

Illinois can boast of a preacher and a legislator, both in one, who has refused to take pay for praying. A resolution was presented in the Legislative Assembly of that State, just previous to adjournment, granting \$3 per day for each person, member or otherwise, who had officiated as chaplain during the session. Rev. Mr. Goodspeed, a member of the House, had opened the meeting on several occasions with prayer. But he declined the money on the ground that he thought the pay should be graded by the amount of good accomplished. He had prayed that the members might be endowed with wisdom, patience, grace and honesty of purpose, but he could not see that his prayers had availed anything. Now from this it appears that either those Illinois legislators are a poor lot or the Reverend decliner has but little faith in his own petitions. However the principle that he enunciates is a pretty good one, and if applied to preachers and law-makers would prove a great financial saving both in Church and State.

#### "THE PEOPLE'S PROBLEM."

THE expected article in *Scribner*, on "The People's Problem," which has just been received, is likely to stir up the popular mind to grave reflection on the tendencies of the times. It shows up in a forcible manner the serious defects in our political machinery as at present constituted. The true objects of government, the purpose held in view in the framing of our national system and its main features, are very clearly set forth. The gradual growth of the "election machine" to its now gigantic and powerful proportions, virtually disfranchising the people, and the change of popular government to a government of party—the chief end in view now being the maintenance of one party and the exclusion and suppression of another—with the effects thereof upon the nation, are presented with fidelity and perspicuity.

And it is set forth that the vote of the individual becomes merely a vote against one of the two political organizations; that the election machine makes slaves of public officials, who must yield to the clamors of those in their party who procured their election or whose aid they will need in future; that centralization of power, which the founders of our country dreaded, is obtained by this machinery in its most centralized form; that it destroys the responsibility of the public servants, and the efficiency and purity of the public service; that it drives the best men out of politics; that it favors the moneyed powers and defies the will of the people; that it prevents a healthy general interest in public affairs and corrupts the public conscience; and it proves that "the first experiment in the history of the world, on a grand scale, to establish a people's government has given as its result the tyranny of an election machine."

Republicans and Democrats, who boast so much about the "liberty of American citizens," and "freedom from dictation," who shriek with anger when Church influence is suggested in politics, and crow about their "manhood and independence," should read the article in *Scribner* and see how their pretended political individuality is a sham, and that professional election managers on either side, who merely play two parts in a great national farce, really do the whole business of nominating, platform-drawing, ballot-printing, and really control the votes of their respective parties.

This article is but one of a series. The first points out the defects and dangers of our present national system; the next will suggest some remedies. The writer bases his reasonings upon the right of the people to alter the government when the proper objects thereof are not obtained, and quotes from the Constitution of Massachusetts in support of this principle, and to show that those objects are simply "to secure the existence of the body politic, to protect it, and to furnish the individuals who compose it with the power of enjoying in safety and tranquillity their natural rights and the blessings of life."

No one can view the present condition of national affairs and compare them with the designs of the fathers of our country without seeing a wide departure from the principles originally announced as fundamental and essential to human liberty, and while it must be conceded that we are enjoying great

commercial prosperity and that everything seems propitious for an era of unparalleled progress, at the same time there are many wise men who look with dread upon the evident tendencies toward the same troubles which wrecked ancient republics that are exhibited in the great popular government of the Nineteenth Century. But whatever may be the destiny of this proud nation, only good can come out of a presentation of alleged defects in its system and the suggestion of remedies for evils that are in their nature weakening if not destructive. The article in *Scribner* is worthy of wide attention and we have no doubt that it will be generally read and discussed.

#### MISQUOTING THE LAW.

THE *Chicago Inter-Ocean*, commenting on the certificate business says: "The law requires that Governors of States and Territories shall issue certificates of election for members of congress and forward the same to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, who is required to place upon the roll the names of persons contained in such certificates." The *Inter-Ocean* figures as a leading radical journal but is often in error. In this instance it has attempted to tell what the law is on certain questions. Now, will the *Chicago* paper with the double name please to quote the law, that the public may consider it for themselves? We challenge the citation of any law which says that the Governor of a Territory shall issue the certificate of election to a Delegate to Congress, or forward it to the Clerk of the House, or that the Clerk shall place the names therein on the roll. The law makes it the duty of the Governor to "declare the person having the greatest number of votes duly elected." It also says that "a certificate shall be issued accordingly." But it does not say that the certificate shall be issued by the Governor. It may be inferred that the Executive should issue the certificate, but the *Inter-Ocean* is not talking about inferences, it is pretending to quote law. If the papers which are handling this question would read up a little they would save themselves—perhaps—from exposing their great ignorance of simple matters. As to the Clerk of the House, he understands the law governing this subject and he has been careful, too, to comply with it. And, whisper, that's what makes the anti-"Mormon" ring so mad just now.

#### THE UTAH CASE.

UNDER the above caption, the *Detroit Free Press*, a strong Republican paper, has the following, which is presented for the consideration of the howling and defeated conspirators:

"The republican press severely criticises Clerk Adams, of the House of Representatives, for putting the name of Delegate Cannon on the roll of the House, instead of the name of Campbell. But it is worth noticing, that with all their bitterness none of them accuse Clerk Adams of doing any wrong to Campbell. No republican journal that lays any claim to a reputation for decency pretends that Campbell is elected or has any shadow of title to the seat, save that which the governor of Utah invented when he gave him a certificate. Even the *New York Times*, while censuring the Clerk for ignoring the certificate, admits that it 'really belongs to Cannon.'"

The case is fresh in the public recollection. Cannon was elected by the popular vote by a large majority over Campbell. The latter claimed that Cannon was not a citizen of the United States and that the votes cast for him were, therefore, void. If this claim had been well founded it would have given Campbell no title to the election, for there is no principle better settled than that which declares that in such a case there is no election. The Governor, however, in defiance of the well settled rule, and in anticipation of the judicial decision which declared Cannon a citizen and lawfully chosen, gave Campbell the certificate to which he had no more claim than any other inhabitant of Utah.

Whether Clerk Adams had any technical right to act upon his knowledge of these patent facts, and the law in the case, may perhaps be open to question, but there can be no question that he has done substantial justice as between Camp-

bell and Cannon. If anybody is wronged it is the Republican party; and it can only be regarded as wronged upon the assumption that it intended to defraud Cannon of his seat. As a matter of fact the way is still open for that. All that Clerk Adams has done has been to put the case in such shape that the defrauding must be openly done, if at all."

#### STUDY OF INDIAN LANGUAGES.

J. W. POWELL, the celebrated explorer and engineer, who has traveled through these regions extensively in the Government service, and is well known in Utah, has published a second edition of his work called "Introduction to the Study of Indian Languages." We have received a copy from A. Bell, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, for which he has our thanks. The work is designed as a help to students of Indian languages, customs and peculiarities. It is the result of much thought and research. A full alphabet is given, with succinct and ample directions for writing the sound of the various Indian dialects. The author says of the work:

"It does not purport to be a philosophic treatment of the subject of languages: it is simply a series of explanations of certain characteristics almost universally found by students of Indian languages—the explanations being of such a character as experience has shown would best meet the wants of persons practically at work in the field of languages with which they are unfamiliar. The book is a body of directions for collectors."

It has been the effort of the author to connect the study of language with the study of other branches of anthropology, for a language is best understood when the habits, customs, institutions, philosophy—the subject matter of thought embodied in the language—are best known.

A system of schedules is embodied in the volume, designed to facilitate the collection of linguistic materials, so that the student may be able to contribute something to the science of philology. It also contains diagrams to show kinship and affinity, and gives a great deal of valuable information on a variety of topics connected with the study of Indian habits and traditions. The work cannot fail to be productive of much good, and shows commendable diligence and ability on the part of the author.

#### SPIRITS IN PRISON.

OUR attention has been called to a sermon delivered by a Methodist preacher named G. E. Jayne, in Provo, and published in that miserably edited monthly paper called the *Rocky Mountain Christian Advocate*. We have been requested to notice the discourse. It is based on 1 Peter III. 18-20:

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit;

"By which also he went and preached to the spirits in prison,

"Which sometime were disobedient when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved by water."

The discourse is designed to "shatter to atoms" and "send back to Hades" the doctrine drawn from this scripture that "the gospel shall be preached to souls beyond the grave." To accomplish this the speaker proceeds to make an elaborate explanation of the meaning of the text, which, boiled down to its essence, is, that "Christ by his spirit preached to the antediluvians," or to use one of his own sentences:

"The idea is that to those spirits who were then in prison who had formerly lived in the days of Noah the message had been delivered."

This is a very common attempt to wrest the scriptures from their plain and simple meaning. It has been used by sectarian preachers, ever since the glorious doctrine of the redemption of the dead was revealed to the Prophet Joseph Smith and declared to mankind in the flesh. No one but a practised perverter of the written word of God, could imagine that the inspired writer endeavored to convey any such meaning. His statement is clear and explicit. He is describing the work of the Savior. Let the

above and two following verses be read in connection, and it will be seen that these facts are presented: First, that Christ, the just, suffered for the unjust, being put to death in the flesh. Second, that he was quickened by the spirit. Third, that by the spirit He then went somewhere. Fourth, that having gone to that place He preached. Fifth, that those to whom He preached were spirits, and that they were in prison. Sixth, that they were those who were disobedient in the days of Noah. Seventh, that the salvation of the earth by water at that time was a figure or type of baptism. Eighth, that Christ was resurrected. Ninth, that he then went to heaven to sit at the right hand of God. The narrative is connected and clear. It has nothing to do with the days of Noah except to show who the spirits were to whom Christ preached and why they were in prison. It takes us from the crucifixion to the ascension, leading us through the scenes that intervened, accounting for the time that elapsed between Christ's burial and resurrection.

But Mr. Jayne, to help out his theory, tries to give a little different rendering to the text. He puts it thus:

"In (by) which also having (he went and) preached unto the spirits in prison."

He also makes the word "sometime" read "sometimes," that is, that the spirits were "sometimes disobedient in the days of Noah." Why does he change the words in this manner? Simply to twist them out of their evident signification. The word "sometime" is used by Peter in the sense of "aforetime." That is, that Christ preached to the spirits who "aforetime," in the days of Noah, were disobedient. Not that they were sometimes disobedient and at others obedient. And the words of Peter are not "having preached," but "he went and preached." The object of the Methodist preacher's perversion of Peter's teachings is apparent.

Now, if the text of the old version is not sufficiently clear, let us take the verses from the new version. If we are to depart from the letter of the old and long-established standard, let us not depend upon the garbled and private interpretation of an obscure preacher, or of a biased sect, but refer to some recognized authority. The old version is good enough for us, but for the benefit of others, we will quote verbatim from the new:

"Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit, in which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which aforetime were disobedient when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah," etc.

This is, if anything, plainer than the standard translation, and is fatal to the perversions of Mr. Jayne. But one admission of his own is equally so. In answer to the question, "What is meant by their being in prison," he answers, "Nothing more or less than that they were in a place of confinement in the invisible world about the time Peter wrote." Now while there is no evidence that these spirits were in prison at the time that Peter wrote—the indications being to the contrary—the admission that they were "spirits in confinement in the invisible world" is against the theory that they were men in the flesh. If they were in confinement at the time Peter wrote, they must have been when Christ died, and it was to them that he "went in the spirit" and to them that he "preached." This is just what Peter declare and what we maintain, but which the gentleman has attempted to disprove.

Mr. Jayne assumes because the disobedient antediluvians are here specially mentioned that Christ preached to no others, and he wants to know "how there could be such a separation that only these sinners could hear the Gospel." If this were the fact their separation could be accounted for easily enough, but there is no need to go into that question because it is an unwarranted assumption. The fact that these spirits are here specially alluded to does not prove that none others heard the glad tidings of deliverance. If such an inference can justly be drawn because these were spirits in confinement, it can be drawn with equal justice in regard to men in the flesh, and thus by the preacher's reasoning, Christ preached to no one in

the world, but to the people in the days of Noah. Into such absurdities do men rush when they shut their eyes to plain truth because it is hostile to their creeds, and wrest the scriptures to tally with their dogmas.

He quotes the saying of Jesus to the thief on the cross, "To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise," and jumps to the conclusion that he could not have gone into Hades because, as shown in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, a great gulf was fixed between the two conditions. That is as much as to say that the Son of God, to whom all power was given both on earth and in the heavens, and who grasped the keys of hell and of death, after passing out of the body into Paradise—the abode of the spirits of the just—had not power to cross the "gulf" and enter the portals of the doomed. All that we have to say on this is, we do not limit the powers of the Redeemer, who held the keys to all heights and depths, and could enter Paradise, descend into Tartarus and then, bursting the barriers of the tomb, arise to the heaven of heavens to sit at the right hand of God!

Another objection offered to the doctrine taught by Peter is, that "it is founded upon a single passage." This is a mistake. In the next chapter—1 Peter iv. 6—it is explained:

"For this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit."

We might refer to other passages bearing on the subject, and indicating not only that Christ would "preach deliverance to the captives and the opening of the prison to them that were bound," but that after the tribulations of the latter days and the punishment of the wicked by being "shut up in the prison house," "after many days" they also "shall be visited." But this second statement of Peter's ought to suffice. He makes it plain here that others besides the contemporaries of Noah heard the gospel in the spirit. The gospel was preached to "them that are dead." They were not in the flesh, but in the spirit, and the same gospel was preached to the "dead" as to the "quick" (see verse 5) that they might be all judged alike. Those who had passed into the spirit state heard the gospel the same as men in the flesh, so that in receiving it they might "live according to God in the spirit."

Mr. Jayne's final objection is that "it is pernicious because it encourages men to sin." This shows that he does not understand the doctrine. It offers no such encouragement. When properly presented it sustains the claims of eternal justice, and shows that all men will receive "according to their works." But it does not sustain the demoniac doctrine of an implacable Deity, most of whose own children are doomed to an everlasting hell of literal flames, in which they are to blister and burn and roast for endless ages without a moment's mitigation of their inexpressible torment, on which Methodist preachers have dwelt with unctious and with which they have scared timid souls to their anxious seats and mourner's benches. But the question is not what the Provo preacher or his friends may pronounce "pernicious," but what is it that Peter teaches in the texts referred to? Has Mr. Jayne "shattered to atoms" and sent "back to Hades" the doctrine that the dead may hear the gospel as well as the living? We trow not. He has "shattered to atoms" his own argument, if it be asserted that there was any substance to it, which we should dislike very much to admit.

And now we testify that the doctrine did not come from Hades. It came from the courts of glory. It brings joy to every believing soul. It shows that the mercies of God are over all His works. It brings tidings of salvation for the heathen, and all the races who never heard in the flesh "the only name given under heaven whereby man can be saved." It strikes a blow at Satan and his deceivings and their results. It opens up to view the possibilities of the final triumph of the Redeemer, and depicts the glorious scene when all shall be brought up by the blood of the Lamb from death and hell, and both in heaven and on earth and also under the earth and in the sea the song of salvation shall be heard, and "every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Jesus is the Christ to the glory of God the Father."