

HULL'S CRUCIBLE.

"And the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is."

Vol. VII.

18 Eliot Street, Boston, For the Week Ending June 30, 1877.

No. 1.

Original Poetry.

FREE LOVE.

BY HORACE M. RICHARDS.*

One nice pleasant morning, in Spring's early May,
Far into the green-wood I wandered away,
Far away from the noise of City or town,
Alone, and weary, I sat myself down.

I was tired, and sad, and sick of this life—
Of its toils, and troubles, its wearysome strife,
Of its mockeries hollow, its great unrest,
Of its unmated couples, the world called blest;

I thought of the souls they were ushering in,
To this world of wretchedness, sorrow, and sin,
Because they were bound by a priest-spoken tie,
That made the twain 'one, though their vows were a lie.

And I thought what a shame, that children should come,
Without their consent, to so cheerless a home,
To grow up like brutes, with no music or song,
Their lives out of tune, from inherited wrong.

And I said to myself: I wonder whether,
Such sad conditions, will govern forever?
I thought 'twould be better to turn square about,
And let so miserable a race die out.

And I almost wished some great tidal-wave,
Would sweep all mankind into one common grave,
Then perhaps, dame Nature, might start a new race,
That would add to her fame, instead of disgrace.

Anybody can see 'twas no pleasant mood,
That was on me, that day I went to the wood,
Yet a chance observation, with reflection
Turned my thoughts in another direction,

For up in the top of a soft maple tree,
Two singing birds warbled a song unto me;
Its burden was this, (I understood each word,
And no sweeter songsters have I ever heard.)

"Never since birds were mated,
Has one, the other hated.
By laws we cannot alter,
We wed at God's own altar.

No marriage vows are spoken
No marriage vows are broken:
Through storms and wintry weather,
Love binds us fast together.

Life is all a wedding feast,
Yet we have no church, or priest,
For Love, can wed us stronger,
And Love, can hold us longer,

Better take lessons from birds,
"Actions speak louder than words,"
And Nature, is a teacher,
Wiser than book, or preacher."

They hopped from their perch and they twitted "adien"
'Twas the last of their birdships I ever knew;
But the more I con their sweet lesson over
The more I incline to be a free-lover.

God's law is free love—the free'r the better;
He never made chain, He never made fetter;
For souls when they meet 'neath the rays of Love's sun,
Unite like two snowflakes that meet into one.

Polemics.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1853, by
STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS,
in the Clerk's office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern
District of New York.

LOVE, MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

—AND—

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE INDIVIDUAL.

A DISCUSSION BY HENRY JAMES, HORACE GREELEY
AND STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS: INCLUDING
THE FINAL REPLIES OF MR. ANDREWS,
REJECTED BY THE TRIBUNE.

CHAPTER X.

(CONTINUED FROM OUR LAST.)

MR. ANDREWS' REPLY TO MR. JAMES.

REJECTED BY THE TRIBUNE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TRIBUNE:

Mr. H. James condescends to reply, obliquely still, to

my strictures upon his crude social theories. The condescension is amiable, but the imprudence is unpardonable. It was obviously one of those cases in which discretion is the better part of valor. He does not appreciate my disposition "not to be cruel." Such ingratitude provokes a severity which he can ill afford to draw upon himself. I am surprised—I may even say grieved—that he compels me to a still further exposure of the unhandsome features of his course of reasoning upon the subject in debate. With an apology to the reader for a thoroughness of criticism, bordering on harshness, forced on me by the indiscretion of "Your Correspondent," I will proceed, as cautiously as I can, and, even, notwithstanding all, with some remaining touches of tenderness, to the dissection of "Your Correspondent's" last article.

The following is the gist of his effort to restate himself:

"You feel that all man's relations to his fellows, and especially to woman, should be baptized from above, or, acknowledge an ideal sanction before all things, and that where this sanction is absent, consequently, the relation is either strictly infantile or else inhuman. In respect to this higher sanction and bond of conjugal fidelity, you call the legal bond inferior or base. As serving and promoting; the former, one deems the latter excellent and honorable but as ceasing any longer to do so, you deem it low and bestial."

Now, the deliberate purpose of your Correspondent here is to show that he is not, and could not have been, adverse to the institution of marriage, because, forsooth, as he has "all along contended, there are circumstances in which that institution is of value to society—namely in its infancy—and to impress upon the incautious reader the idea that I am laboring under a woful degree of mental confusion in attributing to him the doctrine that marriage (the legal bond) should be "incontinently abolished."

Very good, so far; but it so happens that your Correspondent has very recently devoted large space, in more than one of his communications to the *Tribune*, to proving that Society among us is no longer in that state of infancy in which the outward marriage bond is "subservient and ministerial to the higher spiritual sanction," but that it has now arrived, on the contrary, at that precise stage of advancement and full growth in which the legal bond is "inferior and base," or "inhuman," or "low and bestial," or "purely diabolical," and ought, therefore, to be dispensed with or wholly abolished.

Let us betake ourselves again to quotation. Discussing his very subject, and having shown that the legal bond was a necessity of the infant state of human society, your Correspondent proceeded to say; "But now that it [Society] has overleaped that period of infantile fragility, and feels the motions of ripe and sinewy manhood, the questions of order and harmony can be no longer postponed. It is bound by a feeling of self-respect to become decorous and orderly, and to put away, consequently, all those arbitrary methods of action which were dictated by mere expediency or self-preservation." Hence, your Correspondent distinctly makes the changes in legislation requisite to adapt it to the present ripeness of human society, to stand in "fully legitimating divorce," or in discarding our conjugal relations of the "purely diabolic element of outward force"—in other words, the virtual abolition of legal or forceful marriage, as "ceasing any longer to serve and promote the higher sanction and bond of fidelity"—having, "for his own part," as he says, "not the slightest doubt that in that case, constancy would speedily avouch itself the law of the conjugal relation, instead of as now the rare exception."

Now, your Correspondent has repeatedly brought forward and urged, as you well know, and as the public well

knows, this precise remedy for the existing dissonance of Society and its legislation, as a practical cure for a practical evil. Now, then, he says, with an exclamation point for surprise, that I betray so crude an apprehension of the discussion, that I confound his "denunciation of base and unworthy motives in marriage with a denunciation of marriage itself!" What charming simplicity! what delightful innocence! A practical, straight forward, political, or legislative measure, of the most radical and revolutionary kind, proposed and repeatedly urged as the remedy for wide-spread actual suffering and disorder in the community, suddenly retires into the dimensions of a ghostly remonstrance, from a kind hearted spiritual adviser, against bad motives in matrimony! Ah! Mr. Henry James, when hard pressed by a logic that won't bend to "Individual Sovereignty," an "artful dodge" may be highly creditable to one's agility, but hardly to the higher attributes of a manly nature. Were it not for the cunning evinced in the maneuver, the want of courage and the seeming simplicity might be suggestive of "sheep's head" without "the pluck." As it is, we are reminded, also, of a different animal. For myself I once had a good practice in Virginia fox-hunting, and training after these doublings has to me the interest of reviving old reminiscences: to the reader who finds no such amusement in the chase, and who looks merely for candor, truth seeking, and consistency, in a discussion, I fear they may be simply disgusting.

If, in the case adduced for illustration, the "Spiritual Adviser" had gone a step farther, and expressly advocated the theory that "all arbitrary methods of action," in the premises, should be "put away," that nobody should be compelled by "outward force," to restore property which he had found, and that, by such freedom from the "legal bond," the notion of the right of property would be "ennobled," and the man and all men led to act, from their own "humanity and inward sweetness," honorably and honestly in such cases; and if I upon reading such a statement of views, should have said, perchance, that that is precisely my theory for the abolition of all laws for the collection of debts and the like—saving the question, to be settled afterward, what are legitimate debts bearing upon the conscience—and if Mr. Spiritual Adviser, shrinking from the more open and bolder presentation of his own theory, and determined to be respectable at all hazards, should, thereupon, accuse me of confusion of ideas, superficiality, etc., your Correspondent wants to know what I should say, and I reply that I should say, that this "Spiritual Adviser," intent upon saving his own skin, did not hesitate to slander and malign his neighbor, and to obfuscate his readers by a resort to trickery, and *ad captandum* pleadings unworthy of a man of some reputation and literary pretensions.

So much for dodge No. 1. Before proceeding with the catalogue, permit me to furnish a gloss to the reader, to inform him of what I suppose the real position of your Correspondent to be. I do this to remove the impression, to which I feel myself liable, after the showing I have made, of engaging with a combatant whose statements of doctrine are too contradictory and absurd to aspire to the dignity of criticism. Notwithstanding appearances, I do not think so. There is, I am satisfied, a consecutive train of ideas running through the whole of his reasonings upon the subject, which, if it can be cleared of a certain confusedness in the use of terms by which he is constantly prone to obscure, rather than illustrate, his thought, will be found quite as consistent as the notions of many other loose thinkers, who aspire to instruct the public upon philosophical subjects, and who gain considerable estimation for the want of just criticism.

What your Correspondent means to say, then, render

* Originally published in "Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly," Feb. 24th, 1872
Revised by the Author for the CRUCIBLE—This June 28th, 1877.

into comprehensible plainness of speech and tolerable brevity, is just this. Marriage is the union of one man and one woman for life. But there are two phases or aspects of marriage, or, in fine, two marriages, or kinds of marriage. 1. The outward or legal, that of which the perpetuity and exclusiveness depend upon human laws and are enforced by the Courts, which I will call Legal Marriage; and, 2. That which he calls "the ideal sanction of the conjugal relation," and which I will call, for the sake of a convenient term, Spiritual Marriage. This last, he believes, tends to exhibit itself in the lives of all rightly developed men and women, in just the same form of perpetuity and exclusiveness which legal marriage now attempts to enforce by virtue of pains and penalties; that we have now arrived at that stage of development at which this tendency to the spiritual tie declares itself so strongly (or exists undeclared) that the continuance of the old legal bond, which was good enough in its day, instead of securing the action toward which it and the "higher sanction" both tend, operates as an irritant and a disturber, and hinders or prevents the very end at which it aims; that consequently, sound morals and good policy both demand, as the remedy, that "Divorce be Freely Legitimated," or, what is the same thing, legal marriage abolished; not that he is opposed to marriage enacts that is, to the same course of life which legal marriage in the form of law but because this last is not merely unnecessary but hurtful in securing that end.

This theory, so stated, comes pretty much to what is entertained in this age, more or less distinctly, by a good many persons transcendently inclined, and whose views of prospective human improvement take no broader and no more practical shape than that of spiritualizing whatsoever thing, however stupid, which happens now to exist among us. Finding an existing relation so oppressive, that neither they nor their fathers were able to bear the actual yoke, they fancy that exactly the same thing spiritualized, must be exactly the right thing. Still the theory, such as it is, is quite intelligible when not "bedeviled" by unnecessary fog and pretentious mysticism.

It is true your Correspondent has no right to claim any such sensible rendering of his views. He has pertinaciously insisted upon saying that "the legal bond" is the whole of marriage, that the spiritual tie is not marriage at all, and that the legal bond ought now to be dispensed with. I should, therefore, have been perfectly justified, upon ordinary views of criticism, if I had taken him for what he has repeatedly declared himself to be in effect to be, in words, and stated purely and simply that he denounces the institution of marriage entirely. I have nevertheless kindly, as I thought, abstained from taking advantage of this verbal confusion, and inasmuch as he refers to "the higher sanction of the conjugal tie," and uses other similar phrases, although denying that they signify marriage in any sense, I have confined myself to speaking of him as opposed to Legal Marriage. To talk of the Law as sanctioning what will exist just as well without it, and what is to continue to exist by virtue of it, is nonsense. The mere ceremony, having no binding effect, is nothing to which you or your Correspondent, or I, or anybody would attach the slightest importance.

As I happen to think, myself, that forcing two people who hate each other, to live together in the most intimate relation, and become monks or beget children of their hatred, is neither very philosophical nor religious, I was quite disposed to "fraternize" with your Correspondent up to that point. This, alas! was the head and front of my offending. It was not that I differed from, but that I agreed with him, and put in a little clearer and stronger light the points of our agreement, that he was horrified and alarmed, and recoiled.

Our points of difference lie here. He, "for his part," has no doubt that "constancy would speedily avouch itself as the law of conjugal relation, in the absence of all legislation to enforce it." I, for my part, don't know that. We have never yet witnessed a state of society consisting of educated, refined, and well-developed persons, in which Freedom of the Affections, for both men and women, was tolerated and approved. I am unable to dogmatize with reference to the precise nature of the relations which are to prevail under such a régime. I know simply that the right thing, and that its results must therefore be

good, however much they would differ from my preconceived notions of propriety. I decline to make myself the standard: I recognize the equal of sovereignty of all other men, and of women. I do not and cannot know the nature of any other man or woman, so as to be competent to decide for them. I doubt not, I shall do my duty if I obey the highest thing which I find in my own being. I claim the right to do that. I allow the same thing to others. It is a species of spiritual arrogance for me to assume to decide for them, which I voluntarily lay down and totally abjure.

Mr. James claims Freedom because, for his part, Freedom will lead people to act just in that way which he personally thinks to be right. I, on the contrary, claim Freedom for all Men and Women, for no such personal reason, but because they have an inalienable God-given Right as his as Heaven above all human legislation, to judge for themselves what it is moral, and proper, and right for them to do or abstain from doing; so long as they do not cast the burdens of their conduct on me. I plant myself on that Principle, and challenge the attention of mankind to it as the Law of Order, and Harmony, and Elevation and Purity among men. Herein we do radically differ. I take the position which, saving the judgment of my critics, is exceedingly new in the world, that I have no better right to determine what it is moral, and proper for you to do, * than I have to determine what it is religious for you to BELIEVE; and that, consequently, for me to aid in sending you or another man to prison for Fornication, or Bigamy, or Polygamy, or a woman for wearing male attire, and the like, is just as gross an outrage in kind, upon Human Rights, as it would be to aid in burning you at Smithfield for Protestantism or Papacy, or at Geneva for discarding the doctrine of the Trinity.

But to return to your Correspondent. He bases his defense of Freedom upon his personal judgment of the form it will give to the sexual relations. To test the depth and sincerity of his convictions, I ask him a question. I assume that we differ as regards what is the truest state of the relations of the sexes, in virtue of their infinite Individualities. I suppose the case that in the use of our new-fledged freedom, I on my convictions, not his, and change my relations every week or month, or take an unusual number of conjugal partners, or in some way depart from his ideal. I ask, in very good faith, and as a practical thing, since this freedom is to be a practical legislator, whether he proposes or not, still to retain a Police Office to compel me to use Freedom! according to his idea of the way in which it should be used—if not his, whether according to anybody's standard, other than that of the Individual himself. Hereupon he assumes the air of a dignified aristocratic "indifference," and regards my question as trivial, disingenuous, and impertinent. Of course the judicious reader will perceive at once that it strikes home to the very vitals of his whole system of Legislative Reform, and drives him back to a sphere to which it is to be hoped he may find his abilities better adapted, that of Spiritual Adviser to bad husbands, and a general lecturer of fanatics on the amendment of their "disorderly methods of living."

The next point of your Correspondent is either Dodge No. 2. or a gross blunder. The reader shall judge which. It is a perversion of my doctrine of the Sovereignty of the Individual, and it seems to me a deliberate perversion, by your correspondent, in order to have before him a man of straw, that he could knock down. Our formula is, "The Sovereignty of every Individual, to be exercised at his own cost." This simply and obviously means, "to be exercised, not at the cost of other people," or, as we have constantly and repeatedly explained it, "To be so exercised as not to throw the burdensome consequences of one's actions upon others," precisely as religious freedom is and has been for years understood among us. A man may believe what he pleases, and do, in the way of worship, whatsoever wise or foolish thing, providing he assails nobody else's Liberty, or Life, or Property.

This simple doctrine, the mere extension to morals and other spheres of a principle already adopted, and to the partial operation of which the world owes treasures of harmony and happiness, your sagacious and veracious Corre-

* With the limitation just stated, of course, That you do not throw burdensome consequences on me.

spondent has converted into the assertion of the right to commit every species of encroachment and outrage that savages or devils could aspire to, provided one is only ready to take the consequences. This atrocious doctrine he has, by the use of false quotation marks, thrust into my mouth! Of course attributing such nonsense and profligacy to me he has the field to himself, to make the most glaring exhibition of his own absurdity. I hope he enjoyed the pyrotechnic of his own witticisms, as some compensation for the wear and tear of conscience involved in such a gross misrepresentation of an opponent's position, if it were really intentional; if it were a blunder merely, and he has honestly stated principle, "as well as he can master its contents," I hardly know whether to recommend to him so much exertion as to try again. There is certainly little wisdom in attempting publicly to pass off a mere condensed expression of foolishness and diabolism, as if it were the substance of an axiom which challenges the admiration of mankind, as the most exact and the most scientific solution ever to be attained of the great problem of the legitimate limit of Human Freedom.

I quite regret that your correspondent should be opposed by my patronage, but I really can't help it. I must be permitted to admire what there is good and true in every man's utterances. I find much of that sort in what he has given to the world, and I admire it. I even wish that I found more of it, and more especially of that intellectual and moral hardihood which would perceive the extension by implication of the truth he does utter, and stand by the defense of it with a little generous devotion and occasional forgetfulness of purely personal considerations.

A word now as respects my "small insolence." I assure your Correspondent they are merely "put on" upon the principle *similia similibus* and small doses, to cure his big ones. I shall gladly lay them aside whenever good manners begin to prevail. I think I shall be found competent to the interchange of gentlemanly courtesies when gentlemanly courtesies are in demand. Indeed, I decidedly prefer the atmosphere of the parlor to that of the "ring," but I endeavor, at the same time, to adapt myself to the nature of circumstances and men.

Your Correspondent presumes that, when he says Freedom is one with Order, I should greatly like him to add, "and Order is one with License." When License is used for something different from Freedom, I suppose it signifies the bad use of Freedom. Now, it is simply Freedom that I ask for. On what grounds does this Correspondent of yours dare to presume that I desire a bad use to be made of that Freedom, or that I am in any sense, even in his own, a profligate or a bad man; that I contemplate, with complacency, the making of a Hell or a Pandemonium, or that any such result is more likely to come of my freedom, or the freedom that I advocate, than of his freedom, or the freedom he advocates? Whose insolence is it now? Why, Sir, your Correspondent seems to me so bred to the usage of overbearing superciliousness that he ought to be grateful to me for life if I cure him of his habit. This charge of advocating License has always been repeated against the champions of every species of freedom, political, of the Press, and of every sort whatsoever, and it is time that it should get its rebuke. It has not, however, suppressed other men's Truth, and it will not suppress mine. Such Truth has a vitality in which survives the blunders of the stupid, the misapprehensions of the feeble-minded, the denunciations of the bigoted, and the alarm and croaking of honest but timorous friends. The brave and faithful lovers of such Truth have always been, at the inception of its promulgation, a "handful of ridiculous fanatics" in the estimation of the Sophists of their day. It matters not. Truth, no more than the rights of man, can be obliterated by the votes of a majority, the legislation of the State, nor the scorn of the Pharisee; and the viper that tries it always bites a file.

In the next place your Correspondent deems me superficial, because I denominate the State "a mob." He doesn't condescend to tell us what it is other than a mob, but proceeds immediately to define Society, as if that were synonymous with the State. I fancy that I have simply analyzed to the bottom what he has taken on trust and in the gross. He admits that "irresponsible governments are entitled to our contempt." I stand ready to make

good the proposition that all governments are, in their very essence, "irresponsible," just as far as they are governments at all, and that, practically, they have proved so in every experiment ever made by mankind. The whole American theory of "checks and balances" upon parchment, is mere fallaciousness and folly. The only effectual check is that developed Individuality of the People which gives significant notice to government that it won't answer to go too far, and which as it becomes more developed, is sure to dispense with government altogether. The advantages we enjoy in this country, in this respect, come entirely from the greater practical development of the Sovereignty of the Individual; from the greater development of the Individual, so that that exercise of Sovereignty can be endured with less evil result; and from the small quantity of government which we tolerate, not at all, as is supposed, from any superiority, in the quality of the article. Government will become unnecessary just so soon as the true principles of the Science of Society are understood and practically realized. The realization of those principles will begin in their being discovered and promulgated. Hence as occasion offers, I preach. I expect, at first, to be partially understood, misunderstood, and misrepresented; but the time of that nebulous perception of the subject will pass. Ideas which are true and fundamental, and as destitute of fluctuation or exception as Mathematics, will make their way and be accepted. Prejudice will give way to Reason, Arbitrary Institutions to Principles, and Antagonism to True Order and Harmony and a Freedom of a rightly constituted Human Brotherhood.

Your Correspondent says that I exhibit a sovereign contempt for Society. He is certainly mistaken. I am very fond of Society, and especially of good Society. Society is, however, a word of considerable diversity of significations, and is used by your Correspondent in at least three or four different senses, apparently without the slightest consciousness of confounding them.

I may as well use this word [Society] as any other to illustrate a certain tendency on the part of your Correspondent, to which I have already adverted, to a lamentable confusion of ideas and terms, in the midst of the most exuberant and sometimes elegant diction. He begins one of his paragraphs by using Society as if it were synonymous with the State, by which I presume he means the Organization and Machinery of Government. In the middle of the same paragraph he defines Society to be the Sentiment of Fellowship and Equality in the Human Bosom." In the end of the same paragraph he asserts that the "advance of Society—this Sentiment of Fellowship or Equality—causes man to look away from Governments, and from whatsoever external patronage, and find true help at last in himself;" that is to resort to the Sovereignty of the Individual. This last is precisely what I believe. For Society, in which of these senses is it that I exhibit a "sovereign contempt?" Whose superficiality is it now?

In the very next sentence, your Correspondent adds, "Society is the sole beneficiary of the arts and sciences, and the Individual Man becomes partaker of their benefit, only by his identifications with it." In which definition is Society used here? Is it the Government or the State which is the only direct beneficiary of the Arts and Sciences? Is that what it means? Or is it the "Sentiment of Fellowship and Equality among men" which is the direct beneficiary of the Arts and Sciences? Or, finally, is it men individualized by "looking away from Governments and finding true help in themselves," who are the direct beneficiary, etc., and the Individual man, only so because he is "one of 'em?" Whose Superficiality and utter Confusion of ideas is it this time? Words have a tendency to obscurity when no definite ideas are attached to them.

Beauties of style, a certain dashing fluency of utterance, brilliancy of fancy, vague intuitions of floating grandeur, or of sublime truth even, simply or conjointly, don't make a Philosopher. Some clearness of intellectual vision, some analysis and knowledge of causes, some exactness in definitions, a certain expansiveness and comprehension of one's whole subject, and even more than all, perhaps, a rigid adherence to the laws of Dialectics, by which premises are fearlessly pursued to their natural and inevitable conclusions, lead where they may, are requisite to that end. It is always a misfortune to mistake one's vocation. It is a misfortune, however, which can be partially retrieved at almost any period of life, and we all acquire Wisdom by painful experiences. There is some department, I feel certain, in which your Correspondent might excel. As he declines to be patronized I shall abstain from impertinent suggestions.

Dodge No 3 is another cuttle-fish plunge into the regions of the "infinite," and, of course, of the indefinite, the accustomed retreat of impracticable theorists. Your Correspondent informs us that as "ideas are infinite they admit of no contrast or oppugnancy." I think he must have discovered by this time that there is both "contrast" and "oppugnancy" between his ideas and mine, so far at least

as his sublimated conceptions still retain anything of the finite or *definite*. Into the other region I am willing to follow him when occasion offers, and to examine with the rigorous grasp of modern philosophical criticism, your Correspondent's fanciful reproduction of Plato's Idealism and of the rose-colored Atheism of Spinoza, and to separate for him the legitimate from the illegitimate, the possible from the impossible, in the field of human speculation. At the moment, however, my business lies, and his ought to lie, with the simple questions of practical life relating to Marriage and Divorce—the matters under discussion.

The doctrine of the Sovereignty of the Individual is an absurdity, contends your Correspondent, because man is under a three-fold subjection, in the nature of things; first, "to Nature, then to Society" (in which meaning of the word?) "and finally to God." Grant all this be so, does the fact that man must ever remain under necessary or appropriate subjection to Society, that is, under a certain limitation of the spheres of his activity by the legitimate extension of the sphere of other Individuals—does it follow, I say, that it is an absurdity to inquire and fix scientifically what that limit is. Now, this is precisely what we profess to have done, and we give "the sovereignty of every Individual to be exercised at his own Cost" as the result of that investigation. What possible application has the vague generalization of your Correspondent, as a counter statement to that principle, how true soever his propositions may be.

It is as if I were to ask the opinion of a Swedenborgian of the policy of abolishing the laws for the collection of debts, and he should reply, "Sir, my opinion is, that if you act rightly in the matter, your action must be dictated by an equal union of the Divine Love and Divine Wisdom." I must reply, "Very well, my dear sir, but that is all granted to begin with, and although it may give you a great air of profound wisdom to repeat it, my question is a practical one. I want to know what, in your judgment, would be the operation of Love and Wisdom as applied to the case in every-day practical life which I have brought to your attention."

I ask in all sincerity, "What is the scientific limit of man's appropriate freedom as respects Society?" and your correspondent replies, with the solemnity of an owl, Sir, it is frivolous and absurd to ask such a question, because there is an appropriate limit upon man's freedom, and, therefore, man can never be wholly free.

And yet your Correspondent has the hardihood to talk of a Scientifically Constituted Society, as if such terms correspond to any definite ideas in his mind. I want to know whether, in a rightly or scientifically constituted human society, I am to be permitted to read the Protestant Scriptures at Florence; whether I am to be permitted to publish a scientific discovery at Rome; whether I can print my own opinions and views upon general politics at Paris; whether I can travel on a Sunday in Connecticut, etc., etc. I want to know what constitutes an infringement upon the rights of other men, and within what limit I am committing no infringement—not according to the arbitrary legislation of some petty principality, but according to natural and eternal right? To all this, the answer comes back, Nonsense, man is necessarily subject to Society to some extent.

Now, Sir I am fatigued with this sort of infinitude of ideas which never have any "oppugnancy," because having neither substance nor form, they can produce no shock. I hope your Correspondent will be content to withdraw into that field of pure idealism which is devoid of all "contrasts" and distinctions. It must be laborious to him to inhabit a sphere where definitions and limitations are sometimes necessary to enable us to know what we are talking about. Let him seek his freedom in the broad expanse of the Infinite. I, for the present, will endeavor to vindicate some portion of mine, by ascertaining the exact limits of encroachment between me and my neighbor, religiously refraining from passing those limits myself and mildly or forcibly restraining him from doing so—as I must.

STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

THE BIBLE STORY OF CREATION.

BY W. S. BELL.

[A LECTURE DELIVERED IN INVESTIGATOR HALL.]

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."

There are three things in this statement which the writer, who ever he was, knew, nothing more about than you and I know; namely, the "beginning" "God" and what is implied in the term created or creation. "In the beginning."

—But we pause a moment to inquire what is implied in this term beginning. The "beginning" does not refer to the beginning of God, as it is commonly assumed that He had no beginning. Was it then the beginning of matter? Did God about 6000 years ago create matter out of nothing? The explanation most frequently offered is that "God did not create matter at that time but he then fashioned the

universe out of chaos." Now this chaos was matter that was "without form and void." The text does not declare that God created matter out of nothing, yet this has been and is the usually accepted signification of the word "create."

Suppose we assume this statement which is not extravagant in the estimation of the Theist. For we must suppose that God either created matter or he did not create it. If he did not create it, then matter is eternal and God is not the creator of all things—is not the creator of the world, or of the universe. This is the same as to say, God is no God at all and that he has not done anything wonderful that we know of. We are forced to assume that he did at sometime create matter. But when we come to consider this a moment we find that the thought is inconceivable.

Mr. Buckle observes that: "Everything that we at present know has been ascertained by studying phenomena." As this seems to be an unquestionable proposition, we may add that in the whole range of human knowledge there is no general law of more universal acceptance than the law of cause and effect. "Every cause must have an effect because until it produces an effect, it is not a cause. Every effect in its turn must become a cause. Therefore in the nature of things, there cannot be a last cause for the reason that a so-called last cause would necessarily produce an effect, and that effect must of necessity become a cause. The converse of these propositions must be true. Every effect must have had a cause, and every cause must have been an effect. Therefore there could have been no first cause. A first cause is just as impossible as a last cause." —*Ingersoll's Gods*.

"The beginning, as it is phrased, of the Universe, is not thought out by the Theist, but conceded, without thought. It is impossible to conceive existence terminated by a primal or initial cause. We can only cognize the ever succeeding phenomena of existence as a line continuous and eternal. This line has to us no beginning; we trace it back into the misty regions of the past but a little way; and however far we may be able to journey, there is still the great beyond." —*Bradlaugh*.

"In assuming a creation absolute power, as the cause of the world, we must, in applying to it the notion of time, say that it could not have existed before or after Creation. It could not have existed before the notion of power is not reconcilable with the idea of nothing or inactivity. It could not have been a creative power without creating something. We must therefore suppose that this power has for a time been inert in the presence of chaotic and motionless matter a conception we have already shown to be absurd. It could not have existed after creation, as rest or inactivity, are again incompatible with the notion of force." —*Voght*.

"The First Cause cannot be absolute i. e. exist out of all relation to the universe. Whereas a cause not only sustains some definite relation to its effect, but exists as a cause only by virtue of such relations. Suppress the effect and the cause has ceased to be a cause. The phrase, Absolute Cause, therefore, is like the phrase circular triangle. The two words stand for conceptions which cannot be made to unite. We attempt says Mr. Mansel, to escape from this apparent contradiction by introducing the idea of succession in time. The Absolute exists first by itself, and afterwards becomes a cause. But here we are checked by the third conception of the Infinite. How can the Infinite become that which it was not from the first?" —*Fisk's Cosmic Philosophy*.

We see then that we cannot form the idea of a first cause of creation. We may use the words First "Cause" and "creation" but they represent no true conception. We use terms without attaching strict definitions to them; so far as we can learn this law of cause and effect is universal. It not only holds good in all parts of our earth, but it maintains the same relation to all all other parts of the universe, and has done so eternally in the past and will continue to do so for eternity to come. There has therefore never been an atom created out of nothing and there never will be a time when an atom can be annihilated. But let us turn our attention to the history of Creation. "And God divided the light from the darkness." Light and darkness never were united and hence they could not be divided. It is just as inconceivable to think of fire and water uniting as it is to think of a union of light and darkness. And God said let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament. And he called the firmament Heaven." This firmament was the strong floor of heaven where the Elohim dwelt, and it corresponded somewhat with Greek Olympus where the deities domesticated.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

Hull's Crucible.

MOSES HULL,
MATTIE SAWYER, } Conductors.
D. W. HULL.

Boston, Saturday, July 7, 1877.

Hull's Crucible is Independent and Progressive, devoted to the interests of no sect or party. Its editors solicit short, pithy articles on any subject germane to the interests of humanity. Lengthy articles will only be inserted when of great interest, or when not crowding too much on other matter. No well-written article will be rejected on account of its sentiments. The *CRUCIBLE* has no room for offensive personalities. Anonymous articles will not be published unless, as a guarantee of good faith, the author's real name is made known to the editors. Rejected articles will be returned only at the request and expense of those who write them.

A NEW VOLUME.

This week HULL'S CRUCIBLE enters upon the seventh decade of its existence. It has not done as much during its past six volumes as its conductors wished, but it has done so much that it feels, to use the language of a minister mentioned by Rev. Thomas Scott. After preaching twenty years, he was advised to turn his attention to some other business, inasmuch as, for his entire twenty year's only one genuine convert could be found. The minister responded—"Is it so? and has one been converted under my labors? then here goes for twenty years more."

Has the CRUCIBLE made one convert? has it opened one pair of eyes? has it enlightened one mind? has it carried consolation to one poor soul? has it cheered or encouraged one on life's journey, so that he or she has been able to take reform's burdens with a lighter heart? then here goes for one more volume.

In some respects we enter the present volume with more courage than we have ever had in our life before. The clouds have lifted, and even if they had not, our long experience in our work has proved our friends—our angel-friends and our earth-friends. In our darkest hours angels have seemed the nearest, and when we have most needed them our earth friends have proved the most true.

We have no complaints to bring: with gratitude in our hearts we can truly say, the prospects of the CRUCIBLE were never so good as to-day. We have no idea of the present volume paying its expenses, but it is steadily approaching it. Our corps of workers, in and out of the office, are true and loyal; every one of them can be trusted. For our own part, we shall, as in the past, try to make our "trumpet give a certain sound." The CRUCIBLE has not, as yet, been our ideal paper, but we hope for more time "in the sweet by and by" to make it the paper we have in our mind. With five hundred more subscribers, our hands would be loosed so that we could devote our time wholly to speaking and making the paper what it should be. Will our friends work to bring about this much desired end? We will wait and see.

M. H.

DID GOD DO IT?

Now Moses, that is too thin! Don't pretend that God separated you and Elvira, after permitting you to live together long enough to raise your children, two of them to womanhood. Why not tell the fact, Moses? Your wife has "borne the heat and burden of the day," faded somewhat, perhaps, so you thought some younger woman would be better than your wife.

Tell the facts, Moses, and don't lay it to

God, he has enough to bear.

Why was it that God did not find out that great mistake about your wife and yourself and put you assunder before he did? I am credibly informed that your children are fine specimens of the race. Now if there had been so great difference between you and your wife, (so very inharmonious) how did that happen?

I take your paper and like it well, but do not endorse all you do or say.

"What a tangled web we weave,
When first we begin to deceive!"

Truly yours,

O. S. LONT, M. D.
Mazepa, Minn., June 23, 1877.

REPLY.

The above, when properly boiled down and separated, means this:

1. Did God separate us?
2. Our wife "bore the burden and heat of the day," and had a hard time generally, until she got old and faded, then we turned her off for a younger woman.
3. We have not told the facts in the case.
4. Why did not God find out sooner that we were not properly mated?
5. If our statement is true, why did we have such fine children?
6. Our sayings and doings are not endorsed.

These six propositions we will try to answer in their regular order.

1. Yes, we said God separated us from our legal wife. This is as true as that God does anything. We know or believe very little about the gods. We were accused of permitting man to separate those whom God joined together. We knew that every act of joining Miss Elvira Lightner and ourself in wedlock was done by man, therefore it was out of place to say that God did it, but as we were not separated by man—as man's law has not acknowledged our divorce, and the gods and devils are generally accused of doing that which man does not do, we thought it proper to say God separated us. Of one thing we are sure, the invisible powers, call them gods, angels, fates, or powers, inhering in ourselves, separated us. Our spirits, tastes and appetites never were married; now we are personally thrown apart, and though we are warm personal friends, we are neither of us sorry that our life lines run in different channels.

2. Yes, Elvira was faithful, always did the best she could; she bore "burdens" and "heat," and she "faded," but not so much as nine out of ten of the women fade. She was getting old it is true, (almost thirty-five)—we were *not* old, we were only *thirty-nine*, and much more faded than she. We could today pass Elvira on at the writer of the remarks to which we are replying, as a girl of not more than than twenty years. We traded her for one that was not "faded," a younger woman. Well, the one sent to us was seventeen or eighteen months younger—was sick; had not seen a well day for years; was "faded" until she looked more like a dead than a living person. Earthly prospects, so far as having a stout, robust burden-bearer, were against us. There is one thought more, a little unfortunate for our brother's theory, that is, we never left Elvira, we were not large enough—strong enough to do that. She did what few women have the courage or common sense to do—she left us, and become the conjugal partner of a better man. As for our turning her off when she become old and faded,

she has told the story better than we can. Here it is, taken from her *Massabesic* discourse, published in HULL'S CRUCIBLE, vol. iii. No. 16.:

"We [the family] have not found that Moses has deserted us. Moses did not separate himself from me. I claim all the honor, it honor it be, of the step that finally separated us sexually. We both believed that sexual communion where there is not mutual desire and satisfaction is adultery—yes, *prostitution*. I do not desire to be a prostitute. I *will not*, if I know it, prostitute myself, either sexually, socially, financially, or in any other way. Consequently I said to Moses, we must be consistent, we profess to despise prostitution, yet we are living in it every time we are together. We must stop it, or cease preaching. Moses was grieved that the time had come. It was I who was inexorable. The time had come when the move must be made or we would stand before the world branded—truthfully branded as hypocrites. It was for me to take the step. I assure you I did not do it rashly or thoughtlessly, on the contrary it cost me a struggle, such as I hope may never fall to my lot in the future."

Here, as our paper is full, we must leave the matter, promising to resume it next week.

M. H.

WAYSIDE PENCILLINGS.

To-day is the Fourth of July. Our people continue to celebrate the anniversary with the brandishment of fire-arms, rigging out in fancy or "Horrible" costumes, display of bunting, marching around in the dust, and making the day hideous generally. This etic of barbarism somehow seems necessary, yet we are acknowledged to be a civilized and progressive people and have passed the middle of the nineteenth century.

To me there is always a ludicrous and melancholy side to a Fourth of July Celebration. To stand and "see the multitudes go by," enveloped in clouds of dust—poor cripples, old and young, fat and lean, some evidently from a distance as their "Sunday clothes" bear dusty witness, pedlers of every description, gingerbread and pop corn hawkers, all pulling on like "pilgrims to the Holy Land" as if the success of the occasion depended upon their immediate presence.

I remember the last celebration I attended; the collation was the chief feature of the occasion, It was soon after the "boys in blue" had returned; the town wanted to do something for them and what grander demonstrations could be tendered than to prepare a "feast of fat things" and invite them to partake. Accordingly funds are raised, edibles imported from the city, tables spread, soldiers were invited their wives mothers and sweethearts, and the "relicts" of "the brave boys who fell" I thought the boys paid dearly for their dinner: they were marched about the town, compelled to stand in the hot sun and listen to patriotic speeches by men who were too cowardly to fight during the war; were told all they had suffered—probably that was to refresh their memory—and finally at a late hour were marched into a hall that was decorated with savage looking instruments, tattered banners and national mottoes. The soldiers were here joined by their friends and of course were in good condition for dinner. But the crowd was called to order, and were not permitted to touch as much as a glass of water until some one had made a prayer. The chaplain had disappointed them by his absence, and now a substitute must be obtained, for it would not be in keeping with the rules and

regulations of a well ordered company to serve dinner without telling God about and asking him to bless the roasted pigs and multitudinous viands. The officers tried to look serious, but to some of us it seemed more of a joke than anything else. Hundreds of tired, hungry, thirsty, persons compelled to wait for somebody to tell God something he ought to have known before.

The services of a clergyman were at last secured; after his speech, dinner was served. Then followed a prayer of thanksgiving; the amen was scarcely spoken before the Col. ordered his regiment "to arms," and in a few moments, the music of pedlers, snapping of fire-crackers, and oaths of drunken men formed a curious melange on the street. And this was the best testimonial the citizens could tender the returned soldiers! At this moment, a poor organ-grinder stands under my window. He is clad in pants and blouse of blue. He has but one arm; probably the other is mouldering somewhere in Southern soil; he has an honest looking face. He has suffered. If his subsistence depends upon the few pennies that he catches as he passes, God only knows how he lives; and there are hundreds in the same condition within the circuit of this city. What are the "Home Guards" doing for those to whom they promised so much?

Bells are ringing, cannons booming, the National Ensign floats from the State House; for what? To-day we are celebrating the anniversary of our Independence; what a farce! Who and where are the free and independent ones? Turn which way we will, slavery and its direful results meet us on every hand. One of the fiercest battles ever waged in this country is engaging the people to-day. They are *Battling for Bread*. Think of it! In this "cradle of Liberty"—in this boasted land of freedom and plenty. Will another anniversary bring relief to the struggling waiting ones? We shall see.

Our last Sunday's meeting at Laurel Grove, came near being a total failure. The rain in the morning kept the people at home. It cleared away early in the afternoon and a few ventured out to hear the gospel. Toward night it threatened rain, and nearly all of the visitors to the grove returned home. The evening boat brought a few from Lawrence so we decided to hold a meeting. We were compelled after singing the opening piece to adjourn to the dining hall. Moses talked for about half an hour but the wind and rain made more noise than he could so we were compelled to dismiss the meeting. The steamboat was waiting, and in the midst of a terrific thunder shower we started up the river for Lawrence. We landed safely and were soon enjoying the hospitalities of Bro. Alvah Webster's pleasant home. Moses has promised to make another effort and will hold meetings in Laurel grove next Saturday evening; by request will lecture on the Cause and Cure of Panics. He will also hold meetings in the grove all day Sunday and in the evening. Au Revoir.

MATTIE.

VICARIOUS ATONEMENT: Three Lectures by Joseph Cook, Reviewed.

BY D. W. HULL.

Lecture II.

REVIEW OF COOK CONTINUED.

Mr. Cook next says:

"8. A perfect religion will harmonize us with our environment.

"9. But our environment, here and hereafter, convicts unalterably of God, conscience and our record of sin.

"10. In the nature of things we cannot be harmonized with that environment, unless religion provides for us both pardon and holiness.

"11. A perfect God, who wills man's perfection, will teach man the methods of harmonizing himself with his environment."

His ninth proposition might be a matter of dispute. If "our environment convicts unalterably of God," no individual could have any doubt of His existence; but whatever deference they may pay to conscience, there are many who doubt the existence of such a being, and there is now extant a society that is trying to alter the constitution of the United States so as to force those who doubt his existence to change their views upon the subject. But he continues:

"12. After 6000 years experience, man's philosophical and moral restlessness proves that, without violence to self-evident truth, he has found no way of harmonizing himself by his own excellence, or solely by his own good works, with his entire environment, including conscience, God and a record of deliberate sin in an irreversible past."

On this I have just been writing. Man's past record is "irreversible," and can't be changed. How then is the atonement to affect or change his case? Mr. Cook anticipates this objection in the following:

"Some men ask how, if the past is irreversible, we can be happy even in heaven? Was the past of the prodigal who returned to his father's house, not irreversible? Forever and forever it could not be changed. But was he happy after his return? Assuredly. Is the house not made with hands so very different from the present dwelling-place of men that we cannot reason from the experience of a prodigal here to experience there? Moral as well as physical law has unity and universality. In some respects a prodigal's record enhances his bliss on his return; in other respects it diminishes bliss, as it must always be remembered with regret."

"Our environment," then, in heaven, will "convict unalterably of conscience and our record of sin," and I am unable to see in what way the atonement will change his conditions. It should be remembered that in the previous lecture, Mr. Cook took occasion to differ from Mr. Moody and denied that heaven was a locality. How it is that "the prodigal's record enhances his bliss," I cannot comprehend, unless it is through the doctrine of progression—profiting in the future by the mistakes of the past.

He has all along been discussing the need of a perfect religion. Now he comes more directly to what a perfect religion is. He says:

"15. So far forth as any religion provides for man's holiness and pardon, it has the marks of being a perfect religion."

As I have just been denying the power of any religion to furnish holiness and happiness, we pass to the next propositions:

"16. Alone among all religions yet known to men, Christianity, without coming into conflict with self-evident truth, provides both for man's holiness and his pardon.

"17. Alone among all religions known to men, Christianity, therefore, has the marks of being a perfect religion, for it and it only provides for both man's holiness and his pardon.

"18. It does the latter by the revealed truths of the incarnation and the atonement.

"19. So far forth as Christianity could not, in the nature of things, provide for man's blessedness and perfection, or his holiness and pardon, without the incarnation and the atonement, so far forth the incarnation and atonement had an eternal and abid-

ing necessity in the wise and free love of God, since this love wills the perfection of man who cannot be perfect without a perfect religion, and cannot attain blessedness without both holiness and pardon.

"20. So far forth as this necessity inheres in the nature of things, the divine idea relative to the completion of the world, first arrives at perfection, or at realization, through the incarnation and the atonement.

"21. The religion of Christ, including the truths of the incarnation and the atonement, is the only religion that, without violence to self-evident truth, brings man to peace with his entire environment.

"22. It is therefore a perfect or absolute religion."

Mr. Cook mistakes when he claims that Christianity is the only religion which professes to "furnish holiness and pardon." The doctrine of vicarious suffering was preached long before the Christian era, by various heathen nations, and there is yet so little difference between Christianity and the Hindoo religion that, if we may believe Sir Wm. Jones, missionaries are much embarrassed, and labor hard to show that there is a distinction. They have their trinity, divine incarnation and vicarious sufferings, the same as Christians, and the difference between them and Christians is very little greater than the difference between the various sects.

In these propositions, Mr. Cook makes the atonement indispensably necessary. This he has labored to do all through his lectures. Now let us assume that in this respect he is right. The atonement being made for Adam's transgression, could reach no farther than the children of Adam. As the children of Adam are all confined to this earth, it has no effect upon the inhabitants of other worlds. This takes all the force out of Mr. Cook's argument, for he based it upon the assumption that God wills man's perfection. If he is able to accomplish his will, man will be made perfect; this Mr. Cook admits will not be done. What shall we say then when we learn that he utterly ignored all the inhabitants of all other planets, and exhausted his scheme of salvation upon ours? He either does not will their perfection, or he has made a mistake in coming to the most unimportant part of the universe and save only a handful of men, on one of the smallest planets.

I suppose if this argument were pressed we should be told that no other planet needs salvation, as we do that none have sinned. If they have not sinned, God has made either:

1. Better able to bear temptation; or
2. He has not suffered them to be tempted; or
3. He has protected them in the hour of need.

If God protects the inhabitants of other planets, and does not our own, he is partial.

If he could not protect us, his greatness is limited.

If he could protect us, but allowed us to be led astray, that he might exercise his might, he was trifling with us.

The next two propositions are as follows:

"23. But there cannot be two perfect or absolute religions, or one with Christ and one without Christ.

"24. The religion of Christ, including the truths of the incarnation and the atonement, is therefore the only absolute religion."

The first proposition is true; but as a religion with an atonement-attachment is as

powerless to replace the old conditions as one without it, and as unnecessary as it is monstrous. There is no evidence of incarnation and no possibility of atonement, therefore the doctrine is false.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

Turkish Rules Of Conversation.

Conversation in Europe has been described as a duetto in an opera, which the two persons engaged in are talking to the imaginary third person, each recounting a tale of his own. "I say something and you say something else, and we will agree to call it a conversation." Now in Turkey there are certain forms or canons of conversation, any violation of which is considered an outrage, and the sum of which constitutes their code of politeness as applied to conversation. I will enumerate these, one by one:

1. Never to interrupt a speaker while he is talking. However long-winded or uninteresting his conversation may be to you, politeness requires that you should wait for his conclusion. You are not under any obligation to enter into any conversation with him at all; but if you do, it is understood condition of your conversational treaty that you should let him have his say.

2. Never to diverge, in the middle of a conversation from the main thread of discourse into a collateral issue. The breach of this rule is considered by a Turk as an unpardonable rudeness. To drive a red herring, as it were, across the scent of conversation, is, in his opinion, to confound all thought and render all profitable consecutive conversation impossible. This leads, as a corollary, to

3. To allow a short but sufficient pause between the conclusion or a discussion on one subject and the entering on a new subject.

4. Never tell a person a thing he knows already.

5. Not to excuse oneself when convicted of being in the wrong. How very seldom you hear in Europe, "Yes, I was in the wrong. I am sorry for it." But in Turkey it is considered a violation of principle and breach of politeness to refuse to be convicted of an error. The cause of this difference lies deep in the character of the two races; in the absence on the part of the Turk of petty vanity and distracting self esteem. The proudest race in the world, they are entirely exempted from vanity.

6. When you have nothing to say to hold your tongue. They never talk for the sake of talking. Empty, idle jabbering is a Frank but not an Ottoman practice. In Europe it is considered *de rigueur* to "say something," whether that something is worth saying or not. Not so in Turkey; to say something when you have nothing to say worth saying is considered there a degradation to yourself and a rudeness to your neighbor.

Hayes Reception in Boston.

THE President of the United States entered Boston on Thursday with great ceremony. The procession was imposing and the displays of bunting profuse. One noteworthy fact about the thing, however, was; that it was nearly all paid for out of the public purse. The procession was entirely of a military character and every one who marched in it received his *per diem*, as the Adjutant General was very careful to previously announce. Not an organization of any kind voluntarily offered to escort the chief magistrate of the nation. The carriages were all hired, the civilians who rode in them were all under pay. PAID, PAID, PAID, was indelibly stamped on the countenances of every mourner, and obtruded itself upon the eye of every gazer at the flags and pictures hung along the streets. The march of the cortege commenced at the outskirts of the city where the President stepped down from a crowd of railway officials who had accompanied him to Boston. An express train whizzed along by the station a short time before that which bore Mr. Hayes appeared, and the Battery of Artillery stationed in a field near by, anxious to get at the dollars in

prospective, banged away their noisy welcome. Great consternation was exhibited among the Governor's lackeys who were in attendance and haste was made to quell the importune salute. The question has since arisen whether the battery should be paid for firing two salutes or only one. The crowd in waiting at the railroad station was turbulent and ugly, and the fat policemen used their clubs without mercy. Amid the booms of the cannon, the yells of the crowd, the dull thuds of the policemen's clubs, the chief magistrate was welcomed to the official part of Massachusetts. The procession wended its lugubrious way through the city by the aristocratic street called Columbus avenue, avoiding Washington street, the principal and most direct thoroughfare, upon which only boarding-houses and shops were located, and finally brought up at the hotel where the President was to stop. A round of gay festivities has marked his stay, relieved by a solemn reception at Faneuil Hall from which Mr. Hayes hurriedly tore himself away to wash his hands.

The officials of the State and city have provided everything that the public money could buy, to make the visit of the President agreeable to him and his companions as well as impressive upon the multitude at large. We presume the chief magistrate will depart from this locality with a deep consciousness of the loyalty to his interests of the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.—*The Echo.*

Giving Away Silver.

One of the most infamous frauds forced upon the people was the bill authorizing the purchase of silver to redeem the fractional currency. As the bill first passed, it authorized the purchase of silver to exchange dollar for the currency. Silver was purchased and coined, and after millions of it had accumulated so that they were crowded for storage room, they began the exchange. Before ten days had elapsed there came a thundering cry from different parts of the country about the scarcity of small change. The fractional currency was hoarded up for exchange for silver, and as soon as the silver was obtained it was hoarded too, so that between the two there was a great lack of small change, and the retail business was greatly embarrassed. Both silver and currency went up to eight per cent in Wall street. Congress, then in session, was importuned to pay out silver for greenbacks. The hard-money members saw what a fix they were getting the country into, and rushed a bill through authorizing the purchase of 50 millions of silver, and to pay it out in exchange for greenbacks, and assign those thus received to the sinking-fund, and a sinking fund it is. It is simply taxing the people with bonds to purchase silver, and then giving away the silver to foreigners. It is being brought up and shipped to South America, China, India, and to other countries to pay for merchants, goods. Congress has, by legislation, destroyed the margin between silver and greenbacks, and by coining it, are putting it in a convenient abode to ship out of the country. The 50 millions of silver now purchased will not redeem ten millions of fractional currency.

The next Congress will probably order the purchase of 50 millions more. The people might just as well, so far as their benefit is concerned, purchase the silver and throw it in the ocean. So soon as the Government ceases to purchase silver to coin, then comes the scarcity for small change. It has never before been the function of the Government to supply the people with metal with which the currency of the country was coined, but simply coin the specie when brought to it for that purpose. It now proposes to buy all that is required for money purposes. This might be a good speculation for the people if they did not have to foot the bills, by being taxed the principle and interest of bonds, by means of which silver is bought. This policy, if pursued, will lead to bankruptcy and repudiation.

THE UNIVERSAL REFORM Association CAMP-MEETING

The above named Association of SPIRITUALISTS and REFORMERS will hold a *CAMP-MEETING*

AT

Shawsheen River Grove.

Commencing August 1st, 1877. and Continuing
Twenty-three Days.

This Grove is located on the Boston & Maine R. R.,
20 miles from Boston. It is bounded on one side by

SHAWSHEEN RIVER

which affords fine facilities for boating and fishing

The services of many of the ablest speakers among
Radicals and Conservatives have been secured.

Arrangements have been made with A FIRST CLASS CATERER, to
furnish meals on the European plan, at the lowest Restaurant prices.

Tents or Lodgings can be had on the Ground very cheap, the highest
prices for the Largest and Best Tents being only *nine dollars*, from that
the prices are graded down to *three dollars and seventy-five cents*.

Good, comfortable beds and bed-rooms can be had within one-fourth of
a mile from the Camp Ground for *one dollar and fifty cents* per week.

The Ground will be fully supplied with Stores, Restaurants, Laundries,
Barber Shops, Carpenters and EVERY THING that can make Camp-
Life pleasant.

Trains on the Boston and Maine Railroad stop on the Ground almost
every hour. Fare Reduced almost one half from the Regular Price.

The Public Meetings will be held in a Comodious and well-seated
PAVILION.

The DANCE HALL is one of the best in the State.

The Platform is ABSOLUTELY EREE for the discussion of every
side of every Question.

The National Band,

Under the Direction of

Prof. E. W. Masters,

176 Tremont St., Boston,

will be on the ground during the entire meeting.

For Further Information Address Dr. C. C.
YORK 31 Chapman St., Boston, or MOSES
HULL & Co., 18 Eliot St., Boston.

MORAL PHYSIOLOGY.

A TREATISE ON POPULATION,

BY ROBERT DALE OWEN.

This work is one of the first importance, not only as a re-
ply to Malthus, but also as supplying to every father and moth-
er of a family, the knowledge by which without injury of
health or violence to the moral feeling, any further increase
which is not desired may be prevented, more especially where
the health of the mother, or the diminished income of the a-
ther, imperatively advises no further addition to the number
of offspring. This is illustrated with a frontispiece. Price
including postage, 68 cents. For sale by MOSES HULL & Co

Physio-Eclectic Medical College.

The Physio-Eclectic Medical College is progressive, and has
for its foundation, scientific facts that are discovered in the
laws of nature. It embraces the very essence of all that has
been found to be good, in every system of Medicine in the
world.

We will give our graduates positive cures for Carcinoma
or Cancer, Hemorrhoids or Piles, Catarrh, Fits of all kinds,
Chorea or St. Vitus' Dance. We have sold to a few other
physicians the method of cure for Hemorrhoids alone for from
\$100 to \$500. These remedies we give to our students who
graduate.

For a course of lectures and diplomas
with all the specifics \$100.00.
For examination and diploma to those who have
practiced medicine, without specifics \$25.00.

Address,
Prof. W. NICELY, M. D.,
370 Baymiller Street, Cincinnati, O

STATE OF OHIO, } SS.
HAMILTON COUNTY. }

THIS IS TO CERTIFY, That the Physio-Eclectic Medica
College of Ohio is duly incorporated under the Laws of the
State of Ohio, located at Cincinnati, Hamilton Co., Ohio, that
I prepared their Certificate for Charter for the same, that the
same is recorded in Record Book No. 4, page 195, Hamilton
County Records.
D. HUMPHREYS,
Notary Public, Hamilton Co., O.

Cincinnati, Feb. 9, 1876.

[SEAL.]

HISTORIC ART.

THE DAWNING LIGHT.

This beautiful and impressive picture represent-
ing the

Birth Place of Modern Spiritualism,

was carefully and correctly drawn and painted by
our eminent American Artist, JOSEPH JOHN.

The price, which heretofore has been \$2 is now
reduced to \$1

THE PACIFIC LIBERAL

Is the only journal on the Pacific coast devoted to Fre
Thought, Radical Reform, and the Secularization of the State
As its name indicates, it is Liberal, its columns being open to
—Protestant and Catholic, Spiritist and Materialist, Theist
and Atheist, Christian and Pagan, Jew and Mohammedan
follower of Buddha, Zoroaster, Jesus, Confucius, or anybody
else. Its editor does not hold himself responsible for the
opinions expressed by others through its columns, nor does
he wish to do other people's thinking for them; he only fur-
nishes this medium, through which men and women of brains
can reason together, that the truth may prevail and men's
minds and bodies be relieved from the curse of religious su-
perstition and nonsense.

Terms—One dollar for Twelve Numbers. Ten cents a
number. Send for Specimen copy. Address all communica-
tions to
A. J. BOYER,
113 Leidsdorf St., San Francisco, Cal.

THE WORD.

A Monthly Journal of Reform;

E. H. HEYWOOD, Editor.

The "Word," regarding the subjection of Labor, of Wo-
man, and the prevalence of War as unnatural evils, induced
by false claims to obedience and service, favors the abolition
of the State, of Property in Land and its kindred resources.
of Speculative Income, and all other means whereby Intru-
sion acquires wealth and power at the expense of useful peo-
ple. It seeks the extinction of interest, rent, dividends, and
profit, except as they represent work done, and the repudi-
ation of all so-called debts, the principal whereof has been
paid in the form of interest.

Terms, 75 cents annually, in advance. Address
THE WORD, Princeton, Mass

Republic of Industry.

SADA BAILEY will answer calls to lecture on Co-operative
Industry and reforms—will give all necessary information
in regard to the above movement, and solicit members for the
same. Friends desiring her services can address her at
Vineland, N. J. Other competent Lecturers in the field will
also work for the above enterprise.

THE COMMUNIST

IS devoted to Common Property, United Labor, Mutual Sup-
port, Equal Rights to All—Liberal Communism. Issued
monthly by the *Friendship Community*. Fifty cents a
year. specimen copies sent free.

Address ALCANDER LONGLEY,
Buffalo, Dallas Co., Mo.

THE TRUTH-SEEKER,

Devoted to Science, Morals, Free Thought, and Hu-
man Happiness

Published weekly by D. M. Bennett, 141 Eighth
Street, New York. Terms \$2 per year.

Liberals, Infidels, Materialists, Spiritualists and all others
demons of promoting LIBERALISM, in America, should
subscribe for the "Truth Seeker" at once.

TEXAS COMMON SENSE. A large sixteen
page semi-monthly Journal. Devoted to the RISE OF
REASON AND THE DOWNFALL OF FAITH. Motto—
"ONE WORLD AT A TIME." "The Prophet is a fool, the Spir-
itual man is mad.—HOSKIA ix: 7. A good newspaper as well,
and contains much information about Texas. Now in its
fourth volume. \$1.50 per annum. Specimen copies five
cents.

Address R. PETERSON,
Proprietor,
Paris, Texas.

SEXUAL PHYSIOLOGY.

A Scientific and Popular Exposi-

tion of the Fundamental Prob-

lems in Sociology. By R. T.

Trall, M. D.

The great interest now being felt in all subjects relating to
human development, will make this book valuable to every
one. Besides the information obtained by its perusal, the
bearing of the various subjects treated, in improving and
giving direction and value to human life cannot be over-esti-
mated. This work contains the most important discoveries in
the Anatomy and Physiology of both sexes: explains the origi-
n of Human Life; how and when Menstruation, Impregna-
tion and Conception occur; giving the laws by which the
number and sex of offspring is controlled, and valuable infor-
mation in regard to the begetting and rearing of children.
This work contains eighty fine engravings, and is written in
the same tone and spirit as the other works by this same au-
thor. It is the best work ever written on the subject.
For sale by MOSES HULL & Co. Price, \$2.00.

E. H. HEYWOOD'S BOOKS.

LABOR REFORM. FREE LOVE.

ANTI-TAXATION.

Yours or Mine: Explaining the True Basis
of Property and the Causes of its Inequitable
Distribution. Thirtieth Thousand. Price 15
cents.

Cupid's Yokes: On the Moral and Physio-
logical Aspects of Conjugal Life and Child Pro-
duction, explaining the Principles and Purposes
of the Free Love Movement. Tenth thousand.
Price 15 cents.

Hard Cash: Treats of the Greenback De-
lusion and demands the Abolition of Usury as
the Right of Labor and the Duty of Capital.
Twentieth Thousand Price 15 cents.

Uncivil Liberty; or, the Social Heism op-
posed to Woman Suffrage, the Political Usurpa-
tion of Men over Women. Seventieth Thousand
Price 15 cents

CRUCIBLE JOB PRINTING OFFICE.

In connection with the CRUCIBLE we have a
good

Book and Job Printing Office,

And are prepared to do various kinds of Job
Printing, such as

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS,

LETTER-HEADS,

BILL-HEADS,

CARDS and

CIRCULARS

At the Lowest Prices.

Address cards, 60 cts. per hundred; Business
cards, \$2.50 per one thousand.

Jobs at a distance promptly sent by mail
or express.

HULL'S CRUCIBLE.

A Wide-Awake, Spiritualistic, So- cial, Financial and Labor- Reform Journal.

Prominent among the reforms advocated in
HULL'S CRUCIBLE are the following:

1. Reforms in Religion.--Such as shall
do away with many of the outward forms and re-
store the power of godliness.

2. Reforms in the Government.--
Such as shall do away with Rings, Cliques and Mo-
nopolies, and put all matters concerning the Govern-
ment of the people into the hands of the people.

3. Reforms Regulating the Rela-
tions of Capital and Labor.--Such as
shall secure to Labor the producer of Capital, the
control of Capital.

4. Reforms Regulating the Rela-
tions of the Sexes to Each Other.--
Such as shall secure to every member of each sex
the entire control of his or her own person, and place
Prostitution, in or out of Marriage, for money, or
any other cause, out of the question.

HULL'S CRUCIBLE joins hands with all Reforms
and Reformers of whatever School, and welcomes
any ideas, however unpopular, calculated to benefit
humanity.

Any thought, the carrying out of which relieves
the oppressed, whether coming under any of the
above, or any other propositions, will find a cordial
welcome in the columns of HULL'S CRUCIBLE.

Those interested in a live Reformatory Journal
are invited to hand in their subscriptions.

TERMS:

One Subscription, one year, \$2.00
" " six months, 1.00
" " three months,50

Address MOSES HULL & CO.,
18 ELIOT ST., BOSTON

Hull's Crucible.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY

18 ELIOT STREET, BOSTON.

TERMS: ONE YEAR \$2.00, SIX MONTHS 1.00, THREE MONTHS .50, SINGLE NUMBER .05

Correspondence, Money and Articles for the CRUCIBLE should be addressed

MOSES HULL & CO., 18 ELIOT STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

Editorial Brevities.

We hold meetings in Laurel Grove on the Merimac River again next Sunday.

Just step into the office of HULL'S CRUCIBLE and see our neat little book store.

There will be a first class Laundry at the Universal Reform Campmeeting at Shawsheen River Grove.

Over one hundred persons can obtain good and cheap lodgings in comfortable houses during our campmeeting within one quarter of a mile of the camp ground.

We now think we will be compelled, during the Campmeeting to go to press each week on a half sheet; if such is the case, we shall issue extra pages enough after the Campmeeting to make it up.

Just now there is a heavy pressure of matter on our columns. We will make room for it as fast as possible. We hope to be able for a time at least, to keep our own pencil in closer quarters.

We are fitting a very nice book store in the office of the CRUCIBLE and, in addition to keeping all manner of reformatory books at publisher's prices, we shall keep pencils, pens, writing paper, envelopes, etc., for sale. Drop in and see us.

F. BURLINGHAM, writes from Washington D. C. The privilege of partaking of so rare a dish as that now being furnished by HULL'S CRUCIBLE, and cooked by Stephen Pearl Andrews, twenty-five years ago is worthy of an universal expression of gratitude from the undesigned and is hereby sincerely tendered.

CHARLES BRADLAUGH, and Miss Amie Bessant, have been fined \$200 each and sentenced to six months' imprisonment and bond over for "Good behavior," for two years, for publishing and selling the truth to the people. Their crime was telling truths which the courts thought the doctors alone should tell.

Two men and one woman stopped the CRUCIBLE last week, because D. W. H., would persist in having his own say, in his own way. This is too bad, but worse is to come. These parties know of somebody else who has threatened to "drop" the CRUCIBLE unless he either ceases to write or tones his articles down. Well rather than loose another subscriber and bust up, we have appointed our senior devil as an especial committee to visit D. W. H., and request him to do as he pleases about writing more. Right here we will inform our readers that no one ever ceased taking the CRUCIBLE without a reason, and the reasons are generally about as good as the one given above. We have no doubt our subscription list could be greatly increased by getting D. L. Moody, Joseph Cook, or H. W. Beecher, to edit it but the CRUCIBLE lives to publish truths that some people can't enure.

Our Literary Record.

REDEEMED. By O. Gerard. This is the title of the most successful temperance song published. It is now being sung nightly at the temperance meetings held in Cincinnati. Everybody should sing Redeemed. Price 35 cents per copy. Can be played on the Piano or Organ. Address all orders to the publisher, F. W. HELMICK, 50 West 4th, St., Cincinnati, Ohio.

THE SPIRITUAL OFFERING: A Monthly Magazine devoted to the interests of humanity. Nettie Pease Fox, editor, 3600 North Ninth street, St. Louis, Mo. \$1.25 per annum; 75 cents, six months; five copies, one year, \$5; single copy, 15 cts., Postage paid.

Contents for July number: After all, is there any such thing as Matter? Materialization and its various phases; The Eclipse, Sights and Shadows of Life; Footprints of Progress; The Closed Door (poem); Spiritualism vs. Materialism; The Blood of the Son hath made me clean; W. F. Jamieson—note of his work; The Phantom form, chapter III.; Organization, is it necessary? Answer; Whence the origin of Evil? Answer; Inspirational Poem; The Spiritual Offering for July; The Spiritual Offering free; The Truth Seeker, Collection of forms, hymns, etc.; Special Notice; After all, is there any such thing as Matter?—Editorial Note; The only Objection; Correspondence; To Correspondence.

The July number of the MAGAZINE OF AMERICAN HISTORY (A. S. Barnes & Co.) is now ready. The leading article is a careful and exhaustive sketch of "Our National Flag—its History in a Century," by Major-General Schuyler Hamilton, the first historian of the American Flag. In it will be found not only an account of the origin of the form, colors and arrangement of the national banner, and the various mottoes and devices which it had borne until it assumed its present permanent shape, changed only by succeeding stars as each new State entered the bright constellation of the Union, but sketches of the various incidents in national progress, military and civil, and of the many victories by sea and land which have been won under its folds. The biographical sketch of William Floyd New York delegate in the Continental Congress, from the pen of Frederic de Peyster, LL. D., the President of the New York Historical Society, is one of the short memoirs prepared for the Congress of Authors, which met at Philadelphia in July of last year.

The department of original documents gives the conclusion of the Beatty diary, which presents some curious details of the manners of the early Western settlers, as shown at a great Barbecue which Major Beatty attended at Louisville, with reminiscences of General Wilkinson, Colonel Crockett and Colonel Boone; and the initial part of an unpublished Diary of Governor Samuel Ward, delegate from Rhode Island in the Continental Congress, 1774—1776, a valuable contribution, in its precise detail, to the history of our early statesmen.

Among the reprints there are, Quinibeg, a chapter from Champlain's Voyages, translated for the Magazine as a pendant to the article on Norumbega which appeared in a previous number, in which the reader will hardly recognize the modern Kennebec, and a quaint description of New England in 1700 from a rare map of Commerce.

The Notes, Queries and Replies are as usual, bright and attractive, and supply amusing material for summer reading.

The Literary Notices are prepared with unusual care, the editor paying conscientious attention to this branch of the periodical. The number closes with an Obituary Notice of the late John Lothrop Motley, in which the characteristics of this eminent historian are carefully and impartially analyzed.

In the August number, the editor will introduce a new feature in the first series of American historical and literary reminiscences, subsidiary to the biographical sketches.

The first will be "Keesiana" Recollections of John Keese, by Mr. Evert A. Duyckinck, whose name is pleasantly remembered by all cultivated readers as the Historian of American Literature.

Special Notices.

ILLUMINATED MOTTO.

Those who would keep before them a memorial of their duty to their Country, should ornament their homes with that splendidly designed Chromo 11 x 33 in., in gold and six beautiful colors, which has just been issued, and which contains a correct portrait of President Hayes, artistically portraying the magnificent words in his Inaugural Address: "He who best serves his Country, serves his party best." In the present Condition of public sentiment, when every one regardless of his political sympathy is eulogizing the policy of the President, this ILLUMINATED MOTTO has only to be seen to be appreciated and purchased.

An efficient Agent wanted in every town in the U. S. Send for a sample copy at once inclosing 50 cents, or \$1 for two, which will be forwarded, post paid by return mail. Address, Room 6, 18 Eliot St.

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

Executive Mansion, Washington Apr., 9. 1877. "I thank you for the Motto and Likeness, it is very beautifully done * * * Sincerely,

R. B. HAYES."

Senator Schurz writes: "I thank you sincerely for the beautiful Motto, you sent me. It is very pleasing." JOHN KINGSBOROUGH.

Cleveland Ohio.

A GROVE MEETING will be held by the Universalist, Unitarians, Spiritualists and Liberalists at Greenwood school-house in Kirklintownship, Clinton Co., Indiana commencing on the 3rd Sunday in July. Good speakers will be present,

Universal Reform Campmeeting. The Universal Reform Association will hold a Campmeeting in Shawsheen River Grove. Commencing on Wednesday, Aug. 1, and holding over three Sundays.

Arrangements have been made to carry passengers to and from the campmeeting over the Boston and Main R. R., at greatly reduced rates. Good speakers, both radical and conservative are being engaged and arrangements perfected for the most profitable meeting, to the participants, ever held in New England.

MOSES HULL, PRES. MATTIE SAWYER, SECR.

Dr. C. C. York, } Ex. Com. G. W. Keyes, }

A Cure for Hard Times.

The following is the way we are reported in Chase's Chronicle as having talked at the Greenback State Convention at Skowhegan Maine. "Moses Hull of Boston made sharp points and thrusts. He traced the cause of tramps to the treasury of the United States. The government exempted bonds from taxation and paid a higher rate of interest than money would earn if invested in business. Hence there were two millions of tramps in this country who do not know where to lay their heads to-night. Until money will pay as well invested in industrial enterprises as in bondholding and banking there will be no cure for tramps. Many of the tramps are honest, idle workmen who go away from home hunting for work. They soon get discouraged and roam the country like vagabonds, and their lives soon become a struggle for existence. It takes the manhood out of a man to beg his bread from door to door, and the temptation to commit crime is greater when he is half starved than when he is well fed. These tramps are practicing that economy that 'tis said is going to make all rich; they live without beds and are half starved, and yet don't seem to get rich very fast. If the two millions of tramps lived as decent men and women ought it would cost half a dollar a day apiece. Thus every tramp is saving by his economy 50 cents a day; two millions of tramps are saving \$1,000,000 a day—\$365,000,000 a year. What a vast sum is saved by the economy of tramps! If 40,000,000 of our people were tramps how rich we should be! This is the inevitable conclusion of the economy logic of the specie resumptionists. Now let the rag baby lisp a word. If the 2,000,000 tramps had work at \$1 per day they would buy \$2,000,000 worth of the products of labor every day, and in less than a year would knock in the head the bugbear of overproduction. It may be extravagant for tramps to live in houses instead of holes in the ground. If all the people in the coun-

try lived in houses the piles of boards that are piled up around the mills from Skowhegan to Bath would find a market quicker than lightning. Perhaps it may be wrong for the tramp to spend his dollar for food and shelter, but it is the dollar that is spent that will revive business, and it is the dollar that the tramp saves by living half starved in enforced idleness that has killed business. Give the 2,000,000 tramps work—a chance to do good, honest, productive work at fair wages—and they will solve the financial problem, not by hoarding and saving their money but by spending their money to supply their needed wants. The enforced economy that is now practiced not only by tramps but by the masses of the people makes matters worse every day. The way out is to increase the earnings of the people. That cannot be done until a man can make as much by paying fair wages for labor as he can by bondholding or by money-lending. Then there will be a demand for labor and not till then.

New Advertisements.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

Table with advertising rates: ONE COLUMN, ONE WEEK \$10.00; TWO WEEKS 17.00; ONE MONTH 25.00; THREE MONTHS 30.00; ONE YEAR 60.00; HALF COLUMN, ONE WEEK 6.00; TWO WEEKS 10.50; ONE MONTH 15.00; THREE MONTHS 20.00; ONE YEAR 50.00; QUARTER COLUMN, ONE WEEK 6.00; TWO WEEKS 3.50; ONE MONTH 9.00; THREE MONTHS 15.00; ONE YEAR 30.00; EIGHTH COLUMN, ONE WEEK 2.00; TWO WEEKS 3.50; ONE MONTH 5.00; THREE MONTHS 10.00; ONE YEAR 25.00; BUSINESS CARDS, ONE WEEK 75; AFTERWARDS, PER WEEK 25.

\$777 is not easily earned in these times, but it can be made in three months by any one of either sex, in any part of the country who is willing to work steadily at the employment that we furnish. \$50 per week in your own town. You need not be away from home over night. You can give your whole time to the work, or only your spare moments. We have agents who are making over \$20 per day. All who engage at once can make money fast. At the present time money cannot be made so easily and rapidly at any other business. It costs nothing to try the business. Terms and outfit free. Address at once, H. HALLETT & Co., Portland, Maine.

Republic of Industry.

As the signs of the times in the Political world indicate the approaching dissolution of the American Republic, a deep and earnest feeling is manifested in behalf of the new movement that is destined to supersede the old, and secure to the toiling millions all the blessings that result from a well devised Unitary effort. Persons ordering our illustrated pamphlet, giving full particulars, will please not forget to enclose 25 cents. Address as above Vineland, N. J.

DO YOUR OWN PRINTING FAVORITE Self-inking Press \$16 Presses from \$3 to \$125. Offer complete \$7. Send 6c for 75 page book of presses, type, cuts, etc., illustrated with instructions, worth \$1. GORHAM & CO. BOSTON, MASS.

SILVER PLATED LINEN Marker, with case of type, for marking Linen, Cards, Envelopes, etc. Put up and sent FREE by mail for \$1.10. GORHAM & CO. BOSTON, MASS. 200 Washington St.

THIS PAPER IS KEPT ON FILE AT THE OFFICE OF N. W. WYER & SON'S ADVERTISING AGENTS, 733 SANSON ST., PHILADELPHIA, Who are our authorized agents, and will receive Advertisements at our LOWEST CASH RATES.