

# CHRISTIAN SPIRITUALIST

"EVERY PLANT WHICH MY HEAVENLY FATHER HATH NOT PLANTED SHALL BE ROOTED UP."

VOLUME 1.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 27, 1855.

NUMBER 38.

## Christian Spiritualist,

THE SOCIETY FOR THE DIFFUSION OF SPIRITUAL KNOWLEDGE,  
At No. 553 Broadway, New-York.

TERMS—Two Dollars per year, payable within three months.  
Ten copies for Eighteen Dollars; or, one person sending us ten subscribers will be entitled to a copy for one year.  
SINGLE COPIES—Five Cents.

All business letters and communications should be addressed to the SOCIETY FOR THE DIFFUSION OF SPIRITUAL KNOWLEDGE, or, EDITOR CHRISTIAN SPIRITUALIST, No. 553 Broadway, New-York.

### INTRODUCTION OF JUDGE EDMONDS.

In presenting to the world a continuation of our work on the great truth which is marking the nineteenth century, it will not be amiss for me to utter a few words in elucidation and explanation.

In a very early stage of my investigations, long before I was willing to receive it as true that the Spirits of the departed could commune with us who yet remained behind, and when it seemed to me but barely probable that they might, the question occurred, To what end is it? what purpose is there in view? and what beneficial object can be attained by it?

The answer readily suggested itself, that if it be true that they can thus commune with us, they must be able to disclose to us something at least of the state of existence into which they had been and we were to be ushered.

Such disclosure had never yet been made to man. Through Moses and the prophets there had been revealed to him the existence of one God, instead of the hosts of deities which the pagan world had worshipped. Through Christ and his apostles, man's existence for eternity, and the rule by which that existence could be made a happy one, had been revealed. But what that existence was, how it was that that rule was to insure man's happiness, and what was to be his ultimate destiny through the countless ages of eternity, had been concealed from him. His future was a sealed book, and the natural longing of the heart to know could obtain a response only from his own imaginings. Vague, fanciful, contradictory, and material as these were, they left the understanding still to grope in darkness, they left the desire for that knowledge still unsatisfied, and they left man to sink, by gradual but sure progress, from ignorance into infidelity.

I asked myself why may not that now be revealed? Surely nothing could be more important, and man was never before so well prepared for its reception. We believed, and it had been believed in all ages and among all people, that God had in his providence made to man, and through the instrumentality of man, revelations of his mighty truths. And among Christians, at least, this was believed as part of the very foundation of their religion.—Wherein had man's nature so changed in the process of time that he could not again receive of those truths and again be the instrument of conveying them to the knowledge of his fellows? I could conceive of no reason why the humble and the lowly of this day could not as well become such instruments as the fishermen of Galilee, nor why the instructed of modern times could not receive and impart of them as well as him of Tarsus, of whom it was said, even from high places, that much learning had made him mad. As I have often had occasion to remark, I could see nothing in nature or revelation to forbid it, and I concluded that it was possible that a further revelation could be made to us, that perchance it might be that it was now coming, and that the prayer which had ascended for centuries from the whole Christian world, "Thy kingdom come," might now be answered.

I say that it seemed to me that it might be, and if it might, what was our duty in the premises?—Did it become us to say that it could not or that it should not? that we would not receive it? or if it came in spite of ourselves, that we would not promulgate it? that we should not admit that it could be for good, but that it must of necessity be for evil only? that we should condemn without investigation, and repudiate and denounce without knowledge of what it was or what it might teach? that we should be content with our condition of ignorance, and resolve that a knowledge of the future should find no entrance to the chambers of the understanding?

I did not so conceive my duty, nor did I imagine that there were any who would oppose all investigation, and war upon the reception of any further knowledge. And I may pause a moment in passing to say, that I have marvelled not a little that in a country where freedom of thought is so loudly professed there should have been displayed such determined and virulent hostility even to an investigation of what may be truth. But let that pass. My duty seemed to be plain, and that was to ascertain—not to take it for granted—but inquire and ascertain if possible whether such further knowledge might not come.

The result of that inquiry we are now in part giving to the world. How far it is entitled to credit—to what extent it may be true we do not mean to say. We give it as it has come to us, as faithfully and as accurately as in our power, and we leave every one to form his own opinion upon its merits. We do not claim to be authority for anything. We do not ask for any other credit than that of intending fairly and faithfully to give what we have received, as we have received it.

I am aware that there are some things contained in the following papers which will startle even confirmed believers in Spiritualism. I believe so, because they startled us, and there are several things which our first impulse was to withhold from insertion in the book. They were so much in conflict

with all our preconceived notions, and with what we knew to be the general opinion of the world around us, that we were conscious they would not be credited at first, but would be likely to draw down upon us and our publication a still more severe storm of denunciation—if that were possible—than we had yet experienced. But we were professing to give to the world the revelations as they came, precisely and accurately as we received them, and what right had we to withhold any of them because they did not square with our notions, or because, forsooth, we might be subjected to some personal inconvenience? No. We could not so deport ourselves—we could not allow any mere personal consideration to warp or color our communications, our relation to which was but that of the conduit through which they might pass to minds which they might be more acceptable even in the first instance. We therefore give them as we receive them, and withhold nothing. Let each one judge of them for himself.

There are, however, some considerations which tend to corroborate the revelations made to us, and which ought not to be overlooked.

There are at times contradictions and inconsistencies in Spiritual intercourse, as all must be aware, but there is one remarkable fact, viz, that amid all these incongruities—through all mediums, whether partially or highly developed—from all the Spirits who commune, whether progressed or unprogressed, there is a universal accordance on one point, and that is, that we pass into the next state of existence just what we are in this, and that we are not suddenly changed into a state of perfection or imperfection, but find ourselves in a state of progression, and that this life on earth is but a preparation for the next, and the next but a continuation of this.

Through all the thousands and tens of thousands of mediums in this country and elsewhere, so far as I can know, the teachings all agree in this one respect, and through this overwhelming evidence, comes this mighty truth, hitherto unknown to man in general and only guessed at by a few.

If this is a truth, it surely will not require a lengthened argument to demonstrate its vast importance. If, indeed, it only may be true, no profound disquisition will be necessary to show that it is worthy of an enlightened investigation. And if its reality can once be established to the satisfaction of our dispassionate reason, it needs no one to rise from the dead to tell us that it is as novel as it is interesting, and that however much it may be corroborated by all of nature around us, it can be established only by a revelation from on high.

This fact, at once new and momentous, does not, it will be seen, depend on our testimony alone, but finds support in all the revelations of Spiritual intercourse, wherever located and springing from whatever source they may.

There is another important instance in which all the manifestations through others corroborate those which we promulgate, and that is, in demonstrating that man does exist after the life on earth. And this is proved, not by abstract reasoning, not by reasoning from analogy, or by appealing to received and acknowledged revelation, but palpably, by addressing the senses. To all the senses this proof comes, with such copiousness and such overwhelming power as to be utterly irresistible to the rational mind. To those who have never doubted man's immortality, and who have regarded it as irrational to question it, this consideration may not be of much moment. But to those who have questioned it—and alas! their number has been far greater than the unthinking world imagine—it is of vital consequence, and is hailed by them with a joy inexpressible.

There is another respect in which the communications given to us receive corroboration from their accordance with others, and that is in demonstrating that the memory, the affections, and the characteristics which distinguish us in our earthly life follow us into the next existence, and abide with us there, at least for a season. In this, too, I believe that all the communications through all sorts of mediumship agree, and it is thus that we are enabled so often to identify the dear ones who have gone before, even though we cannot see or hear them.

In all these respects the agreement in the manifestations is universal and uniform.

But there is another regard in which, though the agreement is not so general, yet it is, as a corroboration, of equal interest, to me at least. It has been repeatedly said to me, that who! I was beholding in the visions described in this and the former volume was what was absolutely going on in the Spirit-life, and the particular circumstances which occupied Spirits at the time that I saw them.

How it was that I saw this, I do not know.—With all my efforts, I have not been able to understand it. I live in hopes, that in time—as one by one the explanations come to me—I may be able to comprehend and explain it, but at present I cannot. I only know that they come without any volition on my part, but of their own accord, and often when I am not expecting them; that they cannot be in the product of my own mind, for they often differ, *in toto*, from all my preconceived opinions; that they are not mere vague imaginings, for they impress themselves on the mind with all the distinctness and precision which belong to the impression of material objects through the instrumentality of the senses; and that they are not manifested to me alone, but often to others who are present with me, and who do not at the moment know what I am beholding, and often to others far distant from me, and of whose existence even, I am at the time ignorant.

I can now readily lay my hand on two or three

instances of this. In the course of our travels last winter, we spent a few days at a small village in the West. There I heard, from professed believers in our faith, of a physician living among them, who was extensively engaged in the practice of his profession, and who was a Spiritualist, but was generally regarded by them as partially deranged on the subject. I thought, from the accounts I had of him, that it was one of those cases of fanaticism of which we have been pained to witness so much, and I dismissed the matter from my mind. Just before I left the place, he called on me, and during a brief conversation with him, I discovered a calm, clear, logical mind, with good sense, and an utter disregard of the opinions of others in his reception of truth. He was aware of the opinion which was entertained of him, and said it was because he had told of the things which he had seen, and others had not; and that they had attempted to convince him that he had not seen. "But," said he, "I know whether I see or not, though it is not an easy matter to make others know it." And upon inquiring of him what it was he had seen, I was surprised to find he had witnessed many of the very scenes which I had, when I knew that he was ignorant that I had ever witnessed them.

I was struck with the corroboration, for here was a man of whose existence even I had been unconscious, who lived many hundred miles distant from me, who was ignorant of what had been shown to me, yet to whom, at about the same time, precisely the same revelations had been made.

There is yet another consideration with the same tendency, and that is the effect which a careful and close investigation of the subject uniformly produces on the calm, logical, reasoning, cultivated mind.

Believers in Spiritual intercourse are now numbered by millions on earth. Not only in this country, but throughout this continent and the eastern, the manifestations have made their appearance in the salons of the imperial cities of Europe, amid our own mighty forests, in the solitary islands of the oceans, and on the classic shores of Greece they have been witnessed, and everywhere they have produced in the candid, inquiring mind the same effect, namely, the conviction of the reality of Spiritual intercourse. Why, even the pulpit, amid the iron bonds of its sectarianism, begins to acknowledge it; and the press, mighty as it is as an engine of human enlightenment, yet ever lagging behind the car of advancing knowledge, assuaged by the phenomenon which meets it at every step, begins to ask, Can these things be? The jury-box, the ballot-box, and the legislative halls begin to hear its lowly whisperings, and there stands now prominent before the eyes of the world, the fact of the spread of a new faith, whose rapidity of progress has no parallel in the annals of mankind.

May we not then, with propriety, point to these things as evidence of the truth of that which we believe? May we not ask, what but a stern reality could work such marvels before men? Could aught but truth bend in dumb obedience to its best and brightest and strongest minds of an age distinguished for its enlightenment? Could delusion or deception thus sweep across a prostrate world and make conviction ride triumphant over the power of early education, the prejudices of preconceived opinions, and the denunciations of the accumulated knowledge of ages, and in defiance of the universal cry which fear and selfishness have unitedly sent forth in such warning tones? May we not ask what this is, which not only thus carries conviction in its train in spite of all obstacles, but which, coming from whatever source it may, thus accords in its general and leading features? that which, whether heard in the gentle whisperings of the fireside or in the rear of the agitated multitude—whether in the solitude of nature in her wilderness, or amid the din and bustle of city life—whether emanating from high or low, from rich or poor, from the ignorant or instructed—whether amid the moan of sorrow or the joyous laugh of gladness—whether from the confiding repose of childhood or the stern activity of manhood, still exhibits an accordance and a power which acknowledge no equal in the history of the world.

However these considerations may strike others, we confess that with us they have great force, and they encourage us to go on with our work, because they tend to convince us that we do not err.

We have not been without anxiety on that subject, for it would be in the highest degree painful to us to learn that we had even unconsciously taught error and misled only one mind. We have therefore been impelled to great caution as to what we should send forth. We have not deemed it worth while to enter into any detail of the numerous precautions which we have used, or to explain the various processes to which we have resorted in order to test the accuracy of what has been communicated to us, for the simple reason that we did not desire ever to be received by any one as authority. We preferred that each one should examine for himself, and for himself determine whether what we uttered was the truth. If the omission of these details on our part could but result in producing a Spirit of free inquiry in others, we were well content, even though it might subject us to the imputation of some minds of acting hastily and unadvisedly; for of what moment was it what others thought of us in comparison with a freedom of thought which should open the human mind to the reception of the great truths now dawning on the world? Our paramount desire has been to attain the truth, to receive it freely and impart it faithfully, leaving its adoption by others to be governed by their own investigations, by the inner prompt-

ings of their own hearts and by all of nature which they behold around them.\*

But while on the one hand we have attached much importance to these items of corroboration which we have alluded to, we have not, on the other, been unmindful of the numerous difficulties attending the intercourse, nor of their just influence in determining the amount of credit to be given to them.

I pause here a while to dwell on that topic.

In the first place, then, I remark, that I know of no mode of Spiritual intercourse that is exempt from a mortal taint—no kind of mediumship where the communication may not be affected by the mind of the instrument.

Take my own mediumship as an illustration.—The visions which I have are, as I have remarked, impressed on my mind as vividly and distinctly as any material object possibly can be, yet in giving them to others, I must rely upon and use my own powers of observation, my own memory, my own command of language, and I am not infrequently laboring under the difficulty of feeling that there is no word known to me that is adequate to conveying the novel idea communicated. I am often conscious that I fail, from poverty of language, in conveying the sentiment I receive with the same vigor and clearness with which it comes to me. So it is also with what I may call the didactic teachings through me. Sometimes the influence is so strong, that I am given, not merely the ideas, but the very words in which they are clothed, and I am unconscious of what I am going to say until I actually say it. At other times the thought is given me sentence by sentence, and I know not what idea or sentence is to follow, but the language used is my own and is selected by myself from my own memory's storehouse. And at other times the whole current of thought or process of reasoning is given me in advance, and I choose for myself the language and the illustrations used to convey it, and sometimes the order of giving it. But in all these modes there is more or less of myself in them, more or less of my individuality underlying it all. It must indeed be so, or why should I speak or write in my own tongue rather than in a dead or a foreign language unknown to me?

I have noticed the same thing in the Doctor, and more than all that, I have observed in both of us that our communications not only at times contain what may be called Americanisms, but expressions peculiar to our respective professions.

It is, therefore, rarely that either of us can say that the communications through us are precisely what the Spirits designed they should be, and as they designed them; and consequently it will never do to receive them as absolute authority, however agreeable they may be or however consonant to other teachings.

It is not an easy matter to account for this, but it is easy to know that the fact is so, and as easy to observe that it is at times true of all mediums.—Sometimes it is more apparent than at others, owing to many causes ever at work around us; sometimes it is owing to the physical condition of the medium, and sometimes to his mental state; sometimes to the atmosphere; sometimes to locality—some localities, such as high and hilly places, being more favorable than such as are low and swampy; sometimes to the condition of those who are present, whether in a state of harmony or discord, and very frequently to the state and condition of the Spirits who are professing to commune, and their aptitude to the task.

Thus I have known a Spirit, who on earth had never learned to read and write, to be unable to communicate through a writing medium. So one whose education here had been imperfect would spell badly and use bad grammar, and one knowing but little of our language would speak in broken English; and one, Lord Bacon, for instance, who in life had been used to a different idiom from that now prevailing, would yet speak in modern English Americanized, with here and there a relic of the expressions he had used in the olden time.

There is another cause, and that is, the passiveness or otherwise of the mediums to the influence at work with them. Sometimes they resist with a very determined will, and it is impossible for others, and often even for ourselves, to know when the operation of that will is entirely overcome, or how much of its influence may hang around and stain the communication with its taint of mortal life.—Sometimes timidity and diffidence will color and sometimes vanity and fanaticism distort the teaching of the Spirits. Often the want of confidence will warp them; for, strange as it may appear! there are mediums who are not Spiritualists, and who, unaccustomed to the examinations of their own minds, cannot discriminate between their operation and the Spirit-influence; and as often an overweening credulity will put away that which was designed to be plain and straightforward.

There is, it is true, a simple remedy for much of this, and that is entire passiveness in receiving the influence and the full and active exercise of the reason in weighing afterward what it has effected. But unhappily there are many who do not know the remedy, and more still who do not apply it.—The intercourse is beyond conception fascinating, and there are not a few who indulge a selfish gratification in yielding to it. It is never safe to do so, for thus many are misled and many are disturbed and driven off by incongruities which could easily be avoided.

There is another consideration still, which even more fatally affects the reliability of the intercourse, and is very often overlooked.

\*Perhaps as good evidence as we can give of this caution will be found in the fact of withholding this volume so long, when the whole of it could easily be written in a month, and most of it was written twelve months since.

We are taught that the intercourse is not supernatural—not the result of the suspension of nature's laws, but the product of those laws and of their legitimate action. As yet, we are in a great measure ignorant of those laws and of their mode of action; but the results we see and can know—the effects are facts which, perceptible to our senses, appeal to our reason and demand the action of our judgments. From all that we have yet witnessed, we are warranted in the belief that the intercourse is in obedience to, and not in contravention of, natural laws—that so far as we are concerned on earth, mediumship is owing to physical organization, more than it is to moral causes, and that all in the Spirit world, the unprogressed as well as the progressed, have the power of communing with and influencing us in a greater or less degree.

So, too, we are taught that there are Spirits in the next state of existence whose propensities are evil. Not that they are a distinct race of beings, known in the old theology as Devils, and represented as a creation distinct from, and independent of, the human family, but men and women who have lived on earth, perverted and distorted morally, and have passed away from this primary existence with those perversions and distortions unchanged and aggravated by the desolation and misery, apparently to them without end and without hope, in which they find themselves existing.—Selfish, intolerant, cruel, malicious, and delighting in human suffering upon earth, they continue the same, for awhile at least, in their Spirit-home. And having in common with others the power of reaching mankind through this newly-developed instrumentality, they use it for the gratification of their predominant propensities, with even less regard than they had on earth, for the suffering which they may inflict on others.

Some instances of this are disclosed in the following papers, but many, very many more are occurring to the knowledge of inquirers everywhere, and there are perhaps few circles where first or last this has not been in some form or other apparent.

It cannot be difficult to discover in such a state of things the material, not only for such positive mischief, but the cause of many of the crudities and contradictions which so often disturb the superficial observer, and sometimes mislead the credulous and confiding.

This influence displays itself in various forms, but scarcely ever without tending to impair confidence in the manifestations. Sometimes it is with a clearly marked purpose of evil, avowed with a hardness which smacks of the vilest condition of mortal society. Sometimes its fell purposes are most adroitly veiled under the cover of good intentions. Sometimes it is restless and uneasy—"to one thing constant never." At other times it is calm, considerate, and persevering. Now it contents itself with finding amusement in the harmless perplexities to which it subjects us, and anon it is satisfied only when it can goad on its victim to crime, and rejoice in the agony it produces.

But, whatever its form, its existence is too strongly demonstrated to doubt it, and while it shows to us the realization of the "roaring lion seeking whom it may devour" of Holy Writ, or "the instigation of the devil" preserved still in our old law forms, we have the consolation of knowing that now we can be conscious of its presence, and guard against its approaches. We can detect when it is near us, and no longer obliged to battle with it in the darkness of our own fears and ignorance, we can meet it boldly, and contend against it successfully. And, above all, we can expose its unhallowed intrusion upon the communion which is otherwise calculated to lift our hearts upward to our God.

It is not however alone from those evilly disposed that this element of distrust flows. There must of necessity be in the Spirit-world those who are in every imaginable condition of development, and who occupy every imaginable position on the ascending plane of progression. Some are more, and some less, ignorant than others; some more prudent and careful; some more zealous and inconsiderate; some impulsive and rapid, some calm and deliberate; in fine, with every conceivable variety of attribute and faculty. Of necessity, the communications from each of these must be affected, as all human intercourse is, by the peculiar characteristics of each individual. And while from this source must necessarily flow an element of uncertainty, we are taught to avoid its inconveniences and its hazards, by applying to it, as we do when weighing human testimony, the sagacity and searching power of our reason.

There is yet another consideration not to be disregarded. I allude to false communications and fabricated mediumship. Such instances have been known among us; some where the mediumship was entirely an assumption of the pretender, and unworthy of any confidence. In all religions ever known to man, hypocrites have been found; and while we have no reason to expect ours to be exempt from this common lot of humanity, we have abundant reason to know that it is comparatively harmless with us, and must be still more so as we advance in the power which is dealing with us and which is enabling us to read our own hearts and the hearts of our fellow-men. But there are false communications which are not intentionally so. Some arising from a mistake of the Spirit who is communing, and some from the error of the medium who has not yet so studied himself as to be able to distinguish the innate action of his own mind from the impress of Spirit-influence.

Another consideration is, that the character of the mediumship is frequently changing in the same individual, and that no two mediums are precisely

alike. From this latter cause there must of necessity arise an effect producing some uncertainty. It is as if one on earth were sending the same message through different persons. No two would deliver it in precisely the same words, unless they learned it by rote. The main idea might be transmitted correctly enough, but it would be liable to various shadings, from the different capacity of the messengers to comprehend it, and from the variety of their power of language to utter it.

The changes in the medium are often imperceptible at first, and are made manifest only in the effect produced, and at other times they are very great, without any one's knowing when they occurred. I can best illustrate this by a very brief account of one medium whose progress I have witnessed with intense interest.

She was a young girl of tolerable education and warmly attached to the Roman Catholic faith.—Her church told her to disbelieve in Spiritualism, and she refused to witness any of the manifestations, though they were frequent all around her. At length the house in which she resided became what in former days would have been called haunted. It continued so for nearly six months, during which she heard strange sounds and witnessed various acts, which, she became satisfied, were not the product of any mortal agency, but were evidently intelligent. Her curiosity was excited, and she sought a medium. She soon saw enough to convince her of a Spiritual agency, and she very soon became herself a medium. It is now about a year since she was developed as such, and her mediumship in that period has assumed many forms.

At first she was violently agitated in her person. She soon wrote mechanically; that is, without any volition on her part, and without any consciousness of what she was penning. Having a strong will, she was able at any moment, by exercising it, to arrest the manifestation. She next became a speaking medium. She was not entranced as some are, into a state of unconsciousness, but was fully aware of what she was saying and of all that occurred around her. She, however, had not advanced far enough to know the source whence came the thoughts which she was uttering, as she imagined they might be the product of her own mind. To convince her upon that subject, she was shown, through the instrumentality of her own mind, all the particulars of the wreck of the steamer San Francisco—that her upper deck had been swept off and a certain number had thus perished; that the residue of those on board had been taken off in three vessels, and were then on their way in different directions for different ports, and that the steamer had been abandoned on the sea. All this was several days before any news had reached the land of the accident to that vessel, and she was told to wait and see if the information which had been given her, and which was much more detailed than I have written, was not strictly accurate, and then determine for herself whether it was her own mind. A few days brought minute confirmation of every incident which had been disclosed to her.

Since then this faculty of knowing things at a distance has greatly improved. She saw the wreck of the Arctic when it was occurring. She saw and detailed with great accuracy, as subsequent accounts showed, the recent collision on the Canada Railroad, and that a few moments after it happened, and while the dead and wounded were being lifted out of the ruins. She has seen and described the state of things at Sebastopol and its vicinity, and she has frequently described scenes and conversations going on at the moment, at the distance of several hundred miles from her; and all this, not when she was in a trance, but in a state of mental consciousness to all around her.

She next became developed to speak different languages. She knows no language but her own, and a little smattering of boarding-school French. Yet she has spoken in nine or ten different tongues, sometimes for an hour at a time, with the ease and fluency of a native. It is not unfrequent that foreigners converse with their Spirit-friends through her in their own language. A recent instance occurred where a Greek gentleman had several interviews, and for several hours at a time carried on the conversation on his part in Greek, and received his answers sometimes in that language and sometimes in English; yet until then she had never heard a word of modern Greek spoken.

About the same time her musical powers became developed. She has repeatedly sang in foreign languages, such as Italian, Indian, German and Polish, and it is now not unfrequent that she sings in her own language, *improvising* both words and tune as she proceeds—the melody being very unique and perfect, and the sentiments in the highest degree elevating and ennobling.

Her next advance was to see Spirits and Spiritual scenes, and now scarcely a day passes that she does not describe the Spirits who are present, entire strangers to her, yet very readily recognized and identified by their inquiring friends. This has of late been witnessed by very many persons, and many an unbeliever in Spiritual intercourse has been overwhelmed with the evidence of identity which thus by sight and by communion has been presented.

At one time she was used as the instrument for delivering long and didactic discourses on the principles of our faith. Now she is mostly used to give moral and mental tests, which to many are very satisfactory. At one time she saw chiefly allegorical pictures; now she sees the reality of Spiritual life. Once she wrote mechanically, now by impression, knowing the thoughts she pens. Formerly it was difficult for Spirits to converse through her; but now conversation, with any one, however



much a stranger to her, goes on with a freedom and ease most gratifying to the investigator.

These various changes have been wrought generally without any apparent external cause, and have been unknown until they appeared. But what internal process may have been going on to produce them we do not know, nor how far its workings may be at the time affected by the mediumship.

We simply know that they are, and as they may affect the intercourse, we feel an admonition to greater care and caution.

I do not mention this case as a solitary or extraordinary instance of Spirit-power, for I am aware of many others of a similar character. But I refer to it as an apt illustration of the view I am endeavoring to present, and because the whole development having occurred under my own observation, I incur the less hazard of being mistaken.

From this whole class of cases I draw two inferences, one which I have already mentioned—namely, that the communications may be affected by these changes; and the other, that the faculty of mediumship is like all our other faculties, capable of advancement and increase by education and training.

The original power of becoming a medium may be owing to some peculiar power of organization of the individual, like the organs of language, of music, of imitation, and the like; but, like them, the faculty is capable of great improvement by a due course of treatment. If this be so, then, until the medial power be developed to its state of perfection—and what that may be we do not yet know—there must necessarily be great changes in its exercise, which cannot with safety be disregarded.

The changes from this cause are not confined to individual cases, but they are visible in the whole scope of the intercourse. At first the manifestations were generally made in the rudest and simplest physical form, addressing themselves mainly to the senses. But as minds became convinced of the reality of Spirit-communication, and stepped over the threshold of the new school, seeking the higher truths which it was apparent must flow from that reality, there was a demand for a more elevated and more facile mode of conveying them to us.

How often has the most determined unbeliever been struck down from his self-complacent but giddy height by a power which he could not control! How often has the skeptical medium been overpowered, even in his physical action, by an influence, unseen, and to him before unknown! How often has the astuteness of the keenest doubter been set at naught by an intelligence whose capacity he could not measure, and whose source he could not fathom, but whose presence he could not question!

How have the timid, the weak, and the halting been strengthened and sustained until they could easily brave all that the opposition of an angry world could inflict! How have the strong, towering in the might of their own knowledge, been laid prostrate at the feet of those whom they regarded as most ignorant! And how invariably and inflexibly has conviction ever followed investigation!

I for one see and acknowledge in this a power mightier than belongs to mere earthly humanity, and I bend in humble adoration in its presence, but too conscious that without its aid I cannot grasp the mighty truths it can teach. But those truths come, and by instrumentalities so admirably fashioned to the work in hand, so perfectly adapted to the occasion, that to deny their Spiritual origin involves the assumption of a power in the human frame which would tax the credulity far beyond aught demanded by a belief in Spiritualism.

But this is, in a measure, a digression from the topic on which I intended to dwell. My purpose was, as I invoked on the one hand certain fragments of corroborative evidence, so it was due to candor and to the spirit of fair inquiry, by which I hope I am governed, to state on the other those things which are calculated to detract from the force of that evidence.

to the intellect, even when enveloped in its material surroundings—proves it by a direct and unanswerable appeal to the senses—proves it as the Creator proves that the sun shines at noon-day and the stars sparkle at night—proves it as nature demonstrates the existence of the storm and the thunder—proves it as matter makes manifest to us its own reality—proves it through the instrumentality of our material organs—and proves it as so many other things are made apparent to us, so that we may say, not merely that "we believe," but that "we know." And what is most interesting is, that the evidence is within every man's reach.

He has but to knock, and it will open to him—he has but to ask, and he may receive. No man lives but he may have, if he pleases, evidence most satisfactory, that the friends whom he has laid in the grave do yet live and can commune with him.

This is a bold assertion to make, but I make it after years of careful investigation, conducted under most favorable circumstances, after having witnessed innumerable manifestations, and after having beheld the intercourse in all its known phases. I make it deliberately, and as the result to which my examination and that of many, very many others has conducted me, and I know I can not be mistaken.

Whether I am or not, the means are fortunately at hand to determine. I repeat, they are within every man's reach. He has but to stretch forth his arm and be satisfied. The tree of knowledge is planted in our midst and each can pluck for himself its fruit and eat. True, now, as of old, the serpent of evil does coil its loathsome form around its outer branches, but the fruit is at length beyond the reach of its poison—the flower blossoms in despite of its pestiferous breath, and man, when he approaches its grateful shade, may yet crush the tempter's head beneath his heel.

If this be so, can we be sufficiently grateful to the Bounteous Giver that he has at length in His mercy removed the murky cloud of infidelity which was casting its dark pall over the human heart, crushing it out of the very form of humanity amid the crumbling ruins of its own happiness? And can we reject the precious boon which comes on angels' wings to wait us nearer to our God? There may, indeed, be difficulties in the way, obstacles to encounter, inconveniences to suffer, but to the anxious inquirer they will not be insurmountable. It is possible to overcome them, and then will follow conviction, bearing in its train peace and love to man.

But this is not the chief benefit of Spiritualism. It not only teaches us that we do indeed live after death, but it teaches us what that life is, affording us the inestimable advantage of knowing how properly to prepare for it. A part of the knowledge has already been given, not merely in these pages, but in the numerous publications and discourses which have been used as the means of conveying it to us. More will yet in due time be given; for it is the design of this great work to open to us a view of the intimate relation ever existing between us in the mortal form and the Spirit-world, and its ever-present influence over us for good or for evil, and a revelation of what the world is into which we shall be ushered when we shuffle off this mortal coil.

Can we estimate too highly the value of this knowledge? Can we set too high a price upon that which teaches us the true purposes of our existence upon earth, and how to shape it so as most effectually to secure our everlasting happiness? Can we too highly value that which rolls away from our minds the ignorance and mystery which have hitherto brooded over us, and reveals to us the destiny which is before us? that which answers the craving want of the human heart, and so speaks to the Spirit of the Creator, which slumbers there, that starting from the confines of its mortal chamber, it springs forth to meet its God, and returns to its home laden with his blessing?

De the estimate which man may put upon this revelation what it may, whether it be welcomed or crucified, it is coming—coming in the panoply of the Infinite Father—coming with healing on its wings to redeem man from his wanderings, and enable him to stand erect in the presence of his God redeemed by his freedom.

NEW YORK, December 17, 1854.  
[For the Christian Spiritualist.]  
MR. EDITOR: In your issue of January 6, is an article entitled "Translator's Error," over the signature of "L. Bush." The chief point of the article is to comment on the translation in our English Bible of 2 Timothy 3, xvi. Your correspondent maintains that the insertion of the verb *is* in the first clause is unwarranted, and consequently gives a wrong sense. Instead of the reading as we now have it, he would have it, "All Scripture given by inspiration of God, and profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect." Now I have a difficulty in regard to this interpretation, viz.: it makes the sentence an imperfect one—there is in it no verb of affirmation; and the only way of supplying a verb is to insert *is* after Scripture, as in our English translations and as the original Greek requires. In the Greek language this verb is often understood, I should rather say generally understood in connection with participles, as in the case before us. I do not know whether your correspondent professes to have a knowledge of the Greek, but I do not believe any Greek scholar can be found who will endorse the interpretation he proposes.

# Christian Spiritualist.

So long as Men are Honest, so long will Success follow in the Footsteps of their Labors.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 27, 1855.

## WHEN IS IT PROPER TO SPEAK OF PUBLIC MEN AS SPIRITUALISTS?

We ask this question with the hope of calling attention to a prevailing weakness, we may say, a general absurdity, some features of which have lately been introduced among the Spiritualists. We mean the prevailing disposition to dignify this or that subject by insisting that this or that great man or fine lady believes in the theory and fellowships of the believers, be the subject matter what it may. This disposition to rub one-self against gentility and respectability is so common a phase of life and enters so generally into the make-up of society, that it should need a very long article to separate the good from the bad, and point out where emulation becomes vanity to the sacrifice of truth and self-respect. At present, we wish to look the above question in the face, since we are often told that such an one is a Spiritualist, and may be we repeat it unconscious of the injury we do to the fame and conventional standing of the person spoken of. This, no doubt, is natural to all parties, and in a proper sense, is deeply significant of the golden threads of sympathy and affection that tend to bind humanity in the working bonds of brotherhood and union, but in its popular form it goes no deeper than party-ism, and is of course, obnoxious to good sense so far as it compromises the dignity or self-respect of any party. Those acquainted with the method and make-up of most of our theological and scientific controversies, cannot have helped observing that each party makes every effort consistent, and not a few inconsistent ones, to bring to their side of the issue the influence and authority of "great names," that the hearer or reader may infer that the position occupied or the belief adopted is sanctioned in part or as a whole by the good sense and eminent genius of the person brought forward to give testimony. The motives that prompt this vary with the individuals, since affection as well as party-ism may prompt it, but most obviously it is intended to add dignity to the subject while softening the severity of the issue that separates the disputing parties. This, as we have intimated, may be commendable, but like everything that is done for effect, great caution should be used in the liberty taken with such names, since it may not be obvious to all that truth is told or compliment implied by such appropriations of individual reputation. Position and reputation in the present development of society are all in all to some minds, so that if forced into certain relations by the Spiritual zeal or religious enthusiasm of the anxious admirer, the reaction or antagonism resulting will be in proportion to the outrage committed on the conventional reputation of the offended party, since it is notorious that conventional honor and orthodox reputation have more to do with their public position than scientific accuracy or exact love of truth.

The individual that "sold his birth-right for a mess of pottage," and his "near of kin" that betrayed Christ for "thirty pieces of silver," have had extensive family connections, some members of which still "move and have a being." Whatever philosophy there may be in this, sure we are that some explanation like this must account for the late issue of the Rev. E. H. Chapin on Spiritualism.

It has been the consolation of many of the Spiritual family, in separating from the Universalist and other denominations, to think that the day is not far distant when those loved ones, eminent for learning and eloquence, of liberal minds and tolerant dispositions, should be reunited in a more lasting and vital union than the past forms of sectarianism have been able to give, because a new dispensation had added other and more powerful elements to harmonize the mind and cement the Spiritual affinities of the soul. Of course, it was understood that this would be done as soon as it could be effected with safety to the reputation of the preacher, for whether wisely or unwisely it has got into the public mind that with the preachers of this age, it is emphatically true that "the voice of the people is the voice of God."

Now, how far the Rev. E. H. Chapin consults public opinion in adopting this or rejecting that phase of progress and reform, it is not our intention to inquire, but if possible to awaken the Spiritualist to the dignity he owes himself and the faith he delights to own and honor. It may be, that with the conversion of Mr. Chapin, or any other person to Spiritualism, if they be known to fame, and have and have an influence in the make-up of public opinion, that good will come to the cause, since progress and reform will be stimulated and more workers given to practicalize a human and Spiritual philosophy. But this eagerness to claim any man or woman before they make known their conversion to, and wish to be identified with this, or that form of religious belief, has more the element of party-ism than good sense and exact truth. Truth can not be dignified or made respectable by this name or that, and thanks to God, it can not be disgraced or made less lovely by all the falsities of an opposing and a material age.

The effect of disappointment is doubt and suspicion, rather than harmony or union; but disappointment is inevitable where hope and desire are in excess. Since the sermon of Mr. Chapin, not a few have intimated that the "old fogies" of the Church became alarmed at the growing reputation of Mr. Chapin's Spiritualism, and insisted that he define his position, so as to save the church from scandal and the denomination from heresy. Of this we know not, but it is very possible that Mr. Chapin may have found it necessary to define his position, in order to correct the expectations of some of his admirers, who insist on having him of the Spiritual family. We hope also its significance will teach those who go to hear *fine* speaking, that a time-serving eloquence is not "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes," but it is ever so transcendental or nothingarian in its character.

That Mr. Chapin does preach very fine sermons and deliver very eloquent Lyceum lectures, is most true; true he has the reputation for doing such things; but we have yet to learn that Mr. Chapin has ever championed any unpopular truth, or vindicated any unpopular reform. Why speak of him then as a Spiritualist in the reformatory sense of the term, since his present nor his past relations, nor teachings warrant the assumption? We know of no propriety for doing so, and shall consider him as a part of the conservative forces, until we know more of his willingness to be identified with a reformative and progressive theology.

We say this not to prejudice Mr. Chapin, but to save his mind from misapprehension and disappointment. It is true, nevertheless, that in the popular sermonizing of the times, all phases of theology show that a new element of mighty power is softening the crudities and dogmas of antagonizing creeds, and tends to the speedy formation of a working and a practical union of the most advanced and liberal denominations. But this does not warrant the assumption that such parties are Spiritualists, and should not be confounded with that class of thinkers who, believing in Spiritual intercourse as a *fact* in actual life, seek to reform theology, so as to have it acknowledge the sovereignty of God in all time and the harmony of His government.

If any one doubts the tendency of this element in our time, let him or her give some attention to the Spirit and wording of the poetry of our newspaper and periodical literature, and compare it with much in the same publications for five years past. The following extract from the remarks of Dr. Osgood will illustrate this reflection. They were delivered at the funeral of Mr. Havens' three daughters, who were buried at Fort Washington last week. No one we apprehend will think him a Spiritualist, save in the most vague and general of senses, and yet we question if Mr. Chapin ever said anything more direct and positively in favor of the theory of Spirit-intercourse. Dr. Osgood had been speaking of the happiness of Mr. Havens' home, as he had known it, which forms the basis for the following reflections.

And sometimes as I have visited this home, I have heard a strange sound in the air as a sound of harp strings in the heavens, and I have looked up and I have seen a wonderful instrument that bears the thoughts of the nations in this day; and it seemed as if I could hear their voices of gladness and of sorrow; that telegraphic wire lifted high in the air has been for some months a bridge of sighs, bearing from the North to the South a whole world of human calamity that makes the world so sad. But there seemed to be no sorrow here, no sorrow in the lot of this happy family. Yet what sorrow has come I need not say. Look upon these coffins; look upon that blackened ruin and see what sorrow I do not know, but in adding one word I almost despair of the burden of our grief and our prayer. But cannot resist the conviction that I am commissioned to stand here and speak words of consolation. Call it some peculiar influence of former friendship, or call it a providential visitation, according as our opinions may be, I must say that I have had such an intimate sense of the characters and the presence of our departed sisters; they have seemed to come to me—the three sisters—hand in hand. I have seen their pleasant faces by day, and in the night watches they have seemed to stand before me, so that I could not resist the visitation, and say to me, "Go and speak words and deeds of peace to the hearts and minds of our brothers. You have been our pastor in times past; we have known you, and now we look to you. It is well with us; oh, try to make it well with our bereaved parents, our brothers, our sisters and our friends!" In their name, let us say, "Peace be with this house!" Let us not say that no sorrow hath come upon it! Let us not say, "We will not weep!" Rather say, "Weep on father, mother, brothers, sisters, weep on—not in the worldling's despair, but as Jesus wept at the grave of Lazarus, when he was about to break the bonds of the grave asunder."

I will not say more. Human thought breaks down, and human sympathy has little feeling. The language of lowly prayer most becomes a scene like this.

Let us pray.

SOMEbody IS DISAPPOINTED.

We give place to the following item of intelligence, as it was made the subject of some remarks in Conference by Dr. Gray, which the reader will find in another column. Beside this, we hope the reader will take the question "home," as it is a general one, and in his own way and in his own time, let us have an answer.

WHAT IS THE USE OF "SPIRITUALISM?"  
To the Editor of The N. Y. Tribune:  
Sir: I am a Medium—a Spirit Medium—and have been such for over two years, and, for the life of me, I cannot see what good this Spiritualism is going to do to the world—to the down-trodden masses—to the mechanic—to the laborer, or to the poor in any shape or way whatever. If it can, I should like to know it. Will some of our savants in Spiritual Philosophy be good enough to tell us? I have been deluded out of over \$200 in time and money, in trying to get deluded as a medium, besides many a sleepless night; and what does it all amount to? Why, to just this. You are continually chasing an ignis fatuus, a will-o'-the-wisp, and while you are grasping after the shadow you lose the substance. I know many worse off than I am—men who have not only lost their time, money and sleep in this thing, but their health and lives. I thought if I could become a Medium, that the Arcana of Mystery would be opened unto me and the secrets of wisdom would be revealed; but alas! no comfort, consolation or wisdom can I find in any of it. Now then, if Spirits can tell us anything we do not know, I should like to see it done. I should like to see any new truth developed by Spirits, for I ask, in the name of common sense, how can they develop any new truth if all truth comes from the Spirits by Spirit impression, as we Spiritualists all say and believe it has, through impressive Mediums, in all ages of the world? Yours, respectfully,  
New York, Jan. 14, 1855. A. MEDICUS.

We have not the room, nor the time at present for the necessary comment, since the question is so general and comprehensive, that it needs the detail of a clear head and a thoughtful Spirit to answer it. It may be, however, this short article will wake up many, and call out a variety of experiences and answers, so that *fact* and *narrative* will do what theory would fail to do, viz: stimulate inquiry and elaborate information. Whatever may be thought by the Spiritualist of a "medium" that could be a "Spirit medium" for "two years" and still be unable to give an answer to the question, what good is Spiritualism to the world, "the mechanic, the laborer, or the poor in any shape?" sure we are that the day is not far off when this question will be asked by an awakened public in a different Spirit, but for a like practical end. The age is *practical*, and the necessities of life are imperative, and both demand that the words of Spiritualism become flesh and dwell among us.

The Spirit of emancipation is in every department of society in one form or another, and naturally enough, many look for "good fruit" from the tree of Spiritualism. The question here is not one of *fact*, phenomena, or of method in understanding and accounting for the phases of phenomena, but a plain, practical question of *use, economy*, and value to the age.

Again, we say, think for the disappointment of this *medium* may be significant of a class that *live* by the way side, "whose last end is worse than the first." How far Spiritualism is to be held responsible for this, is the question we wish the reader to make personal, so that in acting as *vicar*, he may be able to give his testimony with candor and intelligence.

points of the argument, or show the good Spiritualism has done to those communicating, have been omitted for lack of room. A second introduction will be found in the published volume from Dr. Dexter. As we have not seen this article, we cannot speak of the prominent points set forth, nor the method in which they are discussed, but it would be a pleasure to many to have the Dr.'s philosophy on mediumship, its phases and their developments, since his own experience must aid his observation in grouping the varieties of the phenomena and explaining their relations. We hope soon to see the work, as not a few have asked about the time of its forthcoming.

Published by Partridge & Britton, 300 Broadway.

## A COMMUNICATION AND DRAWING FROM THE SPIRITS.

By this heading we wish to imply a distinction between the following, and communications in general, since it purports to have been written and delivered into the hand of friend Isherwood, without the aid or intervention of the communicating medium.

This will be a startling and doubtfully received statement by the majority, but the testimony is given in good faith, since the parties on whose veracity we rely, have the sections and copied by the testimony of many witnesses for like phenomena. The statement in brief is, that when the "circle is harmonious," the hand being placed under the table, the letter is received from the Spirit in an envelope, sealed and directed. However singular this may seem, in the same circle the hand of the Spirit is to be seen, "as palpable to sight" as any thing can be in a moderately lighted room.

Enter in this all, for the sense of touch has acted in confirmation to sight, both giving positive testimony of Spirit-presence, and Spirit-organization. This is the testimony of those who have seen and felt the hand, and know, therefore, whereof they do testify.

Be the philosophy of the phenomenon what it may, the manner of its delivery is as wonderful as the method by which it was developed, and called forth in exciting thought and investigation. Accompany the following letter, was the drawing of a tree and other objects, which make up in outline a small picture, not only artistic skill, but considerable genius. What is most singular to conceive of, is the fact that the Spirit in outlining as well as coloring the tree and other objects on the picture, must have used a variety of tints, since the shading is effected by the blending in varying combinations of three or four colors.

We give the fact as we find it, and have no doubt, but the explanation will soon be given. In order to understand the following communication, the reader should have in mind the prominent objects of the drawing, which are, a tall and somewhat withered tree with "three branches," a tombstone, and two resting figures; the whole is significant of a burying place. The communication is friendly and affectionate, and in a plain and childlike manner brings home to the mind nearly the whole lesson of life.

The letter is a detail of the following, which accompanies the picture.  
HARRY—You know my heart, I had my failings, yet I injured nobody but myself.  
Those who should have mourned me most, and forgot me soonest, are now even as I am.  
HARRY—Think of your God oftener, so that you may prosper, and offer up an occasional prayer for the soul of  
R. B.  
MY DEAR HARRY: I send you a solution of that seeming riddle, which you could not comprehend. I allude to the TREE with THREE BRANCHES so frequently exhibited for your comprehension.

The tree, Harry, has, as you may perceive, two withered branches, and one branch in a flourishing condition. The two withered branches are types of *myself* and your brother *Bill*, withered from those causes which we might have averted. Cut off in the very prime of our life; but enough of this. The yet flourishing branch represents yourself in the full enjoyment of health, and those faculties which, with a proper discretion on your part, may be exercised by you for the instruction and benefit of your fellow creatures. When you reflect upon the causes which *withered* the two branches, and the means by which we became enemies to ourselves, you should pause and make that *firm resolution*, without which, man becomes a brute, slighting those reasonable faculties bestowed upon him by his all merciful-Creator for a brief hour of selfish enjoyment. Need I say more?

For myself, Harry, I am as it were forgotten, a mound of wet clay, overgrown with rank weeds, covers all that remains of one who was in his time a "right merrie jester." The cold winds whistle round my grave, and the pelting rain plashes the soft earth. But I am now happy, dear Harry, and shall be more so when I find the solitary branch flourishing in the sunshine of temperance. They tell me that you are improved since you have joined the Spiritual circle, for which I most heartily thank God. I am lonely, Harry, very lonely. Those who might best have mourned for me, are now with the Spirits. Pray for me at times, and I shall ever be  
Yours gratefully,  
BACHITA, Script. R. B.

lue, we have but one on the true mission of Spiritualism and the good of the race. May you be happy and blissful as you would have others.

Robert Miller of Wausau Co., Wis.—Your communication, play, farce, life, or whatever else you or the Spirits may choose to call it, has been received and put by for your future orders, as we can make no use of it.

## IS MODERN SPIRITUALISM A NECESSITY AS WELL AS AN EXPERIENCE?

The Spiritualism of the sacred writings must have been overwhelming to the minds of those who received its full truth. In no way can we account for the vast sway it held over the minds of men, but in the belief of the immediate presence of the great pervading Spirit of the universe. Science had not demonstrated that the thunder was an explosion of electrical essences, on the contrary, many believed it the utterance of the voice of God. The earth we inhabit was deemed to be a moveless body, spread out to infinity in one vast unending plain. All the sublime poetry of the Bible is drawn from such sources of belief. Its bold imagery everywhere recognizes the immediate presence and agency of the Infinite one.

The heathen philosophers recognized the immortality of the soul, yet they never seem to have entered into the examination of any presiding power, any great creative essence that permeated all other sources of vitality, therefore, their belief was a mere experience and not a necessity. The advance of scientific knowledge and the enlarged views of the operation of the laws of God make the Spiritual tendencies and developments of our time a necessity. We are assured that all the phenomena of Nature are the result of causes different from what we have dwelt upon. God does not step aside to produce the thunder; he did not lay with his own hands the supposed immovable foundations of the earth. He produces these outwardly developed causes by the operation of his will.—"The law of Nature is the will of God."

Our Spiritualism, then, is the growth of interior life, the approximation of the soul to God, and is not only an experience, but a necessity. He makes it a necessity by his revelations, just as he made the Hebrew faith a necessity, and strengthened credulity by his supposed immediate agency in the phenomena of Nature, which could not be explained or interpreted upon any other hypothesis. Intelligence must be acted upon by intelligence; soul must commune in union with soul, and as every thing goes back to its original soul, so they must blend in the after life, and be united above. If this union in Heaven is certain, it is equally certain that there may be an anterior communication. That the Creator may wish to evidence his decrees in anticipation. The highest form of devotion moreover, is an assimilation towards these unities for they bet a reliance upon his protection and care, when every protection subsides.

What is prayer for any departed soul, but a communication of this Nature? If the soul be sentient in the future world, and we have a full reliance upon it, our inward aspiration may be a constant yearning for this realization, and it is finally answered by some affinities or other. We know not how far other souls may go beyond this in their experience, and therefore cannot question the truth of higher and more exalted revelations.

This is a stumbling block to many; they get no communication, and consequently their belief is enfeebled. I might as well doubt the revelations of Scripture upon such pretences. They were not made to me, and I might deny their authenticity up on and under the same pretences.  
Providence, Jan. 15th, 1855.

## SPIRITUAL MEDIUMS.

Since the creation of earth and man, Mediums of the omniscient intelligence have been chosen as instruments of His revelation. To every great and selected soul who needed this revelation, has he sent His messenger, to teach his favored children of His guardianship and care. He sent down His white-robed angel to Mary, enunciating her blessedness, and such enunciation was no more remarkable than that the bright-winged seraph should have communed with the patriarchs and prophets.

It is not for us to say in what manner the Creator develops himself to these Mediums; some are thrown into a state of clairvoyance, thus abstracting and absorbing the soul from the chains of earth and all objective consciousness. Others are breathed upon by the vital source of all intelligence, and their gaze penetrates the veil that hides the world of form from the world of God.

Facts innumerable sustained this doctrine long before the Spiritual emanations of our time were claimed as discoveries. The Queen of Sweden, who was most intimate with Swedenborg, esteemed the man for his science, learning, and virtue, yet she ridiculed his Spiritual pretensions. Wishing to test these qualities, she desired him to reveal to her some words which her husband when dying, had whispered in her ear. The philosopher required some little time for meditation, and at the expiration of the stated interval, told her the precise words, which her husband had communicated, and which had never been effort to mortal. Can we doubt that the departed Spirit of her husband had made him the medium of this revelation?

An instance of clairvoyant revelation occurred in the life of the famous Dr. Donne, Dean of St. Paul's. The relative of his wife, Sir Woolsey, wished the Dean to accompany him to Paris on some state occasion. His lady was in a feeble state, and greatly objected to his leaving her; their mutual attachment was most extreme, and he hesitated a long time between the duty of a husband and the obligation of friendship. He finally consented, and they journeyed together to the Capital. One morning, when his friends had stepped into an adjoining room, the apparition of his wife passed through the chamber with a dead child clinging to her. When his friends returned, they found the Dr. speechless and in a state of agitation that caused the most lively apprehension on the part of his friends. They made a note of what had occurred, at the hour and the instant it transpired. A messenger was despatched to the lady, who was lying in a languid and low condition, having at the hour, when as from the grave she burst upon his presence, given birth to a still-born infant.

## REPORT OF THE LADIES IN BEHALF OF THE RAGGED SCHOOL.

Those who may have given in aid of the school, or contributed in labor or otherwise to the getting up of the Fair, will see by the following "report," the amount of donations sent in, and the conclusion of the whole matter. A committee of ladies and gentlemen have been appointed to solicit donations and contributions for the support of the school, as it is doing a good work. It has at present eighty children, boys and girls, who receive tuition in the common branches of Primary school education, and a dinner each day. Beside this, every effort is made to clothe them as fast as small means will permit, in such a way as to make them clean and comfortable.

Of the benefit and efficacy of such institutions, too much can hardly be said or felt in a city like New York, where so many of the poor suffer for lack of "daily bread." We shall report progress occasionally.

[For the Christian Spiritualist.]  
LIST OF DONORS NAMES IN AID OF RAGGED SCHOOL.  
November 20th, 1854.

Received of Mr. Tooley, collected at Dodworth's Hall, \$45 75  
Do. 555 Broadway, " 9 07  
Do. 309 Broadway, " 5 01  
Do. Mrs. Wiley, " 1 00  
Do. Mrs. Levy, " 3 50  
Do. Mr. Benning, at 553 Broadway, " 5 16  
Do. Miss A. Burton, " 8 50  
Donations from Mr. Purdy, " 3 00  
Do. Mrs. Emson, " 9 00  
Do. Mr. Bonding, " 1 00  
Do. Mr. Hubbard, " 1 00  
Do. Mr. Price, " 1 00  
Do. Mr. Odell, " 1 00  
Do. Mrs. Levy, " 8 00  
Do. Mr. Clark, " 5 61  
Do. Mr. White, " 4 66  
Total, \$109 04  
Donation from Mrs. Fitzgerald 25 pounds Confectionary.  
Donation from Messrs. Henley & Taylor, 409 3d avenue, half ton of coal.  
Donation from Mr. Odell, one ham.  
From Mr. Horace Waters, use of Piano.  
Cash on hand, \$157 77  
Goods on hand, " 91 25  
Total, \$229 05  
ELIZABETH TAYLOR, TREASURER.  
MR. C. BRAYTON, SECRETARY.

FRIEND HINSHAW.—We have your letter with the enclosed five dollars, which shall be appropriated as you wish.  
Miss Dow has also received your last letter containing ten dollars for the Ragged School, and wishes this to be her receipt, should you fail to get her letter.  
Whatever difference of opinion we may have, my brother, on prayer, its nature, character or va-

\*Since I have been a Spiritualist I have occupied some of my time in perusing "Paley's Evidences of Christianity," and I was struck with the applicability of the whole reasoning to the evidences of Spiritualism. I recommend a reference to that work, especially to those who are disposed to quarrel with our faith because it refuses to save them from the responsibility of thinking for themselves.

The story of "Genial Greathart" will not be further continued in our paper, it being the author's purpose to publish it eventually in book form.



Poetry

And Poesy to shall lead her aid.
Perceiving she the strings,
Scattering o'er your shrouded earth
Sweet incense from her wings.

[From the Niagara Mall.]

INFLUENCES.

God's world is passing into ours;
Its beauty, silent, ripe and sweet,
In truth within us, and in us,
Fashion and strengthen all our powers.

The sun round whom the planets glide,
The moon that gives the light she takes,
The flowers in meadows and in brakes,
The flowing and the ebbing tide.

The granite rock on which are laid,
Level or slanted, slate or stone,
With flowers and mosses overgrown,
Sweet cloaks and the sun and shade.

The bridging rainbow, the blue gloom
That in romantic gorge seeps,
The floating and the creeping
Over the fields where cowslips bloom.

The pale green aureole that gleams
On the sky's rim when suns are low,
Full of a sweet and warm beam,
Yet breathing hope's delicious dream.

God's world is passing into ours;
Sun, moon, and tide, with clouds that dye
And trees that yearn to reach the sky,
Fashion our minds and mould our powers.

Men whom we champion wrong or right,
And women fond of warm beams,
Flowing through lips that kiss till death,
And eyelids trembling with delight.

The children that about us play,
With golden hair and round soft flesh,
Smooth, as magnolia flowers, and fresh
Fall cloaks and blue like dewing day.

The song the elder poets sang,
That in Greece and Rome's new palm,
Thoughts of yesteryear's men gave and calm,
That live, or died when Time was young.

The soul is like a mirror fair,
Reflecting every shape or hue,
Let as it changes, so it changes,
All that we know, and all we do.

God's world is passing into ours;
Ere we are, all that we are,
Holla its swift waves in calm and strife
Over all our feelings, all our powers.

THERE IS LIGHT.

BY J. R. C.

There is light beyond the mountains,
That in the dawn of the new day,
There's hope beyond the breakers,
Which swell with a wail.

There's love beneath the shadows
Of that dark breathing breast,
There are smiles and tears,
The joy mountain's crest.

There's good within the evil,
As the diamond in its crust,
There are flowers in the desert—
Life that flows from the desert.

There's beauty in the hovel,
There are smiles in the disguise,
Near the ragged and the tattered,
To sparkle in the skies.

There's everything to cheer us,
And nothing to grieve us,
Our confidence in Heaven
And the "Great Spirit's" law.

Then we'll rest in assurance
That an end soon will come,
To life's care and strife,
In our bright spirit home.

Where the golden haze of glory
On hosts of angels flows,
Shall begeth their grace,
And bring them to the throne.

LETTER TO DR. DODDS.

NO. VIII.

It is found impossible, to save man, unless man puts God to death in the form of the Son. So God dies and man is saved, because he is so wicked as to commit the most heinous sin of his whole existence, putting to death God in the form of a human being, who is the Son. The Father, notwithstanding, it is said, still lives and pardons all mankind for putting His Son to death, because they did it to save the whole race, because they listened to the wiles of the serpent. No, not all mankind, for who was most instrumental in the sacrifice, one Judas, is condemned as the most wicked man that ever lived, and cannot, it is thought by many, be saved among his brethren. But still there are conditions, notwithstanding all the sacrifices God has made for man, having committed suicide as well as homicide, yet no one except those who believe that has been done, will be saved by the murder, whether he ever knows the circumstance or not. That makes no difference, his wrath is not appeased unless the soul believes that it is appeased, and acknowledges the sacrifice of God the Son, to atone for the wrath of God the Father. Now it appears that a few individuals only came into possession of this knowledge, hence a greater part of mankind, having never heard of these singular facts,—for it will be impossible to guess them, so deep is the tragedy,—must be inevitably lost, notwithstanding all the pains God had taken to have it otherwise.

God, unwilling that any of his creatures should be damned after such ample provision was made, (thousands having died ere the Son was put to death for them, though it is said if they would believe that he was to come, they might have been saved, those that heard of it,) gave them a new revelation through this Son, which transmitted written out as the last will and testament of God to man. Now this will or revelation has never been read except by a few persons compared with the whole, and those few cannot understand it precisely, so strangely is it given, owing to the design of God, or the incapability of his employees, hence various opinions and explanations are given in relation to it, all of doubtful signification. Now peruse this written will, God gave one somewhat different, as many laws contained in the first were repealed in the second, showing he had changed his mind, or that he had thought it best after His Son, alias Himself, had died, a less expensive one was necessary. For one thing in the exchange was this: in the old will, when God was angry, or when He wished them to remember Him and notice Him, he required as a sacrifice offerings of beasts, birds, or the fruits of the land, burnt in the fire as an expiatory sacrifice or otherwise. This more expensive were these, the better was he suited; so he delighted himself in those individuals who had many flocks and herds and much fruit of the land, more than in those who had not these desires. In the new revelation all these rites and offerings were superseded by the one great offering of atonement of the Son unto the Father, and God pardoned all of the race who believed, because they had come on purpose to be put to death, and could not be saved unless they did put him to death. Now it is pretended by some of the believers in this revelation, that not one word of the old will is annulled by the new, though they allow that it is rendered obsolete by it and now not of much use, while others contend that it is as good as the old, only that it is not understood. Now both of the wills, though said to be complete and full, need constant revision and amendments by lawyers appointed to the work, but so far from agreeing as to the interpretation of the same, they set their clients by the ears and are unable to hold a counsel without a jury of more than twelve to sit upon the question. Thus the whole world, (that has become acquainted with this revelation,) is undecided as to what it means. So many constructions have been placed upon it that it has lost

nearly all its power in its divisions, like the Divine God, and is now in a precarious state of health, which threatens a sickness without convalescence, and I fear a death of lingering old age; yet it is urged by the supporters of these revelations, that they are perfect and adapted to the wants of man, and that the second, like the first, can never be superseded by another. They are in no wise suited with themselves, else would they not patch it with so many colored shades of cloth, so that it may suit the eye of all customers.

This God, who is omnipotent and omnipresent, must have known from the beginning of his creation what would come to pass, and if so, must have seen the consequences of his creations. Yet he still goes on in his work, and after he has seen by actual demonstration the wickedness of his children, he, like any man, repents himself of what he has done and strives to remedy the evil. This he can only partly effect, after all that he has done, so that a greater part of mankind he is obliged to damn into everlasting misery, notwithstanding that he would if he could have all come into the knowledge of his Son's death, and the provisions he has made for them. Nor is this all; they are to be damned for the sin of ignorance, for many will never hear the name Jesus, the only name whereby man can be saved, and never know of this revealed will, which is indispensable to their salvation.

[For the Christian Spiritualist.]

LETTER TO THE REV. E. H. CHAPIN.

New York, Jan. 18th, 1855.

E. H. CHAPIN—Sir: In your sermon of Sunday evening last, illustrating Paul's Spiritual authority to preach Christ, as I understand, you ignored all modern Spiritual phenomena, but clung to those of ancient times with a tenacity that seems to me unworthy of the cause of truth. You assumed that the manifestations made patent to Paul, a Spiritualist born out of due time, as are those of to-day, were genuine, while all modern cases were beneath your notice or unreliable. By what logical process you reach your conclusions, I am at a loss to discover, not having heard you, but am informed that it was similar to that which is common to all modern orthodoxy. If the course you adopt is the offspring of a conservative apprehension like that infecting the declarations of those who in ancient times thought their "craft was in danger," I cannot sympathize with you, nor can I admit your right to ignore modern, while admitting ancient, Spiritualism, because Spirits or demons present themselves in questionable shapes or under false pretensions. The Scriptures abound with similar cases, and false Spirits were then more common than the true, and more so even than now, while the demon that knew Christ and feared he should be tormented before his time, finds a parallel in these times. There seems to me an utter fallacy in any attempt to define Spiritualism by any external, Spiritual, or other demonstrations, if we will not accept those of our own time as well as those of ancient times. If we accept as probable phenomena that occurred thousands of years since, not one of which is provable, how can we deny those of to-day? I am prone myself to discredit all evidence of a future state, because I find little in myself or others worthy a preservation, and certainly, none of us are entitled to claim upon our merits so large a compensation. But these modern manifestations led me to admit the possibility of the past relations of Spiritual communion, and to hope for immortality beyond the grave. If I, however, take these from the category, there is no hope for me, for it would be a logical absurdity to admit the first manifestations, and to deny to the last an equal probability. If you can give me the clue whereby to admit the first logically, and equally logically to deny the last, I would be thankful. The state of the case is, that of the ancient I know nothing, and am under no obligation per se to God or man to accept either your or any other man's evidences of Spirituality, and surely, the shadows of doubt resting upon all remote annals, cannot be argued as strengthening their greater probability over the asserted facts of our day! While the very nature of truth, justice and mercy, asserted by all men, Christian or infidel, demand for this age evidences of immortality as clearly as for any other period. Think you God will hold mankind responsible to any interpretation you or others may put upon past records of which we can know nothing certain, or make it obligatory upon me or others to accept them, too, that is by the merest chance apparently, that any knowledge has come down to us of the facts and pretences set up for them? You cannot demonstrate that you or others have a rightful power to dictate a faith, creed, or interpretation of these records, and if not, why is it not my duty to weigh the past in the light of the present manifestations, and in them see a Cornelius coming to me to give me assurances of a future, and a guarantee to believe that the Christ was the son of God, as well as to Paul?

I have seen not a few of these modern manifestations, and if the lifting of tables without material means or the speaking through trumpets without human contact are not evidences per se of Spirituality, by what rule can you claim that the words heard by Paul are or could have been? And what more was the clairvoyant power possessed by Cornelius in seeing Paul in his distress, than the same power manifested in a thousand instances by the clairvoyants of our day?

Yours respectfully,

WILLIAM J. YOUNG.

[For the Christian Spiritualist.]

CHILDHOOD'S VISION OF MANHOOD'S GLORY.

BY S. FARWELL BERRY.

In the eternal oneness of God's creative purposes, His foreordination of all things that exist, is there any basis left for the denial of an assumption, that childhood's mind in its guileless simplicity is capable of receiving or does receive a vision of its ripened manhood's glory, or seal pre-signifying its immortal destiny?

This seal in the knowledge of evil; the struggles of a sensuous existence may be deeply lost to sight, but being a specific or finite imprint of the Infinite life, once manifest in the flesh and poured out unto death to rise again; in that life, in man's final completeness, when the remembrance of sin, through the cross shall be taken off from the face of the earth, it too shall rise.

This I know, for though the maturity of such a vision is yet unattained in a life of forbidden freedom of earth's pleasures, it has found its strength renewed in trial, being cherished as the evidence that I live, and am comprehended in wisdom's plan, and is on manhood's verge the only hope or sustaining principle of my existence.

To Thee, my Father-Spirit! this inquiry I raise. Does it consist with the integrity of this vision and its fulfilment, that in these latter days, when the princes and nobles of the earth, who occupy its places of eminence, that manhood in wisdom is denied for the worship of folly's idol? No! still I

impair of its rays to their oppressed and prisoned subjects, opening a door of hope that points to a resurrection from the grave, were in an atmosphere of Spiritual liberty the brilliant promise of childhood shall renew its life and grow and ripen in power. The Lord by His Spirit giveth answer, All things are true, though it is but in truth, thine forever.

To live is to love; hence the peaceful procession of the soul's energies in fulfilment of its created end—a ministry of universal good. To die or to live, that is to exist as conceived in death, is to contend with universal chaos, that in images of terror and gloom rise before the mind in every form of sickening gaze; but to die as received through faith in resurrection, is to bear the truth in a self-conscious want of good or harmony in every movement.

The soul's re-birth, like its first, is formed in absolute innocence of its end, or the foresight and interposition of its wisdom. And thus, since it is impossible for man, in his own mental light, to see God, he ordained the existence of, and appoints the time of the soul's deepest poverty as the darkest hour of Nature's being, to reveal in surprise Himself, unfolding in light the mystery of the past, manifesting in presence His power, and unveiling by man can be saved, and never know of this revealed will, which is indispensable to their salvation.

Thus is made known the way of truth, the nature and design of the vision whereof I now disclose.

Triune in its halo of light creative, triune in its determinative law, triune in its glory of manifestation, its whole nature in relation to man, how much soever it may wear the appearance of wrath, is always mercy, deep and changeless mercy.

Its nature thus subsisting in mercy, its destination or home of Spirit is mid the sons of sorrow and woe, appearing and working its purpose, not so much in the shavings of the sanctuary, where blinded man would bow his Spirit in idolatrous homage in the shadow of thick darkness, or inconsistencies become a stumbling stone and rock of offence.

The path it traverses in fulfilment of its mission is the fear of God, wavering not to the counsels or judgments of men, but with single-eyed earnestness, pursues its love or giving-life in likeness to the capacity conceiving. And this God-fearing earnestness is accepted as faithfulness by Him.

In self-sustained or unsupported constancy of life is evinced the nobleness of its birth. Its power of descending to meet the most abject condition of man is its glory, for greatness is the meekness of faith, the child-like dependence that bears perpetually in its innocent being the image and presence of the universal Father, who alone is great. God then is in His chosen habitation, and worketh therein and for it.

Being thus exalted to conscious mightiness through the Father's indwelling, it can never desire anything as of right, but moves in its appointed course in silent adoring of the majesty of life, veiled by the cloud of its glory to all sense out of its holy temple, but within, God is known and worshipped as all in all.

The sum of the vision is this: the glory of manhood is the image of the God-like, the divinization of the chosen son, the centre of life and the resurrection of worlds, whence all who live by and in Him are as He is.

TO LOGAN SLEEPER OF ST. LOUIS.

FRIEND SLEEPER: I have read your very long and very kind letter with attention. Your position in regard to modern revelations seems to be rather non-committal. I appreciate your position, and pass it by, to remark on some prominent points of your epistle. Of course, you expect some kind of an answer to so long a letter, and as your "familiar Spirit," or invisible prompter appears to be of a rambling disposition, you will excuse me if mine rambles, too. You say you think it wrong to seek instruction from the Spirit-world, when so many Bible precepts are unheeded and promises untried. I agree with you in regard to the promises, and precepts, too, so far as the sectarian church is concerned. People who profess to be Christians and plead the statute of limitations to the evidences of Christianity, (see Mark, 16th chap. 17, 18 verses,) virtually plead the same for Christianity itself.—The ancient Hebrews claimed to be God's chosen people. The poor benighted heathen around them never suspected it till told so by the Jews themselves, and the miserable pagans were so undeveloped as to doubt the reality of the thing even then. Now I am in the same predicament. My neighbors claim to be Christians. What evidence have I of it? Their word and nothing else. I ask for some of the signs promised by Jesus, and am told that they have all been used long ago.—Brother Sleeper, can you blame me, if "with some restraining of risibility," I ask you, who despises Bible authority and disputes Bible truth? Is it the so-called Christian church that embodies the entire idea of Spirit-intercourse in its creed, and thus excommunicates its members for believing the "ministration of angels, or communion with saints," to be a living fact? Or is it the Spiritualist, whose faith is increased by noting the similarity of manifestations recorded in the Bible, to those he has seen with his own eyes? Do you blame us because we walk no better by the light of a living revelation than the church does by a mummy revelation imported from Asia? The truth is, we have but just begun to walk, and show out precisely what we are. Each man does his own thinking and preaching, and looks for vitalities and not forms. The church, on the contrary, as you well know, has been under drill for a long time, and makes a good show on parade. But when I look into the interior, I feel as you do, my friend, when taking your paper from the box. I feel that its title of "Christian" is rather "specious." Now, Brother Sleeper, don't be so selfish as to deny us a small share of the "flat-footed disputings of Bible truth and authority." Doubtless, you are aware that the Bible had a great many hard twists, before we, of the new philosophy, followed suit in the game. There are in the world over two hundred Christian sects. Each screws the Bible round to its own point of the compass. The Baptist Association reports over twenty thousand errors in the Bible. The Episcopal finds double that number, and both call for a new translation. I am more moderate. At present, I only wish to have a new version of that story of the sun and moon standing still at the command of Joshua. I can't take that. I am prepared for higher lessons in astronomy. But, sir, I have seen no "signs of abiding prejudice against the Christian religion" among Spiritualists. Like all other pioneer parties, we have now and then a disciple, who is ready to swallow Jonah's whale at one mouthful. This class, as a general thing, are as bitter against the Bible as second hand believers are against the new dispensation. Ignorance guides the helm in both cases.—The first disables the book, because he has not read it, the second believes it, because somebody has read it for him. If you please, we will offer

one class against the other. Now, compare the most rational portion of modern Christianity and modern Spiritualism, and you will find that we believe more of the Bible than you do. We have faith to heal the sick by the laying on of hands, and it is done. Yours (the church) have no faith in what you claim as your lawful heritage, and you cannot do it. If you believe that the evidences of true Christianity were limited to a particular period, it is only belief, you can't prove it, and because you have no faith in modern revelations, I have a right to infer that your faith needs rest to prolong its life. It is a remarkable fact in the history of this period, that the self-styled religious teachers of the day are afraid to discuss their own theology in public, or try to learn anything new.—To me, the reason is plain. They lack the moral courage to admit that what they could not fathom has been revealed to children and fools.

Write again, my friend, and do not feel in the least slighted, if an answer is long delayed. Like St. Paul, I support myself by the labor of my hands, and battle for the truth from morning to night, with every head and horn of the Beast, from popery down to the last "little horn."

Fraternally yours, S. M. PETERS.

Abstract of the Proceedings at the Conference at No. 553 Broadway, Friday Evening, Jan. 19.

[PHONOGRAPHICALLY REPORTED.]

Dr. Hatch opened the meeting as follows: Progress seems to be stamped upon Nature's every department, and upon the human mind. We may, in one sense, be considered as the center or embodiment of all the wisdom which has been discovered by previous ages. We are, as we see, receiving the magnetic influence of a thousand generations concentrated upon this one; and the improvement which we have made, the philosophy which we have had, and the science which we have attained, blessing alike as we have been blessed. Man may seem, at times, to retrograde, but if we believe in an overruling Providence, we must believe that even in that capacity, he is working out some Divine purpose. In the present development which has dawned upon the world, we see how rapidly new philosophies seem to unfold to our view, but I think they are much more rapidly so, than we are aware of. We are now in the midst of a philosophy which is now unfolding. The great dream of every man, where among Spiritualists has been facts. They constantly cry out, "Give us facts." This is truly what we want; but in relation to this subject, the question arises, do we need an eternal repetition of the same facts? For one, and I speak the sentiments of most Spiritualists when I say that I am convinced there is a constant process of revelation, and higher truth is being revealed to us, and that we are to be prepared for such revelations, that persons become clairvoyant and clairaudient. But do we want a continual repetition of these facts, or do we want a practical application of the truths given by these means? Is it that we should be eternally reciting the same lessons? The alphabet has been made familiar to us, and we now advance rapidly into monotheism. One great thing needed as a body, by Spiritualists, is less fact and more philosophy. Each of us makes the suggestion that others may give some light upon the subject.

Mr. Tooley followed: Friends, the remarks we have just listened to are very suggestive, and appeal to my mind very forcibly, and in a measure remind me of some remarks that were made last Friday evening. Those who were present will perhaps recollect readily that in the observations I made, I insisted upon what I called the "secret of revelation." This secret, I said, was not to be sought for in the occult sciences, but in the occult sciences, and without feeling we had no life. I have so frequently returned to this subject that it may be a hobby; but I wish this evening to elaborate my mind of some conclusion regarding me. I have no hobbies. I am aiming at the universal mind and its universal emancipation from hobbies; for when we are in the sphere of wisdom, we have no hobbies, likes and dislikes, upon which we are so much attached. The present state of the mind is a constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I might have said, in a wider range, that the difference between man and man consists in the constant process of revelation. If you do not like what I like, it is synonymous with bad taste; and what we like must necessarily be right. The celebrated Chateaubriand—who passes with some as a high mind—said that the only thing that makes one mind differ from another is taste—that the difference between man and man consists in taste. I



