devoted head of the institution—and the son referred to above, an accomplished scholar, devoted himself to the interests of the institution, and gave, as he has continued to give, his gratuitous, laborious and unremitting services as one of the Professors. Mr. H. was one who never threw the responsibility of a measure on others, when he could meet it himself. It was not till the experiment was tried, and the need of such a school was apparent and its success assured, that aid from abroad, in forming a fund to place it on a permanent foundation, was sought. And when others were called on to contribute to this object, his contribution was, we think, a fifth part of the \$50,000 raised. The purity of his motives was universally recognized. From the beginning, leading men, of the Christian denomination, as well as Unitarians, co-operated with him in entire harmony. They knew that his only desire was to increase the means of theological education, to benefit those preparing to hold

the responsible station of religious teachers, and that no person would resist more strenuously than he, any improper interference with the freedom of thought, or religious opinions of those who might resort to the school. Indeed, when the institution was established, and its business matters placed on a proper basis, he withdrew, in a great measure, from any active participation in its concerns. The historian of the Meadville school will always have one fact to record worthy of commemoration,—that its principal founder had in view the advantage, not only of the young men connected with the body of which he was a member, but equally so, the advantage of those who were associated with a denomination to which, personally, he did not belong. He did not require any sectarian bond, before he acknowledged the tie and the claims of Christian brotherhood. It was a true liberality — not that which supports one form of religious belief as readily as another, because it is utterly indifferent to all — but a liberality which is regardless of sectarian names and success, provided that truth prospers and flourishes. The management of the school has been in the same spirit. Christians and Unitarians have been associated in it harmoniously — each using its advantages — and each retaining its name and individuality. It belongs to, and is under the control alike of Unitarians and Christians; or rather, we would hope, it belongs to Christ and Christian objects: and long may this union and co-operation of two bodies of Christian believers in the service of their common Master, continue.

We are not attempting — for we have not the means of doing so at our command — to write a biography of Mr. Huidekoper; but simply mentioning such incidents

as occur to the memory as illustrative of his character.— He was a man whom it was a privilege to know. He possessed a highly cultivated mind and large intelligence; and was particularly distinguished for a clear, direct common sense, which fitted him to take a lead in the practical affairs of life. With no anxiety for wealth, and, above all, with none of that passion for it which reveals itself in wild and heated speculations; he became rich, simply because whatever he undertook was, in most cases, worth succeeding; and his judgment and energy caused everything to prosper which he touched. His interest in politics, and in all matters which related to the public welfare was always strong, though probably the offer of no office could have tempted him for a moment from private life. He sympathized with the great reforms of the day, though never in their extravagancies. He was essentially conservative, but his conservatism was of that kind which conserve by improving. A large part of what he wrote had relations to theology; and was always distinguished for its Christian earnestness, and its logical clearness and force. In 1830–31, he published a series of *Essays*, in a periodical form, for circulation in the region where he lived, on the questions in controversy between the Unitarians and Orthodox. They make a small volume, and for their purpose, we know of nothing better of their kind.

A vicious habit—an indulged little sin—a neglected duty—how easily are they taken care of, if we are in season with them, but how ruinous and stubborn if left alone!

WHO ARE THE ORTHODOX ?

“ORTHODOXY” has long since got to be a term of very loose usage in the religious world. Almost every party claims it, and almost every party has it conceded to them. Its use has become so indiscriminate that some do not care for seeking it. As a party term, it is frequently used as antagonistic to Unitarianism. When speaking of our Trinitarian fellow Christians, we feel no hesitation in giving it to them as such. We are not of those who quarrel about mere terms. In designating parties, we are generally disposed to use those names which are least offensive to the parties themselves.

Yet, when we come to seek the precise meaning of this term, we may discover that it does not lie so near the surface as many suppose. Who are the orthodox? Let an accomplished Trinitarian Professor answer the question; we mean Dr. Campbell, Professor of Divinity and Principal of Marischal College, Aberdeen. “As to orthodox,” says Dr. C., “I should be glad to know the meaning of the epithet. Nothing, you say, can be plainer. The orthodox are those who in religious matters entertain right opinions. Be it so. How then is it possible I should know who they are that entertain right opinions, before I know what opinions are right? I must, therefore, unquestionably know orthodoxy, before I can know or judge who are orthodox. Now, to know the truths of religion, which you call orthodox, is the very end of my enquiries; and am I to begin these inquiries on the presumption, that without any enquiry I know it already? There is nothing about which men have been, and still are, more divided. It has been accounted orthodox divi-

nity in one age, which hath been branded as ridiculous fanaticism in the next. It is at this day deemed the perfection of orthodoxy in one country, which in an adjacent country is looked upon as damnable heresy. Nay, in the same country, hath not every sect a standard of its own? Accordingly, when any person seriously uses the word, before we can understand his meaning, we must know to what communion he belongs. When that is known, we comprehend him perfectly. By the orthodox he means always those who agree in opinion with him and his party; and by the heterodox, those who differ from him. When one says, then, of any teacher whatever, that all the orthodox acknowledge his orthodoxy, he says neither more nor less than this, 'All who are of the same opinion with him, of which number I am one, believe him to be in the right.' And is this anything more than what may be asserted by some person or other, of every teacher that ever did or ever will exist? * * * * To say the truth, we have but too many ecclesiastic terms and phrases which savour grossly of the arts of a crafty priesthood, who meant to keep the world in ignorance, to secure an implicit faith in their own dogmas, and to intimidate men from an impartial inquiry into holy writ."

LETTERS OF W. VON HUMBOLDT.

WILHELM VON HUMBOLDT was an able Prussian Statesman, a man of Science, and an eminent Oriental Scholar. His large observation and extensive experience of the world, were matured by careful and earnest thought. He died at an advanced age in 1835. After his death, two volumes of letters to a French friend were published, translated from the German into English. These letters

breathe a fine spirit of religious wisdom, and stand as a beautiful monument of the harmony and completeness of his character. The intelligent and appreciating reader will not fail to observe in his manner of touching the points referred to in the following letters, the token of a devout heart and well balanced mind. He will see that the Statesman and the Scholar was a Christian also. For the sake of convenience we separate the text of the letters, and indicate the topics by the insertion of heads.

THE USE OF SUNDAY.

I agree in your opinion, that the appointment of certain days of rest, even when they are not connected with any special religious festival, is a happy idea, and one that is in the highest degree gratifying and refreshing to the mind of every one who has a benevolent concern for all classes of his fellow-creatures. There is nothing more heartless and selfish than the displeasure, or at least the sort of contemptuous distaste, with which the noble and the rich sometimes look down on the rest of Sundays and festivals. Even the choice of the seventh day is certainly the wisest that could have been made. However arbitrary it may appear, and may be to a certain extent, to shorten or lengthen work on account of one day, I am nevertheless persuaded that six days are the exact measure of man's physical power of endurance, whether in labor or uniform employment. There is something humane, too, in allowing the animals employed in man's service to share in his rest. To lengthen the time between this constantly recurring day of rest would be no less foolish than inhuman, though I once saw the experiment made. When I spent some years in Paris, during the time of the Revolution, I witnessed there the abolition of this divine ordinance, in order to establish in its room the dull dry decimal system. The tenth day was to be what our Sunday is, and the

work went on for nine days consecutively ; but, when this became evidently too much for the strength, many observed Sunday also, at least as far as the police would allow : hence resulted next, too much idleness, and thus we always blunder between two extremes when we depart from the regular middle way ordained for us. But if this be the case when merely rational and worldly considerations are taken into account, how much is its importance altered when seen in a religious point of view, which makes the idea as well as the enjoyment of the day a source of spiritual peace and real consolation ! Besides this, the greater festivals are connected with such remarkable circumstances, that they from thence gain an especial sanctity. It is doubtless the most proper celebration of these days to read the history of the events which they commemorate in the Bible itself, and all four Evangelists, as you tell me has been your practice for many years.

THE GOSPEL NARRATIVES.

In the Evangelists, the general accordance of the narratives is as worthy of notice as the small differences which occur. This accordance is a pledge of their sincerity and truth, and all bear the stamp of the spirit in which all these immediate witnesses wrote, who saw and accompanied Christ himself. But this spirit, although it indeed was a spirit of unity which animated all, did not at all hinder the peculiar character of every narrator from developing itself in all its genuineness and beauty. Indeed, whoever is accustomed to read the Evangelists frequently, cannot easily mistake from which of them a passage is taken, if it but contain any thing which allows character to show itself. I think I can perceive from your

last letter, as I have thought I discovered also from former ones, that you give the preference to the Gospel of St. John. * * * I partake fully in your feeling: there is in John something peculiarly full of soul, if I may be allowed the expression. * * *

RELIGIOUS PEACE.

By the peace which I mentioned, I mean that which is described in both the very well-chosen texts which you quote; but I must understand them in my own sense. I must take both these texts together; for one alone does not express the idea I have connected with them, at least not entirely. In the first place, if, as it is said in Isaiah, "peace is the work of righteousness," it is unattainable without a severe fulfilment of duty; unattainable to every one, since strictness in the fulfilment of duty is its first and last condition. But this I should call only an earthly, human kind of peace. It may be the groundwork, but it is not all. It is preached all through the prophets, and in the preceding parts of the Old Testament; but it is the New Testament which gives its completion. There alone we find the peace which the world cannot give; an expression not to be surpassed. What belongs to this peace is quite distinct from any external good fortune or enjoyment: it is derived from an unseen power; but there must be that in the disposition which will separate our interior existence entirely from the world; which will prevent us from making any claim to outward good fortune; which seeks only that peace of the soul which results from a life spent in humble and sincere obedience; as a ship finds rest on the still surface of a waveless and safe harbour. The mere practice of duty will not reach so far as this. The subordination of the individual to the law, and yet

more, the recognition of the most exalted guiding and all-pervading love, must be so powerful, that the whole being must be as it were merged in it. Only in such a frame of mind can we appropriate to ourselves the peace of mind promised by Jesus Christ; for it would be a very erroneous interpretation of this beautiful text, were we to believe that this heavenly peace would descend upon us of itself, without any effort on our part. It is a free heavenly gift, flowing from divine grace only; but man cannot lay hold on it save by the state of mind which I have described: he cannot be a partaker of the heavenly whilst he is seeking earthly good. But let him possess such a mental disposition, and he is certain of this heavenly peace; for it is most true that "to him that hath will be given." The earthly must, so far as its frail nature permits, put on the heavenly, if he would really be a partaker of it; and thus it is that our inward peace depends upon ourselves.

THE FUTURE LIFE.

The words of St. Paul, which you quote in your letter, "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable," certainly convey a deep truth, which lays hold on the mind in its very inmost part. They tell, in the shortest and simplest manner, the super-terrestrial nature of man; for we cannot but recognize in the highest, noblest, and most truly worthy feelings of man an origin that is not of this world. The true ennoblement of our nature consists in the feeling that our existence stretches beyond the bounds of this globe. It is this which gives that peculiar feeling to man, which so unceasingly accompanies all those who reflect at all,—that the world around him, in which he immediately acts,

and from which his enjoyments spring, does not suffice him ; and that his desires and his hopes drag him towards another, as yet unknown, and only dimly anticipated. It is in the different relations in which every one places himself to the one and the other world, that the difference of individual character is chiefly found ; for it gives the mind an original bent upon which all the rest depends. He who is wholly taken up with the earthly, so as to have neither thought nor feeling for a higher world, must in truth be termed most wretched : he is without the highest and best inward satisfaction, and is incapable of arriving at the true perfection of his moral nature. But there is also a certain contempt of the earth, and an erroneous mode of occupying ourselves with an existence beyond it, which, even if it does not lead to a neglect of the duties of life, yet at least prevents us from enjoying the good in this world which Providence designed for us. The truly elevated frame of mind avoids this double one-sidedness : it takes its starting-point from the endless traces of the Divinity which pervade everything on earth, and are to be found through all creation in the wise arrangement and loving solicitude for the comfort of every created thing ; and in this frame of mind we connect those pure feelings of the heart which truly belong to a better world, with such of our social relations as we can devote ourselves to without impairing the true worth of our nature. It is thus that we seek and engraft the super-terrestrial upon the terrestrial, and become capable of elevating ourselves to the full purity of a heavenly life. In this sense we live for another world, even in this ; for the earthly then becomes merely the shell of the divine ; and this last, by no means lying hidden within, but beam-

ing forth visibly and brightly, becomes the individual and animating feeling. With these views the soul easily separates itself from the earthly, and raises itself above it; and with this frame of mind is immediately connected the feeling of immortality, and of a state of existence which will have its beginning on the other side of the grave. A mind which in the right sense does not live for this world alone, does not receive this feeling as a mere hope and desire; for it is a certainty, bound up with the very consciousness of existence. Had we not been endowed with this knowledge as soon as we were placed upon the earth, we should indeed have been cast down into utter misery; for there would be no compensation for earthly misfortune, and, what is more and would be more lamentable too, the greatest of all problems would remain unsolved, and our interior existence would remain without the one thing which gives the seal and finish to its perfection.

TEACHING CHILDREN TO LIE.

My nearest neighbor, when I resided in Connecticut, was a man moving in the ordinary walks of life, and was a prudent, careful, honest, and industrious husbandman. Being at a certain time on some occasion at his son-in-law's, one of the boys of the family wished to go home with his grandfather: it not being convenient at that time, the grandfather told the boy that he could not very well carry him at that time, but added, "Next time grandpa comes he will carry you home with him."—The boy was pacified. The old gentleman not thinking

any more, (as, alas! many careless and faulty parents do,) of what he had said to the boy, was several times at the house without fulfilling his engagement; and, perhaps, without once having it come again into his mind. But the boy was not so forgetful. He recollected well the promise of his grandpa. In process of time the grandfather took the boy behind him on his horse, and was conveying him to his paternal abode. On the way the boy began to remonstrate with his grandfather on the subject, by saying, "When grandpa was at our house one time, he said the next time he came he would carry me home — and grandpa *did not*." — "Why," says the old gentleman, "you don't think your grandpa would *lie*, do you?" "I don't know," says the boy, "*What does grandpa call it?*" This confounded the old gentleman, and he knew not what reply to make. This anecdote has convinced me more than almost any thing I ever heard, of the importance of regarding strictly and conscientiously what we say to children. Especially it has shown me the evil of trifling with children, and making them unmeaning promises or declarations which have attached to them no truth or signification. And it is my deliberate and fixed opinion, that oftentimes parents, by disregarding, forgetting, and neglecting to fulfil what they declare unto children in promises or threatenings, are chargeable with the pernicious evil of teaching their children to lie; and then perhaps inflicting punishment upon them for the crime. This is hard, — this is cruel, — this is an evil of a monstrous size, prevalent and triumphant to an alarming degree, and which ought speedily and effectually to be corrected. Watch then, and remember to make good what you say to children. Do not threaten

them with what you have no business to execute,— such as cutting off ears, taking off skin, &c. In this way you weaken your own hands; render the truth doubtful, and train up your child for falsehood and crime. Whatever else you neglect, yet by no means neglect to teach them by precept and example, *an inviolable regard to the truth.*—*Youth's Journal.*

BOOK NOTICES.

THE CHURCH : A Series of Discourses. By Rev. Sylvester Judd, Pastor of Christ Church, Augusta, Maine.

A DEFENCE OF "THE ECLIPSE OF FAITH." By its Author. Being a rejoinder to Professor Newman's Reply. Also, The "Reply" to "The Eclipse of Faith," by Francis William Newman, together with his chapter on "The Moral Perfection of Jesus." Reprinted from the third edition of the "Phases of Faith."

THE FIRESIDE: An Aid to Parents. By A. B. Muzzey, author of "The Young Maiden," etc.

THE foregoing books are all from the publishing house of Crosby, Nichols & Co., Boston; and are for sale, in Montreal, by Mr. Dawson, Place d'Armes. They have just been handed to us, and we have not yet had an opportunity to read them; but from what we know of the authors, we have no hesitation in recommending their purchase and perusal.

INTELLIGENCE.

AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

THE anniversary meetings of the American Unitarian Association were held in Boston, on Tuesday, May 29. The business meeting of the Association was opened in Freeman Place Chapel, at half-past 9 o'clock, A.M. — the

President in the chair. The Treasurer read his annual report, from which it appeared that over seventeen thousand dollars had been received last year. After the election of officers, Dr. Gannett offered the following resolution, which was adopted:—

Resolved, “That the American Unitarian Association cordially and earnestly approve of the proposal of the Executive Committee, to raise a Book Fund of fifty thousand dollars.”

After some remarks from Rev. Messrs. Farley, Gannett, Hale, Miles, Burnap, Bulfinch, and others, the meeting adjourned.

The public meeting was held in the Federal Street Meeting House, at half-past 7 o'clock, P.M. After prayer by Rev. Dr. Lothrop, extracts from the report of the Executive Committee were read by the Secretary.

The President of the Association then remarked, that for the exercises of the evening the committee had invited two gentlemen to read two papers, one on the “Future Church of America,” by Rev. Dr. Newell, of Cambridge. This was read by the President, in consequence of a temporary failure in Dr. Newell’s voice; and the Rev. Mr. Stebbins, of Fitchburg, followed in a speech on the same subject. The second paper was read by Rev. Chandler Robbins, on the “Conditions of Spiritual Growth and Prosperity in a Denomination.” This paper was a most earnest plea for more devoted labor in the field in which our lot is cast. This was followed by some remarks from Rev. Mr. Tiffany of Springfield.

The usual public collation took place on Tuesday afternoon, in Faneuil Hall,—the Hon. Judge Rogers presiding. The tables on the floor of the hall were filled, and some persons found accommodation in the galleries. The assembly numbered nearly one thousand ladies and gentlemen. A blessing was invoked by Reverend S. K. Lothrop, D.D., of Boston, and thanks returned after the repast by Rev. R. Sanger, of Dover. Addresses were de-

livered by the Chairman, Rev. Geo. W. Briggs of Salem, Hon. John C. Park, Dr. J. V. C. Smith, Mayor of Boston, President Allen of Girard College, (Philadelphia), Rev. J. W. Holland of East Cambridge, Rev. S. Osgood of New York, Rev. C. Lincoln, Mr. Crapster of Princeton Seminary, N.J., Mr. James H. Fowler of the Cambridge Divinity School, Rev. Alonza Hill, D.D., Worcester. The exercises were concluded by the audience singing the Doxology, and the company separated at about 6 o'clock, with the usual social greetings.

SUNDAY SCHOOL SOCIETY.

THE meeting of the Sunday School Society was held on Wednesday evening, 31st May, in Freeman Place Chapel. In the absence of the President, Hon. S. C. Philips, of Salem, one of the Vice Presidents, Rev. Calvin Lincoln, took the chair. Prayer was offered by Rev. Mr. Livermore, of Clinton. A report was read by Rev. Mr. Winckley, on the re-organization of the Society. It recommended that a Secretary be appointed to give his whole time to the service, and to have the oversight of our Sunday Schools in the same way that the Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education has the oversight of secular schools.

The Report was accepted on motion of Rev. Mr. Palfry, who also offered a resolution approving the general plan here set forth; and on this resolution a discussion took place. A number of ministers and others warmly interested in the subject took part in the discussion and advocated the enterprise. The following persons were chosen a Committee to frame a plan and call a Convention to be held in Worcester next September, viz.: Rev. Messrs. Hill, Fuller, Adams, Hoar, Winckley, Frost, and Hon. Albert Fearing. After singing the doxology, the meeting closed.

During the anniversary week, meetings for conference and prayer were held in various Unitarian Churches.

These assembled at half-past 7 A.M., and lasted until 9 A.M., and were numerously attended.

As a fitting close to exercises and services, the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper was administered in the Federal Street Church, on Thursday evening; when an appropriate sermon was preached by the Rev. John Parkman of Staten Island, N.Y., and the elements distributed by the Rev. Mr. Bond of Dover, N.H.

ITEMS.

THE following extracts from Rev. Professor Maurice and Rev. Dr. E. Beecher, concerning Unitarians, have been sent to us by a correspondent. For the information of some of our readers it may be useful to say that Professor M. is a clergyman of the church of England, residing and officiating in London; and Dr. B. is a Trinitarian clergyman settled with a church in Boston, Mass.

"I am not ashamed to say that the vehement denunciations of the general faith of Christendom, which I have heard from Unitarians — denunciations of it as cruel, immoral, and inconsistent with any full and honest acknowledgment of the Divine Love, have been eminently useful to me. I receive them as blessings from God, for which I ought to give him continual thanks. Great portions of these charges have seemed to me well founded. I have been compelled to confess that the evidence for them was irresistible. I owe it very much to these protests that I have learned to say to myself, 'take away the love of God and you take away every thing; the Bible sets forth the revelation of that love, or it is good for nothing.' I owe also much to those Unitarians who, being less strong in their condemnation of the thoughts and language of books written by Trinitarians, and avowing a sympathy with some of the accounts which they have given of their own inward conflicts, nevertheless hate orthodoxy as such, with a perfect hatred, assuming it to be the stifler of all honest conviction and all moral growth. I have not been able to gainsay many of their assertions and arguments."—*Professor Maurice.*

"The existence of the Unitarian body is a providential protest in favor of the great principles of Honor and of right."—*Dr. Edward Beecher.*