

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

JOHN HUMPHREY NOYES AND HIS "BIBLE COMMUNISTS"

PROFESSOR BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD, D.D., LL.D., LITT.D.
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

III. THE STRUCTURE

It was in May, 1846, so Noyes tells us,¹¹¹ that "entire communism" was put into practice, and the association which had enjoyed hitherto only a progressively increasing community in goods, entered upon the enjoyment also of a community of women, and so became really "a common family." From this time every man in the association — it consisted then of from thirty to forty members, but was destined to grow to over three hundred¹¹² — looked on every woman in it as his wife, and every woman looked on every man as her husband. When he wished to set this arrangement over against the "legality" of the exclusive "marriage of the world," which he affirmed to be abrogated in the Kingdom of God, Noyes called it "free love." When he wished, on the other hand, to defend it against the charge of "licentiousness," he called it "pantogamy," and insisted that it was as true a marriage as the "exclusive marriage of the world" itself, — only "complex marriage" instead of selfish individual marriage. The enormity of the arrangement will perhaps be best apprehended when we remind ourselves that the community was intended to include, and did, in point of fact, from the beginning include, men and women united to one another by the ties of the closest kinship. A historian of the community, having in mind apparently only the law of promiscuity which reigned in it, cries out in shocked amazement that men of apparently reputable standing could be found, as they were found, to take their wives and daughters with them into such an arrangement. We do not touch the bottom of this degradation, however, until we recall that under this engagement the father at once himself became the hus-

band of his daughters and his daughters the wives of their father. Children growing up in the community were — though they might be brother and sister — the prospective husbands and wives of one another, as well as of their own parents. Noyes himself took into the community with him from its first formation at Putney, not only his brother, who at once became therefore sharer with him in all his marital relations, but two sisters, who became at once therefore the wives of both himself and his brother.¹¹³ We do not affirm that marital rights were ever actually exercised in such cases. Of that we know and can know nothing. Respect for humanity leads us to suppose it incredible that it could have been brought to that pass. But it is of the utmost importance that we should fully realize that this is what Noyes's pantogamy meant; that this pantogamy formed the very foundation stone of his whole system and was put fully into practice; that he was constant in proclaiming it and strict in enforcing it; and that he encouraged its free practice by teaching along with it that the sexual act was of no more significance than any other token of universal affection.

Noyes is insistent in pointing out that the freedom of intercourse inaugurated in his community was not absolutely unlimited in practice, and he appears to fancy that it may on this account escape the stigma of licentiousness and even perhaps of promiscuity. The limitations were, however, entirely of a prudential character, and had as one of their main purposes precisely to secure and maintain the practice of promiscuity. It is just here that the contrariety between his practice and Fourier's fancies, which he much — and rightly — urged in other relations,¹¹⁴ comes most distinctly to view. Both insisted on promiscuity in the sexual relation. But with Fourier this promiscuity was a means to an end — the complete indulgence of passion; he sought, as Ralph Waldo Emerson puts it,¹¹⁵ "the greatest amount of kissing that the human constitution admitted." With Noyes, on the other hand, it was not the amount of the kissing which was the main concern,

but its distribution; it was precisely promiscuity which was his end; and to secure that end everything else had to give way. For example, Fourier¹¹⁶ expected the young people to pair among themselves, of course purely spontaneously — if inclination led elsewhere, inclination naturally was to have its way; and he expected these young pairs to remain faithful to one another at least during the ardor of their first love — of course, again, only because natural inclination would so determine it. Noyes apparently did not doubt that Fourier was right in supposing that this would be the natural course of things. But there was nothing which he more sternly repressed than any tendency among young or old to monopolize one another, as he would say. When any such tendency manifested itself, he required each of those concerned to pair with some one else. We learn that much suffering was caused by the enforcement of this measure:¹¹⁷ it had no other end than the maintenance of promiscuity. It was his policy, also, to repress all direct courtship.¹¹⁸ Pairing was arranged through the intermediation of third parties, regularly the older female members of the community¹¹⁹ being called upon to perform this service. And it was a principle with Noyes to prevent ordinarily the pairing of the young with the young. Fourier suggests that it might happen now and then that a youth would take a fancy to, and obtain the favor of, a lady of mature age: indeed, as A. J. Booth tells us,¹²⁰ he has recorded a thrilling incident "to illustrate how a youth, in all the ardor of virgin passion, may be irresistibly attracted by the personal charms of a lady more than one hundred years old." Noyes, on principle, required the young of both sexes to pair with the old, and discouraged the pairing of the young with the young.¹²¹ Thus, at least on paper, the sexual relations were in Noyes's scheme governed strictly by a principle: there was no spontaneity about it; promiscuity in these relations was required and secured.¹²² The ultimate end, of course, was the safety of the community, which would be endangered by the formation of "monopolizing" attachments. The

end of the safety of the community determined another of Noyes's regulations — the universal practice, through the community, of his method of birth control.¹²³ The care and expense of children would be a burden to the community, which would form a menace to its stability. Afterwards, when the community had passed through its tentative stage, the breeding of children — we use this phraseology advisedly — was undertaken on the most scientific principles. Not all the members of the community were permitted to produce children: certain ones were selected for breeding purposes, and paired with close attention to their mutual characteristics. Noyes calls this "Stirpiculture," and wrote a pamphlet¹²⁴ in the early seventies to explain its importance and the modes of its application. "Previous to about two years and a half ago," he says in this pamphlet, "we refrained from the usual rate of child bearing, for several reasons, financial and otherwise. Since that time we have made an attempt to produce the usual number of offspring to which people in the middle classes are able to afford judicious moral and spiritual care, with the advantage of a liberal education. In this attempt, twenty-four men and twenty women have been engaged, selected from among those who have most thoroughly practiced our social theory."

In one matter at least, connected with the restrictions placed on themselves by his followers in the practice of promiscuity, Noyes is far from candid. He wishes to obtain credit for them for confining their practice within the bounds of the community, and on this ground he invites us to look upon the compact which bound the community together as a true marriage — a "complex marriage," no doubt, but none the less a marriage,¹²⁵ and the community so bound together as a true family. "Our communities," he says,¹²⁶ "are families, as distinctly bounded and separated from promiscuous society as ordinary households." The bounding and separating of these communities from promiscuous society differed from the bounding and separating of families from that society,

however, in being merely *de facto*, and, according to Noyes's most fervent preaching, temporary, affording only samples of what was soon to become universal and preparing the way to it. The promiscuity practiced in these communities was therefore in principle universal, and was expected soon to become in fact universal. It is therefore thoroughly disingenuous to point to its momentary confinement to the communities as if that were of its essence, and on that ground to cloak the unbridled lasciviousness of this doctrine under such names as complex marriage and complex families. In point of fact, the fundamental doctrine which Noyes taught in this relation was pure, unbounded promiscuity; and all adaptations of this doctrine to community life were afterthoughts and were conceived by him as temporary expedients. What he discovered in the spring of 1834 was that in the kingdom of heaven there is no marriage or giving in marriage whatever. What he declared in 1845¹²⁷ was that "the abolishment of worldly restrictions to sexual intercourse is involved in the anti-legality of the gospel," because such restrictions are "incompatible with the state of perfect freedom toward which Paul's gospel of 'grace without law' leads." What he still teaches in 1870¹²⁸ is that, as there is "no intrinsic difference between property in persons and property in things," the community of goods inaugurated after Pentecost carries with it community of women. "The same spirit which abolished exclusiveness in regard to money," he says, "would abolish, if circumstances allowed full scope to it, exclusiveness in regard to women and children. Paul expressly places property in women and property in goods in the same category, and speaks of them together as ready to be abolished by the advent of the Kingdom of Heaven." The restriction of this promiscuity to the community was to Noyes an evil, an evil to be overcome, and to the overcoming of which he looked forward with fervent hope. And it was not the restriction of its practice within the communities which made these communities attractive to him, but the practice of it there. He arraigns "the law of mar-

riage" because, as he says,¹²⁹ "it gives to sexual appetite only a scanty and monotonous allowance, and so produces the natural vices of poverty, contraction of taste, and stinginess or jealousy." He praises¹³⁰ "a community home in which each is married to all, and where love is honored and cultivated," precisely because it "will be as much more attractive than an ordinary home, as the community out-numbers a pair," — which, put brutally, is just to say that the sexual satisfaction increases with numbers.¹³¹ Fourier himself, to whom confessedly the free gratification of passion was everything, could not have expressed his own principle with more frankness.¹³²

Although this iniquity was put into practice in 1846, there seems to have been at first something tentative and veiled in the practice of it. Noyes's own expression is that it was begun "cautiously."¹³³ Even when done in a corner, however, such a thing is not easy to hide. And it became increasingly evident, as time went on, that the people of Putney were, in a general way, aware of what was being done and were quite disinclined to permit it to be done among them. As the antagonism rose, Noyes and his followers braced themselves to meet it. The line taken was the bold one of asserting for themselves immediate divine guidance and sanction. They apparently hoped thus to overcome opposition by the dread authority of Deity itself: and they sank to the mountebank device of invoking pretended miracles in support of their assertion. The crisis drew on in the midsummer of 1847. On the evening of the first of June, we are told by one of their number,¹³⁴ their leader startled his assembled disciples with the question: "Is not now the time for us to commence the testimony that the Kingdom of God has come — to proclaim boldly that God in His character of Deliverer, Law-giver and Judge has come to this town and in this Association?" The significance of this question was twofold. What had been done more or less in secret was now to be proclaimed on the housetop, and the coming of the Kingdom of God was to be asserted because, in Noyes's teaching, it was only

in the Kingdom of God that such things were sanctioned — "woe unto him," he had cried in the Battle Axe Letter, "who abolishes the law of the apostacy before he stands in the holiness of the resurrection." The answer returned by his followers to his question was a unanimous affirmation. "It was seen that a new and further confession of truth was necessary; that it was the next thing before them in the course of progress to which they had been called. It was unanimously adopted, therefore, as the confession and testimony of the believers assembled, that the Kingdom of heaven had come." This, however, was mere assertion; and the only proof of the assertion was that those who made it were living in sexual promiscuity, — which was to them an evident concomitant of the entrance into the world of the new divine order, but which could scarcely be counted upon to impress the outside world in the same way. Hence the appeal to miracles.

The star case was the healing of Harriet A. Hall, a chronic invalid, by the combined ministrations of Noyes and Mary Cragin on June 22. The miracles, it will be noted, did not tarry when they were needed. The patient, says Noyes,¹⁸⁵ "was completely bedridden, and almost blind, lying in nearly total darkness." "From this state," he declares, "she was raised instantly, by the laying on of hands, and by the word of command, into strength which enabled her to walk, to face the sun, and ride miles without inconvenience, and with excessive pleasure." "The cure of Mrs. Harriet A. Hall," he asserts, "is as unimpeachable as any of the miracles of the primitive church." On the contrary, it is as obvious a sham as any of the thousands and thousands of sham miracles which disgrace the annals of the church, and not of the church only but of every popular religious movement throughout the world — differing only from other sham miracles in bearing on its brow the brand of fraud, as many of them do not. The part taken by Mary Cragin¹⁸⁶ in this miracle — and others — is so barefacedly that of a play-actor, that one wonders that so shrewd a man as Noyes permitted the details to

be made public. Other miracles followed in rapid succession; ¹³⁷ and not content even with these, others still, alleged to have been wrought previously, were now brought forward and made public.¹³⁸ But it was all in vain. The people were obdurate; and, having refused to believe Noyes and his followers, would not believe though many rose from their beds. Vigorous action was begun to rid the town of the scandal. Indignation meetings were held. The courts were set in motion; civil suits for damages were brought; the Grand Jury found a true bill and in the indictment thus made Noyes was arraigned on specific charges of adultery and held for trial on heavy bail. The result was, happily, the destruction of the obnoxious community at Putney. The suspension of the publication of the community's journal — *The Spiritual Magazine* — was compelled.¹³⁹ Immunity in the courts was bought only at heavy cost; the civil suits were satisfied by money payments out of court; ¹⁴⁰ before the criminal case came on, Noyes broke bail and fled beyond the jurisdiction of the court.¹⁴¹ The community itself began to scatter and in a year or so it was gone.¹⁴²

It was not at all within the plans of the leaders of the Community, however, because they had been driven out of Putney, to pass out of existence. In the height of the storm at Putney, Noyes was busily preparing for the future. Not content with calling heaven to bear witness to him in manifest miracles, he was as diligently engaged during this fateful midsummer of 1847 in strengthening his interests among the children of men. He turned in his need to those "New York Perfectionists" from whom he had decisively separated himself, and whose ways he had never wearied of declaring not his ways. Nor did he turn in vain. He was treated by them with marked deference from the outset; and in the end he obtained from them the means for reintegrating his enterprise under better stars than ever. Already on July 3d we find him drawing up in an elaborate document "the testimony of the parties concerned" in his star miracle, "at the request

and in presence of" the notorious John B. Foot, "for his private use" — from which it seems that Foot was at the time in Putney.¹⁴³ And in the issue of *The Spiritual Magazine* for July 15, announcement was made of the holding of two Conventions of perfectionists in Central New York, in the approaching September, "called," says Hinds,¹⁴⁴ "for promoting unity and coöperation between the New York and Putney believers." These Conventions were called by John B. Foot and John Corwin, and met, the earlier at Lairdsville, Oneida County, New York, on September 3, under the presidency of Jonathan Burt, and the latter at Genoa, Cayuga County, under the presidency of Foot. Noyes made them the occasion of a five weeks' tour of electioneering character through the region and, of course, was present at both Conventions as the official representative of one of the parties whose coöperation it was their avowed purpose to promote. As a result a series of resolutions, drafted by a committee of which Noyes was chairman, was passed at the later Convention "without a dissenting vote." These resolutions ran:¹⁴⁵—

"1. Resolved, That we will devote ourselves exclusively to the establishment of the Kingdom of God; and as that kingdom includes and provides for all interests, religious, political, social and physical, that we will not join or coöperate with any other association. 2. Resolved, That as the Kingdom of God is to have an external manifestation, and as that manifestation must be in some form of association, we will acquaint ourselves with the principles of heavenly association, and train ourselves to conformity to them as fast as possible. 3. Resolved, That one of the leading principles of heavenly association, is the renunciation of exclusive claim to private property. 4. Resolved, That it is expedient immediately to take measures for forming a heavenly association in Central New York. 5. Resolved, That William H. Cook be authorized, on our behalf, to visit the perfectionists throughout the state, for the purpose of stirring up their minds in relation to association, and ascertaining the amount of men and means that are in readiness for the enterprise."

By these remarkable resolutions the perfectionists of Cen-

tral New York not only committed themselves to communism in principle, but to the immediate establishment of a Communistic Association, and set measures on foot to carry out this declared purpose. We are told further that, on the passage of the resolutions, "with great fervor the strongest men of the Convention came forward and pledged 'their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor' to the enterprise proposed in the resolutions, and for the establishment of the Kingdom of God in the world."¹⁴⁶ Noyes's appeal to men had been more successful than his appeal to God. He had secured from the New York perfectionists action which looked to the mere transference of his establishment from Putney to New York. And that is indeed precisely what happened, but not with the smoothness and facility which appeared likely on a mere surface view of things.

For there was one thing on which Noyes had not been quite candid with his New York brethren, and allusion to which is entirely absent from the set of resolutions whose passage he had secured from them. This was his doctrine of sexual promiscuity — and the relation in which it stood, in his view, to the possible formation of a Communistic Society, such as he had now committed them to. As they became aware of these things their zeal in coöperating with him in the foundation of such a society vanished. A series of resolutions, introduced by Otis Sanford of Clinton, New York, having the design of expressing sympathy and coöperation with Noyes, was passed by the earlier — the Lairdsville — Conference, with cordial unanimity. In these, entire approbation was expressed of the "general course of the press at Putney," and cordial coöperation with the Putney brethren in the circulation of their publications was promised.¹⁴⁷ But Noyes is compelled to add to his report of this resolution:¹⁴⁸ "At the close of the meetings, Otis Sanford, in consequence of discovering that I was the author of the 'Battle Axe letter' (which he had never seen before), retracted his assent to these resolutions." This is but a straw showing how the wind was

veering around. The sentiments of the brethren, in point of fact, underwent nothing less than a revulsion, which wrecked the whole great project which had been entered upon. There were those among them who had been involved in the indecencies of "Spiritual Wifehood," but complete sexual promiscuity and that as the very foundation-stone of their society of saints, was more than, with all their antinomian tendencies, they could stomach. As an eye-witness of what was happening writes:—"As soon as they heard of cross-fellowship, and the fact that their chosen apostle was under bonds for the charge of adultery," they drew decisively back. And thus it was brought about that though by his visit to New York Noyes provided for the removal of his community to that State, it was not with the support of the New York perfectionists at large.

We must suppose that it was in very deep disappointment that Noyes returned to Putney. Certainly he returned to very great trouble. The people were inexorable: his community was dispersed: the criminal suit against him was pending; there was no promise in the outlook. On the twenty-sixth of November he felt constrained to leave Putney forever, taking up his residence in New York City. Meanwhile, there were a few men in Central New York who, being like-minded with him, were not content to permit the resolutions passed at the September Conventions to fall wholly to the ground.¹⁴⁹ They could do nothing so grandiose as was contemplated in those resolutions. But they were resolved to establish a community in a small way on some such lines. These men, Jonathan Burt, Joseph C. Ackley, Daniel P. Nash, united their interests and invited Noyes to join them. This he did about the first of February, 1848, and at once took the lead in the enterprise and, indeed, as was his wont, became the dictator. The members of the old Putney Community joined him, and by the first of March the Oneida Community was fully organized. In giving an account in his "American Socialisms" ¹⁵⁰ of the origins of the Community he wishes

to trace them back alternately to impulses derived from the great revivals of 1831 and the experiments at Brook Farm. "Thus the Oneida Community," he says, "really issued from a conjunction between the Revivalism of Orthodoxy and the Socialism of Unitarianism." Then he descends to details: "In 1846, after the fire at Brook Farm, and when Fourierism was manifestly passing away, the little church at Putney began cautiously to experiment in Communism. In the fall of 1847, when Brook Farm was breaking up, the Putney Community was also breaking up, but in the agonies, not of death, but of birth. Putney conservatism expelled it, and a Perfectionist Community just begun at Oneida, under the influence of the Putney School, received it."

After a quarter of a century of successful development, the exodus could be described in this poetical language. It was anything but poetry at the time. Except the hospitable welcome of Jonathan Burt¹⁵¹ there was little that was inviting in the untamed woods and streams of Oneida Creek; and the first years of the Community's residence there were comfortless and hard enough, but also on that very account bracing and disciplining. "At first," says Hinds,¹⁵² "the community buildings at Oneida consisted of two small frame dwellings, a log hut, and an old saw-mill, once owned by the Indians. It was a dozen years before their members got beyond sleeping in garrets and out-houses. Though the means brought in by the members enabled them to live tolerably well at first they soon learned to content themselves with the homeliest fare." The community, however, grew rapidly in numbers and efficiency; and ultimately, in wealth. Beginning in the spring of 1848 with about forty members, by the first of the next year it had eighty-nine, which it doubled in the course of the year 1849: on February 20, 1851, there were two hundred and five members, in 1875 two hundred and ninety-eight, and in 1878 three hundred and six.¹⁵³ Nearly a hundred and eight thousand dollars were brought in by the incoming members during the first nine

years, of which something more than forty thousand were sunk in living, leaving the Community on January 1, 1857, with a capital of sixty-seven thousand dollars. Now, however, economic success began, and the industries of the Community became profitable. These were mainly concentrated in the business of the canning of fruits and vegetables, and the manufacture of silk and steel traps.¹⁵⁴ It is not necessary to dwell on these things. Information on the industrial side of the life of the community is easily accessible and is indeed in the possession of all. Only enough is required to be said to secure that it should be well understood on the one hand that the Oneida Community became eminently successful in the economic and industrial aspects, and on the other that the development of the Community on this side represents a new phase of Noyes's activities, peculiar to the Oneida period.

Although, of course, community of goods was a dogma with him from the beginning of his speculations, and he had put it into practice at Putney, as there was no necessity for the development of large industrial efficiency before the removal to Oneida, so there was no marked progress made toward it. There is no evidence that Noyes had specially engaged himself with the problems of economic and industrial life prior to his settlement at Oneida. At Oneida, however, he was faced with hard conditions, and, after a period of partial failure, conquered them. There is an appearance that perhaps as a result of this necessary engrossment with these problems, the center of his interests now changed, and that economic matters began to loom in his mind as intrinsically more important than the matters to which he had hitherto given himself with most predilection. Religion, sex, industry — it was along this line of advance that his mind seems to have moved; and as he appears to have come to value religion chiefly as a sanction to sexual promiscuity, so he appears to have come in the end to value sexual promiscuity mainly as a means to economic efficiency. Our meaning in saying this is not that he looked on his religious theories as the neces-

sary foundation of his sexual theory, and on this sexual theory as the necessary foundation of any successful communism. That goes without saying. That was the very essence of his theorizing; and no doubt from the practical point of view, also, he was right—decent people could scarcely have been brought to follow his sexual practice save under the influence of some such religious fanaticism as he imbued them with, and very certainly no communism can stand save on the ruins of the institution of marriage. What we are saying, however, is nearly the opposite of this. It is that Noyes, as he appears at Putney to have lost interest in his religious fanaticism in his absorption in sexualism, so appears at Oneida to have to some extent lost interest in his sexualism in his absorption in his industrialism—necessary as each nevertheless was to the basis of the other. Revivalist, perfectionist, sensualist, economist—that seems to be the line of his development. Not that he ever formally abandoned either his fantastic religious theories or his gross sexual doctrine, but that, an industrial communism having been created on their foundation, and now actually existing, he seems to have come to fancy that it might continue to exist and to function without their aid.

In this he was certainly mistaken, as the event proved. It was precisely through its drawing back from these religious absurdities and sexual abominations that the community crumbled. It lasted just a generation—from 1848 to 1880: and that it was just a generation that it lasted was no accident. What it means is that it lasted so long as those were at the helm who had taken up the enterprise under the impulse of a strong fanaticism; and that it fell to pieces when the guidance came into the hands of a new generation which could not believe the things by which its fathers had lived. W. P. Garrison, writing in *The Nation* of September 4, 1879, as the process of its dissolution was beginning, remarks with great weight:—

“That the split in regard to sexual relations has come with the second generation was only what was to be ex-

pected. Nothing but a Chinese wall and the adoption of a conventional stringency would have prevented it. . . . Nothing is surer than that the Oneida system of complex marriage was a reversion to barbarism,—to ways repudiated by the race in its efforts to rise above the promiscuous intercourse of the brutes. All the attention it deserved at the hands of social philosophers was due to this fact, and to one other, that it was justified by an appeal to supernatural sanctions. . . . What is most surprising in Mr. Noyes' message to the Community is his declaration that he did not regard the hitherto existing sexual arrangements as 'essential parts' of their profession as Christian Communists. He has been saying this, it appears, for a year past. But ten years ago, in his work on *American Socialisms* he still held to the doctrine laid down in his *Bible Communism* in 1848, that 'the restoration of true relations between the sexes is a matter second in importance only to the reconciliation of man and God,' and that 'the sin-system, the marriage-system, the work-system, are all one, and must be abolished together. . . . Mr. Noyes has, we conceive, outlived his headship. His successor . . . is the self-appointed head of the party which has become dissatisfied with complex marriage. In other words, there is no real successor. A revolution has taken place: the Community as it was has suffered a mutilation which practically destroys its identity, and will by the coming historian be added to the list of extinct Utopias."

What was happening in the Community could not easily be better described. Noyes was growing old, and was losing his hold on the community. Murmurings and disputings were heard on every side. The younger members had become skeptical both of Noyes's religious system and of his theory of sexual relationship,¹⁵⁵ and restive under the control exercised over them. It was clear that a change of some sort was imperative. Noyes sought it in the first instance by retiring from the headship of the Community and putting a younger and more vigorous man in his place. The man he chose for his successor was not unnaturally his own son, Theodore R. Noyes, and he may have hoped the more from the choice because this son was a leader of the disaffected party,—certainly at least with reference to the religious aspects of it.¹⁵⁶ The experiment was not

successful, and Noyes was compelled to withdraw the appointment. The disaffection which had been smouldering was now in flames. There were some, no doubt, who were ready to acquiesce in any settlement commended to them by their "tried leader." But there were now two embittered parties shut up together within the bonds of this "family." The one "could see nothing but a skeptic in the man who had dared to develop the fruits of the spirit of Christ in any other way than through their prescribed methods of professing unqualified belief in some of the doctrines of traditional Christianity."¹⁵⁷ The other was made up of enthusiastic supporters of the younger Noyes, and some of these, offended by his enforced withdrawal from the leadership, themselves withdrew from the family.

At this period a new factor entered the situation — external opposition. The tardily begun and tardily culminating protest of the people of the State of New York against the toleration in their midst of such a moral offense as the Oneida Community constituted, had now at last reached the point of effective action. The soul of this protest had been for a number of years John W. Mears, then a professor in Hamilton College, and the credit of bringing it through many difficulties to a decisive issue belongs mainly to him. We may date the beginning of the end, doubtless, from the appointment by the Synod of Central New York in 1873 of a committee charged with the duty of conferring with other religious bodies and determining on what measures were feasible. And the end itself was foreshadowed when a Conference called by J. W. Mears, F. D. Huntington, E. O. Haven, A. F. Beard, and E. G. Thurber, met on February 14, 1879, in the University Building at Syracuse, New York, "for the purpose," as it is brusquely reported in *The Nation*,¹⁵⁸ "of breaking up the Oneida Community." This brusque language does not unfairly represent the temper of the Convention. The Oneida Community was recognized as intolerable, and every sort of difficulty had been raised to dealing with it decisively. It sheltered itself under the constantly re-

peated assertion that no law existed under which it could be proceeded against: as the lawyers put it, you cannot prove adultery without first proving marriage, and the Oneida people were not generally married. Sentimental objections to proceeding against them were also diligently advanced. The Oneida people were good citizens, and good business men, and good neighbors, and good employers of labor; they were a model of order and sobriety and diligence: why disturb them? Their morality? Well, said *The Nation*,¹⁵⁹ "the Oneida theory of the relation of the sexes is odious, no doubt, but it is the product of a crack-brained biblical exegesis and is sincerely held, and the sheriff can hardly kill it." All this was brushed aside by the Convention. Morality, it said, is worth as much to a community as business ability; and if no law exists by which an end can be put to such flagrant immorality as flaunts itself in the Oneida Community — why the sooner such a law is made the better. So it appointed a committee to see if new legislation was really needed to meet the case, and if so to set steps on foot to secure it. That committee met in June, enlarged its numbers and very obviously got to business. It had become clear to every eye that the Oneida Community was doomed.

This had already become so clear to Noyes himself before the Conference of February 19 met that he approached that Conference with a document, which he caused to be distributed among its members, in which he practically promised that the Community would adjust itself to any special legislation the Conference might secure. The Oneida Community should be compared with the Shakers, he pleaded, not the Mormons: its members "had always been peaceable subjects of civil authority, no seditious act had been charged upon them; they had never proposed to carry out their peculiar principles in defiance of the laws or of the public opinion of their neighbors; and if special legislation should be obtained unfavorable to them, they would still be faithful to their record of submission to the 'powers that be.'" ¹⁶⁰ Possibly the Conference took heart of

grace from such a promise; at any rate its representatives proceeded on their way with increased activity. Noyes's fear in February had increased by June — when the Conference's Committee met — to a certain foreboding of evil, and that with reference to his own person as well as with reference to the Community. He fled beyond the jurisdiction of the New York Courts and took up his residence in Canada, where he resided for the rest of his life.¹⁶¹ From this safe retreat he immediately (August 25, 1879) proposed to the Community which he had left behind him a complete surrender of its obnoxious practices.

"I need hardly remind the Community," he wrote,¹⁶² "that we have always claimed freedom of conscience to change our social practices, and have repeatedly offered to abandon the offensive part of our system of communism if so required by public opinion. We have lately pledged ourselves in our publications to loyally obey any new legislation which may be instituted against us. Many of you will remember that I have frequently said within the last year that I did not consider our present social arrangements an essential part of our profession as Christian Communists, and that we should probably have to recede from them sooner or later. I think the time has come for us to act on these principles of freedom and offer for your consideration the following modifications of our practical platform." The modifications thus intimated, he then propounds as follows:—

"I propose: (1) That we give up the practice of complex marriages not as renouncing belief in the principles and prospective finality of that institution, but in deference to the public sentiment which is evidently rising against it. (2) That we place ourselves not on the platform of the Shakers, on the one hand, nor of the world on the other, but on Paul's platform which allows marriage but prefers celibacy. To carry out this change, it will be necessary first of all that we should go into a new and earnest study of the seventh chapter of 1 Corinthians, in which Paul fully defines his position, and also that of the Lord Jesus Christ, in regard to the sexual relations proper for the Church in the presence of worldly institu-

tions. If you accept these modifications, the Community will consist of two distinct classes — the married and the celibate — both legitimate, but the last preferred." "What will become of communism after these modifications," he now proceeds, "may be defined thus: (1) We shall hold our property and business in common, as now. (2) We shall live together in a common household and eat at a common table, as now. (3) We shall have a common children's department, as now. (4) We shall have our daily evening meetings, and all of our present means of moral and spiritual improvement. Surely here is communism enough to hold us together and inspire us with heroism for a new career. With the breeze of general good will in our favor, which even Professor Mears has promised us on the condition of our giving up the 'immoral features' of our system, what new wonders of success may we not hope for in the years to come? For my part, I think we have great cause to be thankful for the toleration which has so long been accorded to our audacious experiment. Especially are we indebted to the authorities and people of our immediate neighborhood for kindness and protection. It will be a great and gracious thing for us to relieve them at last of the burden of our unpopularity, and show the world that Christian Communism has self-control and flexibility enough to live and flourish without complex marriage."

It must not be supposed from the tone of the preamble and appendix of this communication that Noyes was arguing with an unwilling community, to secure if possible from it action to which it was indisposed. He was really yielding to what had become the general demand of the Community; but in doing so supplying them with a plausible account of their action, such as would as far as possible save their and his susceptibilities. The action of the Community on this proposal was so immediate as to appear eager. The same number of the *American Socialist*¹⁰³ which prints the proposal prints also this action: "The above measure was considered by the Oneida Community in full Assembly, August 26, 1879, and its propositions accepted; and it is to be understood that from the present date the Community will consist of two classes of members, namely, celibates, or those who prefer to live a life of sexual abstinence, and the married, who practice only

the sexual freedom which strict monogamy allows. The Community will now look for the sympathy and encouragement which have been so liberally promised in case this change should ever be made."

By this action, naturally, the bottom was knocked out of the agitation against the Community. That agitation was directed solely against its "immoral features," and these were now abandoned.¹⁶⁴ But the bottom happily was by it knocked out of the Community also.¹⁶⁵ It was precisely in its system of "complex marriage" that the coherence of the Community consisted; that was the cement which held it together. That gone, everything was gone. If Noyes cherished any real expectations that the Community would seek to prolong its existence on the new "social platform" which he outlined for it, he was quickly undeceived. No celibacy for it! Before the close of the year "in addition to those cases in which there was a resumption of former marriage relations, there were twenty marriages in the Community," and, the chronicler adds, "the work continued apace," and in a few years "scarcely half a dozen" remained unmarried.¹⁶⁶ And no more communism for it! The change here was scarcely more difficult to manage and was no less decisively carried through. By the end of the year 1880 all communistic features had been eliminated and the Community had become an ordinary joint-stock company, carrying on as such the large business enterprises which had been developed. Noyes himself, writing in 1885, enumerates for us the steps in the process by which his lifework was undone.¹⁶⁷ "On the 20th of August, 1879, I proposed that the practice of Complex Marriage be given up; on the 26th my proposition was adopted by the Community unanimously; on the 28th it was published to the world; and was received by the press generally with commendation. From that time the proposal of a general change from Communism to private ownership and joint-stock began to be agitated in the Oneida Community. It was discussed carefully and peaceably; and after sixteen months of study and preparation

of details communism of property was given up, as complex marriage had been before it, and on the 1st of January, 1881, the joint-stock company called the Oneida Community, Limited, took the place of the Oneida Community." There were naturally some in so large a community who regretted this final change and would fain have preserved, if not a completely communistic organization, yet as many communistic features in their organization as possible. But there seems to have been no doubt, either in the sentiment of the community at large or in the minds of their responsible leaders, that this was a case in which it is the first step that counts; and that the abandonment of "complex marriage" was in fact the abandonment of communism, and should be acted on as such.

In this they were undoubtedly right. It was in point of fact a part of their most intimate experience through a generation of communistic living that, while the obnoxious "mine" and "thine" continue valid in the most intimate relation of life, it is folly to speak of their abolition elsewhere. But though we may justly say that the experience of the Oneida Community provides an empirical demonstration of the theoretically obvious proposition that communism cannot exist apart from the aid of "complex marriage," with all its accompaniments and consequences, it by no means follows that permanency can be secured to it merely by this outrage on the deepest instincts of human nature. There are other instincts of human nature also which communism outrages, and on which all attempts to establish a communistic society must ultimately be wrecked. Property itself, for example, upon which communism makes its most immediate assault, is just as much a law of nature — or, let us say, a law of God, — is just as much an ineradicable instinct of man — as marriage, with which it is indeed inextricably involved. Goldwin Smith, in an illuminating page,¹⁸⁸ instructs us to think of property not as an institution of human society, but as a fundamental condition of human life. "A state of things in which a man would not think that what he had

made for himself was his own," he remarks, "is unknown to experience and beyond the range of our conceptions." The economical value of property may arise from the circumstance that it is "the only known motive of production." But the right of property does not rest on this consideration of expediency, but is intrinsic in the individual's right to himself. This right he can never yield, and all attempts at communism, which are at bottom only attempts to deprive men of their ineradicable rights — to themselves and the fruits of their own activities — are bound to break to pieces in the end on these primeval instincts of the race. The persistence of the Oneida Community for a generation suggests nothing to the contrary. It was not a self-subsisting communistic state. Economically considered, it was only a limited commercial association, pooling its earnings and living parasitically on the surrounding community. It not only recruited itself steadily from outside, but it depended wholly on the wider community in which it was encysted for all the necessities of living — police protection, social intercourse, trade distribution, peace, and opportunity to labor. More. It obtained the raw material for its industries from outside; it found the market for its product outside; it even came, as it grew prosperous, to draw a large part of its labor, by which its product was made, from outside. It became in fact, in principle only an employer-manufacturing concern, whose earnings were enjoyed in common by the owners, instead of divided, in this ratio or another, among them in severalty. When the time came to convert it into a joint-stock company, nothing could have been easier. Its six hundred thousand dollars of invested capital needed merely to be distributed equitably in stock among the owners, and the thing was done.

It was Noyes's contention that religion is the only foundation on which a stable communism can be reared. He does not seem to have been very exigent as to what the nature of this religion should be. The rôle which he assigned to it in his speculations¹⁶⁹ was to chasten and discipline the

spirit for the hardships and restrictions demanded by community life. What has wrecked the communistic societies which have sprung up so luxuriantly in America has been largely, he says, the influx into them of idle, selfish, designing men. "General depravity," he says, is, according to the universal testimony of experience, "the villain of the whole story" — a truth much more profound than apparently he was intending to express. May it not be, he asks, that "the tests of earnest religion are just what are needed to keep a discrimination between 'noble and lofty souls' and the scamps?" The function he wished religion to serve, thus, was to act as a sieve to strain out the unfit — and a great variety of religions might serve this purpose if only they were earnestly held. If a community could be formed of earnestly religious men only, he thought, there might be some hope of its members' living in harmony. He contended, now, that these speculative views had been verified in practice. Looking over the whole list of communistic experiments in America he singles out those which have shown unusual vitality. There are only eight of them; all the rest have quickly died; these only have lived. And now, says Noyes,¹⁷⁰ "the one feature which distinguishes these Communities from the transitory sort, is their religion; which in every case is of the earnest kind which comes by recognized afflatus, and controls all external arrangements." He wishes to draw the induction that it is religion, and religion alone, which makes communism possible.

Goldwin Smith, in criticism, remarks¹⁷¹ that while it is true that all the communities thus singled out by Noyes were religious, yet the list thus singled out does not include all the communities which were religious. Others were religious too — and died. And he might have added, had he written a little later, that these eight have died too — for they are now all dead, except the Shakers, who have become moribund, and the Ephrata and Oneida communities, which survive only in the changed form of joint-stock

companies. Goldwin Smith does add one other remark which is very much to the point. All eight of Noyes's enduring Communistic societies had one other thing in common besides religion, though Noyes does not note it. They all rejected marriage — "whereby," Smith explains, "in the first place they were exempted from the disuniting influence of the separate family; and in the second place, they were enabled to accumulate wealth in a way which would be impossible if they had children to maintain." Some of them were strict celibates, and the others discouraged marriage; and it is much more probable that what enabled them to endure longer than such experiments have ordinarily done was this complete or partial elimination of the particular obstacle that stands most in the way of communistic practice, rather than their religion — except so far, of course, as it was from their religion that they derived the sanction for their misprision of marriage. It was this function, as we have seen, that Noyes assigned to religion in his own communistic experiment. He was insistent, no doubt, that putting first things first, religion was first with him. His Communism was not mere communism standing on the "ordinary platform of communism." It was "Bible Communism," and as such very distinct from the Communism, for example, of "the infidels and Owenites of twenty years ago."¹⁷² God was a party to their communism. "Their doctrine is that of community, not merely or chiefly with each other, but with God." "God as creator, is owner of all; every loyal citizen is joint-owner with God of all things."¹⁷³ But he was not content with laying such a general religious foundation as this for their structure. He shaped his religious teaching so as to provide a particular religious sanction precisely for that community in wives which he rightly saw was the prime essential to the stability of any communistic establishment.

IV. THE DOCTRINE

It will be well for us to obtain some sort of a connected view of the religious system which Noyes taught, as a whole.¹⁷⁴

We have already had occasion to observe—what is obvious in itself and was very fully recognized by Noyes—that his religious system was determined by two fundamental doctrines. "The two corner-stones of doctrine, equally important, on which Communism rests," we read,¹⁷⁵ "are the doctrine of complete Regeneration, or Salvation from Sin, and the truth that the Second Coming of Christ, and the founding of His heavenly Kingdom, took place eighteen hundred years ago. The first furnishes the personal or experimental basis, the second, the historical and political." The former of these determining doctrines is unduly subordinated to the latter in the following enunciation of the "most important elements of faith" held by the Communists,—no doubt because this statement is drawn up from the point of view of their social or "political" theories, and is printed in the opening pages of Noyes's formal exposition of those theories.¹⁷⁶ Nevertheless, the most of what was really effective in Noyes's faith appears in it, and it is worth quoting here for the pointed brevity of its enunciation of the elements of his faith with which it does deal:—

"We believe in the Bible as the text-book of the Spirit of truth; in Jesus Christ as the eternal Son of God; in the Apostles and Primitive Church, as the exponents of the everlasting gospel. We believe that the Second Advent took place at the period of the destruction of Jerusalem; that at that time there was a primary resurrection and judgment in the spiritual world; that the final Kingdom of God then began in the heavens; that the manifestation of that Kingdom in the visible world is now approaching; that its approach is ushering in the second and final resurrection and judgment; that the Church on earth is now rising to meet the approaching Kingdom in the heavens, and to become its duplicate and representative; that the inspiration or open communion with God and the heavens, involving perfect holiness, is the element of connection be-

tween the church on earth and the church in the heavens, and the power by which the Kingdom of God is to be established and reign in the world."

There is no lack of comprehensive statements of Noyes's faith. He was rather fond of framing series of articles of faith or doctrinal theses. He prints, for example, in *The Witness* of August 20, 1837, a full systematic statement of "What we believe" in thirty-four articles, and again in *The Perfectionist* of February 22, 1845, fifty "Theses of the Second Reformation."¹⁷⁷ Each of these fairly covers the whole ground of his faith. We may, however, perhaps content ourselves, for such a general glance over the entire system, with the shorter series of articles printed in the preface to "The Berean." These he speaks of as a "frank synopsis of the leading doctrines of the book" — the book itself being "*the religious book of the Community,*" from which Noyes advises us "the religious theories of the community" may be best ascertained. A polemic form is given these articles, and in each instance the doctrine taught in the Community is set in its relations to the teachings of other bodies. We omit that feature of them and otherwise compress them; and so arrive at the following nine heads of doctrine which may be thought fairly to comprise in utmost brevity the system taught by Noyes. 1. God is not a Trinity, but a Duality — Father and Son: these two are co-eternal but not co-equal. This duality in the Godhead is imaged in the twofold personality of the first man, who was made male and female, and as Adam was to Eve, so is the Father to the Son. 2. God has foreordained all that comes to pass. Evil, however, was eternal, and hence does not fall under the divine foreordination. Its admission into God's creation, nevertheless, was foreordained; and this was done because it was necessary for the judgment and destruction of the uncreated evil. The foreordination of the reprobation of some men and the salvation of others rests on foresight of their divergent conduct. 3. In consequence of Adam's transgression all men are born under the spiritual power of Satan. But there are two

essentially different classes of men. One class are of the very seed of Satan and in every sense depraved. The other class are only subjected to Satan's evil influence and therefore instinctively respond to the word of God when it comes to them. 4. The Atonement is not legal but spiritual. The death of Christ does not satisfy the demands of the law in the place of sinners. It perfects Christ in all human sympathies; destroys the spiritual power of the devil in whom all men are held captive by nature; and delivers those whom He thus wakes and releases from the condemning sin-occasioning power of the law. 5. The motives of the law and a change of purpose in the creature are necessary preparations for the second birth. But the second birth itself is a change not of purpose or acts, but of spiritual condition. It is a divorce of the human spirit from the power of Satan, and a junction of it with the Spirit of God. It is a progressive work, in the double effects of outward cleansing brought about by external moral and spiritual influences, and the inward quickening communicated by the life of Christ through faith. 6. "We agree with the most ultra class of Perfectionists, that whatever is born of God is altogether free from sin." But this complete freedom from sin is not ordinarily attained in the first stage of discipleship. Hence there is in the Church a class of persons called believers or disciples, but not "sons of God," and they are not yet free from sin. 7. Whoever is born of God will infallibly persevere in holiness unto salvation. But believers who are not yet "sons of God" may fall away. 8. Christ's second coming took place in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem, at the end of the time of the Jews. At that time those were judged who had been ripened for the harvest of history by the Old Testament dispensation and the preaching of Christ to the Gentiles. The formal judgment is yet to come, at the end of the times of the Gentiles, bearing the same relation to the period in which we live as that former judgment did to the precedent time. 9. Those that sow to the flesh shall reap eternal punishment.

It is in the vague generality given to them in such brief statements as this that Noyes's doctrines appear to their best advantage. When taken up one by one and explicated in their details, their combined grotesque crudity and reckless extravagance are seen to pass all belief. He has not escaped wholly from the hands of his teachers. Nathaniel W. Taylor has given him the general method of his thinking; Moses Stuart has built the piers on which he supports his dogmas; the fanatical Perfectionists of central and western New York have supplied to him their fundamental content. But he has rounded out the outline and filled in the chinks with material derived from the most outlandish sources, giving to the whole an aspect both fantastic and in the highest degree repellent. He has been most influenced by the Shakers; or it would be more correct to say that the whole formal nature of his system was borrowed from them. They taught, for instance, that God is a dual person, male and female; that Adam was also dual, having been made in God's image; that all angels and spirits are also both male and female; and that the distinction of sex in mankind is eternal, inhering in the soul itself. They taught also that the second coming of Christ had already taken place, that the Church has been apostate since the primitive age and is only now, in themselves, being rebuilt; that the Kingdom of heaven and the personal rule of God is now in process of restoration; that the old law has been abolished; and the direct intercourse between heaven and earth has been renewed; that sinlessness of life is not only a possibility but an obligation; that the use of marriage has ceased; and that death itself has passed away and become only a change of dress, a shedding of the visible robe of the flesh and assumption of the invisible glory of the spirit. To every one of these items of Shaker teaching Noyes presents a clear counterpart. Sometimes he simply takes the Shaker doctrine over just as he found it. More frequently he tried to fit it into his own personal lines of thinking. But even when he most alters it—as in his transformation of their celibacy into his promiscu-

ity — the genetic connection is not wholly obscured. He has not contented himself, however, with borrowing from the Shakers. He has not disdained to pick up fragments of notions from what appears to have been his student's reading of the early history of the Church, and thus to embroider his doctrine with scraps of all sorts of outworn heresies. Thus, for example, he has thus given it especially the odd aspect of a revival of Gnostic Dualism.

The place which the dualistic principle takes in Noyes's theological constructions is nothing less than astonishing. We have seen that, following the Shakers, he conceives God as "a dual being, consisting of the Father and the Word,"¹⁷⁸ and if he does not go on with the Shakers and proclaim Him flatly, in His duality, "male and female," he fails of this by the narrowest of margins. He speaks of the "law of duality" which is indicated in all nature and suggested by the creation of the first pair, and then of this law he declares that it "takes its rise from the constitution of God Himself, who is dual — the Father and the Son — in whose image man was made, male and female, and of whose nature the whole creation is a reflection."¹⁷⁹ Nature being a reflection of the nature of God, we may of course learn what God's nature is from nature. "If we reason," says he,¹⁸⁰ "from the seen to the unseen, assuming that the essential nature of the effect is in the cause, we have proof as broad as the universe, that the Godhead is a duality: for every link of the chain of productive life, in its whole visible extent from the lowest region of the vegetable Kingdom, to the highest of the animal, is a duality. The distinction between male and female is as universal as vitality, and all visible evidence goes to prove that it is the indispensable condition of reproduction, that is of vital creation. If we find two elements in all the streams of life, why should we not infer that the same two elements are in the Fountain?" If this reasoning has any validity whatever, it proves not merely that there is a duality in the Divine Being, but that the duality takes the specific form of a differentiation into male and female. Accord-

ingly we find Noyes saying: "We are led to the simple conclusion, that the uncreated Creator, the Head of the Universe, like the head of mankind and the head of every family, though one, is yet 'twain' (Mark x. 8): in a word, that the creation has a Father and a Mother."¹⁸¹ And his formal confession of faith runs:¹⁸² "We believe, not in the Trinity,¹⁸³ nor in the Unity, but in the Duality of the God-head; and that Duality in our view, is imaged in the two-fold personality of the first man, who was made 'male and female' (Gen. i. 27)." He does, to be sure, add, "As Adam was to Eve, so is the Father to the Son; i. e. he is the same in nature, but greater in power and glory"; and this can hardly be understood otherwise than as confining the difference between the Father and Son substantially to one of "power and glory." And, elsewhere, he certainly argues at considerable length for this general idea.¹⁸⁴ Perhaps his most lucid explanation of his meaning, however, is conveyed in the followed extended sentence:¹⁸⁵ "I do regard the Father and the Son, as two Spirits, who bear a similar *social* (not *physical*) relation to each other as that which exists between man and woman, one of whom is greater than the other (as the man is greater than the woman), who love each other and have pleasure in their fellowship (as man and woman love and have pleasure in spiritual fellowship), who are the joint parents of all created things (as man and woman are the joint parents of their offspring), who are thus the prototype in whose image Adam and Eve were made." If this, however, be all that Noyes means, there certainly is less in his conclusion than in his premises.

If the sexual distinction in God may be understood, however, only of a differentiation in Him of those spiritual qualities and modes of action which we associate with the two sexes as known to us among men, the same cannot be said of any other living beings. All other living beings besides God are veritably male and female. This is true, for example, of the angels. "I confess," writes Noyes,¹⁸⁶ "I see nothing very horrible in the idea of there being

sexual distinction in the angelic race. If the distinction of *spirits*, the twofold life, which I have described in what I have said of God, exists in the angelic nature (as I believe it exists in every living thing, from God to the lowest vegetable), I see no very alarming reason why that distinction should not be expressed in the bodily form of angels as well as man." Of course this involves the assignment of a corporeal nature to angels, and this Noyes does without hesitation, and then proceeds to interpret Gen. vi. 1, 2, Jude 6 f., of carnal sinning on their part. Not only does sex distinction thus exist in the angels, it persists also in the disembodied souls of men. The human soul is not in Noyes's view, however, pure spirit—which itself is thought of by him after the analogy of what he calls "fluids," that is to say the "imponderable fluids" of the old physicists—electricity, galvanism, magnetism, light, heat,—and therefore at least after a material image. It is the product of the union of this spirit, of the increate spirit which is the breath of God, and the dust of the ground. It is thus, he says,¹⁸⁷ "a *modification* of spirit produced by union with a material body." It takes the form of the body and its size and parts; and receives into itself some of the properties of matter. "As Adam's body was spiritualized matter, so conversely Adam's soul was *materialized* spirit." The soul thus stands between spirit and matter. The materialization of the spirit in the soul gives it its individuality and immortality. Had it not been thus materialized, on the release of the spirit from the body, it would return to the abyss of life whence it came: but it has entered in the soul into a "materialized or partly indurated state," and so persists in separation from the body. On the other hand, as the whole nature of God "is in the breath of God," the spirit which enters into the composition of the soul of man is still "in communication with God and assimilated to him."

This dualism of sex, characterizing the mode of existence of all animal being, is, however, far from the whole of the dualism which Noyes teaches. Beneath it he discovers an

underlying ontological dualism, according to which an Eternal God stands over against an eternal matter. And side by side with this (not identical with it) he discovers yet another eternal dualism, an ethical dualism dividing the realms of spirit itself between the principle of good (which is God) and the principle of evil (which is the devil). Creation with him is not *ex nihilo*, but out of pre-existent uncreated material; and if we ask him whence this material came, he claims the right to reply by another question — Whence did God come?¹⁸⁸ All creation, however — if we can speak of creation when nothing is really originated — is from God: it is not parcelled out between God and the devil. Not that sin or death originated “in God or any of His works”; or that God “by creation, by decree, or by permission gives birth to” evil. “The ultimate cause of all evil is an uncreated evil being; as the ultimate cause of all good is an uncreated good being.”¹⁸⁹ But evil enters the realm of created being subsequently to its creation, God permitting it so to enter into His creation because only in this field can He grapple with it and destroy it — an authentic Manichæan trait.¹⁹⁰ By his fall Adam, who was a creature of God, came under a divided dominion. “The streams from the two eternal fountains flowed together in him. His spiritual nature was primarily good, as proceeding from God; but secondarily evil, as propagated by the Devil.” It seems, however, that though propagating his offspring in his own likeness, the two elements of “his compound character” were distributed unevenly among them. God and the devil strove for mastery over them, and the result was two distinct classes of men, in one of which good, in the other evil, predominates.

“As the offspring of Adam’s body was twofold, distinguished into male and female, part following the nature of the primary, and part the nature of the secondary parent; so the offspring of his spiritual nature was twofold, distinguished, like that nature, into good and evil, part following the character of the primary and part the character of the secondary spiritual element. In other words, Adam has two sorts of children — one of them like himself, pri-

marily of God, secondarily of the Devil, of whom Abel was a specimen; the other primarily of the Devil and secondarily of God, of whom Cain was a specimen. Thus mankind are divided spiritually into two classes of different original character, proceeding respectively from uncreated good and evil. . . . The depravity of mankind, then, is of two sorts. The seed of the woman are depraved, as Adam was after the fall, — not in their original individual spirits which are of God, but by their spiritual combination with and subjection to the Devil." "On the other hand, the seed of the serpent are depraved as Cain was, not only by combination with and subjection to the Devil, but by original spiritual identity with him. They are not only possessed by the Devil, but are radically devils themselves."¹⁹¹

There are thus two radically different kinds of men in the world, differing by nature not by grace, and by their natural difference determining the difference which they manifest under grace. To put it shortly, the one kind of man is accessible to grace, the other intrinsically inaccessible to it. "There is an *original difference* in the characters of men, — a difference which is not produced by the Gospel, but which exists before the Gospel is heard, and is in fact the cause of the different consequences resulting from the Gospel in different persons."¹⁹² The gospel no doubt is presented to all alike, but there are some who *cannot* receive it, while others are so far "honest and good" that the Word, when it comes to them, is gladly received. They are "not saved by nature, but they are adapted by nature to be saved by grace."¹⁹³ "Human nature," says Noyes, reverting as is his wont to sexual imagery, "is a female which conceives and brings forth sin or righteousness, according as it has Satan or God for its husband"¹⁹⁴ — which is only a lame figure by which he means to say that those men who are in the deepest depths of their nature of God are "saved," those who are in the deepest depths of their nature of the devil are "lost." God, being a prudent person, does not attempt to save those who are by their very nature lost. The Gospel, which is sent indiscriminately into the world, reaches them, of course, as well as others — though only to manifest, by its rejection, their real char-

acter. But in all the hidden operations of His grace He confines Himself to those who are salvable, electing them to "salvation" and reprobating those whom He knows in His infinite foreknowledge to be inaccessible to His saving operations, to eternal misery.¹⁹⁵

With this ontology behind him, Noyes's soteriology naturally takes the form fundamentally of the destruction of the evil principle in the world. Christ came primarily to destroy the devil, and to deliver those who have been taken captive by him from his domination — that is to say, those of them who are capable of this deliverance. He does not bear our sins; He delivers us from sin. It is Satan, not He, who bears our sins. "The penalty of all sin is actually inflicted on the devil, who is actually the author of it. Here is no evasion, — no substitution of an innocent person for an offender. The law has its course, man is saved, not because God abrogates the law, or evades it by a fiction, but because He rightfully imputes the sins of which men are the instruments, to the devil as their real author."¹⁹⁶ If it be the devil, however, who expiates our sins, it is Christ who delivers us from them. He does this by entering by incarnation the very sphere in which sin reigns and bringing there "the strength of the Godhead into immediate contact with the strength of the devil, in the very field which was to be won." A twofold effect was sought and was obtained. On the negative side men were to be freed from the dominion of the devil; on the positive, they were to be effectively united with God. In the place of the devil, God was to be brought into immediate control of their lives. In order to accomplish this double work Christ required not only to enter this world of living men but to follow men into the world of the dead where Satan "had his sanctuary." Here His saving work culminated. For "the death of Christ was a spiritual baptism into the devil, of which the corporeal crucifixion was only an index and continuation."¹⁹⁷ Or more fully stated: "Jesus Christ, by His death, entered into the vitals of the devil, and overcame him. He thus destroyed the actual cause of sin. The

effect of this act on them that believe, is to release them from the power of sin; and on them that believe not, to consign them with the devil to destruction."¹⁹⁸ Everything depends on faith; for faith is the vehicle by which Christ—not merely the word of Christ, but Christ Himself—is received into the soul. No doubt, this reception of Christ is mediated by the word, but the word is no mere series of sounds. "It is a fact well known to Spiritualists, that the word of every spiritual being is an actual substance, sent forth from his inward center, carrying with it the properties of his life. It is also a known fact that the act of believing actually receives into the soul and spirit, the substance conveyed in the word believed. So that communication by word from one person to another effects an actual junction of spirits, and conveys to the receiver a portion of the life and character of the communicator."¹⁹⁹ Thus by believing, we receive Christ, His "flesh and blood"—which does not mean His material body, but "a spiritual substance of which His material body was but the envelope"—"His soul and spirit, belonging to His preëxistent state," "a spiritual body and a life within it." Receiving this, we "become sons of God and partakers of the eternal life of the Father." Our salvation shows itself in four great benefits which we enjoy: salvation from all sin; security from all future sin; deliverance from external law; independence of all human teaching. We have become one with Christ, and thereby are freed from the evil one, and these things are the mark of our emancipation. "We say," says Noyes,²⁰⁰ "that none are or have been *Christians*, in the sense that Paul was (if his state corresponded to his preaching) who have not received *perfect holiness, perfect security, perfect liberty, and perfect independence*, by the blood of Christ."

"Holiness," says Noyes,²⁰¹ is "the principal object of the atonement." Forgiveness is first in the order of time, but is only a means to the end of purification. "Dividing salvation into two great parts, viz., forgiveness of past sin, and purification for present sin, it is plainly implied in

nearly all the declarations of the Bible touching the subject, that the latter part is the *primary*, and the former the *secondary* object of the work of Christ." ²⁰² There is a sense, of course, in which such a statement might be accepted as substantially true: it is intended here, however, in the sense in which it is the common declaration of all perfectionists, and has as its end to convey the idea that enjoyment of the salvation from sin wrought out by Christ is just immediate entrance into a perfectly holy state. Noyes does not hold, to be sure, this proposition to be universally true. The Old Testament saints, for example, he teaches, did not receive their salvation until the coming of Christ; they lived not in fruition but in hope: they had not yet been born of God (Christ was the first-born Son of God), but were only *heirs* of a future Sonship — only prospectively children, experimentally merely servants. When Christ came, they received their perfect holiness — both those in this and those in the spiritual world together. The disciples of Christ and apostolic believers, similarly, did not receive their salvation until the second coming of Christ — which took place, according to Noyes, in A.D. 70. ²⁰³ Hence the sins of Old Testament saints, disciples of Christ, apostolic believers are irrelevant as objections against the assertion that perfection is essential to the experience of salvation: we need not look for perfect men until after the second coming (A.D. 70). ²⁰⁴ Somewhat inconsistently, however, a good deal of space is given to proving that Paul was perfect. ²⁰⁵ Of course Noyes begins by setting aside Rom. vii. 14 ff., Phil. iii. 12 ff., 1 Cor. ix. 27 — this passage no doubt, rightly — 2 Cor. xii. 17, 1 Tim. i. 15, and ends with Paul's assertions of his own integrity. Ritschl could not have done it better. There are visible in the apostolic church, he says in explanation, "two distinct classes of believers," immature and mature (1 Cor. ii. 6), and the mature, of whom Paul was one, were "perfectly holy." This class grew in number and distinctness, "till at last, when John wrote his epistles, Perfectionism was fully developed, and had become the acknowledged standard of Christian

experience." Quoting the passages in 1 John which are ordinarily relied on in this sense, he comments:²⁰⁶ "If this is not Perfectionism, we know not how, by human language, Perfectionism can be expressed." There is left, he admits, "one little text (1 John i. 8) — but when rightly understood this does not run athwart the others; it refers to pre-perfection sins. "We think it not uncharitable to say," he remarks, "that they who persist in construing this verse as opposed to the doctrine of salvation from sin, or in regarding it as sufficient to offset all the plain assertions, scattered through the whole epistle, that perfect holiness is the only standard of true Christianity, belong to that class of persons who 'strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.'"

It would be hoping too much to expect that Noyes could wholly escape the universal tendency of perfectionists to explain the perfection which they assert as something less than perfect. When answering objections to his doctrine,²⁰⁷ he tells us, for example, that to be perfectly holy is not necessarily to be free from infirmity. "We mean by perfect holiness," he says, — adding, "using the expression in its lowest sense" — "simply the *purity* of heart which gives a *good conscience*." This is a very ambiguous statement. Doubtless, taken strictly, the purity of heart which gives a good conscience is an absolutely pure heart, — or else the conscience fails to accuse when accusation were fitting. But employing the language in its current meaning, something very far from perfect purity may be expressed by it. And that Noyes is employing the language in this lowered meaning an illustration he adduces in connection with it sufficiently proves. This is not, however, his ordinary manner of speaking of the perfection he asserts. It is rather characteristic of him to carry it to the height of its idea. In one passage,²⁰⁸ for example, he expounds 1 John iii. 3-10 with a view to showing from the declaration, "he that committeth sin is of the devil," that the real Christian never sins at all, seeing that one sin is enough to manifest an essentially devilish character. When

asked how much a man may sin and still be a Christian, he says: "John answers that he cannot sin at all and be a Christian. There is no middle ground: we are either as righteous as Christ, or as wicked as the devil." "The children of God are perfectly holy. Sin, in every case, proves the subjects of it children of the devil."²⁰⁹ "John does not say, He that committeth sin *habitually* is of the devil; or, He that committeth *known* sin is of the devil; or he that committeth *wilful* sin is of the devil; or, he that committeth sin is of the devil while he is committing it. He says, He that committeth sin is of the devil; and we are to take the word of God just as it stands. It is good philosophy which James enunciates when he said, 'He that offendeth in one point is guilty of all.'"²¹⁰

This insistence on the perfection of perfection is not only the usual view which Noyes expresses, but it is the natural, or rather the necessary, one for him to take, on the ground of his mystical doctrine of the procuring cause of our perfection of life which we have already seen him expounding. "Christ liveth in me" — it is all summed up in that. "The necessary consequence of that condition," he says,²¹¹ "is perfect holiness, because Christ is perfectly holy." It belongs to the fundamental elements of his doctrine of salvation, that Christ has "destroyed the devil," and secured to God — to Himself as the saving God — the entire control of the children of the woman, hitherto living under the divided rule of God and the devil. That is what salvation consists in; and that is the reason that salvation is in the complete meaning of these words, salvation from sin. It is possible that Noyes is not quite consistent with himself, however, when he seeks to answer the question: "How is this union by which Christ dwells in the soul, and so saves it from sin, to be effected?" At the place at the moment before us, he replies, as we have already seen him elaborately arguing elsewhere, "The witnesses of the New Testament answer with one voice — by believing the gospel."²¹² His prepossession at the moment, however, is to show that this faith is not exercised in our own strength,

but is the gift of God. It is "an act of the heart of man, possible to all, and in the highest sense obligatory on all, but actually existing only when God in His sovereign mercy, gives special grace." "He has forgiven all, and sent the Spirit of grace to all, and so has left all utterly without excuse for remaining unreconciled; but He has given *faith* only to them whom He chose in Jesus Christ before the world began."²¹³ It may be this teaching which he has in mind when he protests against Dixon's representation²¹⁴ of his doctrine of how we arrive at salvation from sin. Dixon says in effect that he teaches that we have only to believe, and it is done. In the passages that have been before us Noyes apparently teaches just that. But he also teaches that we do not acquire holiness directly by faith; but it as well as faith is a gift of God.

For Noyes, like other perfectionists, has a first and a second conversion.²¹⁵ Only he does not make the second a mere repetition of the first, seeking an additional blessing. It is a radically different transaction. The first is "an action or purpose of our own, a voluntary movement." The second is an effect wrought on us. We do the one; we suffer the other. The one is "proximately our own work; the second, the operation of God." By the first we become disciples; by the second the children of God. It is only by the second that we receive "deliverance from all sin": and on this teaching it is quite true that we do not merely have to believe—and it is done. Deliverance from sin is a gift of God, given to none but believers, it is true, but not acquired by faith. The inevitable question is, of course, raised whether it is imperative that these two stages in the process of salvation from sin must be traversed, or we may pass "from a state of irreligion" directly to "perfect holiness."²¹⁶ The reply is that it is at least "a general principle" that "men by their first conversion are introduced into sinful discipleship," and "reach perfect holiness only by a second conversion." But it is added that the facts seem to require the admission "that some have passed directly from irreligion to perfect holiness." This

is translated in a new paragraph into the explanation that while in the order of nature a twofold process is necessary, the interval may be shortened so that to all intents and purposes no time intervenes. And it may be, it is added, that after a while this may become the regular experience. The height of the perfection thus secured, we must remind ourselves, is manifested not only in its completeness according to its idea, but also in its indefectibility. It is Noyes's constant teaching—a teaching by which he differentiates his perfectionism from that of others—that perfection once secured is secure. Thus, for example, writing of the New Covenant,²¹⁷ he tells us that, first it secures salvation from sin, interpreting this as “perfect sanctification,” and then secondly, it secures salvation from sin forever”—adding further that this is really to speak repetitiously, “for salvation from sin, in the proper signification of the expression, is salvation from sin forever.” It is the characteristic of the new covenant, he says, that God secures the fulfillment of its requirements,—disposing men's hearts to fulfill them.

The second conversion is coincident—or rather is identical—with the second birth; by the one as by the other we are said to become the children of God and free from all sin.²¹⁸ To become sons of God by this new birth means just what is meant by being united with Christ, as we have already seen that idea expounded. It is, now, Christ that lives in us, and it is no more we that live: all that we do He does through us, and thus our total life manifestation perfectly corresponds with His will. We are, as in this view we must be, just as perfect as Christ is. And of course we are just as spontaneous in our holy activities as He is. As it is absurd to suppose Him governed in His conduct by the precepts of an external law, so it is absurd to suppose us, His children, and the organs of His activities, to require or to be subject to an external law. The children of Christ, just because they are perfectly holy and perfectly secure in their holiness, are also emancipated from the law and need not that any should teach them. Of

themselves they do that which is right. Noyes naturally desires not to be thought of as an antinomian. It is not antinomianism that he teaches, he says,²¹⁹ but "anti-legality." He believes that the law, — the whole law, moral as well as ceremonial — has been abolished for the sons of God. But this does not mean that we have escaped beyond the government of God; it means only that the instrument through which He governs us has been changed — from law to grace. He even says that the "standard of the holiness which constitutes the ultimate object of God's government" has suffered no alteration. Only "the measures which God chooses to employ to effect that object" have been changed. The children of God neglect law not because they desire to be free to sin; but precisely because they have no desire to sin and do not require law to restrain them from it. It is the way of holiness, not of sin, that they pursue; and they pursue it because it has become their second nature and they cannot do otherwise. They do not transgress the law but have transcended it. They are not seeking "an easy mode of escaping the necessity of works," but have found "the only and the sure foundation of such works as will survive the fire of judgment."²²⁰

Now, Noyes says,²²¹ "regeneration or salvation from sin," that is perfection, "is the incipient stage of the resurrection." We are married to Christ, he reasons,²²² and the status of the wife, of course, follows that of the husband: since Christ has risen from the dead, we therefore are living the resurrected life. We have passed from the carnal into the resurrection state; from this world into the heavenly world; "our state and relations are as fully changed, as the idea of a translation from earth to heaven demands." "Believers by fellowship with Christ in His resurrection, are released from the beggarly elements and carnal ordinances of that worldly sanctuary which they have left." We are freed, then, from sin; and we are freed from the law — for law "cannot carry its claim beyond death"; and we are freed, indeed, even from death itself — at first,

from its sting, but not its form, since men were so far within the territory of him that has the power of death that they are slow to escape from its form; but this too is coming. "The intent of the Gospel," we are told in another place,²²³ "was, and is, to take people out of this wicked world into a state beyond death, in which the believer is spiritually with Christ in the resurrection, and hence is free from sin and law, and all the temporary relations of the moral state." The church has its "standing" therefore now "in a posthumous state"; a posthumous state which may also be called "the angelic state." In this angelic state, as is natural, different conditions obtain from those of the carnal state in which we have hitherto lived, and "free social relations are to be inaugurated as soon as existing obligations can be disposed of."

When he wrote these words, Noyes was thinking of the abolition of marriage in the "resurrection" or "angelic" state, in accordance with Matt. xxii. 26-30, which he absurdly reads as the proclamation of the reign of promiscuity in this state,²²⁴ thus throwing a lurid light on his contention that the abolishment of the law in the resurrection state is not that evil may be done, but that good may be done spontaneously. In this case at least the law is simply reversed and made to read, Thou shalt have thy neighbor's wife. It is not, however, merely a relaxation of morals which Noyes finds in the "resurrected" state. He finds in it also, as has been already incidentally noted, nothing less than "the abolition of death" itself,—although he recognizes that this "is to come as the last result of Christ's victory over sin and death."²²⁵ And it is to be noted that it is precisely through the abolition of marriage—that is to say, the institution of promiscuity in the relations of the sexes—that the abolition of death is to come. "Death is to be abolished, and to this end, there must be a restoration of true relations between the sexes."²²⁶ When what he has to say on this point is weighed, the underlying meaning appears to be that sexual promiscuity is absolutely essential to the existence of a

communistic society, and the abolition of death is to result from the removal in a communistic society of the wearing evils which in the present mode of social organization bring men to exhaustion and death.²²⁷ Remove these evils which kill man, and man will cease to die. Communism, that is, is conceived as so great a panacea that it not only cures all the evils of life, but brings also immortality; and there seems to be no reason for a man to die in a communistic society. Running through the four great evils in which he sums up the curses which afflict life in our present social organization, Noyes says: "First we abolish sin"—that is by entering through faith into a perfect life: "then shame"—that is by practicing free love; "then the curse on woman of exhausting child-bearing"—that is by using his recipe for birth control; "then the curse on man of exhausting labor"—that is through community labor, in the attractive association of the sexes; "and so we arrive regularly at the tree of life." All "the antecedents of death" are removed; and so, of course, death itself. "Reconciliation with God opens the way for the reconciliation of the sexes; reconciliation of the sexes emancipates woman, and opens the way for vital society. Vital society increases strength, diminishes work, and makes labor attractive, thus removing the antecedents of death." Perfectionism, free love, community in industry in happy association—take these things and you will not die. At the bottom lies nothing other than the amazing assumption that communistic association, if you can only achieve it, will bring immortality. All the other steps are only the means to communism.

We have permitted ourselves to be drawn aside from the purely theological aspects of this matter by Noyes's own later mode of speaking of it. His doctrine of the abolition of death dates, however, from the spring of 1834, the period when he formed his theological system; and he wrote of it frequently before he became engrossed in the actual experiment of communism. He gives us a full account of the origin of it in his mind in an article written

in 1844.²²⁸ On one occasion, he says, when he sat down to write, his mind wandered off to the subject of the resurrection. He explains:—“The Gospel which I had received and preached was based on the idea that faith identifies the soul with Christ, so that by his death and resurrection, the believer dies and rises again, not literally, nor yet figuratively, but *spiritually*; and thus, so far as sin is concerned, is placed beyond the grave, in ‘heavenly places’ with Christ.” This was the doctrine of the “New York Perfectionists,” and, carrying it beyond its application to the cessation of sin, they derived from it their notion of “spiritual wives” as Noyes was just at this moment deducing from it his notion of sexual promiscuity. But Noyes continues: “I now began to think that I had given this idea but half its legitimate scope. I had availed myself of it for the salvation of my *soul*. Why should it not be carried out to the redemption of the *body*? . . . The question came home with imperative force—‘Why ought I not to avail myself of Christ’s resurrection *fully*, and by it overcome death as well as sin?’ . . . I sought that identity with Christ by which I might realize his emancipation from death, as well for my body as for my soul; that I might with Him see death behind me—the ‘debt of nature’ paid. What I sought, I obtained.” He plays a little with the difference between “deliverance from the spiritual power of death,” and from “the act of dying.” He will not affirm that he will “never die.” But he asks, Why should he die? And he asserts that he is “not a debtor to the devil even in regard to the form of dying.” And “this I know,” he says, “that if I live till the Kingdom of God comes, which I believe is near, I shall never die in fact or in form.” This was written in September, 1844; and on June 1, 1847, it was solemnly declared by Noyes and his whole community, by unanimous resolution “as the confession and testimony of the believers assembled,” precisely “that the Kingdom of God has come.” After that they were not to die.

The confidence of the possession of a deathless life, thus

expressed, is grounded on a purely spiritual experience. The anticipation elaborately argued a generation later that the practice of communism would confer immortality on men, is drawn chiefly from materialistic considerations. Must we see in this difference an index of the downward growth through the years? Fantastic always, fanatic always, must we say of Noyes, — he once was religious; now he is secularized? No doubt this was the direction of his growth. But there is a form of religion which is worse than any secularism: men's religions are often their worst crimes. And there are forms of secularism which approach religion in their nobility — though Noyes's secularism can hardly find a place among them. These are the salient facts to keep well in mind: All that was salacious in his secularism, Noyes found a sanction for in his religion; and all that was bad in his religion was already in it in 1834. We cannot think there ever was a time when Noyes's influence was wholesome, or when it was creditable to his associates that they had attached themselves to him or found profit or pleasure in his teachings. That he did not draw men of light and leading to him causes us no surprise. What astonishes us is that men like Charles H. Weld and James Boyle were temporarily associated with him; and that even a William Lloyd Garrison found in him something to admire and imitate. A fact so remarkable ought not to be passed by without remark.²²⁰

Garrison appears to have been familiar with Noyes's Perfectionist movement and an admiring reader of his journal practically from its beginning. Personal acquaintance was instituted when Noyes called on him at the anti-slavery office at Boston in March, 1837. In describing the interview, Noyes says that he "found Garrison, Stanton, Whittier and other leading abolitionists warmly engaged in a dispute about political matters." "I heard them quietly," he continues, "and when the meeting broke up I introduced myself to Garrison. He spoke with interest of the *Perfectionist*; said his mind was heaving on the subject of Holiness and the Kingdom of Heaven, and he

would devote himself to them as soon as he could get anti-slavery off his hands. I spoke to him especially of the government and found him, as I had expected, ripe for the loyalty of heaven." Noyes was not the man to fail to strike such iron when it was hot. He at once addressed Garrison a letter in which he sought to push home whatever advantage he had gained in the interview. In this letter he announced his emancipation from "all allegiance to the government of the United States," and declared war upon it, — "a country which, by its boasting hypocrisy," he said, "has become the laughing-stock of the world, and, by its lawlessness, has fully proved the incapacity of man for self-government." "My hope of the millennium," he declared, "begins where Dr. Beecher's expires — viz., at the overthrow of this nation." The times seemed to him to be ripening to the issue; which would come "in a convulsion like that of France." He calls therefore on the abolitionists to "abandon a government whose President has declared war upon them." Then turning to the special fish he wished to fry, he adds: — "Allow me to suggest that you will set Anti-Slavery in the sunshine only by making it tributary to Holiness, and you will most assuredly throw it into the shade which now covers Colonization, if you suffer it to occupy the ground, in your own mind, or in others', which ought to be occupied by *universal emancipation from sin*. . . . I counsel you and the people who are with you, if you love the post of honor — the forefront of the battle of righteousness — to set your faces towards *perfect holiness*. Your station is one that gives you power over the nations. Your city is on a high hill. If you plant the standard of perfect holiness where you stand, many will see and flow to it."

That Garrison should have been affected by this empty rhetoric is astonishing; but he was, deeply and lastingly. Noyes's phrases and representations lingered in his memory: he quoted from them publicly, and publicly spoke of their author as "an esteemed friend," whose words had "deeply affected his mind." He even made Noyes's anti-

government and perfectionist ideas his own. No wonder that the soberer friends of the anti-slavery agitation took alarm and sought to dissociate the movement from what were, and were likely to be, Garrison's personal vagaries. And little wonder that those who already were full of outrage at Garrison's "ultraisms," attributed to him this further "ultraism," — his friend and mentor's doctrine of sexual promiscuity. In doing this they were happily wrong. Garrison's infatuation for Noyes had limits, and did not carry him into this cesspool. He repudiated the imputation with passion, and was led, in the end, to explain that his perfectionism was not the perfectionism of Noyes, but that of Asa Mahan, whose book on "The Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection" was opportunely published in 1839. He permits to appear in the *Liberator* in December, 1839, a communication in which it is said of him: "But some say he is a Perfectionist, and believes that, let him do what he will, it is no sin. That is false. His views on the subject of holiness are in unison with those of Mr. Mahan." That is to say, although asserting the attainability of perfection in this life, and the duty of all to attain it, he did not advance with Noyes to Antinomian contentions. "If," says he, writing in self-defense in 1841, "what we have heard of the sayings and doings of the perfectionists, especially those residing in Vermont, be true, they have certainly turned the grace of God into licentiousness, and given themselves over to a reprobate mind." But, he adds, "whatever may be the conduct of these perfectionists, the duty which they enjoin, the ceasing from all iniquity, at once and forever, is certainly what God requires, and what cannot be denied without extreme hardihood and profligacy of spirit. It is reasonable and therefore attainable. If men cannot help sinning, they are not guilty in attempting to serve two masters. If they can, then it cannot be a dangerous doctrine to preach; and he is a rebel against the government of God who advocates an opposite doctrine." Thus, although Noyes contributed to that great accumulation of "ultraistic" notions

which filled Garrison's mind, he could not attach him to his "sect." It is not without its interest, meanwhile, to find Garrison among the Perfectionists, and indeed, to tell the whole truth, vigorously engaged in the perfectionist propaganda. It might almost be said that there was no "ultraism" current in his day which he did not in some measure embrace.²³⁰

NOTES

²³⁰ Dixon and His Copyists, p. 20.

²³¹ The numbers given are not always exactly the same: we are following here the Hand Book of the Oneida Community for 1875. According to that Hand Book the members on January 1, 1849, numbered 87; Feb. 20, 1851, 172; year later, 205; in 1875, 298. Hinds (ed. 2, p. 175) gives the numbers, Jan. 1, 1849, 87; Jan. 1, 1850, 174; Feb. 20, 1851, 205; in 1875, 298; in 1878, 306.

²³² Of course his own wife and his brother's wife and his sisters' two husbands are to be added to this quartette, raising it to an octette, which constituted about a fourth (or a fifth) of the whole promiscuous community. Noyes was married on June 28, 1858, and he plumed himself vastly on having, in doing so, made it perfectly plain to his partner that the marriage was not to be interpreted as an "exclusive" union, but left room for the "complex marriage" into which he led her eight years later. We are not sure that he made it plain. The language in which he expresses himself in what is perhaps, on that hypothesis, the most remarkable proposal of marriage ever made, is studiously ambiguous. We do not know how far the lady addressed was prepared by previous knowledge to interpret it in its extremest sense. In that sense, it is a repetition of the "Battle Axe Letter" of two years earlier. The proposal was made in a letter dated June 11, 1838, and may be read either in Eastman, as cited, pp. 133 ff., or in Dixon's *New America*, vol. ii. pp. 235 ff.

²³³ This contrariety is, for example, elaborately argued in *Bible Communism* (1853), p. 7, where Fourier's principle of "attraction" is rejected and the principle of "community of goods" is asserted over against it. The two systems, it is explained, begin at opposite ends. Fourier begins "with industrial organization and physical improvement, expecting that a true religion and the true relation of the sexes will be found three or four hundred years hence." Noyes begins "with religion and reconciliation of the sexes, and expects that industrial reform and physical improvement will follow"—and that speedily. This is said over again with even more elaboration and emphasis in *American Socialisms* (1870), p. 630.

¹¹⁴ The *Atlantic Monthly*, Oct. 1883, p. 538. "It argued superior courage," he says, speaking of Albert Brisbane's advocacy of Fourierism,—"to advocate the adoption of Fourier's system, to even a limited extent, with his books lying before the world, only defended by the thin veil of the French language. The Stoic said, Forbear; Fourier said, Indulge. Fourier was of the opinion of St. Evremond; abstinence from pleasure appeared to him a great sin." "It was easy," he says again, "to foresee the fate of this fine system in any serious and comprehensive attempt to set it on foot in this country. As soon as our people got wind of the doctrine of marriage held by this master, it would fall at once into the hands of a lawless crew, who would flock in throngs to so fair a game, and like the dreams of poetic people in the first outbreak of the old French Revolution, so theirs would disappear in a slime of mire and blood."

¹¹⁵ Fourier's doctrine of the relation of the sexes is sufficiently explained at pp. 547 ff. of the very illuminating account of Fourier and his theories by Arthur J. Booth, printed in the *Fortnightly Review* for 1872 (vol. xii. pp. 530 ff. and 673 ff.).

¹¹⁷ Cf. the statement in Charles Nordhoff, *The Communistic Societies of the United States* (1878), pp. 276-277; also Estlake, p. 90.

¹¹⁸ The general situation brought it about, however, as Estlake, p. 90, naïvely puts it, that "life became a state of continuous courtship," both women and men seeking always to attract one another.

¹¹⁹ Cf. Nordhoff, as cited, p. 276.

¹²⁰ As cited, p. 549.

¹²¹ Cf. Nordhoff, p. 276; Estlake, p. 54-55.

¹²² One saving clause was indeed admitted in his regulations: "persons are not obliged, under any circumstances, to receive the attentions of those whom they do not like" (Nordhoff, p. 276).

¹²³ Cf. *Bible Communism*, chap. iv., and *American Socialisms*, p. 632.

¹²⁴ *Essay on Scientific Propagation* (no date), pp. 32; Nordhoff conjectures "about 1873" for its date.

¹²⁵ An odd formal inconsistency results from Noyes's insistence, on the one hand, that *all* marriage is abolished in the Kingdom of Heaven in accordance with the Saviour's declaration that there shall be *no* marriage or giving in marriage in it (e.g. *The Berean*, p. 431), and his equal insistence that the arrangements in his community amounted to and were in effect a binding marriage—only a "complex," not an individual marriage.

¹²⁶ *American Socialisms*, p. 639, cf. Hinds, second section, p. 183.

¹²⁷ *Bible Communism*, p. 52.

¹²⁸ *American Socialisms*, p. 625.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 628.

¹⁰⁰ P. 634.

¹⁰¹ What is said in *Bible Communism* (1853), p. 201, taken from *The Circular*, for 1852, is scarcely consistent with what is said in *American Socialisms* (1870), pp. 628, 634, and is probably only an unconsidered apologetic assertion.

¹⁰² In *Bible Communism* (1853), pp. 114 ff., we find a distinct minimizing of the sin of adultery.

¹⁰³ *American Socialisms*, p. 616.

¹⁰⁴ W. A. Hinds, ed. 2, pp. 169 ff.: we are drawing from his narrative.

¹⁰⁵ *Spiritual Magazine*, Oct. 15, 1847, cited by Eastman, pp. 185 f. Cf. the full account of the details of the miracle by all the participants in it, in *The Spiritual Magazine*, Sept. 15, 1847, transcribed by Eastman, pp. 187 ff.

¹⁰⁶ Mary Cragin's name should not be passed by without some notice. The accession of George Cragin and his wife (with a child) to Noyes's community was obviously felt by Noyes himself and the community at large to be an event of great importance. Even in the brief account of the Community which he gives in his *American Socialisms* he notes it. "Gradually a little school of believers gathered around him. His first permanent associates were his mother, two sisters, and a brother. Then came the wives of himself and his brother, and the husbands of his sisters. Then came George Cragin and his family from New York, and from time to time other families and individuals from various places" (p. 615). The Cragins are the only persons he mentions by name. Similarly Hinds (ed. 2, p. 157), after mentioning the accession of J. L. Skinner, who married one of Noyes's sisters, adds: "The next important accession was that of the Cragin family, consisting of George Cragin and wife and child, in September, 1840. Mr. Cragin had been a merchant of New York City, the General Publishing Agent of the *Advocate of Moral Reform*, a co-laborer of John McDowell in reform work, and a revivalist under Chas. G. Finney. His wife had been a teacher and a Sunday School worker in New York City, and a zealous revivalist. Mr. Noyes never had more active and willing helpers." We are not told here, however, the whole story or that part of it which connected these people with Noyes. This part is that, while still at work as revivalists in New York, they became perfectionists and accepted Noyes as their leader. Then they became inmates of the house at Rondout of Abram C. Smith, a fellow perfectionist of Methodist antecedents, who owned some such relation as their own to Noyes. Then Smith made Mary Cragin his "Spiritual Wife," or, to be more explicit, his mistress. Noyes, in accordance with his custom in dealing with such cases, disapproved of the relation and sternly rebuked Smith. The result was that the Cragins found their way into

Noyes's community, where Mrs. Cragin occupied the position of matron. The whole sordid story was told at great length by Cragin himself in the Oneida Circular and has been made accessible to all by being reprinted (Noyes says, "with slight alterations") in Dixon's *Spiritual Wives*. The facts were, however, perfectly well known independently of Cragin's narrative (cf. Eastman, p. 430). It seems probable that it is Mary Cragin whom Asa Mahan means when (*Autobiography* [1851], p. 239) he tells of a "professedly Christian woman" in New York, in, say 1835, who told him: "I attend church not from any good I expect from the services, but as an example to others. These ministers cannot teach me; I understand the whole subject already." She had, he says, "been very active and influential in the revivals." "Years after that," he adds, "I heard of her as a blubbering Perfectionist, practicing, it was believed, the abominations of the sect." With reference to John R. McDowell and the Advocate of Moral Reform, perhaps this notice by D. L. Leonard (*The Story of Oberlin* [1898], p. 72, cf. 303) will be enough: "In 1830-4 McDowell undertook a well-meant but unwisely conducted work in behalf of fallen women in New York, which soon ended in failure and bitter sorrow to himself, but also out of which grew a wide-spread and lasting movement for 'moral reform' whose equivalent is found in our day enfolded in the phrase, social purity." For a contemporary estimate of this movement and its methods, see an article on "Moral Reform Societies" in *The Literary and Theological Review*, for Dec. 1836, pp. 614 ff.

¹²⁷Hinds (ed. 2, p. 170) writes thus: "Events followed this confession in quick succession of such a character as to convince those making it that the heavens had approved it, and welcomed them into new and more vital relations with their spiritual superiors, and they did not hesitate to make a present personal application of Christ's promises of miraculous power to those who believe in Him. Many of the Putney believers testified that they had personally experienced miraculous healing, with and without the laying on of hands." Thus, as late as 1902, it was still claimed among Noyes's followers that heaven had by visible testimonies set its seal of approval on the promiscuity at Putney!

¹²⁸The fullest and best account of the miracles of this date is given by Eastman, pp. 185 ff.; cf. also Hinds (ed. 2), p. 170. Also in general Nordhoff, p. 272.

¹²⁹Its publication was suspended, Nov. 23, 1847. We say suspended because it was soon resumed at Oneida Reserve. Noyes himself says in the issue of Aug. 5, 1848 (Eastman, p. 55): "It is sufficient to say here, that the *immediate* cause of the suppression of our paper at Putney was a resolution passed at an 'indignation meeting' of the citizens of that place, denouncing our

production as licentious, and requiring an immediate stoppage of our press."

¹⁰⁰ Eastman, p. 58.

¹⁰¹ Eastman (pp. 35 ff.) gives a full account of the criminal proceedings against Noyes, and prints in full the court record.

¹⁰² Noyes and his friends naturally retorted on the Putney people with abuse. In the Second Annual Report of the Oneida Association (1850), p. 23, it is declared that Putney does not present "an average specimen of the civilization of the country," and "the transactions of 1847" are characterized as "foolish," "mean," and "brutal." It was a ground of great congratulation to the Oneida people that they were able a few years later to find some sort of a footing in Putney again. Hinds (ed. 2, pp. 170-171) states the facts as follows: "In less than three years a colony community was established at Putney, which was maintained there for five years, free from every disturbance, and many regrets were expressed when all the Community's property there was sold and the final exodus of the Perfectionists took place." An annotator of the pamphlet called *The Oneida Community; its Relation to Orthodoxy*, which appears to have been published about 1912, is not contented with so bare a statement. We read (p. 14):—"The inhabitants of Putney—ashamed of their bigotry and coming to appreciate the usefulness and exalted moral goodness of the Oneida Community—soon invited them back, and a branch of the Community thenceforth existed at Putney (as at other places) for some years, until a policy of concentration absorbed into the parent society at Oneida all the branches except the one at Wallingford (Connecticut)."

¹⁰³ The document is published by Eastman, pp. 187-196.

¹⁰⁴ Edition 2, p. 173. The language of the call seems to have been "for the purpose of acquaintance, acknowledgment of each other, and coöperation" (Eastman, p. 140).

¹⁰⁵ They are printed in full in Eastman, p. 142; and the first part of them in Hinds, ed. 2, pp. 173-174.

¹⁰⁶ Hinds, ed. 2, p. 174.

¹⁰⁷ Eastman, p. 141.

¹⁰⁸ *Spiritual Magazine*, Oct. 5, 1847, as quoted by Eastman, p. 141.

¹⁰⁹ "On the same day that the exodus from Putney commenced (Nov. 26, 1847), practical movements were being made by Perfectionists of the same faith toward the formation of a Community at Oneida, Madison Co., N. Y. The Putney exiles joined these brethren and on the first day of the following March the Oneida Community was fully organized" (*Handbook of the Oneida Community* [1867], p. 10).

¹¹⁰ Pp. 615-616.

¹¹¹ "The gathering of the Community of Oneida was due to the

hospitable invitation of Jonathan Burt, who possessed a few acres of land and a rude saw-mill on Oneida Creek" (Oneida Community: 1848-1901 [n.d.], p. 6).

¹³² Ed. 2, pp. 175-176.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, p. 175.

¹³⁴ Hinds, ed. 2, p. 189. Cf. further details of the work in 1868, American Socialisms, pp. 342 f.

¹³⁵ So we are explicitly told in an annotation to the extract from F. A. Bisbee's article on "Communitistic Societies in the United States" in *The Political Science Quarterly* for Dec. 1905, printed in G. W. Noyes's *The Oneida Community: its Relation to Orthodoxy*, p. 15.

¹³⁶ He himself tells us (*The Nation*, Sept. 11, 1879, p. 173) that his father accused him of "Positivism"; and Estlake (pp. 9 ff.) confirms this by telling us that he had passed "beyond the pale of certain phases of Christianity."

¹³⁷ Estlake, p. 13.

¹³⁸ Feb. 20, 1879.

¹³⁹ As quoted.

¹⁴⁰ Hinds, ed. 2, p. 197.

¹⁴¹ He died, in Niagara Falls, Canada, April 13, 1866, aged 74. He was nearly 68 when he retired to Canada.

¹⁴² *American Socialist*, Aug. 28, 1879, quoted in Estlake, p. 86; cf. Hinds, ed. 2, p. 202.

¹⁴³ August 28, 1879.

¹⁴⁴ How the matter was looked at within the community may be perceived from the following passage from A. Estlake's book (p. 45): "There is no law under which the Oneida community could have been interfered with; so they were safe from any action under existing statutes; but the Presbyterian Church, led on by Professor Mears of Hamilton College, who for years had been an unswerving foe to the Community, had organized a movement, with Bishop Huntington at its head, to obtain special legislation against them at Albany. If Mears had succeeded, it is impossible to conjecture how a band of unprincipled lawyers and politicians might have robbed our members, nor to what extent ruin and hardship might have been entailed upon the aged and children of the community. It was the leader's duty, therefore, to protect them in the best way that he could. Complications had arisen within the Community that rendered the task more difficult, but he completely disarmed the opposition from without by a graceful concession to public prejudice, and then prepared himself for consideration of the best plans that could be devised for the successful winding up of the communistic experiment,—a winding-up, which, in the very nature of things, had become inevitable."

¹⁴⁵ This was fully understood in the Community, and in the pas-

sage from Estlake, quoted in the immediately preceding note, is treated as intended. In winding up the Community, Noyes chose this method so as to obtain time and freedom for winding it up to the best advantage. Cf. Hinds, ed. 2, p. 205.

¹⁶⁶ Hinds, ed. 2, p. 204.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 206.

¹⁶⁸ Essays on Questions of the Day (ed. 2, 1894), pp. 8 ff.

¹⁶⁹ He has discussed the matter, e.g., in the forty-seventh chapter of his American Socialisms, pp. 646-657.

¹⁷⁰ P. 655.

¹⁷¹ Essays on Questions of the Day (ed. 2, 1894), p. 372.

¹⁷² Bible Communism (1853), p. 83.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹⁷⁴ Noyes himself tells us (American Socialisms, p. 616) that the "religious theory" of the Community is best read in The Berean (1847); and it emerges that the members of the Community looked upon The Berean as little less than an inspired book (see, e.g., Eastman, p. 50). There is an excellent account of Noyes's doctrinal system, derived from The Berean, in The New Englander, vol. vi. (1845) pp. 177-194 (by J. B. Warren). A useful account of it will be found also in Eastman, pp. 309 ff.

¹⁷⁵ Handbook of the Oneida Community (1867).

¹⁷⁶ Bible Communism (1853), p. 7.

¹⁷⁷ These may both be read in Eastman as cited, pp. 309 ff., 315 ff.; and the former of them is printed in C. G. Finney, Lectures on Systematic Theology, vol. ii. (1847) pp. 167 ff.

¹⁷⁸ The Perfectionist, Feb. 22, 1848, Eastman, p. 315.

¹⁷⁹ Bible Communism (1853), p. 35.

¹⁸⁰ Eastman, p. 224.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 324.

¹⁸² The Berean, p. 5; Eastman, p. 325.

¹⁸³ "The Holy Spirit," he says (The Berean, p. 3), "is not a distinct person but an emanation from the Father and the Son."

¹⁸⁴ The Berean, p. 488; The New Englander, as cited, p. 180.

¹⁸⁵ Eastman, p. 325.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 332.

¹⁸⁷ The Berean, p. 57.

¹⁸⁸ The Berean, p. 96. It is a crotchet in his doctrine of creation that he teaches, on the ground of Heb. xi. 3, that it was wrought by faith on God's part. His motive for this impossible interpretation of the passage was apparently to escape having to allow that "we understand by faith." It is amazing that Thomas C. Upham repeats this absurd exegesis of Heb. xi. 3 (Divine Union [1857], pp. 32 ff.).

¹⁸⁹ The Berean, pp. 97 ff.

¹⁹⁰ In struggling with his incomplete theodicy Noyes sometimes

speaks of a necessity being laid on God "by the existence of un-created evil" to permit evil to invade His creation. He does nothing to show in what such a necessity is grounded, however, except by pointing to the exigencies of the conflict between good and evil.

¹²¹ The Berean, pp. 104 ff.

¹²² *Ibid.*, p. 112.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, p. 127.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 113.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 122.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 150.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 106 f.

¹³² *Ibid.*, p. 136.

¹³³ "The second coming," says Noyes (The Berean, p. 288), "was an event in the spiritual, not in the natural world." It was "a spiritual manifestation" (Paul's Prize, p. 10). It means Christ's "coming in the power of judgment, to reckon with, reward and punish those to whom He delivered the gospel at his first coming" (The Berean, p. 275). It is the "day of judgment for the primitive church and the Jewish nation"—not the final judgment, for there are two judgments corresponding to the two great human families, Jews and Gentiles. "The Bible describes two dispensations of Christ, two resurrections, two judgments, one of which is past and the other future" (p. 33). The common view, he says, sees only the future judgment; many perfectionists see only the past.

¹³⁴ The Berean, p. 157.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 173.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 162 ff.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 176.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 170 f.

¹⁴¹ New America, vol. ii. p. 227.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 182 ff.

¹⁴³ The Berean, pp. 237 ff.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 184.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 238, note.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 187.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 142 ff.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 226, e.g., the second birth is said to be a state of complete salvation from sin.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 218.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 178.

¹⁵¹ American Socialisms, p. 622, resuming The Berean, p. 155.

¹⁵² The Berean, p. 255.

¹⁵³ Bible Communism (1853), pp. 75 ff.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 26 ff.

¹⁵⁵ American Socialisms, p. 633.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 629, summarizing Bible Communism.

¹⁵⁷ American Socialisms, p. 636.

¹⁵⁸ The Perfectionist of Sept. 7, 1844, quoted by Eastman, pp. 343 ff. Eastman gives a very full account of Noyes's teaching on the subject.

¹⁵⁹ For what follows we have drawn on the detailed narrative of William Lloyd Garrison: The Story of His Life told by his Children, vols. ii.-iii. (1885, 1889). The passages drawn upon may be

easily turned up from the excellent indices. The narrative is fully documented and the references given. A brief summary account will be found in Goldwin Smith's *The Moral Crusade: William Lloyd Garrison* (1892), chap. ix.

²⁰⁰ Noyes made the freest possible use of the press for the exposition and propagation of his theories. He maintained a periodical practically continuously from the beginning to the end of his career. This periodical bore successively the following titles: *The Perfectionist* (1834), *The Witness* (1836-43), *The Perfectionist* (1843-46), *The Spiritual Magazine* (1847-50), *The Free Church Circular* (1850-51), *The Circular* (1851-71), *The Oneida Circular* (1871-74), *The American Socialist* (from 1875). Of separate publications emanating from the community, the following, most of them from the pen of Noyes himself, have met our eye:—*Paul Not Carnal, or Christianity Full Redemption from Sin*, exhibited in an exposition of *Romans viii. 7-25* (1834); *The Way of Holiness*; a *Series of Papers* published in *The Perfectionist* (1838); *Salvation from Sin, the End of Christian Faith* (Edition seen, 1876, but often before); *The Berean: a Manual for the Help of those who Seek the Faith of the Primitive Church* (1847); *Confessions of John H. Noyes, Part First; or a Confession of Religious Experience* (1849); *First Annual Report of the Oneida Association* (1849); *Second Annual Report of the Oneida Association* (1850); *Third Annual Report of the Oneida Association* (1851); *Bible Communism: a Compilation from The Annual Reports and other Publications of the Oneida Association and its Branches, presenting, in connection with their History, a Summary View of their Religious and Social Theories* (1853. Noyes uniformly speaks of *Bible Communism* as published in 1848: the edition of 1853 is the only one we have seen); *Hand-Book of the Oneida Community, with a Sketch of its Founder and an Outline of its Constitution and Doctrines* (1867); *Male Continence* (1872. We have seen only the second edition, 1877); *Essay on Scientific Propagation* (n.d.); *History of American Socialisms* (1870); *Dixon and His Copyists, a Criticism of the Accounts of the Oneida Community in "New America," "Spiritual Wives" and Kindred Publications* (1871); *Home-Talks by John Humphrey Noyes, edited by Alfred Barton and George Noyes Miller; Paul's Prize* [reprint of a Home Talk by J. H. Noyes] (n.d.); *Hand-Book of the Oneida Community* (1875); *Mutual Criticism* (1876). There may be added the following:—*Faith Facts: or a Confession of the Kingdom of God and the Age of Miracles*, edited by George Cragin (1850); *Favorite Hymns for Community Singing* (1855); *The Trapper's Guide*. By S. Newhouse and other Trappers and Sportsmen (1867); *Oneida Community Cooking, or a Dinner without Meat*, by Harriet H. Skinner (1873); *Oneida Community: 1848-1901* (n.d.); *The Oneida*

Community: its relation to Orthodoxy: being an outline of the Religious and Theological Affinities of the Most Advanced Experiment in applied Ethics ever made in any Age or Country. By G. W. N[oyes], a member of the Oneida Community from Birth (n.d. but apparently 1912). The following accounts of the Oneida Community and discussions of the principles involved, seem to be the most worthy of note:—J. P. Warren, "Putney Perfectionism," in *The New Englander*, vol. vi. (April, 1848) pp. 177-194. An excellent article. Hubbard Eastman, *Noyesism Unveiled: a History of the Sect self-styled Perfectionists; with a Summary View of their Leading Doctrines* (1849). A good and informing book. William Hepworth Dixon, *New America* (4th ed. 1857), vol. ii. pp. 208-282; *Spiritual Wives* (1868), vol. ii. pp. 292 ff. Brilliant and informing, but sensational and so far inexact. Goldwin Smith, *Essays on Questions of the Day, Political and Social* (2d ed. 1894), pp. 361-384; "The Oneida Community and American Socialism," reprinted from *The Canadian Monthly* of Nov. 1874. Charles Nordhoff, *The Communistic Societies of the United States, etc.* (1875), pp. 257-301. Good account: a Bibliography, pp. 428-429. William Alfred Hinds, *American Communities* (1878), pp. 117-140; superseded by revised edition enlarged (1902), pp. 144-213. Hinds was a member of the Oneida Community from an early date and writes from its standpoint. The account in the first edition is negligible; that in the second is good and informing. Allan Estlake, *The Oneida Community. A Record of an Attempt to carry out the Principles of Christian Unselfishness and Scientific Race-improvement* (1900). Estlake, like Hinds, was a member of the Community and writes from its standpoint; but his work is indefinitely less valuable than Hinds's. Frederick A. Bisbee, "Communistic Societies in the United States," in the *Political Science Quarterly* for December, 1905. The brief biographical notices of Noyes in *Appleton's Cyclopædia of American Biography*, vol. iv. p. 543, and *The American Cyclopædia of American Biography*, vol. xi. p. 238, give an outline of his personal career: there are good brief accounts of the Community in the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge*, vol. i. p. 188 (by W. H. Larrabee), and *Hastings's Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, vol. iii. pp. 785 f. (by R. Bruce Taylor). See also Otto Zöckler, in *Herzog-Hauck*, vol. xv. p. 130; and W. Köhler in *Schiele und Zscharnack*, vol. iv. p. 1356.