RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

July 23---Eighth Sunday After Pentecost.

Schedule of Services To-Day—Important Religious Correspondence—General Religious Intelligence.

Services To-Day.

Mr. Thomas Gales Forster speaks before the Society of Spiritualists at Lyric Hall morning and evening.

Rev. Charles B. Smyth descants upon the riot at both services at the University before the American Free church.

At the Broadway Tabernacle Professor Seelye, of Amherst College, preaches at both services.

Rev. G. W. Lord will discourse at the Central Methodist Episcopal church morning and evening.

Rev. Dr. Wescott will deliver a sermon at the Plymouth Baptist church.

Rev. M. Richardson preaches at the New England Congregational church.

At the Church of Our Saviour a sermon will be preached by Rev. J. M. Pullman.

Services will be held, as usual, in St. Thomas' church.

Rev. Dr. Aikman will preach at the Spring street Presbyterian church.

Rev. Mr. Deming, of Boston, takes the pulpit at the Tabernacle Baptist church during the absence of the pastor.

Baptismal Regeneration.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

Noticing by the papers that the Bishop of Illinois is about to make a visitation to Mr. Cheney's church I would like to say the following on the subject of baptismal regeneration:—Every sincere member of the Episcopal Church must be at a loss to comprehend the reason of Mr. Cheney's refusing to recognize the doctrine of regeneration in baptism which is so plainly stated in the twenty-seventh article, and which is founded entirely upon the teaching of Scripture. Christ distinctly said:—"Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the Kingdom of God," and again, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." What more indubitable evidence can we have of the consistency of Church teaching with that of Scripture? Of course no one is absurd enough to believe that the application of water has in itself any efficacy in the washing away of sin; but every Christian must believe that this is the means appointed by God through which He imparts the grace of His Spirit to man. By this sacrament man is brought into a state of grace, and in subsequent sin he falls from grace; he does not sin because he has never received grace, but because he has not labored sufficiently to perfect and bring to maturity the seed which the Spirit has sown.

A denial of this doctrine savors too much of the rationalistic mind, which refuses to acknowledge what is not within the sphere of the human understanding. It is impossible for the wisdom of this world to find out God; for it is foolishness in His sight. There can be no faith evinced in accepting only what is logically clear to human comprehension.

It is much to be lamented that there exists in the Church that dangerous element which shows an insubordination to all authority, and a desire to infuse a dissenting spirit among the members of the Church. It is not a mere question of ritual that certain professed Christian clergymen are agitating, but they are aiming a blow at a doctrine which has been regarded as an article of faith by the Church for 1800 years. What can Mr. Cheney and his illustrious sympathizers mean by such recreant conduct? Are they aware of the vows taken by them at their ordination? Are they not traitors to the cause which they pretended to espouse? Do they not see that their actions are incompatible with their position as priests of the Church? If they can no longer fight under the banner of the faith to which they have sworn allegiance, let them depart from our midst, for "he who is not with Me is against Me." In times like the present, when materialism, pantheism, rationalism and all isms subversive of the faith are rife everywhere, we cannot cling too strongly to the doctrines of Christianity, and discountenance too severely all attempts of free thought to shake the foundations of religion. It is to be hoped that if Mr. Cheney does not return to the cause which he has forsaken that the Bishop will degrade him from the office of priest, and permit him no longer to engender strife in the Church.

E. H., New York.

The Relations of the Rev. Messrs. Tyng, Cheney and Others to the Episcopal Church.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

How can you, my dear sir, as faithful and just as you are to all parties of Church or State treat a subject as you do to-day that of the relations of Tyng, Cheney and other reverends to the Episcopal Church? The only answer I can give to this question is that you have not given it your usual thorough attention, and therefore not met the questions pending. You must remember that the Rev. Mr. Tyng was not tried for "preaching in a Methodist church." This the laws of the Church allow, and true churchmen desire that all Episcopal clergymen preach everywhere, in church, barn or shed, where they can do good, only using the Church services. Mr. Tyng, then, was tried and convicted for preaching in a brother Episcopal parish, and directly, as it were, in competition with him, and without his consent—a flagrant violation of the law of his Church, which he had promised to obey.

So of the Rev. Mr. Cheney. All admit that he was "sworn in" to the Episcopal Church to obey its laws, which, certainly, he then knew, and subsequently refused to obey one of those laws, and still persisted in staying in the Church. Now, if you or any man, under the solemnity of an oath, join a religious or other association with known byelaws, and afterwards find out you cannot conscientiously obey those laws, and can't get the association to change them, should you stay, in violation of your vows, or should you withdraw?

This is really the whole question for those of the Tyng school, and it seems to me there can be but one rational answer to that. Do you not think so? The HERALD is too influential a paper to teach an error, and I am sure we will hear from it in a sensible way on this point.

L. S. C.

"Is Man Immortal?"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

In last Sunday's issue of the HERALD an editorial was published with the above heading, and, by your kind permission, I should like to say a few words in opposition to the position assumed by you and your correspondent who signs himself "Truth." Believing the HERALD to be quite all you claim for it—the exponent of the ideas of all, and the partisan of none—I do not think its columns will be closed to me in this instance simply because I have taken an opposite stand. All should go on the principle, hear both sides, then decide."

In introducing the subject you admit "there is no such declaration, in words, in the Bible as that man is immortal, which admission, to my mind, is quite an argument against the position assumed by you, and which is held by nearly all the so-called Christian world. Nevertheless, you undertake to prove that man is immortal. That you have not succeeded I shall endeavor to demonstrate.

To begin, you assert "that facts are stated which presuppose and which rest upon the immortality of the soul," and, in support of this, you instance verse forty-four of the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians. Let us look at it a moment. The Apostle is speaking of resurrection, and, in the course of the argument, he asserts that "there is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body;" hence we find it written in the next verse, "The first Adam was made a living soul (not an immortal soul), the last Adam a quickening spirit." Now, Mr. Editor, the fact which is here disclosed is that the spirit is a body, and as real and tangible as the natural body. Now, it is notorious that the whole world denies that the soul (or spirit) has either body or parts. We have an example in the person of our Lord who, to all appearances, had the same body after he arose from the dead as before; but, as the result of a resurrection, He was made a quickening (or life imparting) spirit, on the same principle that the first Adam was made a living soul, as the result of having breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. Paul plainly declares in the eighteenth verse of this same chapter that "if the dead rise not, they who are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." Where is the spirituality of man in this case? Paul shows beyond dispute that they are dead to all intents and purposes, and only gives hope by affirming that there will be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust. We have another witness in the person of Solomon, who says "that the living know that they shall die, but the (already) dead know not anything." Men receive immortality or spiritual bodies at the resurrection. As Paul says, "at his appearing and in His kingdom—"which He will restore again to Israel (Matthew xix., 28) as He promised His disciples—will Christ give to those 'glory, honor, immortality, eternal life,'" Romans, ii., 7), who have sought these things by a "patient continuance in well doing." Mr. Editor, I appeal to the intelligence of every reasoning person if it is an evidence of sanity to expect a man to seek for that which it is assumed he has already—to wit, immortality. This is the conclusion which the popular mode of reasoning would have us come to. If you examine still closer you will see, too, that immortality is only conferred upon those who have done good, while the very opposite is meted out to those who have done evil. According to the general opinion (it has never yet been proved a fact), all men possess (inherently) immortal souls. Now this is a direct contradiction of Paul's declaration to Timothy, wherein he says that "He only hath (inherent) immortality who dwells in unapproachable light, whom no man hath seen nor can see"—1. Timothy, vi., 16. The term "immortal soul" is as meaningless and empty as anything can be, and for this reason:—Those who believe in it hold that it is that part of the man which is capable of receiving moral and intellectual impressions. Some of its characteristics are love, hatred, envy, malice, capacity for acquiring knowledge, &c. Now, if this is the soul, whether of the good or bad man, when death overtakes him it perishes. Ecclesiastes, ix., 6.

Next in order you cite II. Corinthians, v., 6, to uphold the doctrine. If you will turn to the chapter and take notice of the context, Paul will explain what he means by being present with the Lord. "For," says he, "we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive in body (and we get no bodies till resurrection, neither natural nor spiritual, as we have seen in the case of Christ) according to that he hath done, whether good or bad." The Apostle in this place takes no account of the interval which might elapse in the event of death. I think the same remarks will apply to Philippians, ii., 23. Should we, therefore, endeavor to fill up the gap with our own imaginations in order to sustain one of the "old wives' fables?" Such ideas are purely the result of false teaching or working of the "mystery of iniquity," as Paul calls it, which had already begun to work in the days of the apostles. The origin of this mysticism is traced to men who were utterly ignorant of God, and therefore contrary to Him. Speaking through the Prophet Isaiah, He says:—"My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord, for as the heavens are higher than the earth so are my ways higher than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts." You will perceive, Mr. Editor, how likely, or unlikely, we are to attain to the divine mode of thinking and acting, unaided by the Divine power or wisdom.

Next you have produced I. Peter, iii., 18, 20. I shall not attempt to go into an explanation here, as it would take up too much space; but, in the light of what has already been proved and disproved, it is impossible to take your view of it. We should, Paul says, "interpret spiritual things by spiritual things," and if we observe this rule in this case we can only come to a conclusion which is in harmony with the general teaching of the Scriptures upon this subject. "To the law (of Moses) and the testimony (of the Prophets)—if they speak not according to these it is because there is no light in them"—are the words quoted by Paul from the Prophet Isaiah for the purpose of giving us a rule by which we might know whether men spake according to the truth or not.

You have instanced the appearance of Moses and Elijah at the Transfiguration, and appear to be at a loss how to account for their presence except upon the hypothesis of the soul's immortality. I would ask, is the power of God straitened? While it proves nothing for this delusion it proves much for the resurrection of Moses; though in his mortal state, Elijah never having died, of course it was not necessary to raise him from the dead, for it was translated that he should not see death.

Mark xii., 27, is next produced. If you will look at the chapter again you will see that the subject under consideration was resurrection. Jesus was arguing with a class who denied any such thing. He taught resurrection (not the immortality of the soul) by saying that God "was not the God of the dead, but of the living;" for, as He says in another place, "all live unto Him." Not at the present time, however, for Paul says they "all died in the faith, not having received the promises; but, having seen them afar off (to the day of Christ, when He shall come with power and great glory) they were persuaded of them, and embraced them, &c. God, having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect"—Hebrews, xi., 13, 40. It is a divine principle that "God speaks of things that are not as though they were," which principle will apply to the text you have quoted from John, iii., 36. The principle laid down by Paul to Timothy also does away with the idea of at present possessing eternal life, as also does the passage quoted from Romans; and as Paul has it in another place, "Hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth why doth he yet hope for it?"

In your quotation of Ecclesiastes, iii., 21, you have ignored the words of Solomon in the previous verses, in which he declares that men are beasts, "For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts: even one thing befalleth them. As one dieth so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath (or spirit), so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast." Now, Mr. Editor, it is just here where Solomon and the popular theologists differ. He has given us to understand distinctly what is the end of man and beasts, and that one thing befalls both is very evident. The popular theologist teaches that man (or his spirit) goes to Heaven or hell torments. Solomon says, "As the one dies so dies the other." Now, in order to make harmony we must allow that the beasts have souls which are capable of realizing happiness or misery; but this would be sheer nonsense, and a person of the meanest intelligence would scout such a ridiculous theory. Now, as we have the true sense of the passage just quoted we must read the twenty-first, so as to make harmony, thus:—"Who knoweth that the spirit (or breath) of man goeth upward, and that the spirit (or breath) of the beast goeth downward to the earth?" And the moment we alter the meaning of the spirit of one we must alter the other, for "they have all one breath (or spirit)."

In Ezekel xviii., 21, it is written, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." Popular theology says that it lives and is tormented. In Psalms xxiii., 18, 19, it is written, "Behold, the eye of Jehovah is upon them that fear Him, upon them that hope in His mercy, to deliver their soul from death," &c. Is it possible to save that from death which, it is assumed, can never die? Common sense will answer this question. Was there any necessity for the angelic guard to prevent Adam and Eve from eating of the tree of life if they had become possessed of immortality previously? In Genesis xviii., 27, Abraham declared he was but dust and ashes. Popular theology says he was immortal. Which is right?

And I might go on citing text after text, but enough have been produced. But one word more and I have done. You say, Mr. Editor, you "have no reason to doubt that it accords with the universal belief of the human race." Allow me to inform you that "whatsoever is highly esteemed among men is an abomination in the sight of God." You assert that "it harmonizes fully with human consciousness." Remember that "the carnal mind is enmity against God; it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be," so long as man thinks and acts according to the imaginations of his own evil heart.

Surely the "strong delusion" spoken of by Paul has taken deep root in the minds of men, as is evident from the "gross darkness that covers the earth and gross darkness the people." And this state of things will continue, too, until "Jenovah's judgments are abroad in the earth, when the inhabitants thereof will learn righteousness" and truth. C. V.

A Reply to "Truth" on the Nature of God.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

It seems to me that if "Truth," in his article entitled "The Nature of God—Who and What He is," which appeared on Sunday, 16th, had commenced with the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis, instead of the second verse of that chapter, and had given an impartial scope to the meaning of "created," his article would not have so abounded in "absurdities" concerning God and His production—creation.

"Truth" would take God as a mere co-ordinate existence with matter, and view Him as the mere animator. He would narrow His creative powers and excellent attributes down to the genius and merit of a mechanic. Could error do worse?

The beginning of the Bible introduces us to the beginning of the world. It goes back to where nothing existed but in spirit, and makes the unqualified announcement that "God created the heaven and the earth," which announcement "Truth," in the honesty and purity of his heart, passes without recognition.

The word "created" occurs three times in this chapter in connection with three natural and important stages of that memorable six days' work. The first—Genesis i., 1—describes a creative effort of God, which resulted in the existence and presence of every needed ingredient and element.

These came in a chaotic pile—a crystallized, tangibilized conception of a being of creative power—unordered by those laws and unaffirmed by those relations which gave the mass the consistency it enjoyed after God enacted law and instituted relations.

Light was not the result of a creative effort, but of the combination of elements (already existing) produced by that first comprehensive effort. The conditions, relations, then fixed will never fail to produce light until God changes His mind and extinguishes the relations of those particles which enter into and compose light.

Pronouncing this good, His next work was on the earth, positing the waters, &c., bringing about those conditions necessary to vegetation; these attained, vegetation was fixed by Him as a legitimate offspring of these conditions.

The construction of the heavenly bodies and a declaration of their uses and influences was the last act preceding the second creation.

Verses twenty and twenty-one tell us of God's constituting the lower or primary order of living beings from material already in existence. Their systems being more complex, their requirements more varied, a new property, not material, not yet existing, was essential to their completeness, and a simple, rudimentary intellect was created, which was another creative act mentioned in verse twenty-one.

Following this was the introduction of man.

We must not fail to notice the suggestion that God, in the case of the first forms of life, effected that combination of His ready material which constituted their bodies and then superadded to the structure this new creation—*i. e.*, sense, instinct, &c.

The same process is seen in the making of man. First his body is formed, in which the crude system of nourishment, assimilation, &c., seen in vegetation enters, then the senses, instincts, &c., of beasts, and when man is thus matured God superadds another and higher piece of creation—the soul—verse 27, chap. ii., 7. All these creations, as Mr. Weiss very justly intimates, in nature are in perfect keeping with the mind creating them. They are the legitimate births bearing the impress of the author. Concerning "Truth's" quotations of John i., 1, 2, 3, 10 and 14, his undiscriminate use of "world" for "word" is so palpably erroneous that I only ask him to look again.

"Truth" declares that the Bible nowhere inculcates the doctrine of the existence of three in one. I refer him to Matthew xxvii., 46, and Mark xv., 34. The Son here declares himself forsaken. By whom? By Himself in the office of His Father? Impossible! He cannot forsake Himself, and if He could and did, how grossly absurd for Him to ask why He had done it. Also John xv., 26, and xvi., 7-15. Here are two again, one of which is one of the former two, the other a third party. The Son here speaks of going away in order that the Spirit might come and exercise its peculiar functions. Did He mean that He was to go away to invest Himself with new offices and come to exercise them? Not so. He cannot go away and at the same time stay here.

GEO. H. B.

Church and State.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

A misfortune is frequently the precursor if not the generator of a benefit, which sinks it into comparative insignificance. The mariner who loses a single sail, the merchant who meets with a small reverse, the lover who is for the moment checked, all are awakened by what appears a misfortune to a more careful and energetic prosecution of their labors, and they thereby insure a prosperous crowning of their efforts. This general principle will be found applicable to all classes, positions and pursuits of life. Let us then watch closely these warnings as they present themselves, that we may be prepared to direct our course to eventual benefit and not to continued injury. The government of the United States and that of each State are supposed not to have any connection with any church, and there is no principle in our constitution which is more generally and earnestly upheld by our citizens than the sentiment, "No connection between State and Church." Indeed, it is a vital part of our political theory, and can in no way be dismembered. At a future day, however, discussion may arise, so let us look now whether some few small seeds have not accidentally fallen which may become plants strong enough to assist in sheltering other noxious ones. In our federal and State Legislatures we have chaplains, and it is conceded that up to this day the greatest moderation and charity have been observed in selecting them. This is, no doubt, attributable to the general sentiment of toleration and to the diversity of the religious proclivities of our legislators. But suppose that some religious question should be before the community, and a house pretty nearly equally divided between two sects opposed to each other upon this question, the election for chaplain might be warm work. Let us have no chaplains. We take an oath on a Bible or a Testament; if the latter, the Old Book is excluded; the Koran is at any rate excluded. Here is decidedly a religious discrimination. Marriage, known to the laws of this country as a civil contract only, is solemnized by clergymen. Of course those of all denominations are on the same footing in this matter, and no one feels the least repugnance to their acting; but still they do it under a power delegated to a clergyman and withheld from a carpenter. Let none of our readers be startled; for we are looking ahead. If they will be shocked let them so shape the shock that it may conduce to a benefit.

PRUNER.

The Swedenborgians Not Spiritualists.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

In the HERALD a few Sundays ago some questions were asked concerning Swedenborgians and Spiritualists, which many of your readers would like to have answered, some for the sake of knowing the truth, and others for the purpose of correcting the very common mistake under which your correspondent seems to lie—namely, that the Swedenborgians and Spiritualists are identical, or nearly so, in belief.

Swedenborg was not a Spiritualist as that word is now understood. He does, indeed, claim that his spiritual senses were opened and that he conversed freely with spirits and angels for many years. But that of itself does not constitute a Spiritualist. Nor does the belief in the possibility of open spiritual vision. If it did all Christians would be Spiritualists, for they believe that the prophets and apostles, as John in Patmos, had their spiritual senses opened, and what they saw and heard is recorded in the sacred Scriptures.

Swedenborg's case was unlike any of the modern mediums. He was not in a state of trance, but retained the full consciousness of all his natural faculties while his spiritual senses were open to the scenes of the spiritual world.

The opening of his spiritual senses was not sought by him, but was, as he claims, a gift for a special purpose, and that was that he might from experience make known to men the substantial existence of the spiritual world and of man as a spiritual being. He repeatedly declares that conscious intercourse with spirits is very dangerous except to those who are specially prepared for it, and contrary to divine order, and he shows how and why it is dangerous. He described the phenomena of modern Spiritualism with as much accuracy as any one who has been familiar with all its phases could do. He showed its dangers, and how unreliable any communication from spirits must be when uncorrected by revelation.

Swedenborg was distinguished from modern Spiritualists also by his devout belief in the divinity of the Bible. He regarded it as a divine Book, as written in a divine manner and as superior to all books of merely human composition, as the Lord's works are superior to man's works. He constantly refers to the Bible as the Word of God, as the repository of infinite wisdom and the only reliable source of knowledge concerning spiritual and divine things. The greater part of his theological works was written in exposition of the "Word," as he generally calls the Bible. He declares that he received his communication from the spiritual world while he was reading the Word, which is the divinely appointed and only reliable means of conjunction with the Lord. No candid mind can read Swedenborg's works without being impressed with his wisdom and docility and his profound reverence for the Lord and his Word.

The Swedenborgians desire no other evidence than that which they find in Swedenborg's writings to convince them of the dangers of Spiritualism. The only points of agreement between them and the Spiritualists, so far as I know, is the belief of the real and substantial existence of the spiritual world and of man as a spiritual being, when separated from the material body. For the benefit of your correspondent and others who may desire to know I will mention a few fundamental points on which they totally differ.

The Swedenborgians believe in the supreme and absolute divinity of Jesus Christ. They call Him Lord and they regard Him as the only proper object of worship, believing that the whole Trinity of Father, Son and Holy Spirit is combined in His person. The Father is in Him as a man's soul is in his body; the Holy Spirit is from Him as the life of man's soul flows through his body into act.

The Spiritualists are mostly Unitarian or deistical in their ideas of God, and their writers and mediums often speak of the Lord in a manner which makes a New Churchman shudder.

The Swedenborgians believe that the Bible is the Word of God and contains a revelation of divine and spiritual truth from Him. They believe that it is written in a peculiar style, according to the relation between spiritual and natural things, and, therefore, that it can never be superceded. I venture to say that there are no people who place so high a value upon the sacred Scriptures or accord to them so high a degree of inspiration.

On the other hand, the Spiritualists very generally reject the Bible as the Word of God, and regard the communications of their mediums as later and more correct information from the spiritual world.

The Spiritualists regard evil as undeveloped good and believe in the endless progression of all men after death.

The Swedenborgians regard evil as the opposite of good. They believe that a man's character is essentially determined in this life, and that only those in whom the principles of goodness have begun to germinate in this world will continue to advance in knowledge, goodness and happiness in the other life. The false principles and evil passions of the wicked may become less active and violent, but there is no possibility of their passing the gulf in their own characters which separate them from the good. These are some of the radical points of difference between the two systems of belief. I make no attempt to say which is right; I have only aimed to answer your correspondent, and to correct the misapprehensions of many minds concerning the identy of belief between Swedenborgians and Spiritualists.

The Swedenborgians, or New Church men, as they call themselves, are not unbelievers or disbelievers. They accept the great cardinal facts of Christianity in the fullest manner. They differ from other Christians, not in believing less, but more; not in discarding any vital doctrine, but in getting a rational and Scriptural view of it. They fully sympathize with your correspondent in the desirableness and great value of obtaining a doctrine of spiritual truth which will satisfy the head and the heart. It was the desire to find such a system of spiritual truth which first led them to examine Swedenborgianism, and they have the great happiness of knowing that they have found what they sought.

A SWEDENBORGIAN.

The Restoration of the Temporal Power of the Pope Predicted.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

It is strange that the HERALD, with all its sagacity, should make such statements as "At last Rome has become the capital of Italy, free and united," when it knows it is neither the one nor the other, and that it is only a question of a very short time when the smouldering volcano will burst into a revolutionary conflagration such as Italy has never yet seen. The Roman correspondent of the HERALD, though prejudiced in favor of the Italian filibusters, tells pretty plainly that there is no unity in Rome, and as for freedom and the carrying out of Papal guarantees, of which we have heard so much, the following paragraph from the HERALD'S Roman letter speaks volumes. It tells that the Roman people dare not display a Papal flag or illuminate on the day of jubilee, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the first Pope who has reigned so long for 1,800 years. The paragraph reads:—

Only one little yellow flag was hung out of a window to-day with the inscription, "Long live Pius IX." It was soon removed by the authorities, in view of the hostile feelings of the majority of the citizens and the repression which the government could use. The clericals have determined not to demonstrate publicly or to illuminate their houses.

This is freedom with a vengeance. To please the revolutionary rabble that poured into Rome with the invaders, and whom your correspondent is pleased to term "the majority of the citizens," the actual people of Rome are forbid celebrating an event nearest and dearest their hearts, which they have looked forward to for many years. This in the Pope's own dominions, where he is the only legitimate sovereign.

The HERALD is not so ignorant of history as not to know that forty-seven Popes have been despoiled of their dominions and temporal power and have regained them. There is more than human hand in this work, and the folly of asserting that the Pope's temporal power is at an end is about as great as saying that God Almighty has ceased to be.

FERRARI.

Religious Freedom in Russia.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

Many thanks for your well-deserved rebuke to Priest Bjerring, administered to him through the editorial columns in a late issue of the HERALD. For the last eighteen years I have been a constant and a careful reader of the HERALD, and I often asked myself the question, "What would become of the truth of every important subject if it was not for the HERALD?" ANY ignorant foreigner may come to this country, assail the most cherished institutions of this land, and palm himself off on the American public as a man of consequence, and represent his despotical home government as being the best under the sun, if it were not for the HERALD, which at once discards the man and brands his statements with falsehood. It is, indeed, a matter of surprise where and how does the HERALD obtain all the information concerning men and facts belonging to foreign lands. In all liberal movements, good cause and man's freedom the HERALD always takes the lead, and yet its editor is charged with being in the service of the Pope. Is there a newspaper in this country, religious or secular, that has passed more severe and sensible rebukes on some of the doings of the Vatican in Rome, or more heartily endorsed the unity of Italy and the emancipation of Europe from priestly intolerance than the HERALD? Is there a warmer friend to the cause of human freedom everywhere than the HERALD? I myself, although engaged in a work antagonistic to the Church of Rome, have received kindness and most generous and to me most valuable favors, times and over, through the columns of the HERALD. This fact convinces me that the HERALD is in the service of right against wrong, and its fearful and most effective batteries are directed against every oppression, be it in the Church of the West or of the East; in the Protestant faith, Jewish synagogues or Mahommedan mosques or the temple of Confucius.

And now comes Priest Bjerring in his attack on America's noblest institution, the "Evangelical Alliance," a strictly Protestant association, and the Popish HERALD comes to its rescue and vindication, and I trust Protestants will not be unmindful of this fact.

The statement of Priest Bjerring that there is in Russia freedom of conscience is simply preposterous. Are not the followers of the Greek Church who become Protestants, or even Roman Catholics, treated by the Russian government as criminals, thrown into prison or banished to Siberia? At the convocation of the late Ecclesiastical Council in Rome did not the Russian government forbid the Latin prelates to attend the same?

Priest Bjerring calls himself an American citizen. Precious specimen of an American citizen he must be! A few Sundays ago, when he celebrated the birth of another Russian prince, he in his prayer invoked God's blessing on the crowned tyrants of Russia, but avoided to ask the same blessing on the country of which he is a citizen, and upon the Chief Magistrate of this great free people, till he was ordered so to do by the Russian Ambassador.

Priest Bjerring came to this country and established in New York a Russo-Greek chapel, without asking permission from the authorities so to do. In Russia, again, no Roman Catholic, Protestant or Jew would dare to build a church without special permit from the government. Again, Priest Bjerring says that the Russian government sustains Roman Catholic and Protestant schools at its own expense. This is false, and I challenge Priest Bjerring to name to me one solitary school—Protestant or Roman Catholic—sustained at the expense of the Russian government, except one theological German seminary, supported out of the private purse of the late Empress of Russia, who was the sister to the present Protestant Emperor of Germany. Again, Priest Bjerring says that all the clergy in Russia—Greek, Roman and Protestant—are paid by the government. This I do most emphatically deny. The Roman Catholic priests in Russia, like in every other country, are paid out of the treasury belonging to their own Church. The few German Protestant ministers are paid by their own congregations, and receive aid from Prussia. The Greek priests in no country have a fixed salary, but they receive pay from their people. They have a regular tariff for all their services. For baptismal, so much; for funeral, so much; for marriage, visitation of the sick, &c., so much. Besides, every man who has landed property must give the priest yearly so many bushels of corn, wheat, potatoes, &c. As regards the much-abused fellow mortals of ours, the Jews, why, they have no show at all in Russia. They are treated by the liberal government of the pious and orthodox Czar like so many homeless dogs.

Concerning Poland—poor, enslaved and unhappy, but patriotic and freedom-loving Poland—Priest Bjerring has made statements that are untrue from beginning to end. He says that in Poland the Roman Catholic priests are masters of the situation. No, sir; in Russian Poland they are slaves. The higher, more educated portion of the people of Russian Poland are Roman Catholics, and it is they that fought the battles for Poland's liberty. The peasantry belong to the Greek Church, and hence the reason why they sided with the government of the Czar in every Polish revolution and were guilty of the most barbarous cruelties inflicted on "Popish dogs"—men, women and children.

Look at the Danubian Principalities, Moldavia and Wallachia. As long as they were directly governed by the Turkish government there was religious freedom. But as soon as they set up a government for themselves and the Greek Church became "the Church," other religions had no show whatever. There are no Protestants in those principalities and a Protestant mission could not be sustained. The few Roman Catholics are living in constant dread, and the poor Jews, God help them! Whenever the Moldavians wish to have some exciting pastime and amusement they go to butchering the Jews and burning their homes—all in the name of orthodox piety and the liberty of conscience as represented in the Greek Church. The foul murder of the Jews in Odessa, a Russian city, but a few weeks ago, speaks in eloquent language how a man's conscience is respected in Russia.

Again, Priest Bjerring denies the statement that consecrated bread was forced down the throat of a Protestant girl. He says they use bread in wine, cut in small pieces. Now I happened to be born in a country where there are 4,000,000 of our people belonging to the Greek Church. I have frequently attended their services and claim to know as much of the Greek religious ceremonies and rules as the New York Greek priest does.

Every Greek church is divided into three apartments, viz., the altar, the male and the female. The entrance to the altar is through three doors—right, left and centre. The middle door, which is called *soyala preflata*, is covered with a curtain, which is, but on few occasions, drawn aside. Inside is the *soyala trapeza*, the holy table, adorned with a silk cover, the Bible, the communion service, pictures and robes of the priests, consisting of *stihaz, poyar, petrahil, narukwize, odeshda*, and, if the priest be of the monastic order, a *kamilavka*. The priest dresses himself inside of the altar and does not show himself to the people but tree times (I speak now of the service which is the main one and which they call *liturgia*), viz., when he carries the Bible to the people; when he brings out the sacrament (cap in right hand and plate on his head), and when he distributes the "poskurize," or "consecrated bread," which is done after every noonday service. The people come to him, kiss his hand and receive a piece of consecrated bread. In regard to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, they do receive consecrated bread independent of wine. The priest places himself in front of the middle door leading out of the altar. On his left is some authorized person with napkin. The people approach the priest with crossed hands and open mouths. He takes a spoonful of wine and three crumbs of bread that are placed into the wine and places them into the mouth of the communicant. The man with the napkin wipes the mouth and the communicant passes to the right of the priest to another man stationed there with a plate filled with consecrated bread, who puts into the mouth of the communicant one piece. Now, Mr. Greek Priest, next time don't try to palm off your yarns on an American public, for there are a great many men in this country who know all about the Greek Church. Here in New York there are many pious men who have been missionaries in foreign lands, and every one of them will tell you that there is more religious liberty, more protection to the missionaries in Turkey than in Russia. In fact, the Turkish government, in a religious point of view, is by far more preferable than that of Russia.

The followers of the Greek Church are the most bigoted, intolerant and fanatical people on the earth. They are barbarians under the guise of Christians. Had I time, and the HERALD willingness to publish, I could tell you, Priest Bjerring, how the barbarous Croatians, all of whom belong to your Church, under the leadership of their Ban, Joseph Jelashich, treated both Protestants and Roman Catholics during the Hungarian revolution in 1848. Every city, town and village in the states of Batchka, Barat and Baranya were burned to the ground. Crowds of women and children were driven into the Danube and Theis and drowned. Protestant and Roman Catholic clergy served as targets for military practice. Orphan asylums were burned and the children put to death. The very name of a Croatian became a terror to humanity. And yet all those atrocities were done in the name of the holy orthodox Greek Church. I have seen Greek Croatian priests set fire to Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches, and lead the soldiers in search of their ministers.

Again, the invasion of Hungary by 300,000 Russian hirelings in 1849 gave us an excellent chance to become satisfied that Russia, her government and people, are cruel, barbarous and void of every feeling of humanity and refined civilization. The Russian soldiers, their priests and officers, have been guilty of most revolting outrages in Hungary—outrages that can be only rocked in a most barbarous mind and practiced by a most wicked heart.

And lastly, Priest Bjerring, your comparing the mission of the Evangelical Alliance to that of Ku Klux and the Mormons is an insult to every Protestant clergyman. By such an assertion you have proven yourself to be an ungrateful recipient of the hospitality of this country. Every door of an American family ought to be closed against you.

NEW YORK, July 20, 1871. OSCAR HUGO.

The Gospel Scheme of Salvation.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE HERALD:—

I have been much interested in the perusal of the leading articles in Sunday's HERALD of the 16th instant, especially the one headed "Is Man Immortal?" in which you have done me the honor to make frequent reference to a few remarks of mine in a letter to the HERALD, published on the 2d instant, and in reply to which permit me to say, in the first place, that for many years I thought on the subject as you think. I accepted the popular mode of Scripture interpretation, taking for granted that professional Bible students and public teachers ought to know best. But at length I was induced to make a personal investigation of the entire source of religious belief, and soon found, to my astonishment, that the "one-half had never been told me," and that very much of what had been told me was "not according to sound doctrine." The more I investigated the more I was convinced of the doctrinal errors of popular theology; and this fact induced me to investigate carefully and, as I hope, thoroughly, every portion of the sacred writings in a systematic way. And I may here remark that no desultory mode of searching the Scriptures, if continued for life, will enable any one to arrive at a clear knowledge of the gospel scheme of salvation. Nothing but the most systematic study of the sacred oracles will disclose the plan of redemption. Such a mode of research will soon reveal the fact that religion is a holy science, and that it must be studied as a science to be fully comprehended. A long course of private investigation has demonstrated that the doctrine of man's natural immortality is not once asserted and that it is a thousand times denied. All the assertions of all the clergy in Christendom will never convince me to the contrary. It would be as impossible for me to believe in the "soul's immortality," after my own investigations on the subject, as it would be for you to believe me if I told you that two and two are six. If you desired to be of my opinion on the point you could not. Just so with me on the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. While I was ignorant of the Scriptures I believed it; now I know better I cannot.

I am, sir, totally unacquainted with the "Free Religion Association" mentioned in your interesting article, and I have made no attempt to "apologize" for any religious creed but my own. A blind, unintelligent belief is no belief, and is "sure to err." Popular belief is taken for granted, and no one really knows whether any of it is true or false, and many of them don't care so they are spared the trouble of searching the Scriptures for themselves. Many of what I may term the "working class" of the human race in all countries are daily so much exhausted in body and mind, in laboring for "the bread that perisheth," that they have neither time, inclination nor mental power to investigate for themselves. The mental, moral and religious nature of the class, so far as they are individually responsible for the cultivation of either, is by the wealthy class and the priesthood entirely ignored. Whatever religious knowledge they may have must be supplied, for a pecuniary consideration, by the licensed clergy, who give them whatever they choose, and make it a sin to question the genuineness of the article supplied. This system goes on through life, and the great mass never really know any more about the gospel plan of redemption than Hottentots.

I am pleased to see you confess "we admit there is no such declaration in words (as the soul's immortality) in any part of the Bible." My heart always leaps at the annunciation of any great and important biblical fact. "But," you add, "when facts are stated which presuppose the immortality of the soul we cannot see what additional force a verbal declaration would give them." On this point permit me, sir, to ask a question:—If God, through the medium of prophets and apostles, has failed to declare, "in so many words," in any portion of the holy Scriptures, that man has within him an immortal soul which survives the dissolution of the body, and can exist independent of it, upon what foundation, upon what authority are "facts stated which presuppose the declaration of such a doctrine?"

The Bible contains the only revelation of God to man; and if God has not revealed "in so many words" in any part of it such a doctrine, where is the testimony that such a declaration as the soul's immortality has ever been made? If God has no where revealed it in so many words, who else had the right or authority to announce it? That God should be silent and leave the human race in doubt on such an important subject is incomprehensible. That such a doctrine should be left for support and confirmation to "facts stated which presuppose the truth of a declaration which God has never made to man," is most extraordinary. Who can believe it?

The whole of the Scriptures are of Jewish origin. Every word of the sacred MSS. was penned by Jews. To what other nation has God ever revealed a plan for their redemption? From what other nation of the Adamic race have we received a single doctrine claiming God for its author? And if the only revelation we have contains no declaration of the soul's immortality, where could it have come from but, as I have before asserted, from heathen sources? It emanated from that "vain philosophy" of Greece and Rome against which Paul found it necessary to warn the churches of his day. It originated in heathen reasoning unaided by the light of divine revelation. Those who know the doctrine is false also see that its propagation has been one of the greatest curses of the Christian dispensation. And this fact will become visible to all when the "veil is taken away from the face of all nations" and the truth appears in native beauty before the astonished gaze of a deluded world.

You say "if it (the doctrine of the soul's immortality) can be successfully denied, very much of what mankind now believes and has for ages believed must be cast aside as worse than useless—as positively mischievous;" and, I may add, some of it positively blasphemous. The statement is as true as the gospel; and "pity 'tis, 'tis true."

King David in one of his psalms declares that when a man dies "in that very day his thoughts perish." When a man is dead and his thoughts perished we think it would puzzle an exceedingly clever anatomist to say what there is of him left alive. The spiritual mystification of religion for trade purposes has almost banished apostolic teaching and practice from the face of the earth. Were the doctrine of the soul's immortality true we should have had "line upon line" on the subject, running like a "silken cord" through the whole of the Scriptures; whereas all men, even those who