Fifty Affirmations.

Religion.

1. Religion is the effort of Man to perfect himself.
2. The root of religion is universal human nature.
3. Historical religions are all one, in virtue of this one common root.
4. Historical religions are all different, in virtue of their different historical origin and development.
5. Every historical religion has thus two distinct elements,—one universal or spiritual, and the other special or historical.
6. The universal element is the same in all historical religions; the special element is peculiar in each of them.
7. The universal and the special elements are equally essential to the existence of an historical religion.
8. The unity of all religions must be sought in their universal element.
9. The peculiar character of each religion must be sought in its special element.

Relation of Judaism to Christianity.

10. The idea of a coming "kingdom of heaven" arose naturally in the Hebrew mind after the decay of the Davidic monarchy, and ripened under foreign oppression into passionate longing and expectation.
11. The "kingdom of heaven" was to be a world-wide empire on this earth, both temporal and spiritual, to be established on the ruins of the great empires of antiquity by the miraculous intervention of Jehovah.
12. The Messiah or Christ was to reign over the "kingdom of heaven" as the visible deputy of Jehovah, who was considered the true sovereign of the Hebrew nation. He was to be a Priest-King,—the Supreme pontiff or high-priest of the Hebrew church, and absolute monarch of the Hebrew state.
13. The "apocalyptic literature" of the Jews exhibits the gradual formation and growth of the idea of the Messianic "kingdom of heaven."
14. All the leading features of the gospel doctrine concerning the "kingdom of heaven," the "end of the world," the "great day of judgment," the "coming of the Christ in the clouds of heaven," the "resurrection of the dead," the condemnation of the wicked and the exaltation of the righteous, the "passing away of the heavens and the earth," and the appearance of a "new heaven and a new earth, "were definitely formed and firmly fixed in the Hebrew mind, in the century before Jesus was born.
15. John the Baptist came preaching that "the kingdom of heaven is at hand." But he declared himself merely the forerunner of the Messiah.
16. Jesus also came preaching that "the kingdom of heaven is at hand," and announced himself as the Messiah or Christ.
17. Jesus emphasized the spiritual aspect of the Messianic kingdom; but, although he expected his throne to be established by the miraculous intervention of God, and therefore refused to employ human means in establishing it, he nevertheless expected to discharge the political functions of his office as King and Judge, when the fulness of time should arrive.
18. As a preacher of purely spiritual truth, Jesus perhaps stands at the head of all the great religious teachers of the past.
19. As claimant of the Messianic crown, and founder of Christianity as a distinct historical religion, Jesus shared the spirit of an unenlightened age, and stands on the same level with Gautama or Mohammed.
20. In the belief of his disciples, the death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus would not prevent the establishment of the "kingdom of heaven." His throne was conceived to be already established in the heavens; and the early church impatiently awaited its establishment on earth at the "second coming of the Christ."
21. Christianity thus appears as simply the complete development of Judaism,—the highest possible fulfilment of the Messianic dreams based on the Hebrew conception of a "chosen people,"

Christianity.

22. Christianity is the historical religion taught in the Christian Scriptures, and illustrated in the history of the Christian church.
23. It is a religion in virtue of its universal element; it is the Christian religion in virtue of its special

element.

24. The Christian Scriptures teach, from beginning to end, that "Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ of God,"—that is, the Hebrew Messiah. This, the Christian Confession, was declared both by Jesus and the apostles to be necessary to salvation or admission into the "kingdom of heaven."

25. The Christian Church, from its origin to the present day, has everywhere planted itself on faith in the Christian Confession, as its divinely appointed foundation,—the eternal "rock" against which the "gates of hell shall never prevail."

26. The Christian Confession gradually created on the one h and the theology, and on the other h and the hierarchy, of the Roman Catholic Church. The process was not as is claimed, a corruption, but a natural and logical development.

27. The Church of Rome embodies Christianity in its most highly developed and perfect form, as a religion of authority based on the Christian Confession.

28. Protestantism is the gradual disin- tegration of Christianity, whether regarded theologically or ecclesiastically, under the influence of the free spirit of protest against authority.

29. "Liberal Christianity,"—that is, democratic autocracy in religion,—is the highest development of the free spirit of protest against authority which is possible within the Christian church. It is, at the same time, the lowest possible development of faith in the Christ,—a return to the Christian Confession in its crudest and least developed form.

30. Christianity is the religion of Christians, and all Christians are believers in the Christ.

31. The Christian name, whatever else it may include, necessarily includes faith in Jesus as the Christ of God. Any other use of the name is abuse of it. Under some interpretation or other, the Christian Confession is the boundary line of Christianity.

Free Religion.

32. The Protestant Reformation was the birth of Free Religion,—the beginning of the religious protest against authority within the confines of the Christian Church.

33. The history of Protestantism is the history of the growth of Free Religion at the expense of the Christian Religion. As love of freedom increases, reverence for authority decreases.

34. The completion of the religious protest against authority must be the extinction of faith in the Christian Confession.

35. Free Religion is emancipation from the outward law, and voluntary obedience to the inward law.

36. The great faith or moving power of Free Religion is faith in Man as a progressive being.

37. The great ideal end of Free Religion is the perfection or complete development of Man,—the race serving the individual, the individual serving the race.

38. The great practical means of Free Religion is the integral, continuous and universal education of man.

39. The great law of Free Religion is the still, small voice of the private soul.

40. The great peace of Free Religion is spiritual oneness with the infinite One.

41. Free Religion is the natural outcome of every historical religion—the final unity, therefore, towards which all historical religions slowly tend.

Relation of Christianity to Free Religion

42. Christianity is identical with Free Religion so far as its universal element is concerned,—antagonistic to it so far as its special element is concerned.

43. The corner-stone of Christianity is faith in the Christ. The corner-stone of Free Religion is faith in Human Nature.

44. The great institution of Christianity is the Christian Church, the will of the Christ being its supreme law. The great institution of Free Religion is the coming Republic of the World, or Commonwealth of Man, the universal conscience and reason of mankind being its supreme organic law or constitution.

45. The fellowship of Christianity is limited by the Christian Confession; its brotherhood includes all subjects of the Christ and excludes all others. The fellowship of Free Religion is universal and free; it proclaims the great Brotherhood of Man without limit or bound.

46. The practical work of Christianity is to Christianize the world,—to convert all souls to the Christ, and ensure their salvation from the wrath of God. The practical work of Free Religion is to humanize the world—to make the individual nobler here and now, and to convert the human race into a vast Co-operative Union devoted to universal ends.

47. The spiritual ideal of Christianity is the suppression of self and perfect imitation of Jesus the Christ.

The spiritual ideal of Free Religion is the free development of self, and the harmonious education of all its powers to the highest possible degree.

48. The essential spirit of Christianity is that of self-humiliation at the feet of Jesus, and passionate devotion to his person. The essential spirit of Free Religion is that of self-respect and free self-devotion to great ideas. Christianity is prostrate on its face; Free Religion is erect on its feet.

49. The noblest fruit of Christianity is a self-sacrificing love of man for Jesus' sake. The noblest fruit of Free Religion is a self-sacrificing love of man for man's own sake.

50. Christianity is the faith of the soul's childhood; Free Religion is the faith of the soul's manhood. In the gradual growth of mankind out of Christianity into Free Religion, lies the only hope of the spiritual perfection of the individual and the spiritual unity of the race.

Modern Principles:

A Synopsis of Free Religion.

I. Christianity" as a System.

1. Regarded as to its universal element, Christianity is a beautiful but imperfect presentation of natural morality.

2. Regarded as to its special element, Christianity is a great completed system of faith and life—a coherent body of doctrines logically developed and organized as an historical power by the Christian Church. It claims absolute control over the collective life of society and the outward and inward life of the individual. It rests this claim on the supernatural revelation of the will of God; that is, on the' principle of DIVINE AUTHORITY.

3. The chief features of this system are the doctrines of the Fall of Adam, the Total Depravity of the human race, the Everlasting Punishment of the wicked, and salvation by Christ alone. Through the transgression of the first man, all human beings lie under the consuming wrath of God, and are condemned to an everlasting hell, from which the only escape is by the Atonement of Christ.

4. This system demands absolute and unreasoning submission from the human mind. It teaches that doubt is sin, and that disbelief is damnation. It everywhere condemns freedom of thought, and persecutes it in proportion to its power. It is the worst enemy of liberty, science and civilization, because it is organized Despair of Man.

II. Free Religion as a System.

5. Free Religion is a great and growing system of ideas, hitherto very imperfectly developed, but destined to become embodied in a world-wide Commonwealth of Man. It will claim absolute control over the collective life of society and the outward and inward life of the individual. It will rest this claim on the natural perception of truth by the universal human race; that is, on the principle of HUMAN FREEDOM.

6. The chief features of this system are the supremacy of liberty in all matters of government, the supremacy of science in all matters of belief, the supremacy of morality in all matters of conduct, and the supremacy of benevolence in all social and personal relations. It puts the Church on the level of all other institutions, the Bible on the level of all other books, the Christ on the level of all other men, leaving them to stand or fall by their intrinsic merits or demerits.

7. This system encourages the largest activity of the human mind, and asks no assent that can be withheld. It is the best friend of progress of every kind, because it is organized FAITH IN MAN.

III. Antagonism of the Two Systems.

8. Between these two great systems there exists an absolute conflict of principles, aims and methods. The one ruled the world in the Dark Ages of the past. The other will rule the world in the Light Ages of the future. Their battle ground is the Twilight Age of the present.

9. Free Religion emphasizes the *Unity of the Universe, the Unity of Mankind, the Unity of the Person, and the Unity of the Unities*.

IV. The Unity of the Universe.

10. Nature is an organic, living whole. All things are in harmony as parts of a perfect cosmos. All phenomena, physical and spir- itual, are correlated in the unity of a perfect order.

11. The laws of Nature are elements of one underlying, all-permeating, all-comprehensive system of Law. Fixed and inviolable, from eternity to eternity they know no change. The belief in miracle is an infinite delusion.

12. The forces of Nature are modes of one omnipresent Energy, illimitable, uncreatable, indestructible—the cause of all metamorphoses and the life of all that lives.

13. Thus Nature is infinitely *many* in her phenomena, and absolutely *one* in her order, laws and forces.

V. The Unity of Mankind.

14. The origin of the human race is one, in virtue of a common descent from inferior types of being.

15. The nature of the human race is one, in virtue of the universal possession, in varying degrees, of the same fundamental faculties.

16. The destiny of the human race is one, in virtue of a slow but constant progress towards a universal and perfect civilization.

17. The human race ought to be a political unit, as a universal Republic of Republics based on the principle that the liberty of the individual is absolute except as limited by the equal rights of all individuals.

18. The human race ought to be a social unit, as a universal Co-operative Union based on free industry and free commerce,—labor and capital being reconciled by the education of ignorance and the reformation of selfishness.

19. The human race ought to be a religious unit, as a universal Brotherhood of Man, based on faith in human nature and love for all human beings.

20. Thus the human race is one in origin, nature and destiny; and it ought to be one politically, socially and religiously.

VI. The Unity of the Person.

21. Every human being is an independent consciousness, manifesting itself on the one h and in numerous unlike faculties (sensation, perception, locomotion, passion, affection, will, reason, conscience, etc.,) and manifesting itself on the other h and in the absolute unity of personality (the *I*.)

22. Every human being ought to develop the unity of personality into the unity of character, based on the principle that the liberty of every faculty is absolute in the exercise of its natural function.

23. The unity of character requires that the Intellect shall make experience its point of departure, reason its road, knowledge its goal, and the love of truth its inspiration and guide; that it shall count all questions open that are not shut by positive demonstration; that it shall reject all answers which have no better basis than ignorant assumption or dogmatic authority; and that it shall seek answers to all questions through the patient study of universal Nature according to the laws of scientific thought.

24. The unity of character requires that the Conscience shall govern all personal action by absolute and universal moral ideas (truthfulness, justice, benevolence, purity, honor, integrity, self-respect); that it shall speak in all places and at all times with the voice of absolute command; that it shall shine like a sun that never sets, flooding the soul with the light of an ever-beautiful ideal? that it shall unsparingly rebuke every betrayal of the right, encourage fidelity to it by approving smiles, and waken deathless aspiration towards it by unveiling the eternal possibility of virtue; and that it shall make the welfare of all a private duty to each, thus consecrating the private life to the public good.

25. The unity of character requires that the Affections shall irradiate life in all its relations with the splendor of unselfish love;: that they shall make manhood more manly and womanhood more womanly by blending them in one pure and happy home; that they shall dignify existence with noble friendships; that they shall deepen the joy and; lighten the grief of others by respectful and tender sympathy; that they shall reverence the good and pity the evil in every human soul, and broaden out into a mighty and self-forgetful love of universal man.

26. The unity of character requires that the Will shall serve the conscience and reason, and know no other law; that it shall master the passions and confine them to their lawful functions; that it shall be incorruptible in this servantship, and unconquerable in this mastership; and that thus, harmonizing the animal and the spiritual, it shall bring the entire man into harmony with the laws of Nature.

27. The unity of character requires that the Sentiments and Imagination shall soar to the beautiful and

sublime, and never trail their wings in defiling mire; that they shall venerate the truly venerable, delight in the magnificence of universal Nature, and thrill to its mysterious life; that they shall recognize the infinitude of the unknown, and add to the clear insights of science the deep glow of poetry and the deeper reverence of worship.

28. Thus the individual is one in the unity of personality, and ought to be one in the unity of a free, powerful and self-harmonized character.

VII. The Unity of the Unities.

29. The Unity of the Universe is repeated in miniature in the ideal Unity of Mankind; and the ideal Unity of Mankind is repeated in miniature in the ideal Unity of the Person. The macrocosm is mirrored in the microcosm.

30. The great inspiration of the nineteenth century is faith in these ideal unities as possible in fact. Its faith in Man is part of its faith in universal Nature; and its faith in universal Nature includes and necessitates Its faith in Man.

31. The great endeavor of the nineteenth century, half-conscious though it be, is thus to reproduce the eternal harmony of Nature in the life of the race and the life of the individual,—to create a civilization grounded on universal reverence for freedom, truth, and the equal rights of all mankind.

32. The Universe is Many in One, and One in Many. Such also will be Humanity, when its ideals shall have been realized in the world and in the soul. The national motto of America has become the great watchword of the ages—
E Pluribus Unum.

Cultured Free Thought.

Rev. O. B. Frothingham; "The Christian Amendment," by F. E. Abbot. This series contains in the aggregate over two hundred patres of closely printed reading matter. Address The Index, 90 St. Clair street, Toledo,. Ohio.

Fear of the Living God.

"It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."
HEBREWS, X, 81.

I wonder how many people know that this text is in the Bible. I wonder how many know that it is in the New Testament. I wonder how many know that it is in the most carefully finished book in the New Testament. I wonder how many of those who know of its existence underst and what it means, or ever tried to underst and it. If it were written thus:—"It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living Satan," or "it is a fearful thing to fall *out* of the hands of the living God"—that would be intelligible. But the passage as it runs is loaded, every word, with incomprehensibleness to modern Christians. I will not try to carry you back to the state of feeling about God which prevailed two thous and years ago, even in the Christian Church. Two thous and years are a long time; and when everything else that people thought and did then looks so very strange to us, what they thought and did about religion should not surprise us.

I might explain the sentence I have quoted by two others in the same chapter, the one immediately preceding this—"We know him who hath said, Vengeance is mine, I will repay;" the other concluding the chapter—"For our God is a consuming fire.

But to explain these sentences so that they would seem true to a modem mind would be as hard as to explain the text. Let us give up all attempt, then, to get fully into the mind of those dark ages of Faith, and see what there may be in our own modes of thought that throws light on these strange words.

Is it not common now to think of God as standing for moral law, judgment, retribution? Is he not the representative of the accusing and avenging conscience? When is he instinctively thought of? In dark days, in gloomy times, in periods of fear, when calamity befals, or sorrow comes, or death approaches, or the sense of guilt oppresses the mind. How is he commonly thought of then? As the Being who darkens the day, makes the time gloomy, produces the fear, sends the calamity, causes the sorrow, inflicts the death, holds over the sense of guilt the rod of penalty. He is the awful Being. At the mention of his name men droop their heads, lengthen their faces, subdue their voices, let the light out of their countenances, and recall their misdoing. The word "punishment" calls up the thought of God. The mention of hell suggests Him. His attributes are the great swelling attributes that appal. He is *Omnipotent*; men are pigmies before Him; they are grasshoppers; He can blow them away as dust; they are as a sleep. He is *Omniscient*; He knows what everybody is about, knows what they are thinking of, what they are feeling, has a detective in every bosom. All over Christendom people tremble as they think of that Justice that holds every one to the letter of the Law; and makes each answerable for his deeds without regard to all those fine considerations which diminish the weight of personal responsibility. All over the world God is a terror. It is the effort of religious men to make him felt as a terror. Often he is the worst of terrors—a vast, vague, shadowy terror—a bugbear, as men call it. Hear men pray to him. Read the Church litanies. Listen to the warning counsel given to wilful, vicious, and criminal people. "Be careful. You are watched. The Avenging Angel is dogging your footsteps. You are rushing to your doom. Christian men and women have not yet outgrown the feeling that the living God is an unsleeping policeman incessantly walking his rounds. It is still the fashion to talk to people about him as parents talk to their adventurous children, telling them the bears will catch them if they go out of doors. This, I, say is a habit of mind ever with us. I believe it is still an inveterate instinct with us to get as far away from God as we can, to think of him no oftener than we must, and to rescue from association with him as much of our life as is possible. To fall into his hands is to suffer; to fall into his hands is to be shut up in prison; to fall into his hands is to be punished. There is a general impression that we are safest when we are out of his reach.

I do not say that our deliberate thoughts of God are so terrible as these. Our people would probably resent the charge of entertaining such black beliefs. They say handsome things of God. They give him sweet names. They praise him in songs. But, for all that, they do not care to come too near him. A chill creeps over them when they think of that. They will then feel their poorness and weakness. They will have to see dreadful sights. It is a "fearful thing."

Now this I take to be the effect of ignorance. It is blindness of mind. Very intelligible blindness, very natural and pardonable blindness, but still a very sad and pathetic, yes, and a very' painful and hurtful blindness. It is the blindness that leads people to imagine that unknown lands are infested with wild beasts; that the wilderness is peopled with goblins; that solitary places are evil places; that unexplored seas are full of monsters; that untried roads are dangerous roads; that the atmosphere is haunted by spirits of the air; that new sciences are

perilous, new knowledge uncanny, new opinions hazardous, new acquaintances temptations, new experiences damaging to the soul, new experiments in life things of questionable salvation.

Let us try to suppose an is land savage to be made acquainted with the fact that he lived on a round globe. Let us suppose him to have on his mind a clear image of the earth as a round globe Let us go further, and suppose him to think of himself as standing on the topmost summit of the mighty ball, shelving downwards from him on every side as far as the horizon line, the heaving waters that encompassed his island tossing uneasily, as if they were struggling to keep their position on the steep declivity. Suppose now that to this savage islander, trembling on his point of rock, should come a civilized man from the other side of the globe, who should tell him of the possibility of passing from where he stood to the opposite side of the ball, and that, not by going straight down through the middle, of it, but by going round it on the outside by sliding down the steep declivity, dipping over the edge of the horizon and crawling along the under side head downwards, like a fly on a ceiling. Can any imagination do justice to the poor savage's terror, as he conceives himself tearing down that awful rapid, dashing over that dizzy verge? and then suppose our educated traveller to tell him something about the immensity of space in which floated the globe he was on,—the billions and billions of miles of distance, where was nothing but bleak, impalpable vastness, black to the eye, noiseless to the ear, senseless to the touch, where was nothing to breathe, where was nothing at all but, incalculable leagues apart, bewildering clouds of globes, lowering and glaring, spinning and whirling, with nothing to hold them or move them. Would not the terror of the poor savage be horribly increased as he imagined himself falling into this terrific void, falling, falling, and never ceasing to fall? and would he not cling more desperately than ever to his little speck in the sea as the only hold he had on existence?

In much the same way as we imagine that poor savage to feel about falling off his island into the bottomless space, do ignorant people seem to feel about, falling into the hands of the living God; and almost as hard is it to convince them that they may safely launch out into unexplored spaces of thought, as it might be to convince the islander that, in putting oft' from his island, he would not be hurried along frightful rapids—would not be dashed over a precipice, would not be dropped off the globe into a bottomless void; but would proceed as over a perfectly level surface—would have his head always in the air and his feet always on the ground—would. have the stars above him just as they were, and in the course of his proceedings would find other islands and continents, other trees and plants, other men and women, living industriously, peacefully and happily in towns and great cities, no more apprehensive of falling off the globe than he was before he knew it was round. We have no fear of slipping off the planet; we have no dread of infinite space; our ships are sailing round the planet all the time. We know that the force that keeps our feet planted where they are, whether they be on the upper or the under side of the ball, keeps everything else in place, keeps in place the distant stars, keeps in place the comets and aerolites. We know that the great laws are invisible, and that, things invisible are under Law; we know, in a word, that we cannot fall *out* of the hands of the Living God, and that because we cannot fall out of them we are safe. All this the European might tell the savage. He might describe his voyage to the island, the vessels he met, the lands he saw, the ports he touched at, the races he encountered; but still the savage would remain unsatisfied.

So, from far-off regions of thought and experience, travellers bring the tale of their discoveries; but the unknown will still be the perilous, and to enter upon it will be a "fearful thing."

We have a faith in which we have been educated, in which we have lived, to which we have been wonted. It is comfortable and warm to us. We feel safe in it. It is our home. It is our tower. With every part of it we are familiar. We have touched its extreme edges all round. Prom this point we gaze abroad, as an islander might, upon an ocean of restless, tossing, troubled minds, questioning, doubting, fearing, tumbling about in the whirl of speculation; some seeming to rush furiously along, some apparently trying to keep their footing on a smooth descent; some slowly sinking from view; some hovering on the verge of a precipice; and we say—"Alas, poor souls! They are lost. They are slipping off the planet. They will tumble into the dreary spaces of unbelief,' atheism, despair. For what is there out there to hold them?"

A man has lived all his days under aristocratic in- stitutions, like Thomas Carlyle, for instance. Order for him is associated with government; and government, in his mind, is associated with a governing class, or a governing person who holds other men subject to him. To him belong the right and privilege and power. Rule and authority are his. This will gives to law its force. Army and navy are his arms. He has power over life and death. So accustomed is he to such an order of things that, though he knows these governing men to be of the same stuff with all other men,—though he knows that these governing men can have no real power save such as belongs to their manhood,—though he knows that the human alone is entitled to rule, and that the human is not held as a monopoly by any set of people,—he cannot conceive of any safety out of that condition of things. From his aristocratic enclosure he looks abroad on men, experimenting on other forms of government, venturing on new fields of social existence, tampering with entire institutions, and is filled with terror. He sees them "shooting Niagara," and afterwards plunging down, down into absolute chaos. "What!" he exclaims,

"allow men to govern themselves! Let them choose their own rulers, make their own laws, regulate their own institutions, launch forth upon the untried sea of republicanism and democracy! Put the ballot into uneducated hands! Admit the working-men to the franchise! Let the rabble be represented! Let the ungoverned say what shall be government! What can come of that but anarchy?" It is, you see, the same old distrust of the living God. It is the same old fear that, outside there, the space is infested with evil spirits. It is the islander's fear.

Everywhere we come across this fear, and everywhere it is the same torment. The living God is terrible. The Conservative has it. He is never safe unless he is protected by Law. Everything must be provided for by Law. The Law must undertake everything, and the letter of the Law must be adhered to And so, when any one comes along who proposes to let people manage their own affairs in their own way, to build their own railroads, pave their own streets, mend their own sewers, educate their own children, maintain their own worship, feed their own poor, nurse their own sick, reform their own criminals, they are seized with a formidable trembling, and talk anxiously of the danger there is of falling off the social planet into shoreless, bottomless space.

The same superstition prevents people from adopting new customs of living, and makes them feel more comfortable in the discomfort they are used to, than in trying some new experiment of existence. They do not know where they are going, and not to know where they are going is to be apprehensive lest they are going to a bad place. We see it in the reluctance with which political privileges are granted to women, in the unwillingness to adopt the rational treatment of children, in the indisposition to trust principles, however rational, in the jealousy of what are called theories—as if sound theories were anything else than truths to which men were not accustomed, the living God who was outside the limits of ordinary experience! Nothing is more difficult than to imagine people who go away forever, as going into the sunshine. And the reason it is so difficult is here—the unknown is the dark, the untried is the dangerous. Except the little spot that we stand on, the world is full of evil spirits that lurk in the air.

And the secret of this monstrous and disabling error is the old notion, not yet outgrown, of God as a jealous, watchful, prying, censorious Being, who has no confidence in his children, and who does not feel kindly towards them; a Being, therefore, whom they must hold in distrust and suspicion, and be very careful to keep on the right side of. How slow we are to use the results of our experience in new fields!

We have, as I said before, no fear of falling into the hands of the living God when we start in trains across a continent, or sail in ships out on the deep sea; for we know that the winds are his messengers, the flaming fires his ministers. We know that the telluric and etherial forces befriend, that gravitation is a powerful servant, that we never can be out of the reach of air and light, and that the living God has no symbols and no agencies more beautiful than these. Here we have demonstration that the un- known is the beneficent. The open mid-ocean is *safer* than the harbor. When the storm threatens the pilot keeps *clear of the coast*. Why should we not feel that the living God fills with his presence the immense outlying space of mind where our thought has never been, and the vast outlying reaches of experience where our frail barks have never ventured? Why fear falling into the hands of the living God, when we launch forth upon the deep sea of knowledge, or reason, or faith, or feeling, more than we fear the same catastrophe when launching forth upon the salt brine of the Atlantic?

Is it answered that in the latter case we are certain, and in the former cases we are not? But how did we become certain in the latter case except by experiment? We were not always certain. There are people now who deem it a tempting of Providence to cross the ocean in a steam ship, or to take a railway train. Is it replied again that, in the latter case, we conform to certain rules which ensure our safety? We build ships after a certain model; we have learned how to regulate steam; we underst and how to adjust ourselves to the elements; science tells us precisely *what we must do* when we launch away upon the deep of adventure; we have chart and compass and sextant; the course is marked out for us. True again. But are such appliances wanting when we commit ourselves to those other seas upon which the soul puts forth under providential direction? Are there no laws of right-mindedness? Has the Heart no compass in its pure affections? Has the Conscience no star in its loyalty to rectitude? Has Reason no pilot in its fidelity to what it knows, in its allegiance to what it is convinced of? Surely the living God does not confine himself to the department of mechanical forces. The chambers of the air are not his only dwelling-place, He is not omnipresent merely, as electricity or gravitation. He is intelligence; He is love; He is justice; He is beneficence. You would not say He is to be trusted as atmosphere and distrusted as Mind! We have no fear of him as a force, but we dread Him as a Spirit! We can venture to touch His hand, but we cannot venture to fling ourselves upon His bosom! We am commit our lives to Him, but we shrink from trusting Him with our souls! He has furnished our bark for commerce between l and land; He has not supplied our souls for their more necessary voyage from one region of experience to another! You would not say that!

Certainly there needs to be caution, prudence, practical wisdom in making sure that we are in his hands. None but the foolish put off to sea in bowls, or trust themselves to the elements as children play with fire. None but the foolish say:—"We take our chance; we know nothing; we have taken no precautions; we simply know that God is good and will take care of us. It makes no difference what we do or how we behave; we venture in

the dark, knowing that at the instant when it seems likely to cover us, the very night will be light about us." They who do that find that the living God is living law, living justice, living reason, living common sense, who will have no scruple to blow them up, or send them to the bottom, or starve them out, as he did those miserable deluded colonists of Jaffa. It is a fearful thing for such people to fall into the hands of the living God. But it is so simply because he is a God of order and equity and truth. This summary dealing with outlaws and fools furnishes the grand reason for trusting him on the part of right-minded men and women. At all events, it is time we abandoned the idea that the unknown is the terrible, or that the living God is a thing to be afraid of in advance of all experience.

Nay, we have experience. Multitudes have trusted themselves to the living God, and have found it very sweet to do so. Broad thinkers, cutting themselves adrift from the quiet moorings of their Faith, have launched away under the guidance of knowledge, and, instead of falling sheer into the gulf of unbelief and despair, have found themselves floating over sunny waters, beneath heavens lit with the glory of new constellations; have discovered islands and continents never heard of before; have made acquaintance with fresh territories of thought, and have learned how beautiful it was to be citizens of the world, free to come and go where they would, in full faith that the further they went the more won- dering, reverential, and loving they would become, provided they went in sober earnestness and faith.

Venturing to believe in humanity, we have tried republican institutions; and in proportion to the fidelity of our experiment has been the demonstration of its success. Mr. Carlyle's frightful picture of "shooting Niagara" provokes a smile. In live humanity we find shere is a live Deity; and so far from its being a "fearful thing" to fall into his hands, we are only praying that we may have grace to fall into his hands more entirely. If anything will save us from the fearfulness of the ancient systems of government, which assumed that the living God dwelt in a palace, and left it only to prowl round the gardens and awe intruders, it is trust in the principle that people are best governed when they govern themselves.

It was believed in the olden time that the State must maintain religion; that, if it did not, the evil one who was constantly going about seeking whom he might devour would snap up many souls, as a vulture snaps up chickens, and would bring the whole l and to the barrenness of infidelity. The State *did* cease to have any concern with religion, and the churches multiplied innumerably. Never was so much worship. Never so much piety. Never so much personal faith or conviction, Never so much deep individual concern for spiritual things. The wicked one who prowled about seeking whom he might devour, proved to be the living God stirring in his children's hearts the embers of the personal religious life.

It was believed in the olden time that either the Church or the State must undertake the support of schools. It was a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the malicious demon of ignorance which infested the world. But on the voluntary system, which throws on people the responsibility of educating themselves, the schools not only increased in numbers but improved in quality. There is better teaching, better discipline, better school architecture and regulation. And so on in other things. We have discovered that the whole universe is filled with the living God; that the living God is not living jeal- ousy, or wrath, or cunning, but living truth and goodness and beneficence. We have learned to see him in the elements that bring us health, comfort, prosperity, happiness. We have learned to see him in the elements which bring discipline, experience, wisdom. We have learned to see him in air and light, in the fine gases, in muscle, nerve, fibre, and tissue, in organs and functions. We have learned to see him in intelligence and affection, in the glow of aspiration, and in the courage of a noble will. We have learned to see him in the wise economies that administer life, in the knowledge that centuries have built up, in the principles that brace us in our difficulty and solace us in our grief. We have come to the belief that the dreadful thing is to fall *out* of the hands of the living God, to fall out of knowledge and reason and truth and charity, to fall out of confidence and trust, to remain so shut up in our narrow houses of belief or cnstom that we do not know what the living God is, and are continually fancying that he is living ogre or living devil.

Is it a fearful thing to fall into the hands of health or understanding? Is it a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the Being who will make you better? Yes, even if in making you better He make you for the time feel worse.

I know men dread nothing so much as health and knowledge. We will go about with an ugly pain in chest or side, fearful of getting into the hands of a wise physician who may tell us our complaint is more serious than we imagined, and calls for immediate treatment; as if, so long as we were ignorant of the complaint, it was not there! As if the physician in telling us of it put it there and made it incurable! None dread cold water so much as they who most need it. None loathe medicine like the sick. The crisis of virtuous experiments is always fearful. It is a fearful thing when the drunkard puts away his glass; when the opium-eater discards his poisonous drug: when the idler sets himself to work; when the dissolute man enters on a course of virtue; when a pleasure-seeker is immersed in care; when a person of luxurious habits is compelled to endure wholesome hardships; when one who has all he wants is deprived of a portion of his means, and is obliged to work hard to

get what he once had for nothing. It is a fearful thing for a mother or father to lose a child, and to be driven by sorrow out of the sweet seclusion of a home untroubled by affliction, into the blank spaces of loneliness; when the winds of restless thought blow chill, and the bitter night dews of grief fall, and the feet stumble over graves, and the blackness of doubt closes round, and only a star, now and then visible in the night heavens, calls back the remembrance of the skies that used always to smile. It is a fearful thing when one who has never questioned his belief first begins to question it, and, stepping out of his old home of Faith, sees what looks like a howling wilderness about him. It is a fearful thing when one who has always dwelt on problems he could master, and has felt perfectly at home with the ordinary questions of his lot, finds himself face to face with problems he cannot master, and gropes about in the dark for an answer to questions that baffle his intelligence. All experimenting of this kind is a fearful thing—all venture into the l and of the unknown, though it has been going on for thousands of years, and has always resulted in the nobleness of mankind. Nothing is so fearful as Novelty in custom or institution. However confident their anticipation of heaven, none are ready to die. But experience teaches us that the fearfulness is for the instant. The momentary shock of the plunge over, a new set of powers comes into play; a new order of satisfactions reveals itself to view; a new and broader existence is disclosed. We come to learn that to live under law, to live justly, healthfully, obediently, trustingly, is the furthest possible from being a fearful thing. The liar, the thief, the traitor, the murderer, would all be the happier for falling into the hands of the living God. Let His hands make the criminars arrest; let His hands institute the discipline: let His hands execute the sentence; the pain will be brief, the peace will be everlasting.

I plead, then, for full faith in the living God—for full confidence in the mysterious—for full trust in the unknown. I plead for the substitution of a spirit of quiet repose for a spirit of fear, as we think of the power that holds our destiny in its hands. I plead for a spirit of courage in meeting emergencies, facing difficulties, coming in contact with trials, encountering what seem to be evils, entering upon new and untried paths of life. Let us be sure that there is no demon but the demon of doubt, fear, ignorance, in our own timid bosoms—that out of doors all is light and power. How simple all this is, yet how dark! The words of the old Christian Apostle sound in our ears almost like impiety. Yet how many practically regard them so!

"Yes. write It in the rock!" Saint Bernard said;
"Grave it on brass with adamantine pen.
'Tis God himself becomes apparent, when
God's wisdom and God's goodness are displayed.
For God of these his attributes is made."
Well spake the impetuous Saint, and bore of men
The hearty suffrage. Now not one in ten
Recalls the obscure opponent he outweighed.
God's wisdom and God s goodness! Ay, out fools!
Misdefine these, till God knows them no more.
Wisdom and Goodness, they are God! What schools
Have yet so much as heard this single lore?
This no Saint preaches, and this no Church rules;
'Tis in the desert, now and heretofore.

Cultured Free Thought.

The Index Association,

With offlces at 90 St. Clair Street, Toledo, O., and 22 Vesey Street, New York City, has been organized with a Capital Stock of One Hundred Thous And Dollars, for the purpose of publishing Tracts, Books and

The Index,

A Weekly Paper devoted to Free and Rational Religion.

It is the object of The Index to give public utterance to the boldest, most cultivated and best matured thought of the age on all religious questions. The Index is edited by Francis E. Abbot, with the following list of Editorial Contributors:

O. B. Frothingham, of New York City.

Thomas W. Higginson, of Newport, R. I.

William J. Potter, of New Bedford, Mass.

Richard P. HalloWell, of Boston, Mass.

William H. Spencer, of Haverhill, Mass.

MRS. E. D. Cheney, of Jamaica Plain, Mass.

REV. Charles Voysey, of London, England.

Prof. Francis W. Newman, of Weston super Mare, Eng.

Rev. Moncure D. Conway, of London, England.

Every Liberal should subscribe for The Index, as the best popular exponent of Religious Liberalism.

Every Christian minister and every thinking church-member should subscribe for it, as the clearest, most candid and most scholarly expositor of the differences between Free Thought and Evangelical Christianity, and as the best means of becoming well informed of the arguments which the Church will have to meet in the future.

Almost every number contains a discourse or leading article which alone is worth the price of one year's subscription.

Send $2.00 for one year, or 50 cents for three months on trial.

Address

The Index,

Drawer 38, Toledo, Ohio.

pointing handThe series of "Index Tracts" (No. 1 to No. 10) will be sent postpaid on receipt of sixty cents. These include "Truths for the Times" (of which Mr. Charles Darwin, author of "The Origin of Species," says:—"I have now read 'Truths for the Times,' and I admire them from my inmost heart; and I agree to almost every word);" "Lecture on the Bible," by Rev. Charles Voysey; "Christian Propagandised." by F. E. Abbot; "God in the Constitution," by Rev. A. B. Bradford; "The Sabbath," by Parker Pillsbury; "The Present Heaven," by Rev. O. B. Frothingham; "The Christian Amendment," by F. E. Abbot. This series contains in the aggregate over two hundred pages of closely printed reading matter. Address The Index, Drawer 38, Toledo, Ohio.

Index Tracts

No. 1.—Truths for the Time, ON REPRESENTATIVE PAPRUS FROM THE INDEX, contains the "Fifty Affirmations" and "Modern Principles." It gives a bird's-eye view of Free Religion as conceived by the Editor of The Index, and states the "irrepressible conflict" between it and Christianity. Mr. Charles Darwin, author of "The Origin of Species," says, in a letter to the Editor not originally intended for publication, but subsequently authorized to be used:—"I have now read 'Truths for the Timee,' and I admire them from my inmost heart; and I agree to almost every word." Price—Ten Cents (*New Edition*.')

No. 2.—Fear of the Living; God, an eloquent and beautiful disccurse by O. B. Frothingham, exposes the debasing character of the popular notions of God, and presents concert ions of him that are worthy of the nineteenth century. Price—Single copies Five Cents; Twelve copies Fifty Cents.

No. 3.—Lecture on the Bible, by the Rev. Charles Voysey, of England, who has recently been deprived of his benefice by the ecclesiastical courts on account of his bold and outspoken heresies, is an overwhelming demonstration of the imperfections and errors of the Bible, both in the Old and the New Testaments. Passages sustaining the argument are copiously quoted, with references to chapter and verse in every instance; and no abler, fairer, or more high-toned treatise on the subject can be found in the English language. Price—Single copies Ten Cents; Sir copies Fifty Cents: Twelve copies One Dollar.

No. 4.—Christian Propagandism, by F. E. Abbot, is a complete exposure of the weakness, costliness, and inefficiency of the System of Foreign Missions. *Full of Figures, Facts, and Interesting Extracts*. Also, a very remarkable article by a Siamese Buddhist is appended, giving an account of a spicy conversation between himself and a missionary. Price—Single copies Ten Cents; Six copies Fifty Cents: Twelve copies One Dollar.

No. 5.-"God in the Constitution:" Would it be right to Incorporate Religious Dogmas into the United States Constitution? By Rev. Arthur B. Bradford. A very clear, pointed, and able argument against the Proposed Theological Amendment to the United States Constitution, which ought to he circulated throughout the country. Price—Single Copies Ten Cents; Six Copies Fifty Cents: Twelve Copies One Dollar.

No. 6.—"The Sabbath," by Parker Pillsbury, is a scathing denunciation of Sabbatarian superstition. *New Edition*. Price—Single copies Ten Cents; Twelve copies One dollar.

No. 7.—"Compulsory Education," by F. E. Abbot, maintains the right of every child to be educated, and the duty of the State to ensure it an education. Price—Single copies Five Cents; Twelve copies Fifty Cent.

No. 8.—The Present Heaven, by O. B. Frothing-Ham, is a singularly felicitous treatment of a subject that interests everybody. Price—Single copies Five Cents; Twelve copies Fifty Cents.

Address,

The Index,

Drawer 38, TOLEDO, OHIO.

Lecture on the Bible.

By the Rev. Charles Voysey, Late Vicar of Healaugh, England.

Part I.

This evening I shall endeavor to fulfil the promise made in my Lecture on Rationalism, that I would verify, by illustrations drawn from the Bible itself, all that I have said against the doctrine of its infallibility.

I do not ask for your indulgence so much as for your pity, in having to perform a task which must deprive me more than ever of the esteem of many good men.

At the outset, I must confess that it is an odious and a thankless task to have to show up the faults of a venerable book which has been the fruitful source of blessing and happiness to countless millions of our race, and which is to me, this very day, both dear and precious. The very faults which I have to hold up for your censure are by no means exceptionally bad, when considered in the light of those times in which they occurred. Some of them are common human blemishes, which any of our best men in the 19th century might have fallen into, had they lived and written in those early times. Nay, I am not sure that in every period throughout those 2.000 or 3,000 years supposed to be covered by the Biblical writings, the Bible writers were not always in advance of their own times, and that their views of God and of duty were not at each successive point superior to those which prevailed in other nations around them. Thus what now appears to us faults were, by comparison, originally great merits, whereby alone the books of the Bible obtained their supremacy over the literature of the world. To illustrate this, let me remind you of the story of Abraham offering up Isaac. We will criticise it from another point of view by and by. At this moment, I ask you to look at it in the light of those times in which Abraham lived. The narrative, at least, assures us that the Patriarch resisted the temptation to offer up his son as a burnt offering; and in overcoming it, Abraham most surely made a protest against the horrible human sacrifices Which prevailed around him, and which he so narrowly escaped imitating. Bad as things seem to be, and really are, in some of the Bible records, it is more than probable they were not nearly so bad as much that went on among the Gentile races which were coeval with the personages in the Bible histories. Moreover, the Bible contains so much that is true and beautiful, so much that will never perish so long as men aspire to virtue and communion with God, that the whole world would be a loser if its pages were to be closed forever, and its precious words forgotten. In proper hands, and read in a reasonable common sense manner, by persons whose minds are absolutely free from superstitious reverence for it, the Bible may still be, and I hope ever will be, a source of delight and instruction—a text-book of praise and worship, and a treasury of examples of all that good men admire.

My opponents, then, will not accuse me of approaching this subject without due reverence for what is really reverend, or without a becoming tenderness for those pious feelings which have thrown a halo around this venerable book—feelings in which I myself share, and which I should be sorry to lose.

This present work is forced upon us by those who have placed the Bible before us in a false light, who have made claims of Divine origin and authority for the book which the book does not make for itself, and who have foolishly and suicidally affirmed that, if the Bible be not infallibly true from beginning to end, it is of no value at all.

Our opponents are not all agreed in their views of the Bible, but I shall endeavor to answer them all at once. Their leading positions are the following:—

Some Revelationists affirm that the Bible is all true from beginning to end, that "every letter, every word," and so on, has been written under the direct inspiration of God, and is, therefore, of one uniform Divine authority throughout.

This class I shall endeavor to answer by showing that there are absolute and irreconcilable contradictions between one part of the Bible and another part; and that in the Bible there are downright falsehoods. One such instance, of course, would be sufficient to overthrow the position taken by this class. Another class of Bibliolators affirms that though there may be errors in science, history, chronology, and geography, in the Bible, yet on one point it is absolutely and invariably true, namely. in its religious and moral teaching.

This class will be answered by showing that the religious and moral teaching in the Bible is not uniform nor coherent, but in some places contradictory of itself, and that some of the religious teaching is degrading to God, and some of the so-called moral teaching is degrading to man.

Another class, driven from both of these positions, has finally taken refuge in that part of the Bible which relates the history of Jesus Christ, and they affirm that, although the Bible is full of errors, scientific, historical,

etc., and even religious and moral, yet the teachings and life of Jesus were absolutely perfect, without the slightest blemish or defect. This class will be answered by my illustrating, from the Gospels, certain moral blemishes in the character and life of Jesus, and even in parts of his teaching, as reported in the Gospels themselves.

But I beg you to observe, and especially desire any opponents who may be present to observe, that the whole and sole aim of this Lecture is to refute the ideas *that the Bible is infallible and that Jesus was no less than the Almighty God*. I stand here tonight with this single purpose; I do not come here to make men love the truths of the Bible less than they did before, or to regard with diminished homage the noble life and beautiful teaching of Jesus himself. I at tack only the extravagant notions that the Bible is all true, that its moral and religious teachings are infallible, and that Jesus was more than man and free from every human blemish.

My arguments will be addressed to your reason, your consciences, and your hearts. "I speak as unto wise men; judge ye what I say."

First of all, I would warn all the spectators in this contest against the tactics of orthodoxy. They will be told that all these objections to the Bible are old, and have been answered over and over again. To this my reply is, that I have searched in vain for any satisfactory answers to them, and have never found them; my reputation and my future prospects as a teacher of religion are at stake in this evening's work. I offer *these* as a pledge that I am going to speak honestly of the Bible, and not wilfully to misrepresent any part of it; and also that I am not going to make myself a laughing-stock by bringing forward objections which have really been already satisfactorily answered. Another of the orthodox manoeuvres is not to allow us to take the words of the Bible as they stand, but they insist on altering an ugly passage by the change or withdrawal of a word or two so as to get rid of a difficulty that cannot otherwise be overcome. The school represented by the Rev. F. D. Maurice is eminently skilful in this manipulation of texts. In my opinion, if this be permissible, then any text may be made to give any meaning, and the greatest possible comfort may be drawn from an Athanasian Creed. The attempt to alter and modify passages in the Bible should at once be recognized as an admission that those passages are not God's word, which of course it would be impious to tamper with or attempt to improve.

I may be called very narrow and arbitrary, but I insist upon keeping close to the plain sense of the words in our authorized Bible, which the ministers of religion of all denominations put, without any warning, into the hands of every one who can be got to read it. Revision of translation is no doubt necessary, and, if conducted fairly, would in many instances be unfavorable to orthodoxy. But until we have a new authorized version, we must use the old one.

I will give you the book, the chapter, and the verse for every quotation which I shall make. I cannot render myself "infallible" for the occasion, or else I surely would; but I may safely say, that if a wiser head or a keener eye than my own should discover a blunder or two in my remarks, those few possible blunders will not detract more than a grain from the weight of the crushing evidence which will still remain.

If all my quotations but one could be explained and harmonized satisfactorily, and that one irreconcilable contradiction or moral blemish remained, it would be enough to accomplish my task of refuting the infallibility of the Bible. My work divides itself into the following sections, though here and there they may unavoidably overlap one another:—

- I shall adduce a few illustrations of contradiction pure and simple.
- I shall cite passages of Scripture which attribute to God feelings or conduct unworthy of Deity.
- Passages which directly or indirectly inculcate wrong-doing or bad motives in man.
- Passages from the Gospels illustrating the human error and infirmity of Jesus; inconsistent with the idea of His being God.

(1) Contradictions, Pure and Simple.

The first instance which I will notice is the contradiction between the two versions of the Ten Commandments as given in Deuteronomy v. and Exodus xx.

The Fourth Commandment, as given in Deuter. v. 12, 13, 14, runs thus:—

"Keep the Sabbath day to sanctify it, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all they work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; that thy manservant and thy maidservant may rest as well as thou. And remember that thou was a servant in the l and of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty h and and by a stretched-out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day" (please to notice the reason here given for the observance of the Sabbath day).

Now at the end of the ten commandments here given in Deuteronomy v. (see verse 22) we read:—"*These words* the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice; *and he added no more*. And he wrote them in two tables of stone, and

delivered them unto me."

Compare this with Exodus xx. In the 1st verse we read:—"God spake all these words, saying." Then follow the Ten Commandments as we read them in Church, and the Fourth Commandment (ver. 8—11) runs thus: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it.

Here we find two glaring contradictions—first, a different reason for the ordinance of the Sabbath is given in Exodus to that given in Deuternomy, and and if "*Godadded no more*" than those words given in Deuteronomy, he could not have added the reason assigned for the Sabbath as given in Exodus.

Another instance of contradiction is where one and the same act is ascribed in one place to God, in another place to the Devil. In 2 Samuel xxiv. 1, we read, "and again' the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go number Israel and Judah." Ver. 10, "and David said unto the Lord, I have sinned greatly in that I have done."

In Chronicles xxi, 1—7, the same event is thus described, "And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel . . . . And God was displeased with this thing; therefore he smote Israel."

In Genesis xxii. 1, it is written, "God did tempt Abraham." In James i. 13, it is written, "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man."

This is a case in which shuffling is resorted to. Opponents will say the word "tempt" does not mean to tempt, but to "try one's faith;" to which I reply for the present by asking on what authority do you give a totally different sense to the same word in a book written by one and the same Divine being? If this is God's word, what right have you to say that He does not exactly mean what he has written? We shall come to the temptation of Abraham presently.

1 Samuel, xv. 10, 11. "The Word of the Lord came unto Samuel, saying, It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king." Verse 29 says, "and also the Strength of Israel (God?) will not lie nor repent; for he is not a man, that he should repent."

Exodus xx. 5 (2nd Commandment). "I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children." Compare this with Jer. xxxi 29, 30, "In those days they shall say no more. The fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the children's teeth are set on edge. But every one shall die for his own iniquity; every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth are set on edge." and this from Ezekiel xviii. 20, "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son."

Deuteronomy xxiv. 16. "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin."

This was quoted and acted upon. 2 Kings xiv. 6, "The children of the murderers he slew not: according unto that which was written in the book of the law of Moses."

It is the boast of the Bible worshippers that we should have no ground for belief in immortality, were it not for the Bible. I beg to remind them of the following passages, which distinctly teach that there is no life after death:—

Psalm vi. 5 "For in death there is no remembrance of thee: in the grave who shall give thee thanks?" This occurs in a prayer offered up in sickness that the speaker's life might be spared.

Isaiah xxxviii. 18. "The grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for the truth."

Job xiv. 10, 12 and 14. "Man dieth and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? So man lieth down, and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep. If a man die, shall he live again V'

Eccles. iv. 5, 6. "The dead know not anything, neither have they any more reward. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy is now perished; neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun."

Verse 10. "Whatsoever thy h and findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest."

Eccles. iii. 19. "That which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath: so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast.

The inspired Solomon certainly had no faith in immortality. And his words are contradicted both in the Old and New Testaments repeatedly.

The contradictions in the New Testament, where they are not merely verbal, can only be proved by quoting very long passages. But they include the following:—

Luke accounts for the whole time of Jesus' infancy in this way. After his birth in Bethlehem (Luke ii. 22)

his parents took him to Jerusalem to perform some religious ceremony in the temple, when he was 40 days old, and then at once departed (Luke ii-39) into Galilee to their own city, Nazareth, and from there they went every year up to Jerusalem at the feast of the passover. (41)

The youth of Jesus was thus accounted for till he was 12 years old.

Now Matthew ii. says that immediately after the birth of Jesus his parents carried him down into Egypt. Moreover, in the three first Gospels it is affirmed that Jesus did not openly and publicly claim to be the Messiah, and that when Peter acknowledged him to be the Messiah (Matt. xvi. 16—20) Jesus "charged his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ." Whereas the fourth Gospel (John i. 41. John iv. 25, 26) describes Jesus as openly claiming the title of Christ, or Messiah, from the very beginning of his ministry, not only among the Jews, but also among the Samaritans.

It is impossible to get over a contradiction like this. Take again the intentional omission by Matthew, from the genealogy of David's descendants, of no less than four persons, only to make his assertion appear to be true that there were three periods of fourteen generations each.

Moreover, both the genealogies in Matthew and Luke say they trace to Joseph—not to Mary—and yet both the books say that Joseph was not the real father of Jesus; how then could Jesus be descended from David through a man who was not his progenitor at all? The names purposely omitted by Matthew are Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah in one place, and Pedaiah in another place. See 1 Chron. iii. 11, 12, and 18.

In the first three Gospels Jesus is represented as going to the wilderness *immediately* after his baptism, and being there 40 days. In the fourth Gospel he is said to be on the third day at a marriage in Cana of Galilee, and not a word is said about the wilderness or the temptation. If he was not in two places at once, one of the varying accounts must be false.

Again the first three Gospels fix the day of the last supper on the night of the Passover; the fourth Gospel makes it the night before that. To prevent mistake, in John xiii. 29 we find that after the supper Jesus says something to Judas understood to be an order to buy what was necessary for the morrow's celebration. According to this Jesus was crucified on a Thursday, not on a Friday.

The inscription on the cross, though copied down toy the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, is different in the different inspired books.

Matthew xxvii. 37. "This is Jesus, the King of the Jews."

Mark xv. 26. "The King of the Jews."

Luke xxiii. 38. "This is the King of the Jews."

John ix. 19. "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews."

1 Cor. xv. 5. Paul says Christ was seen of the 12 apostles after his resurrection, whereas there were only 11, if Judas had hanged himself; and the 12th apostle, Matthias, was not elected until after the ascension.

Human beings might easily fall into such discrepancies in their reports; but God certainly could not have done so.

Then there are all the endless contradictions between Kings and Chronicles, and between the first three and fourth Gospels; between the several narratives of the Resurrection; between the Acts of the Apostles and Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. It is impossible to enumerate them. In place of this, I beg to refer you to the following admirable books, which deal with these subjects at length.

"*The Hebrew Monarchy*," by PROFESSOR FRANCIS W. NEWMAN.

"*The Creed of Christendom*," by W. R. GREG; and a new and very complete work entitled

"*The Bible, it the word of God?"* by T. LUMIS-DEN STRANGE.

"*The finding of the Book,"* by JOHN ROBERTSON, of Coupar Angus.

"*John or the Apocalypse*," by Rev. PHILIP DES-PREZ, Vicar of Alvediston.

"*The English Life of Jesus*," published by THOMAS SCOTT, Esq., of Ramsgate.

"*The Fourth Gospel*," by the Rev. J. J. TAYLOR.

Part II.

I come now to the consideration of those passages which attribute to God feelings or conduct unworthy of Deity, It must be observed that very many of these passages will apply equally to the third branch of our subject, namely, to instances in which wrong doing, or bad motives, are directly or indirectly inculcated upon men.

As the chief aim of this inquiry is to correct popular impressions as to the moral character of God, I pass over those passages in which God is described as walking upon earth, talking face to face with men, and even eating and drinking with them—all of which are totally at variance with our modern conceptions of the Divine Being.

In Genesis vi. 5—7, we read, "God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every

imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart. And the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man and beast and creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them."

Here is a degrading picture of the Almighty and All-wise God. He is represented as having made a grievous mistake, and being sorry for it. "It grieved him at his heart." He has created a race of men incurably wicked, and there is nothing for it but to destroy them. Not content, however, with destroying the wicked men and women, he must needs destroy the innocent beasts, and creeping things, and the fowls of the air, as though he could not destroy man without destroying all creation as well.

In Gen. viii. 21, after Noah's sacrifice of one of every sort of clean animals, "The Lord smelled a sweet savor; and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake." Why? One would expect it was because they were now going to be good—not at all. God goes on to say, "for t he imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth; neither will I smite again any more every thing living as I have done." The same reason is given for God's sparing men, as was given before for his destroying them; as much as to imply that God had acted on an impulse of savage and Indiscriminate rage, which had also proved to be futile, and when he had had time for reflection, or after being appeased by a burnt-offering, he resolved never to do so again.

In Gen. xii. 11—20, we have an account of a deliberate lie told by Abraham, in order—not to protect the honor of his wife—but to save himself from being murdered on her account. I will not read the whole passage, but ver. 17 tolls us that God punished—not Abraham for his falsehood—but poor Pharaoh for his being deceived. "The Lord plagued Pharaoh and his house with great plagues because of Sarai, Abraham's wife." Pharaoh had taken her on Abram's own statement that Sarai was his sister, and being purely innocent he was yet punished as guilty, while the cowardly and guilty Abram goes free.

In chap, xx., a similar scene is recorded between Abraham and Abimelech. King of Gerar, Sarah being dangerously beautiful at 90 odd years of age (Gen. xvii. 17). In ver. 9, Abimelech asks Abraham in reference to his falsehood, "What have I offended thee, that thou hast brought on me and my kingdom a great sin? Thou hast done deeds unto me that ought not to be done." and yet in ver. 7, God is represented as saying to Abimelech, "Abraham is a prophet, and he shall pray for thee and thou shalt live." and in ver. 17, "So Abraham prayed unto God. And God healed Abimelech, and his wife, and his maid servants."

Any child in a Sunday-school would learn from this passage that God was monstrously unjust, because Abimelech had not even laid his h and upon Sarah, whereas all the wrong done, or intended, was the direct result of Abraham's lie. For the benefit of those who do not know their Bible, it is striking to observe that a similar affair is related also of Isaac and Rebekah, and Abimelech, King of Gerar, in chap. xxvi. of the same book.

We come now to the story of Abraham's sacrifice of his son Isaac (Gen. xxii.) To state it briefly, it was either wrong or right for Abraham to kill and burn his son on an altar as a sacrifice to God. If it was right, why did God stop him from doing it? It was wrong, and God knew it. Then since it was wrong to do this, it was unworthy of God to tempt Abraham to do it; to command him to do it; to keep that wicked purpose harbored in his heart all those three days of silent agony. It was horrible in a Divine Being to suggest so odious a thought as that of child-murder, and that to satisfy his own craving for human sacrifice. The whole story may be easily and satisfactorily explained by reference to the customs of the time, except that part of it which describes God as tempting Abraham, and commanding him to do a wicked deed.

We pass now to the Book of Exodus. In the Second Commandment (Exodus xx. 5), the reason urged by God against idolatry is that he is a "jealous God," *i. e.*, jealous of the false Gods. This is not a noble trait in any human character, even though it be very natural to man; how much more, then, is it unworthy of God!

If you ask a child who has been trained in a Sunday-school, who are God's favorites among the Bible heroes, he will be sure to mention Abraham and Isaac, ready to sacrifice t he virtue of their wives for their own safety; Jacob, the fraudulent and accomplished liar; Lot, a drunkard and worse; David, addicted to bloodshed and lust; and Solomon, a notorious and wholesale profligate. This comes of your indiscriminate Bible teaching.

Exodus iii. 8, the Lord said, "I am come down to deliver them (*i. e.* the Israelites), out of the h and of the Egyptians (ver. 17), and to bring them into the *l and of the Canaanites*," etc. Ver. 18 says that God ordered Moses to say unto the King of Egypt, "Let us go, we beseech thee, three days' journey into the wilderness, that we may sacrifice unto the Lord our God."

What is this but to teach that the God of all truth did not hesitate to order his prophets to deceive the king in order to secure his purposes?

Verses 21 and 22 of this chapter give God's orders to the lsraelitish women to borrow jewels of gold and silver and raiment of the Egyptian women. "and ye shall spoil the Egyptians." This order is repeated in the 11th chapter, verses 2 and 3, where the men are included in the order. Thus God is represented as making men

rogues as well as liars. Many times in the 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, and 14th chapters of Exodus, God is described as telling Moses that he would *harden Pharaoh's* heart and the heart of his servants, so that he should not let the people go. And then it is stated on each occasion but one, "The Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart." The Bible worshippers shall not get out of these obnoxious passages by saying that it was a judicial hardening caused by the sinner himself, for this interpretation is not only flatly contradictory of the words in Exodus, but the Apostle Paul himself cuts off that retreat by adducing this very case of God hardening Pharaoh's heart as an illustration of the doctrines of election and predestination. Rom. ix. 17, 18, "Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth;" therefore adds St. Paul, "therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth."

We might well ask the Apostle what sort of a name hath this vile representation of God declared throughout the earth? A name of infamous untrust-worthiness and malignity; the name of one who instead of helping to turn a humble sinner from the error of his ways at the moment of his softening, deliberately stepped in to quench the rising flame of good intention, and to harden his relenting spirit into fresh evil—and all to show his power!

That is not the name of "the Lord God merciful and gracious, abundant in goodness and truth, who will not break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax."

These early books abound in such misrepresentations of God, but I must press on and miss a great deal, or else we shall never have done.

In the 32nd chapter of Exodus, verses 9—14, God is represented as being on the point of consuming all the people in His fury, but was kept from doing so by an appeal to His vanity.

"And the Lord said unto Moses, I have seen this people, and behold it is a stiff-necked people. Now therefore let me alone, that my wrath may work hot against them, and that I may consume them. And Moses besought the Lord and said, Lord, why doth thy wrath wax hot against thy people which thou hast brought forth out of the l and of Egypt with great power and with a mighty hand? Wherefore should the Egyptians speak and say, For mischief did he bring them out, to slay them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth? Turn from thy fierce wrath and repent of this evil against thy people. And the Lord repented of the evil which he thought to do unto his people.

In Numbers xiv., verses 11—20, a similar scene occurs in which (ver. 15, 16) Moses says to God, "Now if thou shalt kill all these people as one man, then the nations which have heard the tame of thee will speak, saying, Because the Lord was not able to bring this people into the l and which he sware unto them, therefore he hath slain them in the wilderness. Pardon them, I beseech thee . . . . . And the Lord said, I have pardoned according to thy word." But now just consider what this pardon amounted to. God goes on to say, ver. 21, "But as truly as I live all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." and how was this "glory" to be shown? Verses 22, 23, tell us, "All those men which have seen my glory and my miracles which I did in Egypt and in the wilderness," etc., etc., "surely they shall not see the l and which I sware unto their fathers; neither shall any of them that provoked me see it. But ray servant Caleb, because he had another spirit with him and hath followed me fully, him will I bring into the land, and his seed shall possess it." So, after all, the children of Israel who came out of Egypt, deluded by promises of the l and of Canaan, all perished in the wilderness except two, Caleb and Joshua. God was either unable or unwilling to keep his oath which he sware unto them.

On another occasion, the revolt of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, Moses and Aaron again prevent the destruction of the people, but this time by an appeal to God's sense of justice. Numbers xvi. 20—23, "The Lord spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, saying, separate yourselves from among the congregation, that I may consume them in a moment. And they fell upon their faces and said, O God, the God of the spirits of all flesh, shall one man sin and wilt thou be wroth with all the congregation?" In spite of this plea 14,700 persons died of a plague, besides the 250 insurrectionists who were swallowed up by an earthquake. The plague would have gone on till the last man was dead, if it had not been for Aaron rushing in with a censer of incense, which made an atonement for the people, and the plague (ver. 47) was stayed. Can any picture of God be more degrading than these?

In Numbers xxi, ver. 4—6, God is represented as having sent fiery serpents among the people only because they complained that they had neither bread nor water, and they did not enjoy the manna. Then in utter forgetfulness of the 2nd Commandment already written by God's finger on tables of stone, God, instead of removing the biting serpents, orders Moses to make a fiery serpent of brass, and set it on a pole that any one who was bitten might look on it and recover.

In Numbers xxii. verses 20, 21, 22, "and God came to Balaam by night, and said unto him, If the men come to call thee, rise up and go with them. And Balaam rose up in the morning and saddled his ass and went with the princes of Moab. And God's anger was kindled because he went." Verses 34, 35, after Balaam's conversation with his ass, he sees the angel of the Lord and says, "Now, therefore, if it displease thee, I will get

me back again," and yet the angel of the Lord says in reply to this, "Go thou with the men." A thous and asses speaking with a thous and human voices is not so incredible as this monstrous fickleness and injustice Here attributed to God.

At your leisure read the 32nd chapter of Deuteronomy, which abounds in degrading pictures of the Divine character.

In 2 Samuel xxi. 1, we read, "There was a famine in the days of David three years, year after year, and David inquired of the Lord. And the Lord answered, "It is for Saul and for his bloody house because he slew the Gibeonites." After seven of Saul's sons had been hung up before the Lord in Gibeah, we read in verse 14, "After that God was entreated for the land."

2 Samuel xxiv. 1, "The auger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah." Ver. 15. "So the Lord sent a pestilence which carried off 70,000 men." Ver. 17. David is distressed. He says to God, "Lo, I have sinned and done wickedly; but these sheep what have they done? let thine hand, I pray thee, be against me, and against my father's house."

Here is the creature fairly accusing the Creator of an atrocious act of injustice. As usual, after some burnt offerings had been made, "The Lord was entreated for the land, and the plague was stayed," ver. 25.

1 Sam. vi. 19. The Lord smote 50,070 persons in the little village of Beth-shemesh for peeping into the ark. Those who wore left are recorded as say- ing—possibly in bitter irony—"Who is able to stand before this holy Lord God?"

2 Sam. vi. 6, 7. Uzzah ventured to put forth his h and to keep the ark from falling over; but was killed on the spot in reward for his reverend service.

1 Kings xxii. 19—23. Micaiah, the only true prophet out of 401 who persuaded Ahab to go up to Ramoth-gilead, says the following: "1 saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven (heaven only, mark you) standing on his right h and and on his left. And the Lord said, Who snail persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramothgilead? and one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. And there came forth a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, I will persuade him. And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? and he said I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouths of all his prophets. And he (*i. e.* God) said. Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also: go forth, and do so. Now, therefore," adds Micaiah, "behold the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets."

Ezekiel, probably referring to this, says, chap, xiv. 9, "If a prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I the Lord have deceived that prophet, and"—can you believe that I am not reading falsely?—"I will stretch out my h and upon him and will destroy him."

The Apostle Paul, too, says (2 Thess. ii. 11,12), "For this cause God shall send them strong delusions, that they shall believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believe not the truth." (Father Hyacinthe, in a letter from Rome, dated 22nd June, writes: "God never requires falsehood, but falsehood often has need of God; and it is never so effective as when it presents itself to us in His name."—*London Times*, 22nd June.)

My friends, is it not incredible that such teachings as this should be believed to be the very Word of God—the inspired revelation of his mind and will? Surely Atheism is better than this. With what pretence of justice were Ananias and Sapphira slain for lying unto God, when God is represented as lying unto men? I defy the bibliolators to get over such difficulties as these extracts present. No explanation will avail them but that only which carries the inevitable conclusion that God is represented in parts of the Bible as an immoral being, and not "righteous in all his ways," or "holy in all his works;" that He does not "love truth and equity," and that He is neither lust, nor true nor trustworthy. I will only say, further, on this point, that I have had to miss many and many an illustration because it is impossible to give them all.

Part III.

I now come to the third part of our subject, and will cite passages from the Bible which directly or indirectly inculcate what is wrong.

The first group of such passages will consist of those which describe vile and wicked conduct, either without a word of censure or with positive approval. There is a passage in Gen. xix. 30—38, which I have too much delicacy to read, and in which a gross case of incest is recorded, without a word of censure. The offspring of this crime, Moab and Ammon, are especially protected by God, as you will find on reference to Deut. ii. 9 and 19.

In the story of Rebekah's and Jacob's lying (Gen. xxvii.), which is so familiar to all Bible readers, you will not find one word of censure upon them for their wickedness. Jacob himself is always included in the sacred three, when God calls himself the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. This no one will object to were it not that the meaning is that these three men were special favorites of Jehovah. And to show that this is not my own arbitrary interpretation, I refer you to the prophet Malachi i. 2, 3, "Was not Esau Jacob's

brother? satih the Lord; yet I loved Jacob, and hated Esau;" and to Paul the Apostle, who quotes these words approvingly, "Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated." (Rom. ix. 13).

Jacob was an utterly mean, cowardly, and fraudulent deceiver, and made so by his own mother. Gen. xxv. 29—34 says, "and Jacob sod pottage; and Esau came from the field, and he was faint: and Esau said to Jacob, Feed me, I pray thee with that same red pottage; for I am faint. And Jacob said, Sell me this day thy birthright. And Esau said, Behold I am at the point to die; and what profit shall this birthright do to me? and Jacob said, Swear to me this day; and he sware unto him: and he sold his birthright unto Jacob. Then Jacob gave Esau bread and pottage of lentiles."

Gen. xxx. 2S—43 gives us an account of how this chosen servant of God cheated his uncle Laban and secured for himself by dishonest means all the best of the flocks and herds. In xxxi. 42, Jacob says to Laban his uncle, "Except the God of my father, the God of Abraham, and the fear of Isaac, had been with me, surely thou hadst sent me away now empty." Wherein he claims that God had not only sanctioned but helped him in his fraudulent dealings.

Esau, on the contrary, who is never praised in the whole Bible, was a fine, noble, generous character, his only recorded fault being the desire to take revenge on Jacob when he had discovered his villainy; but his truly magnanimous forgiveness of Jacob afterwards made ample amends for that natural fit of anger.

Jacob's faults pass uncondemned, while Esau is said to be hated by God.

I pass now to the history of David, to notice one instance of outrageous villainy which never receives a word of censure in the Bible.

I Sam. xxvii. records how David and six hundred men were sheltered and hospitably entertained by Achish, King of Gath (verses 2—6), "He and his men, every man with his household, even David with his two wives, and planted them in a town called Ziklag." Now day by day David and his men made marauding expeditions against the aborigines of the l and by whom he was sheltered. Verses 9—11 tell us that David smote the land, *i. e.*, the Philistine district, and left neither man nor woman alive, and took away all the spoil and came to Achish. (Ver. 10—12.) "and Achish said, Whither have ye made a road to-day? and David (falsely) answered, Against the south of Judah, and against the south of the Kenites. . . . . And David saved neither man nor woman alive, to bring tidings to Gath, lest they should tell on us. And Achish believed David."

This instance of treachery reminds me of one that must not be left out of this black list. I mean the treachery of Jael (Judges iv.). Like other stories which are so well known, I will not waste time in reciting it all. I only call attention, first, to the extreme sacredness in which Orientalists regard the pledge given and received in acts of hospitality. If food was given and received, it was tantamount to a solemn oath that no harm should be done by one to the other. There is a story told of a robber who entered a house, intending to murder the owner for the sake of his wealth, but that in creeping along his h and touched the walls. He put his h and to his mouth and tasted salt, whereupon he withdrew from the house, gave up his coveted spoils, and afterwards confessed to the owner how his life had been preserved.

I mention this to show how sacred was the implied pledge in hospitality given and received. But what aggravated the conduct of Jael was, that (ver. 17) there was peace between Sisera's king and her husband, Heber the Kenite. As her husband's friend, Jael thus receives Sisera (ver. 18), and says, "Turn in, my lord, turn in; fear not." After being refreshed with a draught of milk from Jael's hand, the weary warrior lies down in perfect security and sleeps. The awful tragedy you know, and one could only extenuate or make excuses for the crime on the possibility of a panic of terror coming over Jael's mind for the safety of her husband, who was thus compromised by sheltering the enemy of the victorious Israelites. But no human heart now-a-days could look upon her act as anything but a crime, and a crime of the deepest dye.

Turn to Judges v., and what do we read? (ver. 24)—"Blessed above women shall Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite be; blessed shall she be above women in the tent." (ver. 31) "So let all thine enemies perish, O Lord." These are the words of Deborah, a prophetess—an inspired woman—and this is a part of that Book which even to-day is asserted to be the infallible Word of God, written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost!

The books of the Kings and Chronicles abound in instances of vile conduct uncensured, or actually commended. I will give you but one—King Jehu. 2 Kings x. 30, informs us that "The Lord said unto Jehu, Because thou hast done well in executing that which is right in mine eyes, and hast done into the house of Ahab according to all that was in mine heart, thy children of the fourth generation shall sit on the throne of Israel." In the 9th chap., verses 6 and 7, we find the command of God to Jehu to "smite the house of Ahab."

Now let us briefly enumerate the acts of Jehu, which were done in obedience to God's command, and which were rewarded by God's approval.

He first shot King Joram, and then ordered the assassination of King Ahaziah (chap. Lx. 24, 27): then, by a subtle and explicit message to the Samaritan elders, he obtained the heads of seventy of Ahab's children (chap. x. 5—10), which were packed in baskets and sent to him to Jezreel. The next morning he addresses the people in most hypocritical language—"I conspired against my master and slew him, but who slew all these?" thus

pretending to have had nothing to do with that massacre. This he followed up by slaying all the rest of Ahab's relations (ver. 11) and friends, and great men and priests, until he left him none remaining (chap. x. 11). But with the usual elasticity of Scripture, after they were all slain, there were a great many left, namely, forty two brethren of Ahaziah (Ahab's son-in-law) and a whole temple full of priests. The former he slays without a word of warning; the latter he ensnares into his hands by hard lying (chap, x. 18—28). It is plain enough to us to see that Jehu only acted like an unscrupulous usurper, who finds the safety of his throne dependent upon the extermination of the late dynasty, while his slaughter of the worshippers of Baal was partly done as a sop to the priests of Jehovah, who had been instrumental in urging his pretensions, and partly to crush all lingering sympathy with the house of Ahab in the minds of the people. He was a consummate dissembler, hypocrite, and murderer; and yet the Bible tells us that he did according to all that was in God's heart, all that was right in God's eyes, and received for so doing God's approval and reward.

Of direct commands which are immoral and degrading there is, alas I a too plentiful supply in the Bible. It is impossible to give more than a few illustrations.

1st. As to the usages of war. God is said to have commanded the slaughter of women and children, even infants and sucklings. Joshua x. 40 sums up an account which must be terribly familiar to the ears of all church-goers:—"So Joshua smote all the country of the hills, and of the south, and of the vale, and of the springs, and all their kings; he left none remaining, but utterly destroyed all that breathed, *as the Lord God of Israel commanded*.

In Numbers xxxi. 17, 18, Moses gives a command to slay every male and every married woman; but the virgins were to be reserved for their own enjoyment. Lest it should be said this was only Moses speaking, refer to the 25th and the following verses—"The Lord spake unto Moses saying, . . . Divide the prey," . . . . so and so—32,000 persons, women, *who were virgins* (I have altered the Bible expression out of decency.) Ver. 40 says "and the persons were 16.000, of whom the Lord's tribute was thirty and two persons." We do not wonder at savage men doing these things; we only ask, in the name of the Holy God, how you Bible-worshippers dare to tell us that these were God's commands?

Turn now to Numbers v. 11—34, beginning "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying." It is the ordeal for jealousy—no, I cannot read it. It is too disgusting; and if I read it here or in church, I should earn the character of that notorious Protestant lecturer, who is blamed for going about the country exposing the alleged obscenities of the Catholic Confessional.

The law of *divorce* (Deuter. xxiv. 1—3), is another instance of immoral commandment; and we have the authority of Jesus for saying so. He upsets the Divine authority for the law, by ascribing it to Moses.

Again, the law of *retaliation* (Deuter. xix. 21), "Thine eye shall not pity; but life shall go for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, h and for hand, foot for foot," is eminently immoral, also reversed by Jesus.

Hosea is commanded (chap. i. 1), to break the Seventh Commandment. (See also chap. iii. 1).

Levit. xxvii. 29, involves human sacrifices; "None devoted shall be redeemed; they shall surely be put to death." "Every devoted thing is most holy unto the Lord." Jephthah, no doubt acted upon some law like this.

Exod. xxii. 18, enacts a law which has caused thousands and tens of thousands of defenceless women to be murdered—"Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." What are we to think of a God who knew so little about the men and women he had made as to believe in witchcraft himself? Slavery is also inculcated in Leviticus xxv. 44—46, "Thy bondmen and thy bondmaids shalt thou buy of the heathen that are round about you, and of the strangers that do sojourn among you, and ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you; they shall be your bondmen forever." (I have condensed this passage for the sake of brevity.)

Although the Hebrews might not marry any foreign women, yet they might have as many concubines as they pleased of the captives taken in war, or by purchase. Hence Solomon figures with his 700 wives and 300 concubines—1,000 women in all.

Lastly, the Bible itself endorses all that I have said, in these words from Ezekiel xx. 25, "Wherefore I gave them also statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live."

I must not omit from this catalogue those blemishes on the beautiful Psalms, in which Oriental hatred and revenge find such fierce expression. Psalms cix., cxxxvii., are enough to quote in establishment of my argument, while I can assure you that there are very few Psalms in the whole nook that are not more or less disfigured by prayers for revenge and curses against foes.

It has been urged by some that the moral teaching of the New Testament is also at fault. No doubt it Is imperfect, but it does not deserve to be placed in the same black catalogue as that from which I have drawn the foregoing illustrations. One book of the New Testament, he wever, has earned our just execration. My sense of justice rose up in rebellion against it when I was but a boy, and I detest the book more than ever now. It is the last in the Bible the Book of Revelation. In ohap. xxii. 18,19, the writer fiercely but vainly tries to guard his production from being corrupted by transcribers, and this he does by a malediction worthy of the spirit which has ever animated the diabolical side of the Christian church. "If any man shall add unto these things, God shall

add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life." I only wish the writer of that book could hear me say to him, "Your mouth is full of cursing and bitterness, and your feet are swift to shed blood."

False pretenses generally defeat their own end. Let Bibliolators beware of making threats against those who question the Divine origin and infallibility of this book. Those threats will make more rebels than they ever made slaves.

Part IV.

I come now to the last branch of my inquiry—that which relates to Jesus Christ. I will show from the New Testament itself that, however splendid and noble he was as a man, he could not have been the Almighty God, creator and preserver of the universe. Nothing that I can say will detract from his great human excellence. His nobleness, and purity, and lofty self-sacrifice for the truth, have never been surpassed. But for all that, he was a man like ourselves; and even in a narrative purposely designed to represent him as faultless, he discloses certain sure signs of human error and infirmity which can never be reconciled to the idea that he was the Almighty God on earth.

(1). His knowledge was defective. In Luke ii. 52, we read that "Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man." The wisdom of God must be absolute and complete, and therefore not capable of increasing at all. If Jesus increased in wisdom, then he must at one time have been deficient in wisdom, and could not have been God himself. But it is further stated that he increased in favor with God. What can be more absurd than to say that God increased in his own favor? This text is perfectly consistent with the idea that Jesus was only a man, but utterly inconsistent with the idea that he was a God.

Then he believed that blindness and dumbness were the result of being possessed of a devil (Matt, xii. 22—28)—"Then was brought unto him one possessed with a devil, blind, and dumb, and He healed him, inasmuch that the blind and dumb both spake and saw. . . . . When the Pharisees heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of devils." and Jesus answered, "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? . . . . But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come to you."

Another proof of his belief that devils were the immediate cause of disease is found in Matt. xvii. 14—21. A poor lunatic lad, subject to epilepsy, falling oftentimes into the fire and into the water, could not be healed by the disciples of Jesus, who thereupon reproaches them for their want of faith, and says, "Bring him hither to me. And Jesus rebuked the devil, and he departed out of him." He adds, in the 21st verse, "Howbeit this kind (of devil) goeth not out but by prayer and fasting."

His knowledge of Jewish history was at fault when he accused his countrymen of having murdered Zacharias, the son of Barachias (Matt, xxiii. 35). It was Zachariah, son of Jehoida, who was slain as described, between the temple and the altar. You will find this recorded in 2 chron. xxiv. 20—22. Zechariah, the son of Berechiah, was one of the prophetic writers of the Old Testament, and lived 320 years later. A very trifling mistake truly, but one which makes all the difference to the claims made for Jesus that he was a God.

With respect to his future return to earth, he himself admits (Matt. xxiv. 30) that "of that day and hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels in heaven, but my Father only." Mark xiii. 32 says that Jesus said still more explicitly, "No man, no, not the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." That he spoke the truth when he confessed this ignorance is too well established by those passages in which he predicted his return "before that generation should pass away" (Matt. xxiv. 29—35. "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. . . . . Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, till all these things he fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." If words have any meaning at all, these words show that Jesus was mistaken in his prediction. I know a common method of trying to get out of this tiresome fact is to say that the "generation" spoken of did not mean generation, but the present epoch or age of the world between Christ's ascension and his return to earth. But this involves the error of the apostles and the early Church, who all firmly believed that Christ would come again in the lifetime of some of them, and who accepted his words literally. (See 1 Thess. iv. 15—17.) I think myself that the immediate followers of Jesus were more likely to have known what he meant than we are. The later epistles show signs of the disappointment of this expectation (see 2 Peter iii. 4, and 2 Thess. ii. 2, 3. The genuineness of these two epistles is doubted by some critics). And it is worthy of notice that the Fourth gospel, which many critics believe to have been written A. D. 160—180, carefully excludes all these predictions of

Christ's second coming, and has a most suspicious passage in chap. xxi. 20—23: "Then Peter, turning about, seeth (John). . . . And saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? .... Then went this saying abroad among the brethren that that disciple should not die. Yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die, but, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?"

When this book was written there can be little doubt that every one of the apostles and contemporaries of Jesus was dead and buried, and John, who perhaps survived them all, had been dead half a century.

That saying of Jesus concerning Judas Iscariot always seemed to me inconsistent with the idea that Jesus was his Creator. "Woe to the man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! Good were it for that man if he had never been born!" (Mark xiv. 21). The Creator is surely responsible for the existence of all his creatures, and such a speech is unbecoming to the lips of the Creator.

Had Jesus been the Almighty God, neither could he have uttered those words on the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" As a cry of anguish and disappointment it was natural enough on the lips of a frail man; but if Jesus were God himself, it would be but a solemn mockery.

In the Fourth gospel we have presented to us a character in Jesus Christ in striking and painful contrast to the Jesus of the first three gospels. In the Synoptics, he is at least simple and plain, willing to teach, and to reply to inquirers, and free from narrowness in his religious views. But in the Fourth gospel we find him represented as often striving to perplex and confound his questioners. He is in a state of chronic antagonism with the men around him who are not his followers, and begins his ministry by condemnation of all who do not believe on Him. Chap. iii. 18, "He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God."

He teaches the doctrine of Election notwithstanding, chap. vi. 44. He says, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." Chap. ix. 39, "For judgment am I come into this world, that they which see not might see, and that they which see might be made blind."

Is this God loving the world impartially, or is it not? In chap. xvii. 9, speaking of those who believe on him, he says, "I pray for them; I pray not for the world." In chap. xi. 41, 42, he is represented at the grave of Lazarus, as saying, "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me," and as saying this only for effect, "but because of the people which stand by I said it." God would surely have known his motives in saying "I thank thee that thou hast heard me," without Jesus telling him so; and to announce the motive to the by-standers was to give an air of insincerity and artifice to his own conduct. I cannot believe this of Jesus. This alone stamps the narrative as incredible and fictitious.

According to this untrustworthy gospel he taught not the doctrine of the Trinity, but rank Tritheism. Chap. xvi. 7, "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you." Chap. xiv. 26, "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost whom the Father will send in my name." According to this, one God is said to be unwilling or unable to be where another God is, but will take his place when he departs. These passages do not teach any doctrine of a Trinity, but only of Three Gods in most unconquerable plainness. Moreover they directly contradict the statement that "Jesus [himself was] full of the Holy Ghost" (Luke iv. 1), and that John the Baptist and his mother Elizabeth (Luke i.) and his father Zecharias, and the aged Simeon were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and the Holy Ghost (Matt, iii.) visibly descended upon Jesus at his baptism.

I see traces of human weakness in the language which Jesus is reported to have used against the chief priests and scribes and pharisees of his time. I know what it is to be tempted to abuse and denounce fiercely the men whom in our day we believe to be hindering the work of God, and keeping back from the people the light of truth. But what holds me from giving free utterance to my angry thoughts? Why, instead of abusing the men themselves, do I force myself into attacking only their erroneous or mischievous opinions? It is my conscience. My moral sense tells me that I must not call ill-names, nor let my righteous indignation against falsehood and blasphemy get the better of me, and lead me into malediction.

My reason also tells me that men are scarcely ever responsible for their beliefs or misbeliefs; that they deserve pity if they are in error, and do not deserve curses. Hence I could not, without a guilty conscience, take up the language of Jesus against the bigots of our own day. I could not say to any men, "Ye are of your father the devil" (John viii. 44), nor this, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" (Matt, xxiii. 33.) I cannot be sure that he ever used such improper language as this to his fellow-men, but I am very sure that the Gospels say that he did, and therefore the Gospels represent him as giving way to bad temper, and doing that which all decent people now-a-days agree in condemning as not only wrong, but futile; for abuse is not argument.

The last point in the recorded character of Jesus which I shall criticise is that which I shall deliberately call his disregard of family ties.

Luke ii. 43, tells us that "the child Jesus [being twelve years old,] tarried behind in Jerusalem; and Joseph

and his mother knew not of it." After three days they found him in the temple, and his mother said, "Son, Why hast thou thus dealt with us? Behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing." Ver. 49. And he said unto them, "How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business? and they understood not the saying which he spake unto them." (Notwithstanding all that is written about the miraculous birth.) "and he went down with them and came to Nazareth, and was subject unto them." Ver. 51. (Notwithstanding his Father's business, which he at once gave up.)

Now what chills my heart in this story is not that a little boy twelve years old should be so thoughtlessly cruel as to get away unknown to his parents; but that when he was told of their sorrow in losing him, he made no sort of apology—never uttered a word of tender regret, but only began to vindicate himself on the ground of a higher obligation; as though God in heaven ever did or ever would desire a child to inflict such a wound as that on its parents' hearts.

I know what it is to lose a child for a few hours. I have helped more than one poor mother to find her lost little one in the dense streets of London, and I have felt and witnessed the agony of parental anguish, worse while it lasts than the wrench of Death. And yet this youth of twelve, said also to be God Almighty, could inflict such a wound as this and not know it: and when tenderly reminded of it, neither felt nor expressed the least sorrow. This disregard of natural ties is again exhibited (Matt. xii. 46—49): "While yet he talked to the people, behold, his mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him." Then a by-stander tells him, Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without desiring to speak with thee." But instead of regarding the firth commandment, which says, Honor thy father and thy mother, he answered and said unto him that told him, "Who is my mother, and who are my brethren? and he stretched forth his h and towards his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren!"

I can hardly read such passages with patience. They exhibit Jesus as completely destitute of natu- ral affection, cruel and disrespectful towards his mother, and carried away by egotistical vanity. Mark iii. 31—35, tells the same tale, and Luke viii. 20, 21, likewise, with this vaiation, "My mother and my brethren are those which hear the Word of God, and keep it." What about the fifth commandment being the Word of God?

The Fourth gospel has furnished two instances in which Jesus is described—and in my opinion, falsely described—as guilty of a coldness towards his mother, which is unpardonable and unworthy of a man. Chapter ii. gives an account of the marriage at Cana in Galilee. Verse 3, "When they wanted wine, the mother of Jesus said unto him, They have no wine." Instead of saying tenderly, Leave it to me, dear mother, he says, "Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come."

Those who are ignorant of Greek must not suppose there was anything disrespectful in the term "Woman;" it was equivalent to Lady or Madam. But the cutting coldness of this reply betrays the absence of natural affection, which, as a son and a father, I here openly denounce as a frightful blemish in the life and character of Jesus Christ.

Worse than all, when that neglected mother, who had followed him about with so much maternal pride, treasuring up every word of his in her loving heart, comes and stands by the Cross, to be at h and in his last hour, to render a kindly service, or to get a loving farewell from those lips which she had idolized more than they deserved to be, what is his greeting? He points to a disciple standing near, and says (John xix. 25, 26) "Woman, behold thy son;" and to the disciple, "Behold thy mother." Even supposing him to have been thus providing for her future support, yet anything more heartless than this you cannot conceive—it betrays a soul in which all natural affection is dead, or in which it never even had birth. There was not a word of love in it, not a word of tenderness. The sword that was to go through that poor mother's soul pierced her to her agony. (Luke ii. 35). I for one would say, if this anguish of heart could not have been avoided because Jesus was God, then it was a thous and pities that he became incarnate at all. No benefit to mankind could compensate for the mischief of such a cruel example—for this persistent and heartless trampling on the purest affections of humanity.

If you, my Bibliolator, insist upon this being a proof that Jesus was Divine, and therefore superior to all family and local ties, then in God's name, I say yours is a God whom I will not follow nor believe in; whose every word I will disobey, and whose every guidance I will distrust.

1 will now place you on the horns of a dilemma. If Jesus treated his mother and his brethren as described in the Gospels, he was not the God who commands us to honor our father and our mother, and to love each other as brethren. If Jesus did not do so, then your Gospels speak falsely, and are no longer to be trusted, when they tell you that Jesus lived before Abraham, or was born without a human father.

My painful task is done. Had I known beforeh and what a mass of evidence there was to choose from, I would not have attempted to treat this great subject in one Lecture. As it is, I have left an enormous quantity of illustrations for future use. When the popular superstition is destroyed, it will then be my privilege and happiness to speak of the truths and beauties of the Bible, and of the character of Jesus, with the genuine enthusiasm which I feel.

I believe I am not saying more than the literal truth when I affirm that I have to-night completely proved

that the Bible contains errors, and immoral teaching, and views degrading to God, and that the very records of the life of Jesus furnish their own, testimony that he was only a man, and was not free from some human imperfections and infirmities.

It would be well for all those who clamor for the infallibility of the Bible, or for the Godhead of Jesus Christ, to be careful not to omit one very important preliminary before they venture upon arguing out their views—the advice I give gratis and with hearty welcome—
"Read Your Bibles."

The Index,

A Weekly Journal Devoted to Free Religion,
Published by The Index Association, At No. 231 Washington Street,. Boston.
Editor: Francis Ellingwood Abbot.

Editorial Contributors: O. B. FROTHINGHAM, New York City; W. J. POTTER New Bedford, Mass.; W. H. SPENCER, Haverhill, Mass.; Mrs. E. D. CHENEY, Jamaica Plain, Mass.; GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE, England; D. H. CLARK, Florence, Mass.; Mrs. ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, Tenafly, N.J.

Every liberal should subscribe for The, Index, as the best popular exponent of Religious Liberalism. Every Christian minister and every thinking church-member should subscribe for it, as the clearest, most candid, and most scholarly expositor of the differences between Free Thought and Evangelical Christianity, and as the best means of becoming well informed of the arguments and the movements which the Church will have to meet in the future. Almost every number contains a discourse or leading article, which alone is worth the price of one year's subscription.

MR. Charles Darwin, author of *The Origin of Species*, says, in a letter to the editor not originally intended for publication, but subsequently authorized to be used: "I have now read 'TRUTHS FOR THE TIMES,' and I admire them from my inmost heart, and I agree to almost every word."

PROF. Max Mueller, of Oxford. England, in a letter to the Editor published in The Index for January 4, 1873, says: "That the want of a journal entirely devoted to Religion in the widest sense of the word should be felt in America—that such a journal should have been started and so powerfully supported by the best minds of your country,—is a good sign of the times. There is no such journal in England, France, or Germany, though the number of so-called religious or theological periodicals is, as you know, very large." and later still: "I read the numbers of your Index with increasing interest."

Send $3.20 for one year, or So cents for three months on trial. Address The Index, No. 231 Washington Street, Boston.

Part I.

A few weeks ago, I published some remarks on "The System of Foreign. Missions," in reply to certain criticisms of the New York *Independent*. I had quoted as a common saying the statement that "it takes three dollars to send one to the heathen," which the *Independent* characterizes as a "stale slander." In reply to this, I said that Dr. Mullen, one of the best authorities on the subject, estimates the total expenditure of the fifty (Protestant) missionary societies throughout the world at $5,104,670, the total number of missionaries employed being 5,033. I then inquired—what is the annual total of "conversions" effected, and what proportion of this vast sum is expended directly on the heathen? I said I believed that fully seventy-live *per cent*. of these five millions is absorbed in salaries and running expenses of various kinds—quoted an English authority as estimating the probable cost of each good convert to Christianity in Siam at ten thous and pounds—and added that it would take more than the "Reports" of interested parties to convince me that the greater portion of this golden stream does not sink into the s and of ecclesiastical organizations. I then added some remarks on the general uselessness of this vast system of missions, characterizing it as a stupendous fraud upon credulous Christendom.

This article has elicited from some of my best friends keen yet kind and thoughtful remonstrances, which have induced me to select Christian Propagandism as the topic of one or two special lectures. I will begin by quoting the letters received, that the objections raised may be stated in their full force. The first says:—

"I thought you shifted your ground a bit about the missionaries. Your first ground was that the means were wasted in the machinery, and did not reach the end—your second that the end itself is of little value. This does not seem to me quite fair. Moreover, on the first ground I don't think you quite hold your own, for 'payment of salaries' includes salaries of *missionaries themselves*, which were legitimately the main objects of appropriation; as much as for an anti-slavery society to pay the salaries of its agents."

To this letter I would say that I do not think I shifted my ground, True, I did intend to say that the means are wasted in the machinery, to at least the extent of seventy-five *per cent*., and that they do not reach the end aimed at. But what is the end aimed at? Not the payment of missionaries' salaries, but manifestly the conversion of all the world to Christianity. It appears to me that I was arguing directly to the point, when I inquired very sceptically as to the annual total of conversions effected, to offset this annual outlay of live million dollars, and when I quoted the opinion of a competent English witness that in Siam, at least, it takes fifty thous and dollars to make one good convert. If this be the ease, there is plainly enough an enormous waste of means somewhere. What I afterwards added about the valuelessness of the end itself was supplementary—an addition naturally suggested by my subject. I cannot perceive, therefore, that I was at all unfair, although I could doubtless have expressed myself more fully and in a manner less liable to misunderstanding. My reasoning was too elliptical, but, I think, to the point.

The second objection made by my friend is that the payment of salaries to the *missionaries themselves* should be excepted in any estimate of waste involved in running the machinery of foreign missions, since these salaries are the main objects of appropriation. If this view of the matter is correct, I am of course in the wrong, and could not justly say that three-fourths of the money raised sink into the s and of ecclesiastical organizations. But it never occurred to me to make any such exception, nor did I ever imagine that it was made in the common saying I quoted about its taking three dollars to send one to the keathen. The words originally criticised by the *Independent* were these:—"Seventy-five *per cent,* of all moneys contributed for foreign missions goes to *pay salaries* and keep the ecclesiastical machinery in running order." I meant, of course, to include the salaries of the missionaries, who are the chief part of the machinery. In estimating the running expenses of a Baptist or Methodist church at home, is it usual to throw out of the account the salary of the minister, which usually constitutes, at the very least, half of the annual expenditure? Certainly not. Then why throw out the salaries of the missionaries from the running expenses of the missionary societies? I see no more reason for doing so in this than in the other case.

Moreover, is it quite correct to say that the missionaries' salaries are the "main objects of appropriation?" The main object of all appropriations by missionary societies is ostensibly the *conversion of the heathen*; and all salaries, whether of home officials or of missionaries in the field, are simply means to this end. I see no essential distinction between these two classes of salaries. Whether the money spent in paying these salaries, of one class as well as of the other, is wasted or not, and, if wasted, to what extent, depends wholly on the success or failure of the entire machinery in accomplishing its purpose—namely, the conversion of the heathen. If the heathen are converted, the money reaches them; if not, not. If they should not be converted *at all*, the money spent would be *wholly* absorbed in running a machine which effects no results. When I said that I believe fully three-fourths of the money spent to be thus absorbed, I think I understated, not overstated, the truth. Further on I will at least make good my charge.

The other letter I referred to says:—

"I fear you have fallen into a mistake that will give you trouble. The charge that 'it takes three dollars to send one to the heathen—in other words, that seventy-five per cent, of all moneys contributed for foreign missions goes to pay salaries and keep the ecclesiastical machinery in running order'—cannot be sustained. Few persons have had better opportunities than I of observing the doings of Protestant and Catholic missionaries and missionary societies, at home and abroad—in Boston, New York, and London—in India and China, the Indian Archipelago, Cape of Good Hope, and the Mediterranean; and I have never known of any facts that would at all justify the above charge. The quotations you make do not touch this point. I believe these societies are as honestly and economically managed as the better sort of public institutions'—colleges, banks, insurance companies, for instance. Doubtless the whole systhem of Christian and sectarian propagandists—home as well as foreign—liberal and even radical as well as orthodox—is a mistake. But that is not the point in dispute between THE INDEX and the Independent. The charge made by THE INDEX and denied by the Independent is that three-fourths of the receipts for foreign missions are absorbed by running expenses. I believe with the Independent that 'none of them has ever expended anything like the proportion Mr. Abbot charges them with using.' I think that the Independent is right in calling it a stale slander. I used to hear it forty years ago, and have looked in vain for proof ever since. Christian missions are the modern and improved form of crusades, and, like the crusades, will probably be followed by important and valuable results,—though not the kind of results especially hoped for and died for by crusaders and missionaries. I dislike the pushing, aggressive, provoking, 'propagandist spirit of Christianity' and of Mohammedanism; and I dislike the same spirit, when found, as it sometimes is, in THE INDEX,—often, in other religious palmers,—seldom, almost never, in the Independent during these last few years."

Now it is plain that the writer of this letter has understood the charge I made in a very different sense from that I intended. In the article which originally drew out the strictures of the *Independent*, I said substantially that the officials of the various ecclesiastical organizations, including those devoted to the support of foreign

missions, derived their entire living from the donations made by the churches for the various objects proposed; that they were thus consciously tempted or unconsciously biased to represent these donations of money as paramount Christian duties; but that fully three-fourths of the money thus raised produced no result beyond giving these officials a livelihood,—in other words, failed to that extent to accomplish the objects for which the whole was raised. If the *Independent* understood me (and it did not occur to me to doubt that it did), it was these charges it denied; and it was only to make these charges good that I noticed its criticisms at all. But the writer of this letter evidently understands me to hint, at least, that the missionary societies are *fraudulently* or *extravagantly* managed—a thing it never entered my head to suggest. I donbt not that they are "honestly and economically" managed, except in rare cases analogous to the Methodist Book Concern. Consequently his wide experience, cited against my charge, fails itself to "touch the point," or to have any bearing on my argument, unless it can prove that the missionary societies *accomplish their purpose* of *converting the heathen*. If they do not do this, they accomplish no purpose but that of supporting a swarm of officials at home and abroad who beat the air in vain; and that is what I meant at first and mean now by saying that this golden stream of five millions of dollars expended annually on foreign missions sinks mainly into the s and of ecclesiastical organizations. I regret that I did not make my points plainer, and admit that there was sufficient vagueness in my statements to justify misapprehensions; and it has been my purpose in this re-statement to make them so plain that no one who chooses to underst and can misunderst and them. Nothing is less my desire than to be unfair to the missionaries or their home societies; but I do not credulously accept their own estimate of the importance, the value, or the success of their own operations, nor do I see anything but strict, however unpleasant, truthfulness in characterizing the entire missionary system as a stupendous, even if unconscious, fraud on credulous Christendom.

If to oppose this system in the interest of sound sense and right reason and human welfare appears to be the manifestation of a "pushing, aggressive, provoking, propagandist spirit," I must submit to the reproach. The task of warring against the great spiritual tyranny of Christianity is not a sweet or beautiful one, I often wish it had fallen into other hands than mine; but the duty of battling for human freedom breaks in roughly upon our pleasant pursuits and quiet tastes—and I count it just as imperative a duty to me to-day as it was to the young brother of mine who buckled on his sword-belt and went forth manfully to die at Gettysburg. I am sorry—extremely sorry—if I manifest at any time a spirit unworthy of the sacred cause I would fain serve in a temper worthy of it; but it is hard to keep a smooth brow or smiling face in the thick of the fight. The task of propagating liberal principles and high ideas may be, after all, a "mistake;" it would Telieve me of much hard and distasteful work to be convinced that it is such. But I believe differently, and must act accordingly—even at the risk of appearing a "propagandist." If life were play or pleasure only—if on each soul there lay no high obligation to make known to others whatever truth seems most precious and most, sorely needed.—then THE INDEX would never have been born. But it lives; and no one who sympathizes with its great purpose will, at least on second thought, blame it for "pro-pagandism." It aims avowedly at nothing but "pro-pagandism;" but what it seeks to propagate is truth instead of senseless superstition, manly and rational conviction instead of childish and mind-benumbing "faith." the spirit of freedom instead of the spirit of slavery. If to any there seems no need of such pro-pagandism as this, there will also seem to him no need of The Index; but to me nothing seems more needed by the world than the multiplication of just such influences. So thinking, so I shall act.

But this is a digression, prompted incidentally by the frank and brave rebuke of a true friend. I must return to the subject of foreign missions, on which I have more to say.

Since the general truth or falsehood of my charge against the mission-system turns entirely on the degree of success it achieves in converting the heathen, I propose first to inquire what results, judged by its own standards of success, it has actually accomplished in this direction, comparing these results with the sums of money spent in accomplishing them; and afterwards to inquire what actual results it has accomplished, judged by *our* standards of success.

First, then, I must discover, if possible, how many converts are annually made to offset the annual outlay of over five millions of dollars. I confess that this method of testing t he success of the missionary system may be challenged by Protestant Christian ad- vocates. Every intensely earnest Christian who believes his own professed doctrines would say at once, that the salvation of one single soul from the awful miseries that await the unconverted will infinitely outweigh all the wealth, principal and interest, of the whole world—that, the salvation of one single soul will alone justify the continuance of the missionary system with all its vast expense. Now on Christian grounds there is no gainsaying this argument. It is true and overwhelmingly conclusive, if Christian premises are true. Hut the latent common sense, even of the vast majority of professed Protestant believers, would notwithstanding revolt at the conclusion. If it could be proved to the satisfaction of the Protestant world that it took five million dollars a year to save a single heathen soul, *the money would not he forthcoming*. People would feel, whatever they said, that this was too expensive a job. They would lose all enthusiasm, in this advanced stage of human progress, and keep their cash in their pockets. This would be the

case even with those most swift to challenge my test. They know that even the Protestant world has lost faith to a large extent in the terrors of hell, and that its interest in missions must be sustained by showing that they exert a wide influence *in civilizing savages, in improving their morals, and in ameliorating their condition, here on earth*. Without a fair show of success in this purely secular direction, the Protestant world's interest in "missions would be speedily and wonderfully cooled. It will not give live millions of dollars a year to save one negro or one Papuan or one Chinaman from everlasting damnation after he is dead. But' it will give this sum to save a *great many* such from this possible fate, provided civilization here on earth is thrown into the bargain.

We see here that mixture of religious and secular objects which is characteristic of Protestantism; the Catholics will give their money for the simple salvation of souls from hell, while the Protestant wants a little temporal improvement to boot. Hence the difficulty I referred to of making any fair test of the mission system satisfactory to Protestant Christians. Ostensibly the salvation of souls is the object practically civilization is also demanded, I hold it to be perfectly fair to judge the system by the amount of Christianization it accomplishes; and I will accept, church-membership as the recognized test of valid conversion. The Christianizing and the civilizing results are to be separated from each other,—the one class being the proper and direct fruits of the missionary theory, the other tin? indirect benefits flowing from it incidentally. I shall therefore judge the success of the missionary system by the number of converts it makes to Christianity, as compared on the one h and with the whole number to be converted, and on the other h and with the amount of money it costs to convert them. I see no other fair method of judging the success of Christian propagandism at the present day.

Now in forming my estimate of the degree of this success, I shall go at once to the highest authorities, relying mainly on the last edition of the "Encyclopedia Britannica." I have spent many hours in studying and comparing all the articles I could discover in this magnificent work bearing on the subject. Tables are here given of the operations of forty-seven Protestant Missionary Societies, embracing all the important ones throughout Christendom. These societies, about a dozen years ago, spent annually $3,000,000 on their missions. I do not underst and how Dr. Mullen's estimate of $5,000,000 is formed. The total number of their converts, communicants or church members in all these missions was at that time a little over 215.000—the entire fruits of their activity from their foundation. How large the annual increase had been, I cannot learn directly from these tables. But I have reached proximate results in the following manner.

The date of foundation is given in one of these tables in the case of each of these forty-seven missionary societies. Adding together the different numbers of years during which these various societies had been in operation down to 1858, and dividing the sum by forty-seven, I find the average duration of their activity, from their organization to that date, to be thirty-nine years. The total number of converts at that time (disregarding, of course, all those who had been previously converted and died) was 215,000. Dividing tins number by thirty-nine, we have 5,588 converts as the *average annual increase* of church-membership during that period. In some years more, in other years less may have been converted; but on the average 5,538 heathen must have been converted every year for thirty-nine years, in order to give the missions 215,000 communicants in 1858.

Now I do not know the average annual expenditure of these forty-seven societies; but in 1858 it amounted to about $3,000,000. It seems fair to assume that the annual expenditure, which of course began with a very small amount and gradually increased to $8,000,000. Amounted on the average to half this sum, or $1,500,000. Dividing, then, this average annual expenditure by the average annual gain of new converts, we arrive at $270 as the average cost of each convert to the missionary societies. This, then, may be set down as the cash price paid, on the average, by Protestant Christendom for the salvation of a heathen soul.

Out of the 215,000 converts, however, reported as communicants by all these forty-seven Protestant societies throughout the world, 88,807 are West India negroes, whose conversion, like that of our own negroes at the South, was undoubtedly the result in great part of slavery to Christian masters rather than to any special missionary activity from abroad. This fact ought to make a large reduction in the total above given. As an indication of the very meagre numerical results achieved by the Protestant missions, I will give the totals of converts in the chief countries, together with the totals of population in round numbers (the latter taken from a common Atlas).—

These figures give a striking idea of the trifling impression made by all the Protestant missionary societies of entire Christendom combined, on the vast outlying swarms of "heathenism." It is well to note in passing, as incidental confirmation of the passage I quoted from Mr. Alabaster, that I find only thirty-seven converts credited to the kingdom of Siam, with its 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 of inhabitants.

In the tables on which I have based my calculations, I do not find a statement of the number of missionaries employed by these forty-seven societies. But according to the recent statement of Dr. Mullen, who, it is evident, gives only the statistics of Protestant missions, their present annual expenditure is over $5,000,000, while the number of missionaries is over 5,000 (the Catholics also employing as many as this). The whole of this enormous sum being directly or indirectly expended in supporting missionaries, each may be allowed, for all our purposes, a salary of $1,000, which, by my previous calculation of $270 as the cost of a single convert,

would allow each missionary to make annually 3.7 converts in all. This is the highest possible average, on the supposition that all the $5,000,000 are expended directly on the work of evangelization, with absolutely no waste at all in any quarter; although it is more than probable that some waste occurs. Thus we arrive at these tangible results:—

- Each new convert costs at least $270 in cash to the missionary societies, on the average.
- Each missionary, on the average, makes only 3.7 converts in the course of a year.

At this rate, allowing 3.7 converts annually to each missionary, it would just about require the 36,000,000 of the whole American people, emigrating *en masse* on a missionary crusade, to convert Hindustan alone with its 130,000,000 in one year,—to say nothing of the rest of Asia or the world.

Or let me put the matter in a different light, and inquire how long it would take to convert heathendom at the present rate of Protestant Christian propagandism. Protestant Europe and America combined, as I have shown, with an average annual expenditure of $1,500,000, made for thirty-nine years an average annual increase of 5,538 new converts. At the same rate, with an annual expenditure of $5,000,000, they would make an annual increase of 18,460 new converts. Supposing, therefore, that the present rate of ex- penditure should continue unchanged, how long would it take to convert the 725,000,000 of the pagan world? and how much would it cost? It would take 39,273 years; and it would cost $196,365,000,000.

But this estimate of the time required to convert, the heathen world is much too small. The required period is much reduced by a disproportionate apparent success achieved by the missionaries in the West Indies, where the work of conversion was really accomplished in great measure by other causes, and in the Pacific Islands, where a small population of very simple-minded savages was exposed to missionary influence under peculiar circumstances. The true test of the power of Protestant Christianity to convert the world must be applied in such cases as that of India and China. In India eighteen missionary societies have been zealously at work, probably the full average of thirty-nine years; and out of this vast population of 130,000,000 inhabitants, the table I quoted shows that only 19,370 converts were made. At this rate, it would take 202,096 years to convert India alone. In China eighteen societies have been at work many years, though probably for a considerably less period than in India, and their converts numbered only 924. But allowing them to make full 1,000 converts *annually*, it would even then take 369,000 years to convert that vast hive of humanity, with its strong and stubborn civilization. Here the missionaries have to deal with no naked and childish savages, but with highly intellectual nations which were civilized while our own ancestors were wild barbarians; and they are brought into contact with religions which, as held by the better classes, are far superior to their own. This may seem a strong statement; but it must be remembered that the Christianity which is trying to convert India and China and the other so-called pagan nations teaches that all the unconverted are doomed to an everlasting hell for simple want of faith in Christ, while the religions it seeks to convert, make in their turn no such monstrous claim. [See the appended article, entitled, "How the Pagan answered the Missionary."] These facts vastly increase the improbability of a speedy conversion of the world, and indefinitely lengthen the period required for the task. Unless an unprecedented increase in the rate of conversion should be made, which there seems no reason to expect, the world will remain unchristianized until a better religion than Christianity shall have come to take its place.

The task, therefore, which the Protestant missionary societies have set before themselves in the conversion of the entire world to Christianity, in order to be accomplished within one year, would require that about 196,000,000 missionaries should be employed instead of only 5,000. If, perceiving the impossibilty of such a crusade as this, they prefer to work on as they now are working, it will take them at the very lowest estimate about 40,000 years to accomplish their task. The attempt, therefore, to con veil the world by the machinery now employed is so miserably, nay, so ludicrously inadequate, that I can compare it to nothing but an attempt by a little boy to dig down Mount Washington with a tea-spoon." Ever since September, 1550, when the first Protestant missionaries, fourteen Swiss reformers, went from Geneva to Brazil to labor among the Indians, Protestantism has kept in motion its missionary machinery; and the net result of all this activity, kept up for centuries, is a little over 215,000 converts to-day—or about 1-3600 of the vast mass to be converted. The work to be done is avowedly the conversion of the world to Christ; but ii is a work that practically can never be accomplished. A very expensive machine is set to work on an impossible and endless job; it is a paying operation only to those who get their living out of it. Looked at in the light of Christian philanthropy alone, as the rescuing of a few brands plucked from the conflagration of a guilty world, of course it pays; but looked at in the light of common sense as the adaptation of professedly adequate means to an openly avowed end: it can be fittingly described by no word but *fraud*. The managers who publicly pretend to believe in the possibility of thus converting the world, and boldly assert it to credulous congregations for the sake of securing large contributions for missionary objects, are guilty of the old priestly trick of swindling the people while they laugh in their own sleeves. The missionary system is a bottomless box for the reception of the people's money; and no one knows this better than they.

In saying, then, that it takes three dollars to send one to the heathen, what did L mean? Whatever the saying has meant to other minds (and I see it has had one meaning I never attributed to it), it meant to me, in effect, that four dollars spent on foreign missions accomplish only the work of one dollar spent on home evangelization,—that, before equal results are attained abroad, four times the money must be spent that is required here,—that it takes three dollars to make one dollar really do one dollar's worth of evangelical work among the heathen. For unless the dollar converts the heathen, it does not get to them at all, but stops with the missionaries; it accomplishes no result but that of supporting an official for doing nothing. In the strict sense, the one dollar *never* gets to the heathen at all, since of course it is not paid to them in cash; it can only be said to get to them when a fair dollar's worth of good, as estimated by church-standards of value, is done to their souls. I have always understood the common saying I quoted in this manner, as exposing in a pungent phrase the costliness and inefficiency of the foreign mission system its compared with the home system of evangelization. If it is a charge of *financial corruption* against the managing boards of missionary associations, it is enough to say I have neither understood nor used it so.

Now the only exact way of finding out whether the saying, as I have used it, is true or not, is to compare the cost of a new convert made by the home missionary societies with the average cost ($270) of a new ileal hen convert. If the saying is true, the cost of a home convert should be $67.50. I have not the statistics for such a comparison. But I believe that a home missionary who should only make fifteen converts a year would not be considered as earning his salary, but soon be cashiered for inefficiency. Yet he would accomplish four times the work of a foreign missionary, who on the average makes only 3.7 converts a year. If fifteen converts a year are a fair average for a home missionary (and I think this a very low estimate), then the common saying is true,—that is, it takes at least the cost of fifteen converts here to make 3.7 converts abroad, or three dollars to get one to the heathen, or seventy-five *per cent*, of all moneys raised for foreign missions simply to run their necessary machinery. The charge I made is thus made good, at the very least. If I am mistaken in my reasoning or my data, I shall be very glad to be corrected; but I seem to be confirmed in my first impressions by a careful analysis of facts.

I have by no means finished what I have to say on this subject of "Christian Propagandism," but I must defer all further consideration of it to a subsequent lecture.

[NOTE.—Since the above lecture was first published, I have found pertinent statements credited to the last Annual Report of the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions, presented at Chicago, May, 1871. From this Report it appears that the annual receipts were over $250,000; that the number of missionaries employed was over 1200; and that the number of conversions effected was over 5,000. It follows from these data that each missionary on the average made 4.10 converts in the year, and that a home missionary is only a very little more successful than a foreign missionary. It also follows, however, that the average cost of each home convert is but $50; and that a heathen convert, costing $270, is five and two-fifths times as expensive as a home convert. Instead, therefore, of saying that it takes *three* dollars to send one to the heathen, it would be correct to say that it takes *four and two-fifths* dollars to send one to them. It is thus evident that, as I supposed, I understated the truth. As to the lower average of conversions accomplished by home missionaries than I had supposed, it is plain that many were reckoned among the latter who gave only a part of their time to the work of missions, inasmuch as the more than 1200 missionaries are reported as having performed an aggregate of only 965 years of service. Probably fifteen converts a year would not be regarded as a large number of conversions, if effected by a missionary who gave his whole time to the work. My original statement, understood as I used it, was *too favorable to the foreign mission system, and understates its costliness as compared with the system of home missions.*]

Part II.

Hitherto I have confined my discussion of the missionary system to the proselytizing operations of Protestant Christendom, showing their great costliness and inadequacy in general as compared with the enormous work to be done. Before speaking of the local results achieved by the missionary system as a whole in various parts of the world, something should be said about Christian propagandism as carried on by the Roman Catholic Church. I regret that my statistics are very meagre, especially as to the actual number of conversions effected by Catholic missionaries; but nevertheless it is possible, even without this information, to arrive at some important conclusions concerning the character and extent of their work.

Passing over the missionary efforts which led the various nations of Christendom to embrace the religion they now nominally profess, I shall briefly consider the work of Catholic missions as carried on in more recent times. The great loss inflicted on the Catholic Church at the time of the so-called Reformation stimulated the Roman hierarchy to great exertions among the heathen, in order to recover their power by new accessions to

their spiritual empire. In this endeavor the Jesuits took the lead, and established flourishing missions in many pails of the world. In 1662, Pope Gregory XV founded the *Collegium de Fide Propaganda*, but I have no statistical information concerning its operations. The eighteenth century, however, witnessed a great decline in the influence of Catholic missions. In 1822, the "Institution for the Propagation of the Faith" was founded at Lyons, and has been sustained by the combined resources of the whole Catholic communion. The number of missionary bishops sustained by this Society in the year 1844 was 139, while the number of priests in the same year was 4,759; and the number of both has since greatly increased, undoubtedly far exceeding the 5,033 Protestant missionaries reported by Dr. Mullen. The receipts of this "Institution for the Propagation of the Faith" were over $800,000 for the year 1856: and it is a very significant fact that *nearly one-third of this entire sum was expended on missions in the United States*. Neither for China nor for India was any appropriation made comparable to that devoted to' the conversion of the heathen Yankees! It is manifest, however, that the missionary operations of the Catholic Church can by no means be-adequately known from these insufficient data; and I make no pretence of giving complete information on the subject.

One feature, however, of the Catholic missionary system is too remarkable to be passed by unnoticed. A great and predominant object of Catholic missionaries is the baptism of sick and dying infants, by which immediate admission to heaven is supposed to be secured. Dr. Perocheau, vicar-apostolic of Sutchuen, in China, reported for 1844 more than 24.000 heathen infants as thus rescued from the flames of hell; while for 1848 he made a similar report of over 84,000. Absurd as this custom seems, it is the logical consequence of the Catholic theology; and it is impossible to doubt the sincerity of the men and women who give up their whole fives to the performance of this sacred duty. But the most singular part of the custom is the fact that most of these baptisms are effected *by stealth*. M. Fontaine, missionary-apostolic in Cochin-China, gives the following description of the manner in which these pagan babies have greatness thrust, upon them:—

"In a village of which the Mayor is a Christian, there exists a house of nuns, whom his lordship (the bishop) sends out in different directions to look for these hapless children. They go generally two by two,—an old one and a young one; and while the elder one enters into conversation, the other, who in good manners should leave her to speak, draws near the mother, who is holding the sick child, or sits down near the mat on which it is left. She fondles it, takes it in her arms, and whilst she caresses it, she succceds in dropping on its forehead a little water out of a bottle which she keeps concealed in her long wide sleeve."

Bishop Battaillon, vicar-apostolic of the South Sea Islands, makes confession of the same device with great self-complacency:—"I have always with me a flask of scented water and a flask of plain water. I begin with sprinkling a little of the scent on the head of the infant, under pretence of comforting the baby; and whilst the mother takes pleasure in spreading it over the baby's face, I dexterously change the flask and use the water which conveys regeneration without any suspicion being excited of the nature of the action."

So also Fatherde Bourges writes:—"When these children are in danger of death, our practice is to baptize them without asking the permission of their parents, which would certainly be refused. The Catechists and private Christians are well acquainted with the formula of baptism, and they confer it on these dying children under pretence of giving them medicines."

During a famine in the Carnatic about the year 1737, Father Trembloy wrote that twelve thous and children and upwards were baptized in this manner.

Occasionally, however, the zeal of the missionaries in baptizing sick infants without due caution has produced consequences disastrous to themselves and their cause. In the year 1668 a Jesuit mission waft established on one of the Ladrone Islands by Father Servitores with five companions, who were at first received with great kindness. But the inhabitants noticed that the infants died shortly after being baptized, and, not being sufficiently skilled in logic to know that it is unsafe to infer causation from mere precedence in time, they fell into the natural mistake of taking the act of baptism as a mysterious style of murder. Filled with this notion, the mothers used to run away, and hide with their babies in the forests on the approach of a missionary. But the men took the supposed outrage in sterner fashion, and killed several of the holy fathers for their over-eagerness to baptize the babies. Among these martyrs to their own superstition and that of the savages combined, was Father Servitores himself, the founder of the mission; and the conversion of the natives was in definitely postponed.

It is manifest enough that such propagandism as this is of the most worthless kind. It accomplishes nothing, and leaves no results. Yet a large part of the missionary enthusiasm of the Catholics is expended on the baptism of dying infants. Could a more profitless object of expenditure be imagined? It is hard to say which superstition is the more childish and frivolous,—that of the heathen or that of their teachers. If the large conquests of the Catholic faith among the pagan nations of which we hear so much vague but confident boasting are composed of such victories as these, it is plain that, however Paradise above may be filled with these myriads of regenerated heathen babies, the earth is but little likely by this process to be made into a Paradise below. The utterly insignificant impression made by Protestant Christianity on the great hosts of the pagan world I have

shown already by statistics whose accuracy can hardly be impugned; and the vast outlay of strength by the Catholic Church in securing the stealthy baptism of perishing heathen infants is the tacit confession of a "plentiful lack" of success with their parents. In the absence of positive information concerning the actual number of conversions made by the Catholic missionaries, this open and even exultant avowal of a method of conversion which depends on the baptism of dying infants without the knowledge of their parents compels the inference that a comparatively small number of adults are converted after all.

One of the most striking results of our comparison of the total number of Protestant converts with the totals of population in the chief countries of heathendom is that the greatest success has been achieved among isolated communities of savages. Countries in which a large population has attained independently a respectable degree of civilization are precisely those in which Protestant missionary success has been most meagre. On the Pacific islands, for instance, where a few thousands of savages are brought under missionary influences, the highest *per cent*, of conversions is reported; out of the 25,000,000 of Oceanica, 48,249 were said to have became church-members. But in India, with its population of 130,000,000, only 19,370 were reckoned as church-members; while in China, with its 309,000,000, less than 1,000 were so reckoned. Yet it is the most populous countries which are necessarily the most important to be considered, when the conversion of the world to Christianity is proposed as the great object of effort. I have no doubt that the Catholics would report a far larger number of converts in these countries than the Protestants. Their religion is better calculated to make an impression on great populations already habituated to idolatrous worship; and the Roman Catholic organization, by its unity and unrivalled system of propagandism, enjoys advantages which are impossible to Protestant sects. Yet Catholics and Protestants combined, after centuries of unwearied exertion, have failed to convert more than an insignificant fraction of the great heathen populations. Christianity has already extended about as far as it will ever go. Its vigorous days are over. Henceforth it must stand on the defensive; and it will be fortunate if it continues to hold its own. Before Christendom can succeed in converting heathendom, it will itself have become dechristianized by the influence of modern science on its own superstitions. No one of the existing great religions of the world will ever succeed in swallowing up the rest; but I believe that a new, free, and cosmopolitan religion, based on fundamental human nature, and aiming solely at the truest and highest perfection of it, will eventually supplant them all.

The reasons for this non-success of Christianity in its great enterprise of converting the world are, of course, various and numerous. One of them is undoubtedly the want of harmony among Christians themselves. Not only is Christendom divided into three great churches. Catholic, Greek, and Protestant, but the latter is sub divided into a vast number of more or less hostile sects. In fact, a vast proportion of the missionary enthusiasm of the Catholics and Protestants is directed, not to the conversion of the outside heathen, but to that of each other. The efforts of the Roman hierarchy to convert Protestant countries are tireless, and the sums they spend on this object are undoubtedly vast. On the other hand, the Protestants are just as eager to convert the Catholics. Rev. Dr. Hurst, translator of Hagenbach's "History of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries," states in a supplementary note to that very valuable work [Vol. 11, p. 458] that "one of the immediate and natural effects" of the unification of Italy under the sceptre of Victor Emanuel "has been to open it to Protestant evangelization." He estimates the number of evangelical Christians in Italy at 50,000, and asserts that Protestant missionaries are now laboring with great zeal in Venice, Verona, Mantua, Milan, Como, Turin, Genoa, Leghorn, Florence, Naples, and other places with great sue- cess. Dr. Hurst also states [Vol. II, p. 478] that the Spanish Revolution of October, 1868, by which Queen Isabella and the Bourbon dynasty were expelled from Spain, produced a similar effect in that country. "No sooner,' he says, "was the Provisional Government established, than the Protestants on the Continent and in Great Britain gave indubitable evidence that they appreciated the magnitude of their new task." Among the evangelical organizations he mentions as pouring into Spain their missionary energies, are the American Bible Society, the American and Foreign Christian Union, the American Tract Society, and the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Thus it appears that our American missionary associations reckon Roman Catholics as among the "heathen" that need conversion—a fact which will oblige us to add from 150,000,000 to 200,000,000 to the number, already so enormous, of those that need salvation according to the Protestant gospel. When we thus see less than a tenth of the world's population boldly undertaking to convert the remaining nine tenths, we may greatly admire their zeal and pluck, but can hardly commend their discretion. Their attempt reminds me of the pious old negro who, having declared that he would do at once whatever the Lord should command him, and being asked what he should do if the Lord commanded him to jump through a stone-wall, replied with great solemnity—"Brudder, if de Lord command dis chile to jump through a stone-wall, I will anyhow jump at it!"

The natural effect of this mutual hostility, however, among Christians themselves, has been to retard the growth of Christianity in the heathen countries. Especially the antagonism and mutual jealousy of the Catholics and Protestants have produced this result by bewildering the heathen mind as to what Christianity is. When Chao Phya Thipakon, the Siamese Minister of State, said to Dr. Gutzlatf—"They [the converts] continually

pray to God, but, it seems, nothing happens according to their prayer,"—the missionary replied—"They are Roman Catholics, and hold an untrue religion; therefore God is not pleased with them." [*Modern Buddhist*, p. 33]. Thus both Catholics and Protestants, while professing to be Christians themselves, deny the Christian name to each other; for no staunch Catholic will concede a Protestant to be a Christian, and the Protestant missionary, at least, denies that a Catholic is one. The heathen are naturally bewildered, and conclude to let the whole religion alone.

But a more important reason for the non-success of Christianity in coping with such religions as Brahmanism, Buddhism, Confucianism, and so forth, is the fact that the heathen themselves discern no superiority in it. To a very great extent they are right. Chao Phya Thipakon justly contrasts the illiberality of Christian missionaries, in consigning all but their converts to hell, with the liberality of the Buddhists, who declare that all the good, of all beliefs, will be saved. "Even those," he says, 'who do not believe in the religion of Buddha, by good actions acquire merit, and will on their death attain heaven; and by evil actions acquire demerit, and on death will pass to hell. Buddhism does not teach the necessary damnation of those who do not believe in Buddha; and in this respect I think it is more excellent than all the other religions which teach that all but their own followers will surely go to hell." [*Modern Buddhist*, p. 85].

Nor is it only in this one particular that Christianity manifests an inferiority to Buddhism. "Purity and impurity belong to oneself; no one can purify another,"—taught Buddha in the *Dhammapada [Buddhaghosha's Parables*, p. cv.] The Buddhists themselves are quite shrewd enough to apply this principle of the strictly personal nature of human character to the Christian doctrine of vicarious atonement. 'How can it be," says this Siamese state-minister from whom I have already quoted, "according to the belief of those who believe in but one resurrection,—who believe in a man being received into heaven while his nature is still full of impurity, by virtue of sprinkling his head with water, or cutting off by circumcision a small piece of his skin? . . . . We do know and can prove that men can purify their own natures, and we know the laws by which this purification can be effected. Is it not better to believe in this which we can see and know, than in that which has no reality to our perceptions?" [*Modem Buddhist*, p. 89.]

The concluding page and a half of the *Modern Buddhist* is so admirable a presentation by Mr. Ala- baster of this part of my subject, that I cannot with stand the temptation to quote it entire:—

"Such are the ideas and arguments of an honest and earnest Buddhist of the present day, defending his religion against the assaults of the numerous body of missionaries who live in comfort and teach without molestation among his countrymen. He is indebted to them for much information, and willingly accepts it. He listens to and admires the morality of the Christian religion until they believe him almost a Christian, and then he tells them that Buddha, too, taught a morality as beautiful as theirs, and a charily that extends to everything that has breath. And when they speak of faith, he answers that, by the light of the knowledge that they have helped him to, he can weed out his old superstitions, but that he will accept no new ones. Their cause is, as the late king said, hopeless:—You must not think that any of my party will ever become Christians. We will not embrace what we think a foolish religion.' The religion of Buddha meddled not with the Beginning, which it could not fathom; avoided the action of a Deity it could not perceive; and left open to endless discussion that problem which it could not solve, the ultimate reward of the perfect. It dealt with life as it found it.; it declared all good which led to its sole object, the diminution of the misery of all sentient beings; it laid down rules of conduct which have never been surpassed, and held out reasonable hopes of a future of the most perfect happiness. Its proofs rest on the assumptions that the reason of man is his surest guide, and that the law of Nature is perfect justice. To the disproof of these assumptions, we recommend the attention of those missionaries who wish to convert Buddhists."

As shown by these very remarkable extracts, the greatest difficulty that Christianity meets with in attempting to propagate itself in the great heathen states, is its own intrinsic narrowness and unreasonableness. Until it can conquer these inherent defects, it can never conquer the world. But inasmuch as it cannot conquer them without ceasing to be Christianity, its hope of a universal conversion of mankind vanishes into thin air.

I have now shown the small numerical success of Christian propagandism in general, and touched upon one or two of the most important reasons for this ill-success. I will next consider the subject more in detail, and inquire into the results actually accomplished by missionaries in a few important countries. Protestants are especially given to exultation over the alleged *civilizing* tendencies of their missions, and very unthinkingly attribute to them whatever advance in civilization has followed the contact of barbarous races with the various nations of Europe and America. The new and destructive vices that are thus propagated among savage tribes they attribute to other causes; but all the real improvement that is gained in consequence of such contact they ascribe without exception to the influence of Christianity. The influences of agriculture, commerce, education, and all the arts and inventions of civilized life, which have nothing to do with Christianity as a religion, and which are the real causes of the larger part of whatever ameliorations are introduced into barbarous communities by Europeans and Americans, they quite forget and leave out of the account; or, if they remember

them at all, they ludicrously ascribe them, and civilization itself, to the sole influence of Christianity. Even the social gain that is derived from the better code of morals that accompanies Christianity owes nothing to the proclamation of distinctively Christian doctrines, but has been accomplished in spite of, rather than in consequence of, these doctrines. But since the missionaries, especially those sent out by Protestants, have partially devoted their labors to the purely secular advancement of the various communities in which they live, it would be unjust to them not to recognize all the good they have really done in this direction. Accordingly I wish to refer, briefly of course, to some of the most striking cases in which missionaries have succeeded or failed in civilizing heathen populations, premising that whatever good has been thus actually accomplished I ascribe to the missionaries *as civilized men*, not *as Christian propagandists*.

No Christian mission ever acquired in any barbarous community a degree of control so absolute as that acquired by the Jesuits among the Guaranis, in Paraguay. In various other parts of America, the Jesuits succeeded wonderfully with their missions; but in Paraguay they built up what deserves to be called a Jesuit empire, mainly by the power of persuasion and kindness exercised over the minds of the Indians. In 1602, Acquaviva, the fifth General of the Society of Jesus, sent out a special commissioner to superintend the plan of concentrating the missionary efforts of the Jesuits on this enterprise; and despite all difficulties, their success was marvellous. The Guaranis were the most wide spread race of South American Indians, mild and passionless in their general character, and therefore exactly such material as the Jesuits wanted. Over these Guaranis in Paraguay the missionaries established a theocracy of their own. Settlements were commenced about the year 1610, and were sustained about one hundred and fifty years. The Indians were gathered into villages, called *Reductions*, and by degrees were persuaded to abandon their wild life in order to cultivate the ground. The social system adopted was a sort of Christian Communism, all the produce being stored in large buildings under the management of the Jesuits, who issued regular rations to all the inhabitants. I cannot describe in detail these singular settlements or Reductions, of which, according to Dobrizhoffer, there were in 1732 about thirty in all, embracing a population of 141,000 "souls." Similar establishments were founded in other parts of South America, embracing in all nearly as many more. Never was the missionary system so fairly or so successfully tried as in Paraguay; and the experiment illustrates the best that can be done by Catholic propagandism.

Now what was the real success of this system in Paraguay, when tested by its ability to create a vigorous and self-evolving civilization? I shall quote first from Nicolini's *History of the Jesuits* [pp. 306-3071:—

"It has been said that the inhabitants of the Reduction were low and abject slaves, led on by the scourge, deprived even of the faculty of thinking, and confined in a perpetual imprisonment, though within a large space. Quinet, with perhaps more eloquence than reason, exclaims—'Are we sure that it (Paraguay) contains the germ of a great empire? Where is the sign of life? Everywhere else, indeed, one hears the squalling of the child in the cradle; here, I greatly fear, I confess, that so much silence prevailing in the same place for three ages is but a bad sign, and that the *regime* which can so quietly enervate virgin Nature cannot be any other than that which develops Gautmozen and Montezuma.' All this is very well said, and may be in part true. *Doubtless these people were kept in perpetual infancy*. Doubtless, nothing great, nothing of a creating stamp, must be expected from them, Doubtless, they did not develop and exp and the new element of life imparted to them, as other nations have done who were more left to themselves; *nor did they exercise the noblest part of their natures, the intelligence, in that pursuit for which we think man was created—the search after truth*. But surely there are nations who have been placed in worse circumstances, and subjected to more disastrous influences, and more deserving our pity and commiseration. . . . . Although we know that humanity must progress in its career, and that this progress cannot be attained without great commotion and great evil, nevertheless, when we contemplate all the miseries which surround our state of civilization, we freely forgive the Jesuits for having, in one part of the globe, let civilization and progress sleep awhile, to render these poor Indians happy."

On the same subject, I will quote a few sentences from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*:—"The Jesuits were able to introduce settled habits and a slight knowledge of religion and the arts among the Indians only by means of the personal ascendancy they acquired over them. It was a few superior minds gaining the respect and confidence of a horde of savages, *then employing the influence they had acquired to lead them as children*—giving them such portion of instruction as taught them to t rust implicitly in their guides, working alternately on their fears, their pride, their kind affections, but never fully unveiling to them the springs of the machinery by which they were governed. The incurable indolence of the savages rendered it necessary to prescribe the labor as task-work, and to carry it on under the constant inspection of the missionaries. The plan of cultivating the ground in common, and of storing the produce in magazines, out of which the wants of each family were supplied, was resorted to as a check upon their improvident habits. In short, the eye and the h and of the missionaries were everywhere; and the social system was held together entirely by their knowledge and address. When these were withdrawn, the fabric soon fell into ruins, and the Indiana relapsed into their idolatry and savage habits, just as boys drop their tasks the moment they are liberated from school."

Let me adduce one more witness on this subject, the *Westminster Review* for July, 1856:—"The Jesuits in

Paraguay are universally considered to have exhibited the best results ever obtained in the missionary field, while the Jesuits in India and China were the grief and disgrace of their church in the opinion of its head. . . . . The system endured till the Jesuit organization was broken up in 1767, when presently the whole fabric completely vanished. No trace whatever remains of this great missionary work. If the question of success is stirred, the reply of Catholics is that a hundred thous and souls were rescued from hell, and that the crowns of the apostles and martyrs of the work are brightened accordingly. Historical students and moralists say that, judged by any radical principle, the work has come to nothing. We sec that among a people saved by their teachers from the trouble of thinking and from the pressure of worldly anxieties, the lash in the school and bribes or terrors out of it must be needed for stimulus; but we think ill of such a state of society, and are not surprised to hear that its subjects were delicate in frame, scrupulous in conscience, indolent at their work, and dull at their play, though their teachers prescribed amusement as earnestly as our Polynesian missionaries interdict it. That such a demure, superficial, dependent, and artificial state of society should fall to pieces at once when its keepers were withdrawn, is just what might have been looked for; and, as all traces of it have vanished, it can be pronounced, in a historical and moral sense, nothing but a failure."

Such, then, is the kind of civilization built up by the Catholic system of propagandism, when left perfectly free to work itself out to its natural results. Of what value it is, you must judge for yourselves. To my mind, it appears scarcely better than the savagery it professed to cure. It was only the change of one barbarism for another.

Turning now to the Protestant missionary system, I will select the Sandwich Islands as the instance which Protestants themselves cite as the most signal and conspicuous illustration of the civilization created by their missions. In this case, it is more difficult to determine the exact degree of missionary influence in producing the present social condition of the Sandwich Islanders. General causes have been at work here; and the claim, insinuated by silence as to these causes rather than directly asserted, that the whole of the social improvement effected is due to the missions alone, will not bear examination. Nevertheless, I am willing for the present to give the missionaries credit for the entire work of civilization so far as accomplished; and I propose to inquire how much this civilization is actually worth.

The Sandwich Islands had. by the census taken in 1836, rather more than 100,000 inhabitants. The whole of the population is nominally Christian, and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions about a dozen years ago reported more than 22,000 church members. The missionaries have busied themselves in planting churches, establishing schools, and training native missionaries and teachers. Idolatry has wholly vanished. Nearly all the children, it is said, are taught to read. Besides 300 common schools, we are told of three high schools and one college. Several newspapers are regularly published. "The total number of pages printed by the presses connected with the missionaries exceeds 196,000,000." The moral condition of the people is said by the friends of the missions to be vastly improved since 1820, at which time missionary operations were first commenced; although very different accounts of it have been given by other parties. Which representation of the matter is the more correct, is perhaps open to doubt. That the nominal conversion of the people to Christianity, or the large number of church-members reported (over twenty *per cent*. of the entire population), is any proof whatever of a higher moral state of society, I cannot admit. So far as general education and individual improvement of character have really resulted from the preaching and teaching of the missionaries, I rejoice as much as any one; but the numerous rose-colored reports of interested parties are not borne out by other witnesses. On this subject, let me quote the testimony of Dr. W. Brown, one of the very highest authorities concerning missions:—

"It may appear surprising that so many of the converts from heathenism should turn out to be only nominal Christians. It might naturally be thought that, in giving up with the religion of their fore-fathers and their country, and embracing a new religion of an entirely opposite character, we might calculate on its being the result of inquiry and consideration, and that, if not particularly intelligent, the generality of them would be true Christians. But to say nothing of the fact that in all countries and in all ages (unless, perhaps, in apostolic times) the great majority of professed Christians have been Christians only in name, there are circumstances which, especially in some countries, will account for the natives coming over to the religion of the missionaries, without there being any substantial or spiritual change in their own state and character. Nowhere in modern times have missions been considered as achieving such great and glorious triumphs as in the South Sea Islands; yet, while we have no doubt that much good was in various ways effected in these islands, it yet appears that the religious revolution which took place in many of them was materially the result of the example and influence of the chiefs,—more, in the first instance, than of the teaching of the missionaries. So long as the chiefs adhered to the religion of their fathers, the people had no thought of changing it; but as soon as they declared in favor of the new religion, their subjects were ready to follow them. They would now destroy the morais, burn or deliver up their idols, profess to be Christians, erect places of worship, observe the Sabbath day with great outward strictness, while yet they continued to indulge in the most degrading vices, living like

beasts of the field. As regards the great body of the people, the revolution wanted not only "purity, but reality. Christianity now became in a manner the national religion, and the mass of the population outwardly conformed to it. It is also worthy of mention that, among the Sandwich Islanders, at least, it was a great object of ambition to be received as members of the church. 'A tabu meeting (i. e. A meeting consisting of selected persons) was to the mind of a Hawaiian one of the most desirable things on earth. Hence the constant pressure by them at the door of the church. It would have been the easiest thing imaginable to have added as many to it in one day as the Apostles did on the day of Pentecost.' We have already seen that the numbers of communicants of the Negro race are very great as compared with other classes of heathens; and though we do not recollect ever to have seen it stated as a fact, yet we greatly suspect that pride is often at the bottom of their desire to be baptized,—that their being so raises them in their own estimation above their unbaptized countrymen, and brings them a step nearer to white men, to whom, though often their oppressors, they cannot help looking up as their superiors. These circumstances, and in some cases self-interest in one form or another, will explain how professed converts from among the heathen are so often only nominal Christians."

Testimony very similar to the above is given by Dr. Livingstone, the famous African traveller, with reference to these Negro converts:—

"The Bechuana mission has been so far successful that, when coming from the interior, we always felt, on reaching Kuruman, we had returned to civilized life. But I would not give any one to underst and that they are model Christians,—we cannot claim to be model Christians ourselves,—or even in any degree superior to the members of our own country churches. They are more stingy and greedy than the poor at home; but in many respects the two are exactly alike. On asking an intelligent chief what he thought of them, he replied—'You white men have no idea of how wicked we arc; we know each other better than you. Some feign belief to ingratiate themselves with the missionaries; some profess Christianity because they like the system which gives so much more importance to the poor; and the rest—a pretty large number—profess because they are really true believers.'"

But the evidence as to the low moral state of the Sandwich Islanders is not merely general, inferential, or vague. I will quote again from the *Wentmin-ster Review,* trusting that the length of the extract will be more than offset by its great interest:—

"In the Sandwich Islands, the decline of the population is such as history can hardly parallel and as every hearer at an Exeter Hall May Meeting should be informed of. We are told, not only by native tradition, but by the early navigators of the Pacific, that there were once human abodes wherever there was good soil and water, and that the population of this group was not less than 400,000. Now it is under §5,000. Twenty-five years ago [1831]—within the period of strenuous missionary efforts,—it was double this . . . . . It is of importance to ascertain what relation the presence of missionaries bears to the broad and clear fact of the unchecked depopulation of the islands in which they have settled. According to the missionaries themselves, an unbounded licentiousness prevailed before any European had set foot anywhere in the Pacific; and it continued after foreigners had begun to resort to the islands, and before the missionaries arrived. During the first period there were the wars and the barbarous heathen customs which tend to depopulation, and a truly heathen licentiousness. During the second period, there was the addition of physical and moral mischiefs—diseases and intemperance,—which, acting upon the established licentiousness, might account, for even such a depopulation as is recorded. Hut now, when the missionaries declare the people to be pure in comparison with their former condition, and cured of their tendency to war, infanticide, and recklessness of life, the depopulation is found to have proceeded faster than ever,—even to the extent of half the total number in five-and-twenty years. The natives themselves charge the missionaries with no small portion of it; and a good many visitors are of the same opinion.

"The people say that the missionaries promised them life, but have brought them only death; and that it is not a future life that they want, but to live long where they are, and as happily as they used to do before all their customs were changed and their pleasures taken away. There can be no question of the injurious effects upon health and life of the forcible change of habits imposed by the missionaries, nor of the fatal results of some of their over-legislation. Even the least important change of all—that of dress—has rendered the people liable in a much increased degree to consumption and related maladies. Ear worse is the effect of the suppression of the old sports and festivals. The people cannot receive hymn-singing and prayer-meetings as a substitute; and they relapse into an indolence and sensuality which leaves nothing to be wondered at in the shortening of their lives. Of the deepening of the poverty of the poor with the growth of the aristocratic spirit under the missionaries, and of the deterioration of the health of whole settlements by a chronic hunger which their forefathers never knew, recent accounts from the most various quarters leave no room for doubt.

"And when the dulness of their lives has aggravated their licentiousness, how do the missionaries deal with it? How do they treat the milder forms of license which they have not succeeded in extirpating? They put upon tropical lovers the screw of puritanical laws too strict for Old England and New England two centuries ago. It is

very well understood that infanticide is most frequent in societies where public shame awaits the unmarried mother, and that sensual vices are most gross where they are most harshly dealt with; and, as might be exacted, the Pacific Islands are no exception to this rule. The girls of those islands are as proud of having white husbands (knowing them to be local husbands only) as the women of Cape Coast now, and the Indian women of the western hemisphere in the early days of its discovery; but the South Sea Islanders, having learned the consequence of the appearance of half-caste children, resort to practices which render the decline of population no wonderful matter at all. Like the grim old Puritan Elders, the missionaries inflict imprisonment and public shame where young mothers are not married in their Church. If in New England such culprits suffered in heart-broken silence, or were hardened or rendered hypocrites, the effect on a people whose ancestors practised infanticide as a duty is easily conceived.

"The children of the tropics suffer under the missionary method more bitterly than their childish hearts can bear. On the one hand, they are accessible to new temptations, and perpetrate frolics which their spiritual masters are the last to know of; and, on the other, they escape punishment by those very forms of crime which Exeter Hall orators hold up to public horror as the most monstrous features of heathenism. Under every imaginable incentive to abor- tion and infanticide, and to licentiousness aggravated by the necessity of secrecy, it is no wonder if depopulation increases, and if the natives consider the missionaries accountable for it. . . . .

"After bearing at some length his testimony to the failure of 'mickonaree' industry and notions of dress, Commander Wilkes adds—'Many of the missionaries now see these things in their true light, and informed me that they were endeavoring to pursue a more enlightened course.' Have they informed their supporters and subscribers to the same effect? Was anything said at the last or any preceding May Meeting,—and will anything be "said at the next, about these mistakes and failures? It was a pretty strong confidence which led men forth to impress on a vast majority of mankind the dogmas and tastes of a very small minority; not to communicate provable knowledge, it must be observed, but to impose dogmas at the cost of eradicating beliefs, warring against all natural influences, local and moral, and thereby breaking the spring of the native character, and preparing a whole race for premature extinction. One would think that, when the agents of such an operation found themselves more or less mistaken in their aims and methods, they would learn modesty in their office, and possibly sympathy with their perishing charge. But where are there evidences of this?. . . . .

"Alas! thus it is. Coal scuttle bonnets for the garland and palm-leaf! The Old Hundred for the national ballad! Levitical law for heroic tradition! A *tabu*-Sunday every week, and no harvest-home once a year! Idleness, breeding slander and dissoluteness, for the easy but willing occupation of former days! All distinctive character covered over with hypocrisy, and native prattle absorbed by cant! The palm-tree growing, the coral spreading, and man dwindling and perishing! If such are the best and choicest fruits of English Protestant missions, with what grace can Protestants scoff at Romish failure?"

I must add also an extract, quoted in the same article, from a record of direct observations by an American voyager, namely, *Residence in the Marquesas*, by Herman Melville, son-in-law of the late Chief Justice Shaw, of Masssachusetts:—

"Readers of Reports are led to infer that the arts and customs of civilized life are rapidly refining the natives of the Sandwich Islands. But let no one be deceived by these accounts. The chiefs swagger about in gold-lace and broad-cloth, while the great mass of the common people are nearly as primitive in their appearance as in the days of Cook. In the progress of events at the islands, the two classes are receding from each other; the chiefs are daily becoming more luxurious and extravagant in their style of living, and the common people more and more destitute of the necessaries and decencies of life. But the end to which both will arrive at last will be the same. The one are fast destroying themselves by sensual indulgences, and the other are fast being destroyed by a complication of disorders and the want of wholesome food. The resources of the domineering chiefs are wrung from the starving serfs, and every additional bauble with which they bedeck themselves is purchased by the suffering of their bondmen; so that the measure of the gew-gaw refinement attained by the chiefs is only an index to the actual state of degradation in which the greater part of the population lie grovelling. . . . . .

"Not until I visited Honolulu was I aware of the fact that the small remnant of the natives had been civilized into draught horses, and evangelized into beasts of burden. But so it is. They have been literally broken into the traces, and are harnessed to the vehicles of their spiritual instructors like so many dumb brutes!

"Among a multitude of similar exhibitions that I saw, I shall never forget a robust, red faced and very lady-like personage, a missionary's spouse, who day after day for months together took her regular airings in a little go-cart drawn by two of the islanders, one an old gray-headed man. And the other a roguish stripling, both being, with the Deception of the fig-leaf, as naked as when they were born. Over a level piece of ground this pair of draught bipeds would go with a shambling, unsightly trot, the youngster hanging back all the time like a knowing horse, while the hack plodded on and did all the work.

"Battling along through the streets of the town in this stylish equipage, the lady looks about her as

magnificently as any queen driven in state to her coronation. A sudden elevation and a sandy road, however, soon disturb her serenity. The small wheels soon become imbedded in the loose soil, and the old stager stands tugging and sweating, while the, young one frisks about and does nothing. Not an' inch does the chariot budge. Will the tender-hearted lady—who has left friends and home for the good of the souls of the poor heathen—will she think a little about their bodies, and get out, and ease the wretched old man until the ascent is mounted? Not she: she could not dream of it. To be sure, she used to think nothing of driving the cows to pasture on the old form in New England; but times have changed since then. No she retains her seat, and bawls out. Hookee,! hookee!' (pull, pull) The old gentleman, frightened at the sound, labors away harder than ever; and the younger one makes a great show of straining himself, but takes care to keep one eye upon his mistress, in order to know when to dodge out of harm's way. At last the good lady loses all patience. 'Hookee! hookee!' and rap goes the heavy handle of her huge fan over the naked skull of the old savage, while the young one shies to one side, and keeps beyond its range. 'Hookee! hookee!' again she cries. 'Hookee tata kannaka!' (pull strong, men.) But all in vain, and she is obliged in the end to dismounts and sad necessity! actually to walk to the top of the hill.

"At the town where this paragon of humility resides, is a spacious and elegant American chapel, where divine service is regularly performed. Twice every Sabbath, towards the close of the exercises, may be seen a score or two of little waggons ranged along, the railing in front of the edifice, with two squalid native footmen in the livery of nakedness standing by each, and waiting for the dismission of the congregation to draw their superiors home."

On the whole, therefore, I conclude that the nominal conversion of the Sandwich Islanders to Christianity is not what it is believed to be, a *prima facie* proof of an improved moral character; and that the accounts given by returned travellers of their low moral condition are not to be branded as self-evident lies. It is more than likely, in my opinion, that contact with Christians and Christian missionaries has fanned, rather than benefited, the inhabitants of the South Sea Islands. They are rapidly decreasing in numbers, and are probably destined to fade entirely a away before a more vigorous race. But just so far as the missionaries have forgotten their Christian doctrines and labored earnestly for the moral and social welfare of these poor people, I would applaud them as real benefactors of their race. This, however, they must do in spite of their system, which places all this as infinitely lower in importance than faith in the Christian gospel of salvation by Christ alone. The highest success that can be claimed for Christian missions in the Sandwich Islands is that they have replaced the old superstition by a new one, and helped to smoothe the Islanders' way to the sure extinction brought upon them by Christian nations. '

In dealing with purely barbarous communities, therefore, I think it just to say that both the Catholic and Protestant missions have accomplished considerable incidental good, by preaching a higher morality and by helping in a greater or less degree to civilize them. But this work of civilization has been hampered and hindered at every step by the supposed duty of first inculcating a new superstition in place of the old. Naturally enough the Protestant missionaries have done more of this civilizing work than the Catholics, for they have shaken off to some extent the shackles of the old intolerable bondage; but they would have done vastly more still, if they had gone out with the pure love of man in their hearts, unmixed with the baleful belief that man needs to be redeemed from future rather than present ills. The missionary spirit—that is, the willingness and the will to devote a whole life to the work of making others better and happier—is surely the sublimest and divinest manifestation of humanity's noblest part. Could it but be dissociated from narrow and narrowing Creeds, and set free to work itself out into action through healthy, natural channels,—could there but be a grand crusade of freedom against slavery, of knowledge against ignorance, of human love and virtue against human hate and vice,—could there but be an organized effort on the part of all nations to carry education, intelligence, and truer and happier modes of living to all the dark corners of the earth,—then surely there would be the dawn of a better day even here at home, and the new-born "enthusiasm of humanity," flaming out in works of mercy and love to the sufferers of far-distant lands, would also light up the hearts and households of our own land with a purer, holier glow. Not till the burdens of all men are our burdens too,—not till we "remember those in bonds as bound with them,"—can we ourselves be truly noble and great; and, despite all its errors and defects and follies, the missionary system of Christian propagandism is a veritable hint and fore-shadowing of a still greater missionary system that is to come.

While a very little child, I heard one day a good old missionary, Dr. Scudder, who had returned from Ceylon after years of faithful toil for a brief visit to his native land, preach about the perishing heathen in the far-off tropics; and a great desire was born in my childish heart to spend my days in the same high toil. Half a dozen years afterwards, when Dr. Scudder had returned for his last visit to his home, and was about to sail again to the familiar scene of his labors, I could not repress the wish I felt to see him once more. Hastening one sunny morning to the rooms of the American Board of Foreign Missions in Boston, I found him just on the point of starting for the wharf whence the ship was to sail for India. I timidly put my quarter-dollar in his hand, and told him I had come to say good-by. The kindly-faced old man bent down and kissed me—I thought with a

tear in his eye; and I hurried home.

But I have often thought that, in a far different manner than he would approve or I imagined, my old wish has come true; and that I am nothing, after all, but a missionary of the better faith that will yet convert Christendom itself, even as he was laboring to convert heathendom to Christianity. Surely, the heathen of Ceylon can scarcely hear with greater coldness or abhorrence the message he proclaimed than the Christians of America hear mine to-day. But what of that? If the servants of the new gospel of freedom and knowledge, truth and virtue and natural humanity, show less zeal and less self-sacrifice than the servants of the outworn gospel of Christ, or if they shrink from difficulties that these have learned to conquer, is it not right that they should be judged men of smaller stature and narrower souls? The world to day needs the new gospel, not the old; and if it be indeed the gospel of truth and hope to all mankind, then most assuredly its missionar- ies will be born. And while I have told you truly what I believe to be the weakness and the mistake of Christian propagandism, I should be less than true to my duty if I spoke no word of faith in the propagandism of Free Religion. If the world to-day needs the principles of free science and free thought, free virtue and free humanity, free reverence for man and free self-consecration to the infinitely Perfect, then it needs missionaries as never before and I count it an honor to be one of them.

The noblest feature of the missionary system is the education it bestows on the disinterested side of human nature—the self-sacrificing generosity which prompts each to give according to his ability, the wealthy man his gold, the intellectual man his brain, and every man his deep, strong, active sympathy. However widely our views diverge from those which prompted a Paul, a Xavier, or a Judson to spend life and heart in the missionary work, we too need the divine chrism of the missionary spirit; for in each and every form it is the *Love of Man*. Be it ours, not to love less, but to love more,—with the light of a larger wisdom and the heat of a purer zeal!

How the Pagan Answered the Missionary.

[By Chao Phva Thipakon, a Siamese Minister of State, in his book entitled the "Kitchanukit." Translated by Henry Alabaster in "The Modem Buddhist," pp. 25 35.]

I have studied the Roman Catholic book, "Maha Kangwon," the Great ('are, and it seems to me that the priests' great cares are their own interests. I set? no attempt to explain any difficult and doubtful matters. If, as they say, God, when he created man, knew what every man would be, why did he create thievesy This is not explained. The book tells us that all those virtuous men who have taught religions differing from the Roman Catholic have been enemies of God, but it does not explain why God has allowed so many different religions to arise and exist. How much do this and all other religions differ on this point from the religion of Buddha, which allows that there are eight kinds of holiness leading to ultimate happiness! (*i. e.* does not insist on Buddhism being necessary to salvation).

The American missionary, Dr. Jones, wrote a book called the "Golden Balance for weighing Buddhism and Christianity," but I think any one who reads it will see that his balance is very one-sided; indeed, he who would weigh things ought to be able to look impartially at the scales.

Dr. Gutzlaff declared that "Somana Kodom(Buddha) only taught people to reverence himself and his disciples, saying, that by such means merit and heaven could be attained, teaching them to respect the temples, and Po-trees, and everything in the temple grounds, lest by injuring them they should go to hell; a teaching designed only for the protection of himself and his disciples, and of no advantage to any others." I replied, "In Christianity there is a command to worship God alone, and no other; Mahomet also taught the worship of one only, and promised that he would take into heaven every one who joined his religion, even the murderer of his parents, while those who would not join his religion, however virtuous their lives, should surely go to hell; also he taught that all other religions were the enemies of his religion, and that heaven could be attained by injuring the temples, idols, and anything held sacred by another religion. Is such teaching as that fit for belief? Buddha did not teach that he alone should be venerated, nor did he, the just one, ever teach that it was right to persecute other religions. As for adoration, so far as I know, men of every religion adore the holy one of their religion. It is incorrect of the Doctor to say that Buddha taught men to adore him alone. He neither taught that such was necessary, nor offered the alternative of hell as all other religions do.

I said to the missionary, "How about the Dewas the Chinese believe in, are there any?" He said, "No; no one has seen them; they do not exist; there are only the angels, the servants of God, and the evil spirits whom God drove out to be devils and deceive men." I said, "Is there a God Jehovah?" He am swered,. "Certainly, one God!" I rejoined, "You said there were no Dewas because no one had seen them; why then do you assert the existence of a God, for neither can we see him?" The missionary answered, "Truly, we see him not, but all the works of creation must have a master: they could not have originated of themselves." I said, "There is no

evidence of the creation, it is only a tradition: why not account for it by the self-producing power of Nature?" The missionary replied, "that, he had no doubt but that God created everything, and that not even a hair or a grain of sand existed of itself, for the things on the earth may be likened to dishes of food arranged on a table, and though no owner should be seen, none would doubt but that there was one; no one would think that the things came into the dishes of themselves." I said, "Then you consider that even a stone in the bladder is created by God!" He replied, "Yes. Everything. God creates everything!" "Then," answered l, "if that is so, God creates in man that which will cause his death, and you medical missionaries remove it and restore his health! Are you not opposing God in so doing? Are you not offending Him in curing those whom he would kill?" When I had said this, the missionary became angry, and saying I was hard to teach, left me.

Dr. Gutzlaff once said to me, "Phra Somana Kodom, having entered Nippan, is entirely lost and non-existent; who, then, will give any return for recitations in his praise, benedictions, reverences, and merit-making? It is as a country without a king, where merit is unrewarded, because there is no one to reward it; but the religion of Jesus Christ has the Lord Jehovah and Christ to reward merit, and receive prayers and praises, and give a recompense." I replied, "It is true that, according to the Buddhist religion, the Lord Buddha does not give the reward of merit; but if any do as he has taught, they will find their recompense in the act. Even when Buddha lived on earth, lie had no power to lead to heaven those who prayed for his assistance but did not honor and follow the just way. The holy religion of Buddha is perfect justice springing from a man's own meritorious disposition. It is that disposition which rewards the good and punishes the evil. The recitations are the teachings of the Lord Buddha, which are found in various Soodras, set forms given by Buddha to holy hermits, and some of them are descriptions of that which is suitable and becoming in conduct. Even though the Lord has entered Nippan, his grace and benevolence are not exhausted. You missionaries praise the grace of Jehovah and Christ, and say that the Lord waits to hear and grant the prayers of those that call to Him. But are those prayers granted? So far as I see, they get no more than people who do not believe in prayer. They die the same, and they are equally liable to age and disease and sorrow. How, then, can you say that your religion is better than any other? In the Bible we find that God created Adam and Eve, and desired that they should have no sickness nor sorrow, nor know death; but because they, the progenitors of mankind, ate of a forbidden fruit, God became angry, and ordained that henceforth they should endure toil and weariness and trouble and sickness, and from that time fatigue and sorrow and sickness and death fell upon mankind. It was said that by baptism men should be free from the curse of Adam, but I do not see that any one who is baptized nowadays is free from the curse of Adam, or escapes toil and grief and sickness and death, any more than those who are not baptized." The missionary answered, "Baptism for the remission of sin is only effectual in gaining heaven after death, for those who die unbaptized will certainly go to hell." But the missionary did not explain the declaration that by baptism men should be free from pains and troubles in their present state. He further said, "It does at times please God to accede to the requests of those that pray to Him, a remarkable instance of which is, that Europeans and Americans have more excellent arts than any other people. Have they not steamboats and railways, and telegraphs and manufactures, and guns and weapons of war superior to any others in the world? Are not the nations which do not worship Christ comparatively ignorant?" I asked the Doctor about sorrow and sickness, things which prevail throughout the world, things in which Christians have no advantage over other men, but he would not reply on that point, and spoke only of matters of knowledge. Where is the witness who can say that this knowledge was the gift of God? There are many in Europe who do not believe in God, but are indifferent, yet have subtile and expanded intellects, and are great philosophers and politicians. How is it that God grants to these men, who do not believe in Him, the same intelligence He grants to those who do? Again, how is it that the Siamese, Burmese, Cochin Chinese, and other Roman Catholic converts, whom we see more attentive to their religion than the Europeans who reside among us, do not receive some reward for their merit, and have superior advantages and intelligence to those who are not converted? So far as I can see, the reverse is the case: the unconverted flourish, but the converted are continually in debt and bondage. There are many converts in Siam, but I see none of them rise to wealth, so as to become talked about. They continually pray to God, but, it seems, nothing happens according to their prayer." The missionary replied, "They are Roman Catholics, and hold an untrue religion, therefore God is not pleased with them." I said to the missionary, 'You say that God sometimes grants the prayers of those who pray to Him; now the Chinese, who pray to spirits and devils, sometimes obtain what they have prayed for: do you not, therefore, allow that these spirits can benefit man V" The missionary answered, "The devil receives bribes." I inquired, "Among the men and animals God creates, some die in the womb, and many at or immediately after birth, and before reaching maturity, and many are deaf, dumb, and crippled: why are such created? Is it not a waste of labor? Again, God creates men, and does not set their hearts to hold to His religion, but sets them free to take false religions, so that they are all damned, while those who worship Him go to heaven: is not this inconsistent with His goodness and mercy? If He, indeed, created all men, would He not have shown equal compassion to all, and not allowed inequalities? Then I should have believed in a creating God. But, as it is, it seems nothing but a game at dolls." The missionary

replied, "With regard to long and short lives, the good may live but a short time, God being pleased to call them to heaven, and sometimes He permits the wicked to live to a full age, that they may repent of their sins. And the death of innocent children is the mercy of God calling them to heaven." I rejoined, "How should God take a special liking to unloveable, shapeless, unborn children?" The missionary replied, "He who would learn to swim must practise in shallow places first, or he will he drowned. If any spoke like this in European countries, he would lie put in prison!" I invite particular attention to this statement.

Another time I said to the missionary Gutzlaff, "It is said in the Bible that God is the creator of all men and animals. Why should he not create them spontaneously, as worms and vermin arise from filth, and fish are formed in new pools by the emanations of air and water? Why must there be procreation, and agony and often death to mothers? Is not this labor lost? I can see no good in it." He replied, "God instituted procreation so that men might know their fathers and mothers and relatives, and the pains of child-birth are a consequence of the curse of Adam." I said, "If procreation was designed that men should know their relatives, why are animals, which do not know their relatives, produced in the same manner? And why do they, not being descendants of Eve, suffer pain in labor for her sin of eating a little forbidden fruit? Besides, the Bible says, by belief in Christ man shall escape the consequences of Eve's sin; yet I cannot see that men do so escape in any degree, but suffer just as others do." The missionary answered, "It is waste of time to converse with evil men who will not be taught," and so left me.

"God in the Constitution."

Would it be Right to Incorporate Religious Dogmas into the Constitution of the United States?

Some time ago a Convention assembled in the city of Alleghany for the purpose of effecting a change in the Constitution of the United States, with the view of making the instrument, and the people under it, "*Christian*" in character. Soon after another Convention met in Philadelphia for t he same object. After much discussion the following memorial to Congress was adopted and circulated among the people lor their signatures:

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress Assembled:

We, citizens of the United States, respectfull v ask your honorable bodies to adopt measures for amending the Constitution of the United States so as to read, in substance, as follows:

"We, the people of the United States, humbly acknowledging Almighty God as the source of all authority and power In civil Government, the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler among the Nations, and his revealed will as of supreme authority, in order to constitute a Christian Government, and in order to form a more perfect union, establish Justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the inalienable rights and blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness to ourselves, our posterity, and all the inhabitants of the land, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

And we further ask that such changes be introduced into the body of the Constitution as may be necessary to give effect to these amendments in the preamble. Subsequently to this a "National Association" was formed, and a monthly paper established in Philadelphia to secure the changes contemplated. When such a man as Judge Strong, of the Supreme Court of the United States, can accept the post of President, and such a man as General Howard, of the Army, can accept the Vice Presidency of such a society, it is time that the people who are to be affected by the desired changes should examine the subject.

The opinions and wishes expressed in the above memorial are confined chiefly to the class of Presbyterians whose seat of influence is in Western Pennsylvania. This section of country, having been settled originally by Irish and Scotch Irish people, is the home and stronghold of the Presbyterian element in the American church. We have Reformed Presbyterians or Old Side Covenanters, Reformed Presbyterians or New Side Covenanters, Associate Presbyterians, Associate Reformed Presbyterians, United Presbyterians, Old School Presbyterians and New School Presbyterians united. The oldest of these sects is the first named, being the descendants and representatives of the men who, at the Revolution Settlement in 1690, refused to acknowledge William and Mary as King and Queen of Great Britain, because they declined to subscribe the "Solemn League and Covenant," as their predecessors had done. They held *verbatim* to the Westminster Confession of Faith, and retain in their creed the following article on the powers and duties of the civil magistrate:

CHAPTER XXXIII, SEC. 2. "The civil magistrate may not assume to himself the administration of the word and sacraments or the power of the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; yet hath he authority, and it is his duty to take order that, unity and peace be preserved in the church, that the truth of God be kept pure and entire, that all blasphemies and heresies be suppressed, all corruptions and abuses in worship and discipline prevented or reformed, and all the ordinances of God duly settled, administered and observed, and for the better effecting

whereof he hath power to call Synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God."

Most, if not all, the other sects of the Presbyterian family in the United States, have repudiated the doctrine of this article; and, adopting sentiments diametrically opposite, have either expunged it from their creeds altogether or explained it away by foot notes. Yet such is the veneration cherished by all Presbyterians for the wisdom and godliness of the Westminster Assembly that to these views of the power of the Civil Magistrate must be traced the present movement for altering the Constitution of the United States by inserting in the preamble a series of theological doctrines. All intelligent lovers of human liberty are free to acknowledge the obligations of the world to the Scotch Presbyterians for the long and arduous service they rendered the sacred cause in their native land. They preserved the Ark of Freedom when it would have been dashed to pieces forever by the crown and the nobility. But they were tainted with the spirit of religious intolerance in common with all their contemporaries, as is evident from the article of their confession just quoted.

Philip II, of Spain, never claimed more for himself as Civil Magistrate than this article claims. When he waded knee-deep in the blood of the Netherlanders, he was thoroughly sincere and conscientious. In slaughtering by fire and sword fifty thousand human beings of both sexes, he was only "taking order that unity and peace be preserved in the church, and blasphemies and heresies," as he understood them to be, "were suppressed." He and his red-handed colleagues, the ecclesiastics, declared that they knew "the mind of God." and that they were acting in accordance therewith.

In regard to this reverence for the authority of our ancestors, I wish to say that, as the world is older now than it was then, we are the ancients, and the Westminster Assembly, their cotemporaries and predecessors, were the moderns. We understand the genius of Christianity, its doctrines and its requirements, far better than those who lived in the first century of the Christian Era, or any other intervening century between that and this. If this is doubted, I ask whether it would be possible to engraft the puerilities and credulities of the Patristic ages upon the faith of this generation? The subject of human rights, and the province of human government are better understood now than they ever were since the creation. This veneration, therefore, for errors, because they were held in the infancy of civilization by men who, although good and sincere and great for their times, were comparatively babes in all kinds of knowledge, is highly discreditable to us who have all the attainments of the past ages with those of the present superadded. We might as well hold to the Ptolemaic system of astronomy, which represented the earth to be flat and the sun to revolve around it, because our ancestors, believed that theory. We might as well believe in wichcraft because so good a man as John Wesley, only a hundred years ago, declared that to give up belief in witchcraft was the same as to give up the Bible.

The National Association, presided over by Judge Strong, ask Congress to take the necessary steps for having inserted into the *preamble* of the Constitution of the United States, which sets forth the *purposes* of the instrument, three distinct theological propositions:

1. "*That Almighty God is the source of all authority and power in civil, government*." Now what is the import of this language? Does it mean simply that civil government is an ordinance of God? Or does it affirm that the form of government must have the divine sanction? If the latter, is it a monarchy with a Stuart at its head, as it was during the reign of the Solemn League, or a Democracy, with a temporary President to execute the laws? Does it mean a theocracy, in opposition to a government by the people? If so, who is to be the Moses to interpret and enforce the will of God as announced? I ask whether it is not clearly taught in the Bible, where our fathers in 1776 found the doctrine and incorporated it into the Declaration of Independence, that to secure the inalienable rights of man, governments are instituted, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed? Did they not insert the same divine truth in the preamble of the Constitution when they declared that the people of the United States ordained the government, in other words, that the source of all authority and power in civil government was, by the will of God, in *the people* and no where else? Was not the prophet Samuel directed to acquiesce in the will of the Jewish people, when they changed their form of government into a monarchy?

After remonstrating and filing his protest against their folly, did he not by divine direction bow before the sovereignty of the people, anoint Saul to be King, and thus lay the broad foundation for the maxim—*vox populi, vox Dei?* Did not Joshua also defer to the same inherent rights of the people when he said to the Israelites—"choose ye this day whom ye will serve?" If the power and right of choice were not in the people, where was the propriety of saying choose?

I do not wish to be understood as holding that this idea of Popular Sovereignty is peculiar to the Bible. It was taught in the Universal Religion of Nature long before there was a Bible or a Jewish Church at all. The Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man are instinctive suggestions of the human heart and conscience, and would have blessed the world in all ages with just, popular governments but for the unholy conspiracy entered into between Kings and Priests to keep the people ignorant and submissive. But the "National Reformers," as they call themselves, appeal to the Bible as exclusive authority, and to the Bible shall they go.

The early Christians settled all their questions by a showing of hands, just as the Jews were directed to do in their political affairs in the days of Samuel; and this was the custom up to the Council of Nice, when the endorsement of the Canonical books of Scripture, and the rejection of the Apocryphal, were settled by a vote of the members. It is, then, clearly the will of God, as revealed in the Book of Nature and the Bible, that the source of all authority and power in civil government is in the *people themselves*; and that to assert the contrary is to utter what the Apostle Paul would denominate a "damnable" political heresy, unworthy of a place in any Constitution of Government.

II. The second dogma which these "Reformers" wish the Constitution to affirm, is that "*the Lord Jesus Christ is the ruler among the Nations*." This language is meant to express the doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus Christ as Mediator between God and Man.

Now there are three classes of our citizens, composing an overwhelming majority of the whole, whose opinions would be subjected to constitutional censure by such a provision as this.

1. There are the *Israelites*, who, for the first time in eighteen hundred years, have found in the United States a resting-place for the soles of their wandering feet. You charge the Hebrew with a want of patriotism, and say his wishes ought not to be consulted in the matter in hand. Have you forgotten that during the long and wearisome centuries of his persecution—a persecution which knew no merey and no abatement—he had no country to love; that he was banished from every land under heaven, and oppressed as no people on earth has ever been? Where was there in all the world a more patriotic people than the Jews, when Palestine was their country and Jerusalem their glorious capital? At Babylon did they not weep and hang their harps upon the willows, when they remembered the land of their birth? You charge the Jew with being selfish and unscrupulous in his methods of making money. In many cases this is true; but have you forgotten that these features of character were ground into him by the ceaseless impositions and robberies committed upon him by every government of the Old World for more than fifty-four generations? These were not the characteristics of the Jews in the days of the Hebrew Commonwealth. Then they illustrated all that was noble and magnanimous in man, and all that was refined and gentle in woman. These attributes are superinduced upon the character of a people by oppression; and it is creditable to our common nature, when we consider how for eighteen centuries the Jew has been treated as the offscouring of all things, that he is no worse than he is. Under the genial influence of our American institutions, all these faults you criticise in the Hebrew character gradually disappear, just as the "blarney" of the Irish, and the imputed deceit fulness of the Scotch character, generated by centuries of civil and political disability in their native countries, give way in the first generation after they become American citizens. I am proud to allude to the fact, and I deem it a pledge and a gurantee of the present and future protection of heaven to the government and people of the United States, that no son of Abraham, the friend of God," has ever been persecuted in this country—that while everywhere else on earth, and by every other government, he has been treated as a brute and a devil, under the outstretched wings of the American Eagle he stands, not only civilly, but politically and religiously free, and the equal before the law of every other citizen. The Constitution now, in order to throw the shield of its protection over him, only inquires whether he is a man. But if "amended" in the way contemplated, it would be compelled to inquire into his theology. For long ages the so-called Christian governments of Europe have tried by fire, by banishment, and by every other means of cruelty, to make him believe in the Messiahship of Jesus Christ, but all in vain. Shall we treat his religious opinions with contempt as a nation, by virtually making the constitution declare him a heretic?

2. Then there are the *Unitarians*, who would be disfranchised by the adoption of the proposition we are considering. Many of the most refined, intelligent, virtuous, and benevolent people in this country belong to this class of religionists. As we, Presbyterians, cannot, with the evidence now before our minds, receive the doctrine of the Unitarians, so they, with existing evidence before their minds, cannot receive our doctrine. Belief is not a matter of choice, as seems to be taken for granted by all those who propose to *legislate* men into the belief of a given creed by pains and penalties, but it is a matter of evidence. A man is not responsible for his honest belief, whatever it may be. He must believe according to the evidence before his mind, and can do no otherwise. But he is responsible for an earnest examination of all the grounds of belief or disbelief of any important propositions in religion. Men's *opinions* are generally a matter of hereditary descent; but *beliefs—convictions*—are the result of a sincere investigation of both sides of a question. But the misfortune, for which there is no remedy at present, is that equally honest men, viewing a proposition in religion from different stand-points, and through, the jaundiced medium of prejudice, differ fundamentally from each other, and that unavoidably. And as no man *knows*, whatever he may *think*:, that he is right and all the rest are wrong, respect for the opinions of others is as much a duty as respect for his own.

Now what havoc would be made of the political status of the Unitarians, the Universalists, the Disciples and other classes whom the orthodox call errorists and heretics, if the so-called Reformers could succeed in putting this dogma of the divinity of Christ into the Constitution, and such legislation by Congress "as will *give effect*" to it? The whole of the New England delegation at Washington, with the exception of Henry Wilson,

and probably one or two more, would be disfranchised and sent home to civil life. Even Charles Sumner, to whom this nation owes a debt it can never pay, must give up his place in the Senate and seek the shades of private life! This proposal is so stupid and abhorrent to one's sense of decency and justice, that the "Reformers," in one or two instances, have denied it to be part of their plan. But look at the facts of the case.

No member of Congress or of a State Legislature can take his seat, no attorney at law can practise in our courts of justice, no man can hold office at all, unless he swears to support the Constitution of the United States. If, then, the Constitution contained this religious article, not standing as a dead letter, but as an essential part of the organic law to be carried out as the memorialists ask, neither the Jew nor the Unitarian could hold office without perjury. For they do not believe, and therefore cannot support, the article of faith embodied in the Constitution, declaring the divinity of Jesus Christ.

3. Then there are at least twenty millions out of our thirty-eight millions of people who are not professors of religion at all, some of whom have no clearly defined opinions on religious subjects, and many of whom may be unbelievers in the Bible, but who are all nevertheless men, and as much entitled to their rights as we are. "Will it make this large class "*Christian*" in the sense of the Alleghany Convention, by simply putting the doctrine in question into the Constitution? And if only a few millions of our population really hold the doctrine as an article of faith, while twenty millions do not hold it, would not the insertion of the doctrine into the Constitution, which purports to express as a test and qualification for office the opinions of the *whole* people, make us a nation either of ignoramuses or hypocrites? And can the Omniscient God who trieth the hearts of the children of men be pleased with so empty a procedure as this would be? It would be re-enacting the folly of the Scotch Presbyterians, who, although they had the best evidence that the two Stuart Kings were perjured traitors to the Solemn League and Covenant, yet seemed satisfied when they went through the solemn mockery of *subscribing* the bond. As if there were the least virtue in a mere profession I

The province of civil government, as an ordinance of God, is just as distinct, peculiar and exclusive, as that of a railroad company, an insurance company, or a bank. Its purpose is confined solely to the concerns of this world, which, in their place, are just as important to our well-being here and hereafter as the things we denominate religious. It is a means to an end. The end of government is the protection of every human being in his person and property. The civil magistrate, therefore, is a minister of God to see to this very thing, *and nothing else*. The moment he transcends his functions and undertakes to meddle with the religious opinions, of the people, he ceases to be the minister of God for good, and becomes the servant of the devil for harm. Why, then, put into a constitution of civil government theological doctrines which no one would dream of inserting into the organic law of a railroad company or a bank? Is not God honored infinitely more by the Government, when it attends religiously to its own specific business of protecting the persons and property of man, than when it impudently, stupidly, and unlawfully intermeddles with those matters with which, in the nature of the case, it has nothing in the world to do? When shall we learn that God alone is Lord of the conscience, and that the moral machinery of the soul by which a human being works out his own religious convictions is beyond the reach of all legislation, either by the Church or the State? God made the intellect to be free and to hold intimate communion with Him on the high places of the truth. But kings and priests have evermore attempted to enslave it, and they sanction and sanctify their high-handed interference by proclaiming that they do it "by the grace of God," and for the good of the Church.

III. But the memorialists demand that the Constitution of the United States shall declare "*the revealed" will of God to be the supreme law of the land*" Now what an apple of discord, what a Pandora's box, this proposition, if adopted, would be! What is the "revealed will of God?" Is it the Old Testament, including the law of Moses, as the Jews allege? Is it the Old Testament and the New combined, as the Christians claim? Is it the Bible, interpreted by the Councils of the Church, and including the Apocryphal Books, as the Catholics contend? Is it the Bible, interpreted by private judgment, and excluding-the Apocryphal writings, as the Protestants declare? Is the moral law called the Decalogue, requiring among others things the observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath, in which no manner of work shall be done by either man or beast upon pain of death, as one class of Baptists maintain? Is it the Moral Law, with the Sabbath of the fourth commandment altered from the seventh to the first day of the week, with a modification of the stringency of" the rule in cases of necessity and mercy, as held by the members of the Alleghany and Philadelphia Conventions? Each one of the innumerable sects of Christendom, from the mere fact that it is a sect, claims that it has the authority of "the revealed will of God" for its existence, its dogmas, and its other peculiarities, as against all the rest. And under the "*amended*" Constitution each would set forth its superior and unquestionable claim with tremendous zeal. In the midst of this jargon, who shall decide- what *is* "the revealed will of God?" The very umpire himself, before he takes his seat, must belong to some sect. Will all the rest agree that his definition of the terms shall be deemed final?

IV. But the "Reformers" "*further ask that such changes be introduced into the body of the Constitution as may be necessary 0) give effect to these amendments in the preamble*." This means that there shall be a

Constitutional requisition on the co ordinate branches of the government to carry out these provisions and require the citizens by law to profess and act in accordance therewith. In short, it means an established church which shall co-operate with the civil magistrate in carrying out the purposes announced in the Preamble. I know that this idea was disclaimed by one or more of the Philadelphia Convention. But 'if the Convention really desired to organize a Court of High Commission after the Scotch model, for the purpose of bringing before that tribunal all those who repudiate the doctrines of the preamble, and violate the "revealed will of God" as the Court understood it, they could not use more precise and definite language than they have used to express the idea. Ask an honest and intelligent old Covenanter, who sincerely adopts the Article of the Westminster Confession on the powers of the civil magistrate which I have quoted, what he means by the language of the memorial, and he will frankly "tell you that it means *legislative enforcement of the doctrines of the Preamble.* For he knows that it would be superlative folly and emptiness to parade a set of religious dogmas in the Constitution without enforcing the belief and practice of them by law. He will tell you that God is not Baal that he can be deceived and hoodwinked by We the people," declaring in the preamble of the Constitution that we believe and practise such and such doctrines and duties, while, at least, nineteen-twentieths of the whole population believe and practise no such thing. The preamble of the Constitution sets forth the establishment of justice as one of the grand purposes of the instrument. And, there fore, in the body of the Constitution we have articles and sections organizing a Supreme Court. For carrying out the other great objects, we have the Executive and Legislative Departments of the Government. But here are three most important *religious dogmas* in the preamble, so important that their adoption is deemed necessary to make us a Christian Government; and lest they stand there a mere *bra- tum fulmen*, like the Pope's bull against the comet, the memorialists ask that such changes may be made in the body of the Constitution, as will *give effect* to these amendments of the preamble. What does this mean—what can it mean but an organization, a fourth department of the Government, whose function, as it is in European Governments, is to give order concerning the worship of God, and to see to it that all the citizens believe the established articles of faith, and square their conduct by the revealed will of God, which is the supreme law of the land, and of the prohibitions and requirements of which that department is to be the judge?

Suppose now the people of the United States were guilty of the stupendous folly of voting themselves heretics, and putting their religious opinions, or non-opinions, under the ban of the Constitution, as would result from these proposed amendments, the next step in the programme might be, as one sect after another found itself in the numerical majority, the introduction into Congress of a bill declaring that—"Whereas baptism by immersion, or baptism by sprinkling, or Episcopacy, or Presbyterian ism, or Congregationalism, or a thousand other things, in belief or practice, is, or is not, contrary to the 'revealed will of God,' which is the supreme law of the land, and contrary also to the other Articles of Faith in the Preamble of the Constitution, therefore, be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives," &c. And then for the thumb screws and the iron boot! Then for Laud, and the inevitable Court of High Commismission, and the Court of Star Chamber, and a recurrence of those scenes of blood, the history of which, one would suppose, would lead the descendants of the Scotch Presbyterians in the United States to thank God every day of their lives that by our glorious and most Christian Constitution they are in no danger of the Sharpes and Lauderdales who martyred their sainted fathers by the thousand. The waves of religious persecution *ebb* as well as *flow*, in the just retribution of Heaven, for such folly and wickedness. And although under our "*amended*" Constitution, the Jews, the Unitarians, and the Infidels would be the first to suffer, the next class to drink the bitter cup might be the very men who are so zealous now in seeking to make the contemplated change. In Scotland the Catholics, having at first the power, persecuted the Protestants in common. The Prelatists mounted the next wave, and overwhelmed the unhappy Presbyterians. Then the Presbyterians in their turn came into power, and wreaked their vengeance on the Prelatists. Then the tide turned under James II, and the Presbyterians had again to bite the dust. Thus it was in England and all over Europe, till the earth was fattened with the blood its inhabitants shed in the unholy cause of religious persecution. *So it would be in this country*. Even in this enlightened age there is no man, no set of men, and no church great or small, that can be trusted with absolute dominion over the human conscience for a single hour. In the minority and powerless, the ecclesiastical or sectarian passion is as amiable and harmless as an unweaned cub. But invest it with *power*, and it becomes as ferocious and blood-thirsty as a Bengal tiger. Such is human nature in all ages and countries when diabolized by the sectarian spirit. This spirit is just as rampant and cruel in the United States as it ever was in the Old World. It attempts to read all history with its eyes shut. It keeps its face eternally towards the Past instead of the Future, and its unquenchable desire is to be both Pope and King. If history teaches us anything clearly, it teaches us this lesson. And now that the American people, by the mercy of God, have this foul fiend constitutionally chained and under their feet, let them keep it there.

The gigantic folly of the proposal to amend the Constitution by incorporating religious dogmas into it consists in this, that in the matter of religion and religious doctrines there is, and can be, *no umpire* on the earth

to decide what is truth and what is error. The Church in all its branches is a perfect Babel of confusion on the subject, one party denouncing as heresy and damnable error what another deems to be truth. Totally and entirely forgetting the Protestant doctrine of common sense, that each man born into the world is to be the sole judge for himself what is Scripture and what the Scripture teaches, the sects of Christendom denounce each other as heretics and malefactors, each one claiming to be right, and authorized to declare their judgments as the will of God. How, then, could we expect unanimity in *Congress* and the *courts of law?*

Suppose, for instance, that the law of Pennsylvania should fine and imprison a citizen of Ohio for violating the Sabbath by working or travelling within our State limits on the first day of the week. He carries the case by appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States under the "*amended*" Constitution. Of the Judges on the Bench, suppose a third of them were Seventh Day Baptists, who believed that the *Seventh* day was still the Sabbath, and that the Westminster Assembly of Divines had no authority to repeal the law of Sinai as they did. These Judges would give their opinions that labor done on the first day of the week was not a breach of the Sabbath, and that the man had done no wrong. A third, however, of the Judges are Presbyterians, believing in the authority of their Confession of Faith, that the first day *is* the Sabbath, and that it is the old Jewish institution, only changed in this respect. They would of course condemn the man. But suppose the rest of the Judges were devout Jews, who still regarded the institution of Moses as authority, what would be the ultimate decision of the Court, and how much would it be worth?

Let no man say I am drawing too much on my imagination for arguments. These things, and worse, are among the possibilities, if not the certainties, of the future, should we, by amending the Constitution as is proposed, transform the Civil Magistrate, who is now the minister of God for good, into a merciless, bigoted, persecuting blood-hound, chasing men and women up to scaffolds and down to dungeons, because they cannot pronounce the word "Shibboleth" as we do.

These men who want to remodel the Constitution are in dead earnest. They feel that loyalty to Jesus Christ as King of Nations requires them at least to make the effort. One of them, the Rev. Dr. Sproull of Alleghany, in an article published in the *Christian Statesman* for January 15th, 1868, while commenting on that clause of the Constitution, Article 6, Section 3—"No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office or public trust"'—uses the following language: "The question demanding consideration is, should those parts of the Constitution be so amended as to secure the appointment of religious men to office, and give the Christian Church the benefit of National support? e take the affirmative, and will in this paper sustain our position. . . . We do not wish an amendment to come as a kind of patch-work—a piece of new cloth on an old garment. We want the whole made new; the government to be put squarely under Christ, and none but Christ's friends to be suffered to meddle with its administration . . . . . The clause in question should be expung- ed, and a declaration inserted in its place, that civil office be restricted to God fearing or religious men."

This is explicit, this is honest—*too honest*; for such was the alarm produced by the language quoted, that the *Christian Statesman* choked off the old Cameronian so that he has never given us, as he promised, the rest of his views. But we all know whom Dr. Sproull means by "Christ's friends"—"God-fearing, religious men." They are such as he allows to come to the communion table of the Covenanter Church. If, by an unprecedented stretch of charity, others are included in these phrases at all, they are regarded as merchants regard their damaged goods; or as English Rail Roads regard second and third class passengers. They are not worthy of being considered the *particular*, reliable friends of Christ—first-class Christians, travelling the land of Canaan in first-class cars with first-class accommodations, but as mere hangers on to the trains—outside of the "uncovenanted mercies of God."

A very specious argument used by the "Reformers," and one which clouds the undisciplined minds of common people, is, that *"the State is a moral person*" and accountable to God for its acts, and therefore ought to have this confession of its faith in the Constitution. The fallacy of the idea is seen in this, that, if the State is a moral person, it stands precisely on the same level' of responsibility and capability as a human being; for a man is no more and no less than a *moral person*. If, then, the State is a moral person too, instead of a corporation without a soul whose only function is limited to the concerns of this world, it can do all that a man can do in the way of duty, and is responsible for the same. But a man can believe in Jesus Christ. He can be baptized. He can take the sacrament. He can go to church and worship. Can the "State," which in this country is only a term to express the *civil authority* of thirty-eight millions of people, do such things? It is not only an impossibility, but an absurdity.

The idea of a *State* performing an act of *worship* when more than two-thirds of the people who compose it make no profession of religion at all, and the minority, made up of Jews, Catholics, and Protestants with their scores of sects, all having conflicting notions of the character of God and the kind of homage that is due to him, is so stupendously foolish that the reader may doubt whether men like Judge Strong, of the United States Supreme Court, and Governor Geary, of Pennsylvania, and Ex-Governor Pollock, would give it their endorsement. But in the Resolutions of the National Association these "Reformers" declare that, by such an

amendment of the Constitution as is contemplated, "no injustice would be done to those few individuals who are enemies of the Christian Religion, and who claim the right to prohibit *the nation as such from all religious worship*.

Now a nation is indeed a body corporate,—only so, however, like all other bodies corporate, in order to reach the specified ends for which a national organ ization is designed, namely, to protect the persons and property of all of its inhabitants. But it is a legal definition of a corporate body, as old as Sir Edward Coke, that "it hath no soul," and therefore no conscience, and no religious diameter in the dogmatic sense. Consequently it cannot worship; it cannot exercise faith; it cannot repent, and be baptized, either by immersion or sprinkling. All these are the acts of an individual and only of an individual. They cannot be predicated of a State reaching from the Lakes of the North to the Rio Grande of the South, and from one ocean to the other, and embracing a people whose religious opinions are multiform and mixed.

That persons of intelligence should make use of so lame an argument proves either that they are dishonest and have no real fealty to the truth, or that the haziness of the object they aim at has obscured' their vision so that they cannot see the wide difference there is between sense and nonsense. If Judge Strong in a law case at Washington should reason in that way, the bar would suspect him of a softening of the brain. Clergymen, who, as a general rule, know little or nothing of the nature and laws of evidence, and who have been trained to look at but one side of a question, may be pardoned for such weakness; but a *lawyer* is presumed to know better, and should blush when detected in an effort to deceive and mislead plain people.

Another favorite argument used by those who urge the unchristian character of the Constitution as a reason for amending it in the way proposed is that, "were this instrument lost, and a copy dug up after a thousand years, no one would be able to determine whether ii was the Constitution of a Pagan or Christian land."

Now, in my humble judgment, the very *opposite* of this would be true. The simple fact that the Constitution—knowing no priesthood, no sect, and no dogmatic religion,—scrupulously abstaining from the remotest interference in matters that were spiritual,—securing to every person, whether Jew, Christian, Pagan, or Mohammedan, his inalienable right to form his own religious opinions and to worship or not worship as he pleased, would be proof cumulative and overwhelming that the newly-found document *was* a Christian Constitution of Civil Government; and that those who framed it understood the will of God better than any other founders of States who had ever lived on earth before. All other governments have transcended their legitimate sphere. They have obliterated the distinction between the three great institutions—the Family, the State, and the Church; and have made the State to predominate over the religion and consciences of men. The consequence invariably has been that human governments, under the dictation of the Church, have been human slaughter houses; and kings in their bloody work have had their consciences drugged by the priesthood with the falsehood that they rule by the grace of God and are nursing fathers and nursing mothers to the Church.

But our statute-book, thanks to the superintending Spirit of God, which guided the framers of the Constitution in their work, is not defiled by a single drop of blood. No human being has ever suffered death, imprisonment, or fine for his religious opinions, whatever they may be. The Church for the first time is free, and the State for the first time attends to its appropriate duties without arrogating to itself the business of expounding, propagating, and enforcing religious doctrines, and thus driving men who cannot conscientiously receive them, either into hypocrisy by professing them, or to prison by denying them. To me the crowning glory of the Constitution consists in this feature of its character. It is pre-eminently Christian. To be sure it does not mouth the name of Christ or God, and babble and bluster about the grace of God, as the priest-ridden and despotic Governments of the Old World do. But it honors God as the Christian man honors Him, by doing the work which God has appointed it to do, and thus accomplishing the end of its being.

I regard the Constitution and Government of the United States, embracing the Declaration of Independence, as the only well-formed, legitimate child which Christianity has ever borne to the world. In all other lands, the Church, to use a Scriptural and most significant phrase, has gone a-whoring after false gods, and the hermaphroditical monsters which they dignify with the name of Governments are the unnatural offspring of such adultery. But our Government is no freak of Nature or of chance. It is no hermaphrodite, impotent because undertaking too much. It belongs to the masculine gender alone, and produces only men, and not priests. Indeed, I see no trace of the priest in its character, for the prophetic woman was delivered of the man-child in the wilderness of this western world where no priest was. But it bears the impress of divinity upon it in this, that it is one thing and not two at a time—that it has only one grand purpose—that the things which are Cæsars it attends to exclusively and ably, while the things which are God's it meddles not with at all. It gives to every man, in our Homestead law, a vine and fig-tree to sit under, and bids him enjoy without molestation all his sacred rights. Hence thousands every week, and tens of thousands every month flock to our shores, to assume the proud honor and the rich privileges of American citizenship. On this account deem any such change in the Constitution as is contemplated, not only not desirable, but intensely to be deprecated.

In regard to the word "*Christian*" in this discussion, I do not use it in a theological sense as an adjective

qualifying either a dogma or a man. A set of religious dogmas professing to be based upon the Bible, and receiving the assent of all the sects of Christendom, has never yet been announced, and never will be. And as for a man who shall embody such a creed, and be universally recognized as a "Christian," he would indeed be a *vara avis in terris*—so rare as to belong, like the Dodo, to the category of defunct species. But I mean the loving, sympathizing, deferring, self-sacrificing, just, and gentle spirit that was pre eminently illustrated in the life and death of Jesus Christ, and which was an exemplification of the religion he inculcated—supreme love to God, and equal love to man. This religion frowns upon the insane attempt to convert the Constitution and Government of the United States into a society for the propagation of dogmas.

But—

"There is some soul of goodness in things evil,
Would men observingly distil it out;"

and this galvanic movement of the bloody and dead Past to throw its dark shadow over the bright path of the Future will only have the effect to lead Americans to study the subject 06 government more profoundly than ever, and to build up around the rights of the human conscience bulwarks of granite to protect them against the heaven-daring assaults of the theological spirit, which the history of the Church for 1800 years shows to be both unscrupulous in its means, and relentless in its aim.

Index Tracts

No. 1.—Truths for the Times, OR REPRESENTATIVE PAPERS PROM THE INDEX, contains the "Fifty Affirmations" and "Modern Principles" It gives a bird's-eye view of Free Religion as conceived by the Editor of THE INDEX, and states "irrepressible conflict" between it and Christianity. Mr. Charles Darwin, author of "The Origin of Species," says, in a letter to the Editor not originally Intended for publication, but subsequently authorized to be used:—"I have now read 'Truths for the Times,' and I admire them from my inmost heart; and I agree to almost every word." Price—One hundred copies for One Dollar, or a less number at the same rate, namely, One Cent a copy

No. 2.—Fear of the Living God, an eloquent and beautiful discourse by O. B. Frothingham, exposes the debasing character of the popular nations of God, and presents conceptions of him that are worthy of the nineteenth century. Price—Single copies Five Cents; Twelve copies Fifty Cents.

No. 3.—Lecture on the Bible, by the Rev. Charles Voysey, of England, who has recently been deprived of his benefice by the ecclesiastical courts on account of his bold and outspoken heresies, is an overwhelming demonstration of the imperfections and errors of the Bible, both in the Old and the New Testaments. Passages sustaining the argument are copiously quoted, with references to chapter and verse in every instance; and no abler, fairer, or more high-toned treatise on the subject can be found in the English language. Price—Single copies Ten Cents; Sir copies Fifty Cents; Twelve copies One Dollar.

No. 4.—Chritian Propagandism, by F. E. Abbot, is a complete exposure of the weakness, costliness, and inefficiency of the System of Foreign Missions. *Full of Figures, Facts, and Interesting Extracts*. Also, a very remarkable article by a Siamese Buddhist is appended, giving an account of a spicy conversation between himself and a missionary. Price—Single copies Ten Cents; Six copies Fifty Cents; Twelve copies One Dollar.

No. 5.—" God In the Constitution Would It be right to incorporate Religious Dogmas into the United States Constitution? By Rev. Arthur B. Bradford. A very clear, pointed, and able argument against the Proposed Theological Amendment to the United States Constitution, which ought to be circulated throughout the country. Price—Single Copies Ten Cents; Six Copies Fifty Cents; Twelve Copies One Dollar.

No. 6.—"The Sabbath," by Parker Pillsbury, is a scathing denunciation of Sabbatarian superstition. *New Edition*. Price—Single copies Ten Cents; Twelve copies One dollar.

No. 7.—"Compulsory Education," by F. E. Abbot, maintains the right of every child to be educated, and the duty of the State to ensure it an education. Price—Single copies Five Cents; Twelve copies Fifty Cents.

No. 8.—Tbt© Present Heaven, by O. B. Frothing-Ham, is a singularly felicitous treatment of a subject that interests everybody. Price—Single copies Five Cents;. Twelve copies Fifty Cents.

Address,
The Index,
90 St. Clair Street, TOLEDO, OHIO.

Cultured Free Thought.

The Index Association,

With offices at 90 St. Clair Street, Toledo, O., and 22 Vesey Street, New York City, haft been organized with a Capital Stock of One Hundred Thousand Dollars, for the purpose of publishing Tracts, Books and

The Index,

A Weekly Paper devoted to Free and Rational Religion.

It is the object of The Index to give public utterance to the boldest, most cultivated and best matured thought of the age on all religious questions. The Index is edited by Francis E. Abbot, with the following list of Editorial Contributors:

O. B. Frothinoham, of New York City.
Thomas W. Higginson, of Newport. R. I.
William J. Potter? of New Bedford, Mass.
Richard P. Hallowell, of Boston. Mass.
William H. Spencer, of Haverhill, Mass.
MRS. E. D. Cheney, of Jamaica Plain. Mass.
REV. Charles Voysey, of London, England.
Prof. Francis W. Newman, of Bristol, England.
Rrv. Moncure D. Conway, of London, England.

Every Liberal should subscribe for The Index, as the best popular exponent of Religious Liberalism.

Every Christian minuter and every thinking church-member should subscribe for it, as the clearest, most candid and most scholarly expositor of the differences between Free Thought and Evangelical Christianity, and as the best means of becoming well informed of the arguments which the Church will have to meet in the future.

Almost every number contains a discourse or leading article which alone is worth the price of one year's subscription.

Send $2.00 for one year, or 50 cents for three months on trial.

Address
The Index,
Drawer 38, Toledo, Ohio.

pointing hand

The series of "Index Tracts" (No. 1 to No. 10) will be sent postpaid on receipt of sixty cents. These include "Truths for the Times" (of which Mr. Charles Darwin, author of "The Origin of Species," says:—"I have now read Truths for the Times,' and I admire them from my inmost heart; and I agree to almost every word);" "Lecture on the Bible," by Rev. Charles Voysey;"Christian Propagandists." by F. E. Abbot; "God in the Constitution." by Rev. A. B. Bradford; "The Sabbath," by Parker Pillsbury; "The Present Heaven," by Rev. O. B. Frothingham; "The Christian Amendment," by F. K. Abbot. This series contains in the aggregate over two hundred pages of closely printed reading matter. Address The Index, 90 St. Clair street, Toledo, Ohio.

"The Sabbath."

A Discourse by Parker Pillsbury.
[Delivered at Lyceum Hall, Toledo, Sunday evening, April 2nd, 1871.]

MARK 2:27.—The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.

The first thing to be said of this text is, it is not true.

The Sabbath was not made for man. In no sense was it made for man. Nor was it ever a divine institution. The Sabbath was made *by* the Priesthood, *for* the Priesthood; and fearfully have they used it to perpetuate, as well as exercise, their authority over man, for thousands of years.

Days of rest and recreation, a great many of them, Sunday with the others, might be unmixed blessings; but it is the strange ill-fortune of men in this world, to pervert what are, or might be, of solid service to them, to the greatest evils.

Even the necessities of human nature, eating, drinking, clothing, sleeping, love of the sexes, are made ministers, every one of them, to the very worst ills, under which humanity suffers.

So of institutions, made for man, for his use, convenience, comfort, happiness; perverted from their legitimate use, and allowed to become masters of man, they are like lire, when in the mastery, destructive of the

very good they were designed to subserve.

This is true, alike of political, educational and religious institutions. Nor is it easy to say which is worst, when once asserting supremacy over man.

The Sabbath is, in itself, an unmitigated usurpation. It has no warrant for existence anywhere; in heaven above, nor in the earth beneath, nor anywhere beneath the earth.

It began in a lie: it lives in lies, and must so live while its life lasts. It has no natural, no legal claim to observance; never had; never can have. It has no authority which any being is bound to respect, in heaven, on earth,—none whatever. .

It was born of a priesthood that was self-created, self consecrated, ambitious, pretentious, tyrannical, hypocritical; and has been the instrument of usurped authority, arbitrary power, and often of outrageous cruelty, in its hands.

Most religionists, however liberal, have conceded that there was a Sabbath of really divine appointment for the Jews, given at creation or at Mount Sinai, to be by them sacredly observed. But all that is false and foolish as the rest. The Hebrew Sabbath law is as ludicrous on the one hand, as it is unnatural on the other. And yet the Sunday might be made a positive, substantial benefit and blessing to a vast multitude of the human family. It is so already. It has done much for me—saved me from being killed by excessive labor when young, as probably it did some of you; and is saving millions still.

But its use, you sec, is remedial only; a cure for, or prevention of, a greater violation of the laws of nature—only another form of the ten hour system, which costs so much to secure, and which, even now, benefits but a small part of man, and a still smaller part of womankind. And if instead of tie ten hour system, a fifth in place of the seventh day of rest system should be substituted, it would be just as sacred, as holy as is, or ever was any Sabbath whatever. The Sabbath, or Sunday, is only necessary at all, because of the undue and unnatural proportion of time devoted to what we call labor.

In the state of nature, neither man nor animals know nor care anything about days of rest. But in what is called civilized and christianized society, both man and beast are supposed to require a day of rest every week. And man and working beasts do need it; and so, most of all, does the working woman. And least of all does woman have it. As the best regulated society is, to the truly domes- tic woman, with numerous family cares, the Sundays bring rather increase of labor, thoughtfulness and responsibility, than rest. And societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals have found that to the noble horse, Sunday is more to be dreaded than any other day of the week.

Still to many, both women and men, the day might be made serviceable to both body and spirit, wore they permitted reasonably and sensibly to use it. But just as emperors, kings, aristocracies and demagogues, in the name of government, have perverted everything truly beneficial to their ambitious designs, preying upon the people like wolves, so the priesthood, in the name of religion and of God, have harnessed humanity to a ritual, as senseless as it is ridiculous, and as heartless as it is hypocritical; and have made the race believe that it was all divinely ordained at or before the foundation of the world—Sabbath with the rest—and that they are ordained to explain, expound and enforce the whole of it upon the race, on pain of its everlasting damnation, until the earth be removed, and its foundations be no more.

If you deem this theme trite, or thread-bare, remember the Sabbath institution is now the whole vitalizing source of priestly rule. Without that day and its enforced obligations, our 40,000 clergy would be as powerless as their fabled Samson shorn of his locks: with it, they are a 40,000 Samson-power, to hug and hold humanity in their embrace, while they rob it of reason and common sense, and compel it into blind and slavish subjection to their unrighteous requirements. And while you keep this in mind, let me show you on what fraud and falsehood, what lies and hypocrisy, this whole superstructure is based; and how well they know it too, unless they are indeed fools; which should also, if shown, or known, be a not less powerful reason for exposing them and making them ridiculous, if not infamous, before all the people.

You remember, many of you, when the authority for the Sabbath was not only primarily but mainly rooted in the first chapter of Genesis. God made haste to institute the Sabbath, it was said, as soon as he had completed creation. Indeed, creation was not complete; woman, its crowning flower, was not yet made. Adam was there, and had received one command, namely: to be fruitful, increase and multiply, and replenish the earth; an enterprise which must have bewildered him greatly, when as yet woman was not. The Sabbath was more important than woman; was long before women—how long we may never know; but as the record runs it must have been very long, for Adam had performed one work which must have occupied him long weeks, if not years, unless Darwinism be true, that of giving "names to all the cattle, and to all the fowls of the air, and to every beast of the field;" but to Adam, it is almost in lamentation added, there was not found an helpmeet for him. (Gen. ii. 18, 25.)

But he had his Sabbaths, happy man that he was! You remember what importance was attached to the circumstance that God hurried up the Sabbath, and rested on it, thus, long before he completed his creative

work.

But what became of the Seventh Day argument when Geology, with its lantern and hammer, went down into the crypts, cloisters, and caverns of the earth, and found written on the underpinning stones, by the great Builder himself, dates and inscriptions which set all man's chronology and almanacs, as well as Bible making, at defiance, and proved Genesis and all the Pentateuch, as then and even now interpreted, to be the veriest fables ever palmed upon unsuspecting mortals! I said, even *now* interpreted. Many ministers, and many in the churches, are still in total darkness on this whole theme, and scout the very word Geology, and all its teachings and meanings, as beneath their sanctified scorn and contempt.

Just as to this day, I find men and women in the Methodist Church, who always supposed that the separation between the northern and southern General Conferences was made by the withdrawal of the north from the south, on account of slavery, and that consequently the northern conference had no connection with slavery afterwards. Their ministers had told them those two falsehoods, and they believed them; believe them to this day. So of this argument from geology, as to the seventh day, Sabbath. I do not suppose one-half of the ministers of this country, or Great Britain know that all learned men, all who have thoroughly investigated the subject, no-matter of what church, have Ions: since abandoned all former claim or pretension that Genesis has any right to be heard. One reason is, because when the champions for the Sabbath are driven from one stronghold, they take refuge in another, and so those who never examine anything for themselves, ministers as well as others, and there are plenty of them, think all must be safe and secure.

But look at the historical argument, as the wisest of the clergy have taught and enforced it.

The world believes there has been a Sabbath-keeping church, at least from the thunders of Mt. Sinai, to the earthquake which rent the grave of dead faints, as well as the veil of the last temple at the crucifixion: and thence onward, with only change of day, from seventh to first, to the present time. So much the world professes to believe, taught by its consecrated ministry; and more, that the institution will be perpetuated on the earth while the earth endures; and will then be transferred to heaven and be hallowed there by all its inhabitants, one eternal day, one *Sabbath day*, whose songs shall never cease, whose night shall never come.

Such is the present popular, almost unshaken faith, wherever waves the banner of the cross. Of course all the church knows, or can know about the Jewish Sabbatb, rests on Jewish authority. And the *variety* of testimony as to its authority is as remarkable, as is the manner of its early observance *ridiculous*.

I have neither time nor strength, nor could you have patience, but for a few examples.

It is stoutly disputed whether God gave the law of the Sabbath at the creation, or not. Disputed, remember, among Rabbis and Doctors who should know, or nobody knows. Nobody *pretends* to know *certainly* whether the patriarchs, in all the 2,000 years before the ten commandments, kept or knew any thing about the Sabbath; or whether any of the *Hebrew* tribes did, from Joshua to David and Solomon—another period of 400 or 500 years.

Some *guess* they did, others *guess* they did not. Those who think they did, and Josephus is one of them, assert that there was no city, Greek or barbarian. and no country where the religion of the Sabbath was not known. Some of them even pretend that Job kept the Sabbath, the argument being that he had seven sons, and that when each one had given the others, and the three sisters, an entertainment, their father offered a sacrifice to God on their account, saying, "it may be that my sons have sinned and cursed God in their hearts,"—taking after their mothers it seems he feared they might be, in their pleasures.

Philo, a very learned Jew of Alexandria (A. D. 1, or thereabout) held that, the Jews having forgotten the clay of the creation of the world, God reminded them of it when he rained the manna on other days, and withheld it on the seventh day. Other Jewish Doctors deny that the day was ever forgotten, and insist, though, as would appear, without a shadow of evidence, that Joseph observed it in the house of Pharaoh. So far the Jews, as to the origin and history of the institution; though I give you but a specimen of their argument. Very brief specimen, too.

And then as to the modes of observance; the same authorities are equally at variety. *Our* scriptures present *some* of the grotesque and ridiculous demands of it; but other Jewish writers, many more; and the *authority* of one is as good as another.

All are Jewish and preserved by Jews; though *studied* by Christians, as well as Jews, and relied upon as far as they think the Sabbath argument is strengthened by them.

All work was prohibited by all alike. In the time of the Maccabees, the Jews could not fight, even if attacked; sometimes their enemies, knowing their Sabbath regulations, waited for that day, and then attacked and massacred them without resistance.

The Rabbins reckon thirty-nine *direct* prohibitions, and innumerable secondary requirements, which it would be impossible to keep. They forbade the roasting or the peeling of an apple. They were not to kill a flea, a fly, nor any insect "if so large that the sex could be determined." None were to sing, or to play on any instrument so loud as would waken a sleeping child. And yet the Samaritans complained of the Jews, that they

were too lax in their observance of the Sabbath.

For themselves, they had no fire, Moses having expressly commanded, "ye shall kindle no fires throughout your habitations upon the Sabbath day." They abstained wholly from women; they did not leave their cheerless, tireless habitations on that day, only as they went to the house of the Lord. They employed themselves in reading the law, in thanksgivings and prayers. Even the "Sabbath day's journey" was in dispute, and is yet. Some made it a mile, others more, some less. Rabbi Moses Maimonides held that he who did not know exactly the distance might walk on the Sabbath day 2,000 moderate paces. And so it was merely guess-work all round, and ever has been.

It is remarkable that no more is said of the Sabbatical year, and year of Jubilee, both of which are as really in the Mosaic code as is the seventh day observance. In the 23d of Exodus, the laws for the seventh year observance are given in the same connection, and with the same particularity.

In 25th Leviticus the seventh year law is reproduced without the other.

"Six years shalt thou sow thy fields, and six years shalt thou prune thy vineyard and gather the fruit thereof.

But the seventh year shall be a sabbath of rest unto the land—a sabbath for the Lord. Thou shalt neither sow thy fields nor prune thy vineyard."

With more to the same purport. Then follows the command with its provisions and regulations for the Sabbatical year.

"And thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto thee; seven times seven years, and the space of the seven sabbaths of years, shall be unto thee forty and nine years . . . .

And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year and proclaim liberty throughout all the land, to all the inhabitants thereof.

A jubilee shall that fiftieth year be unto you. Ye shall not sow, neither reap that which groweth of itself; nor gather the grapes of thy vines undressed. For it is the jubilee."

I am reading only that part of the law regulating the seventh and fiftieth *year* Sabbaths. But there seems no reason in the world, why the seventh day Sabbath should be held more sacred than these, only that the priesthoods could not then, and cannot now use them to their advantage. Probably there is no other reason. The same books, the same chapters precisely, contain the law, the same writer doubtless wrote them, and by the same authority, human or divine.

Coming to the Christian dispensation, nothing is proved or provable, if it be not certain that the Apostles as well as Jesus, regarded the institution as Jewish, binding *only* on Jews; and no longer even on them. But I do not propose now to enter the New Testament scriptures on the subject. I never knew a question with two sides—and surely no theological question ever has less, which had not been proved true and false, many times, many ways before I ever learned the book at all.

But coming away from the scripture record, it is well to know, what the so called Christian Fathers believed and practised in the first Christian centuries, and while both Jew and Christian were on the ground, each with his distinctive claim.

Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Eusebius, and many more, boldly taught that the Sabbath, as mentioned by Moses, signified only the appointment of a day to be observed afterwards by the Jews, but by none others. And they say there is no evidence that the patriarchs in all their 2,500 years ever observed it, or were required, or expected to observe it.

Some very learned as well as zealous Jews, complained to Justin Martyr, that the Christians kept not the Sabbath. The martyr replied in defence of the Christians, with much power, and at great length, saying among other things: "You Jews think when you have passed a day in idleness, you are very religious. Our God is not pleased with such things. There was no need of Sabbaths before Moses, so there is no need of them since Jesus Christ."

Iræneus in the second century, and the flower of that century for integrity as well as learning, says: "Abraham had faith and was called the friend of God; yet neither was circumcised, nor observed the Sabbath."

Much has been written about the change of the day by the apostles, or early fathers and founders of the church, and almost everybody supposes the change was by as divine a sanction as was the institution itself, and that both were divine; and it was just as divine, for that matter; because there was nothing but priestly assumption and arrogance about any part of it.

So far I have only given you what Jewish and Christian writers themselves have furnished us; and will now show you the best that the best authorities of the church give as reason for *changing the day* from the seventh to the first.

Dr. Robinson, an eminent and very able New England divine, about the year 1832 reproduced the Bible Dictionary and Encyclopœdia of Augustin Calmet, a Benedictine monk of the last century, and gave it to the world with emendations of all kinds, abridgments as well as additions, changes and corrections, such as might be expected from a zealous Protestant of the 19th century, dealing with the work of a Roman Catholic monk of

the 18th, born indeed in the 17th century. The book was heralded on the imposing title-page with this meek and modest announcement:

"Seventh Edition Revised with large additions, by Edward Robinson, Professor Extraordinary of Sacred Literature, in the Theological Seminary of Andover, Massachusetts."

I give the precise words of this "professor extraordinary

"The law had fixed the seventh day as the sabbath for the nation of the Jews. It is believed by some, that the apostles, to honor the day of our Savior's resurrection, determined it to every seventh day, and fixed it on the Sunday, that is, the first day of the week among the Hebrews, and the day dedicated to the sun, among the Pagans.

The change of the day is. however, rather to be gathered from the practice of the Christian Church, than as clearly enjoined in the New Testament.

It appears that believers came together on this day to break bread; that collections for the poor were then taken; exhortations and discourses were delivered to the people, and in short, we have the various parts of public worship noted as being performed on this day.

It will follow that we may safely imitate those examples which the apostles and primitive christians have left us. And whatever obligations the Jews might lie under to the observance of the Saturday Sabbath, they do not bind christians; because those obligations were national, not general, and were commemorative, in some degree, of Israclitish events in which others have no interest."

So much for our learned and Reverend Professor Extraordinary; nor do I know where to look for any higher authority. And is it not clear to every pure vision that instead of furnishing any argument in support of a change of the day, by any divine precept, he has shown two other and very different things; first, that nothing is known, nor can be known positively. just when, where, how, nor by whom, the day was changed; and secondly, that whatever might have been the law of the Sabbath to the Jews, it had no binding force whatever on anybody else, then nor at any other time, before nor afterwards. You observe the eminent professor only speaks doubtfully in what he does say. "It is believed," he says. So are many other things *believed,* but who *knows,* is what we are after, not who believes.

Again, he says, "it appears" that the churches did certain things on certain days. That we know, but by what authority, is our question.

After all, he concludes the change of the day is only to be gathered from the practice of the churches, the scriptures being wholly silent upon the subject. And this Is all that *can* be known about it.

To quote the words of the so-called "Christian Fathers," from Justin Martyr, in the first century, to the disputes between the Greek and Roman churches, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, would only weary your patience to no purpose. One thing is to be remarked: in all the controversy among the early Christians about the Sabbath, the complaint was, that those who observed the day at all, observed it as a Jewish and not as a Christian institution.

The controversy commenced among the apostles themselves. Paul and Peter were always at war about that and other Jewish ordinances and observances, or something else, and yet both were Jewish where it subserved their purpose.

To the Jews, Paul said he became a Jew, that he might gain the Jews, going so shamefully far even as to circumcise the Bishop of Ephesus; though he boasts that he seldom baptized, and that he was not sent to baptize. Perhaps, he administered the Jewish rite oftener than the christian ordinance of baptism. Nobody knows nor can know.

One of the reasons for the separation of the Greek from the Roman church was, that the latter still Judaized, as it was called, on the question of Sabbath observance.

Coming to the Reformation, three or four names are so well known, and so highly revered, too, by the Protestant church and pulpit, that this argument would hardly be complete without their sanction. These are John Calvin, Martin Luther, Melancthon, and others.

More than half the Protestant churches in America, namely, the Baptist, Presbyterian and Congregational, if not the Episcopalian, are baptized into the name of John Calvin, as really as into the name of Jesus Christ. And yet I never found but very few, even of their clergy, who did not dispute me. and sometimes with most tropical temper, too, when I told them Calvin, and the great reformers, did not hold to the Sabbath, but on the contrary wrote most positively and pointedly against it.

In Book 2d, Chapter 8th, Calvin's Institutes, the subject is treated at great length, but a few brief specimens of the argument will be sufficient for our purpose.

"The Fathers frequently call the command for the Sabbath a shadowy commandment, because it contains the external observance of the day which was abolished with the rest of the figures at the advent of Christ. . . . .

Though the sabbath be abrogated, yet it is customary among us to assemble on stated days, for hearing the

word, breaking the mystic bread and for prayer, and to allow servants and labore sal remission from work.

The same day which put an end to the shadows admonishes christians not to adhere to a shadowy ceremony.

Christians, therefore, should have nothing to do with a superstitious observance of days.

Paul expresses a fear lest "his labors among the Galatians should prove in vain, because they still observed days. And he writes the Romans that it is superstitious to make one day differ from another."

And that is John Calvin, though only in threads. His whole argument is a perfect chain cable of vigor in reasoning and power of logic, against any Sabbath day. What can be done with it?

Now, I suppose the Calvinistic clergy of this one country must count tens of thousands, and if they know the views of John Calvin, after whom they are called—after whom they call themselves—then, in thus keeping them from the people, they are liars and hypocrites. I have no other name for them.

If, on the other hand, they do not know them, with Calvin's Institutes in every decent theological library, and with all the Sabbath Conventions and discussions of the last twenty years, where they have been presented, and reiterated, and published over and over again, and scattered in newspapers, reports, and tracts, like snowflakes everywhere; if after all this, they do not know, then I leave this audience to baptize them with whatever name you deem proper.

Martin Luther, as quoted by Coleridge, directed like this (I have seen but the quotation)—"Keep the day holy for its use's sake, both to body and soul. But if anywhere the day is made holy for the mere day's sake, if any set up its observance on a Jewish foundation, then I order you to work on it, to ride on it, to dance on it, to do anything that shall reprove this encroachment on the christian spirit and liberty."

The Sabbath sentiment of not only Luther and Calvin, but of all the leaders of the Reformation, may also be seen in the Augsburg Confession of Faith, framed by Melancthon and presented to the Emperor Charles V., at the Assembly of Augsburg in 1530.

"What is to be thought of the Lord's day and such like rites used in the Church The answer is, "That it is lawful for bishops and pastors to appoint ordinances—and that men's consciences should be bound to esteem them necessary services, and to think that they sin when they violate any of them.

Of this sort, is the observance of the Lord's day, of Easter, of Pentecost and such like holy days and rites; for they that think that the observation of the Lord's day was appointed by the authority of the Church instead of the Sabbath, as necessary, are greatly deceived.

The scripture requireth that the observation of it should be more free; for it teaches that the Mosaical ceremonies are not needful after the gospel is revealed. And yet because it was requisite to appoint a certain day that the people might know when to come together, it seemeth that the church did, for that purpose, appoint the Lord's day; which day, for this cause, also seemed to have better pleased the Church, that in it men might have an example of christian liberty, and might know that the observation, neither of the sabbath, nor any other day, was of necessity.

There are extant monstrous disputations, torching the change of the sabbath, which have sprung up from a false persuasion that there should be worship in the Church like to the Leviticus worship. They dispute about the holy days, and prescribe how far it is lawful to work in them. What else are disputations but snares for men's consciences?"

But let me hasten from the Fathers and Grand Fathers of the church to Archbishop Paley, who says:

"In my opinion the transactions in the wilderness a hove related (fix. xvi.), were the first actual institution of the Sabbath. The words (Gen. ii. 2, 3,) do not assert, that God then blessed and sanctified the seventh day, but that he blessed and sanctified it for that reason. St. Paul evidently seems to have considered the Sabbat a a sort of Jewish ritual, and not obligatory on Christians as such. (Col. 11., 16.17.) A cessation upon that day, from labor, beyond the time of attendance upon public worship, is not intimated in any part of the New Testament; nor did Christ nor his apostles deliver, that we know of, any commands to their disciples for a discontinuance, upon that day, of the common affairs of their profession. The opining that Christ and his apostles meant to retain the duties of the Jewish Sabbath, shifting only the day from the seventh to first, seems to prevail without suthcient reason; nor does any evidence remain in the scripture, (of what, however, is not improbable,) that the first day of the wee was thus distinguished in commemoration of our Lord's death."

Archbishop Whately in his notes on the Apostle Paul, has, among much more of similar purport, the following:

"In saying that there is no mention of the Lord's day in the Mosaic Law, I mean that there is not only no mention of that specific festival which Christians observe on the first day of the week, in memory of our Lord's resurrection on the morning following the Jewish sabbath but that there is no injunction to sanctify one day in seven, throughout the whole of the Old Testament, we never hear of keeping holy some one day in every seven, but the seventh day, the day on which God rested from all his labors.'

I cannot, therefore, but think that the error was less of those early Christians, who, conceiving the

injunction relative to the sabbath to be binding on them, obeyed it just as it was given, than those who, admitting the eternal obligation of the precept, yet presume to alter it on the authority of tradition. Surely if we allow that the tradition of the Church is competent to change the express commands of God, we are falling into one of the most dangerous errors of the Romanists.

But in the present case, there is not even any tradition to the purpose. It is not merely that the apostles left us no command perpetuating the observance of the sabbath, and transferring the day from the seventh to the first. Such a change, certainly, would have been authorized by their express injunction, and by nothing short of that; since an express divine command can be changed or altered only by the same power, and the same distinct revelation by which it was delivered. But, not only is their no apostolic injunction, than which nothing less would be sufficient, there is not even any tradition of their having made such a change; nay more, it is even abundantly plain that they made no such change."

This country abounds in Theological Seminaries, and in learned theologians, whose sole business is, to teach the ministers who are, and are to be, the teachers and guides of the people. And it certainly is no extravagance of statemant to say that whatever their *pupils* may know, or not know, they know themselves, every one of them, that all the preaching and pretending about one day as holier than another, is immeasurable delusion, or unmitigated falsehood.

All legislation under any form of government in support of such a dogma, is but binding heavy burdens and laying them on men's shoulders without warrant, without authority.

Nor is it among the least remarkable circumstances in the history of Sunday legislation, that laws have been enacted against Sabbath observance as well as in support of it. And with far better reason too.

When James VI. visited Scotland in 1617, he found the clergy had usurped full authority, especially in matters of religion, and were punishing Sabbath violations, among other delinquonces, with frightful severity. Whipping and branding with red-hot irons were both inflicted on women, both on the same woman at the same time, as well as on men. Against not only these extremes but against any prohibiten of innocent sports and recreations on Sunday, such as walking, visiting, swimming, and peaceful games, did the king oppose the royal authority.

Puritanism, particularly in the State of Connecticut, has made itself ridiculous, if not odious for all time, by its Sunday legislation, as well as by all sorts of spiritual protective tariffs for the benefit of the saints.

But it was in Scotland that the day was best observed, and you need not, wonder that the government interfered, and more than once, to check the arrogance of priestly power and domination. The Scotch cergy have always been the full counterpart of the Roman Catholic priesthood, but in the 16th and 17th centuries, they were scorpions to the milder whips of Catholic sway. Not only Sunday recreations, but almost every sort of sports, were proscribed even to children. It was sin to be pleased or happy at all, except under suffering, because thereby God was displeased.

It was a heinous sin for a mother to wish to have daughters who had only sons; it was no less a sin to love her sons when she had them. To receive her son into her house after he had been excommunicated by the clergy, was almost a mortal sin. Whoever did it had to humble herself, make confession to the clergy and promise not to do so again, but to aid in bringing him to punishment.

Fathers were taught to smite, and even to *kill* their sons rather than permit them to propagate error. Even scripture example was cited to justify murders so unnatural and horrible. To laugh on any day was sinful. To *smile* on Sunday was positively forbidden.

"When in 1580 King Charles was in Scotland, even he was sharply reprehended by the clergy for laughing on Sunday. It was this probably which led to his opposing Government interference against such superstition and priestly arrogance, as his father had attempted years before.

Even on *week days*, the most *godly* never smiled. Much weeping, especially by ministers when praying and preaching on Sunday, was counted evidence of superabounding godliness. The praying and preaching of such was called "*most savory"* and so was most relished and admired. The bands as well as handkerchiefs of some ministers were "all wet with tears, as though they had been *douked'* before they had done the first prayer, which was great recommendation. They said "Christ did never laugh on earth, that we read of; but often wept."

It was a sin in any Scotch town to hold a market on Saturday or Monday, because both days were near to Sunday. The language of the law was: "it ocoasioneth the travelling of men and horses on the word's day before, which postponeth the Sabbath."

All horse exercise was sinful on Sunday, especially riding on horseback.

To sit idle, even at one's own door, or to walk the streets, or fields, to swim, to shave the beard, to cut the hair, were all pronounced "intolerable violations of the fourth commandment."

The clergy recommended that the magistrate prohibit swimming on any day,; a boy on one occasion having been drowned.

Margaret Brotherstone did water her cabbages on Sunday (*Rail* they are in Scotch,) and had to confess her

sin publicly in the church, and promise to do so no more. Cabbage or no cabbage, no more watering on Sunday.

To sleep in sermon was almost unpardonable; though sermons on Fast, and some oilier set days, were two hours long each, and often two by different ministers at a single uninterrupted service. Even children were sharply rebuked for being sleepy at church.

Haliburton, a most eminent Scotch Divine and author of that day, in a sermon to young people asks—"Have ye not been glad when the Lord's day was over, or at least *when the preaching was done* that ye might get your liberty? Has it not been a burden to you to sit so long in church? Well, this is a great sin; a great sin!" It was a sin on Sunday to even save lives, to rescue drowning sailors from a sinking ship in sight of shore; and a crew of fishermen, in the north of Scotland, were made to do penance for Sabbath-breaking, who had done that very thing. And it was expressly ordained that no man do kiss his wife on Sunday, and no woman her child.

In 1594 Dr. Bound, an English Puritan Divine, wrote a book, claiming that the Sabbath was of divine origin, and that at the resurrection, all laws regulating it were *miraculously* transferred to the first day of the week and made obligatory forever. Dr. Bound inculcated that to do any service-work on the Sabbath, was as great a sin as to kill a man or to commit adultery with a woman; that to throw a quoit was as great a sin on the Lord's day as murder, that to make a feast or dress a wedding dinner was as much a crime, as for a father to take a knife and cut his child's throat; and that to ring more bells than one, on the church, on the Sabbath day, was as great a sin as to commit murder.

This was the demand of an English Divine, but never granted, because the ecclesiastical power was not supreme over the civil magistrate, as in Scotland. But had Dr. Bound possessed the power, how soon would all England have been *bound* also in fetters, merciless as hell!

But you must be tired of these citations. I have produced them (and there are thousands more), that you may see where priestly power runs, and how it riots on even all human affections, unrestrained.

The Sunday as now held, is a horriible nightmare on human society, and what you have just heard, are but the dreams thereby induced. And the diabolical spell is upon us still. It is midnight gloom and darkness on this as well as so many other purely religious and theological dogmas; and like children frightened, the world is afraid to go out in the dark, to see what is the matter, or even to uncover its head. And the clergy, like vulgar housemaids, keep telling their dismal stories, to scare us worse and worse.

And yet we are made to believe we are the most civilized, enlightened, Christian people on the globe. Perhaps we are; but considering the time and the circumstances, it is fearfully little that, we can boast, even over Scotland itself.

To trace the history of the Sabbath institution back to its Hebrew origin, is like pursuing the course of a muddy stream tip through a muddy and tangled jungle, to a source more miry and noxious still.

From Mt. Sinai to Mt. Calvary the histories and authorities are of course all Jewish. From Christ to Constantine, the Sabbath, so far as observed at all, was only held as sacred by those mongrel saints, half Jewish, the other half Paul, Apollos, Cephas or Christ, as they happened to be spiritually born into one school or another,

Constantine the Great, becoming head of the Church, added a heathen demand to its observance, borrowed from his paganism, which, of course, added nothing to its sacredness. His decree commanded—"That on the venerable day of the sun, all judges, all town's people, and all trade's people, should rest while those in the country, including all agricultural laborers, could continue their work as on other days. And from that time it has been called Sunday—if not so christened by Constantine himself, not in commemoration of Christ crucified, risen nor ascended, but in idolatrous observance of the day of the Sun, as for ages before in the Roman Empire.

From Constantine to Martin Luther and the Reformation, the institution has had little history one way or another. My muddy stream seems running underground altogether, through most of that thousand years. It had its observance, but the ruling religion was Catholic, and the day had its place, though not in a manner to involve controversy.

The Reformation had no respect for it: nor was it until the fiery zeal of Puritanism revived its ancient claim that it had very serious consideration as a christian institution, from the destruction of Jerusalem, and the dispersion of the Jews, until the Puritanic period.

What now do truth and justice require that we call our solemn priesthoods, who boast their knowledge of the ways, the works, the word of God?

Many, we know, are regarded by the world as fountains of all wisdom, knowledge, and virtue. If they are so, why do they not tell the truth on this important subject?

I believe it was just exactly such classes as our clergy, intellectually and morally, that Jesus addressed when he pronounced one "fools and blind," and the other "hypocrites, whited sepulchres, serpents, and a generation of vipers, that could not escape the damnation of hell!" But let us call them by no such opprobrious names.

And now my work is done. I know, dear friends' I have taxed terribly your patience (a besetting siu. I fear, of mine); but I desired to acquaint you with this subject as thoroughly as possible, in a single discourse.

It is the heaviest and most merciless bondage, this Sabbath institution, that a usurping priesthood now imposes on a long abused, long-suffering world—especially is this true towards the teeming, toiling, sweltering population, young and old, in every large city and town. It is true everywhere, as freedom is preferable to bondage, truth to falsehood.

Break this one yoke, and priestly domination is no more. With their holy day must go their holy office, their holy book, their holy throne the pulpit, and their holy and reverend selves. And the slaves of their 40,000 spiritual plantations, in this one nation, would rise up, redeemed, regenerated and disenthralled by the spirit of God, by the energy of truth, by the omnipotence of justice, by the genius of universal emancipation.

Cultured Free Thought

"Compulsory Education."

[Substance of an address to the First Independent Society of Toledo, Oct. 1,1871.]

"But, Jove all-bounteous, who, in clouds
En wrapt, the lightning wieldest!
Mayest thou from baneful Ignorance
The race of men deliver!
This, Father, scatter from the soul,
And grant that we the wisdom
May reach, in confidence of which
Thou justly guidest all things.
CLEANTHES, *Hymn to Jupiter*.

"The discipline of our Public Schools, wherein punctuality and regularity are enforced and the pupils are

continually taught to *suppress mere self-will* and inclination, is the best school of morality. Self-control is the basis of all moral virtues, and industrious and studious habits are the highest qualities we can form in our children. A free, self-conscious, self-controlled manhood is to be produced only through universal public education at public cost; and as this is the object of our government, it is proper for our government to provide this means and at the cost of the people."

WILLIAM T. HARRIS. *How Far may the State Provide for the Education of her Children at Public Cost*? An Essay read before the National Educational Association, St. Louis, Aug. 23,1871.

One of the three fundamental principles upon which the Toledo Liberal Alliance was organized last summer is—"Free and universal education to be provided and enforced by the State." This is the essential meaning of what is commonly called' Compulsory education"—a phrase which, as used by enlightened men, is too often misunderstood, and therefore is in some respects an unfortunate one. It is the purpose of the present essay to consider this whole subject in a broad light, and, so far as is possible, to remove some of the misconceptions which now obscure it. One of the "Fifty Affirmations" states that—"The great practical means of Free Religion is the integral, continuous, and universal education of man;" *integral*, as embracing the cultivation of all the powers and capacities of human nature in their due proportions; *continuous*, as never ceasing while life lasts; *universal*, as being extended to all members of the human race. In no other way, I conceive, will it be possible to realize the great end of Free Religion—"the perfection or complete devolopment of man." The subject on which I intend to speak, therefore, is one strictly and peculiarly appropriate to this platform; for I know of no question which better deserves to be called religious, if the true essence of religion is the active effort to develop and perfect humanity in all directions. Only by education can the individual be brought to realize the ideal of personal harmony with the great, universal system of Nature; and only by education can society be brought to realize the ideal of a social system which shall aim first and last at the universal prevalence of such harmony throughout the world. Each for all—all for each; education is the road to this grand consummation of human life.

The most dangerous enemy of republican institutions is *ignorance*. Even crime is a smaller peril. Educated criminals are comparatively rare, and their power for mischief would be slight but for their influence over the uneducated. The great majority of educated men and women are peaceable, orderly, well-behaved citizens; and the occasional Ruloffs are only the exceptions making good the rule. But ignorance is of itself the precursor to crime, and almost the necessitator of it, in a community where the average intelligence is high. All doors to wealth and distinction being shut to the ignorant man, he is doomed by his very ignorance to poverty, and poverty, with its privations and heart-burnings and despairs, drives him too often into crime. In fact, the higher you raise the average of education in any community, the more dangerous and demoralizing you thereby make the influences, of ignorance. Crimes, it is said, are rare among the uncivilized, careless, uniformly ignorant tribes of Africa; they have multiplied with our so-called civilization because our civilization has only reached a part of our people. Wherever you find high civilization and low barbarism co-existent in one place, as in Paris or New York, there you find a very hot bed of crime. The only safety to any social system lies in making the people homogeneous, undivided into classes of wide extremes, and unracked by social jealousies. There is no future for a stratified civilization. If the great law of solidarity is broken, Nature revenges herself in social outbreaks and upheavals. Hence the terrible peril to our republic, if we suffer the gradual formation of a large minority within it who are sunk in poverty and ignorance. We shall doom our government to sure destruction, unless we can discover and apply some means of making our people homogeneous—to a reasonable extent equalized on a high common level of intelligence and competence. Of course there will be disparities; but there must be no despairs.

What more frightful warning could we have had of our growing danger, than the present condition of New York City? The ignorant classes have so multiplied there as to hold supreme political power. Knaves and rogues have fastened upon their natural prey; and the Tammany King is the result. The same fate awaits every other city in America in which the same conditions shall obtain. A mob like that so fortunately put down in New York last July exists in embryo in every town of considerable size throughout the land. This fact, so full of menace to our institutions, is partly due to the great flood of immigration from the Old World, but also in part to our own deficient system of education. What right have we to allow a whole generation of "street Arabs" to grow up in our cities? These boys and girls are American born and bred; but instead of growing up to be worthy American citizens, they are ripening for the penitentiary and the gallows. The roughs and rowdies of the metropolis have been the body-guard of Tweed and Sweeny, Connolly and Hall and their accomplices; but it is the vast mass of uneducated voters of the city, in- nocent of great crimes, that has given them the power. Without the ignorance of the many, the crimes of the few could never have grown to such monstrous and horrible proportions. Let us recognize the fact that it is general ignorance, far more than occasional criminality, that is sapping the foundations of our American commonwealth. Remove the ignorance, and the crimes will be very easy to suppress.

Now our system of free schools is the only weapon we have with which to conquer this gigantic demon of ignorance. It is worth infinitely more than whole armies of policemen and militia-men; for, instead of shooting down rioters and hunting down public peculators, it prevents the development of their crimes by educating the masses into citizens too orderly and intelligent to be made tools. Free and universal education will flank the moral evils that are now invading the republic as the hordes of Huns and Goths and Vandals invaded the Roman Empire. Yet, sad and alarming as is the confession, there is a great and rapidly increasing opposition to our free school system which must be put down, or our future will be black as ink. A recent writer in *Harper's Weekly* has made the following statements:—

No more alarming fact appears in the condition of our city—not even the gross corruption of its rulers and the total decay of public morality—than that its free school system has received a fatal blow. Its children are ceasing to attend school. Each year the usual increase in attendance has been three or four thousand; but since 1868 has scarcely been as many hundred. Population advances, but the number of pupils in the public schools remains nearly unchanged. Should this condition of things continue, it is easy to see that in a few years the system of general education must sink into decay, and wholly fail to supply the basis of intelligence and virtue upon which all free government must rest. To destroy our free schools, and perhaps our free institutions, has been for many years the constant aim of the extreme section of the Romish Church. The Romish Church has become identified with the society of Loyola; the Jesuits rule at Rome; the daring and aggressive spirit of that singular body has found a suitable instrument in the Irish Catholics; the Irish Catholics govern New York. Such is the unhappy condition of our free city that the priestly influence which has been cast off with abhorrence in all foreign lands—except perhaps, in distracted France—has thrown its blight upon the very sources of our advancing intelligence and prosperity. In Italy a vigorous free school system has been introduced in defiance of the intrigues of the priests or the anathemas of the Pope. In Rome itself, beneath the shadow of the Vatican, education is open to all. Spain is slowly imitating Italy. It is scarcely three years since fifteen hundred school-masters, the most valuable and progressive portion of the Austrian population, met in an assembly at Vienna, and demanded from the government the perfect freedom of the public schools. Their request was granted; education was relieved from the intolerable burden of priestly interference; the Pope in vain hurled anathema or allocution against the rising intelligence of the people.

"But while Vienna, Madrid, and Rome have, with signal courage, defied the spiritual and temporal power of their former tyrants, the Irish Catholics, the last adherents of the infallible Pope, have made haste to lay New York at his feet. Of all the great capitals ours is the only one that is priest-ridden. The Jesuits and the Irish appoint our Mayor and Controller, our judges and Police Commissioners, the Board of Aldermen, the Board of Education; and the Results of this Catholic rule have become apparent in such enormous peculation, such a wide system of daring robbery, such a rapid growth of crime, such rulers and such officials, as have scarcely been known in the worst governed capitals of Europe. The poor are ground down by an intolerable taxation; corrupt officials in uncounted numbers plunder the people at will; the Romish Church grasps its full share of the spoil. In Madrid, Rome, and Florence, so recently the centres of priestly intolerance, the indignant people have confiscated the ill-gotten gains of the Church, sold monasteries, convents, Jesuit colleges, and abbey lands, and applied their proceeds to the relief of the embarrassed nation. In New York, within a few years, Romish colleges, and convents, churches, hospitals, and cathedrals, have sprung up startling numbers, and were paid for, either secretly or openly, from the already bankrupt treasury of the city. Already we need a Henry VIII, to break up our monasteries, and may well imitate the example of Italy or Spain.

The power thus nefariously acquired by the Catholics has been steadily and remorselessly directed against our free school system, and with alarming, success, as shown by the relative decrease of attendance in New York. The Catholic papers I read are fall of denunciations of our free schools. They clamor for a division of the school funds, which would be the destruction of the entire school system. They dread the enlargement of knowledge, because it breaks the fetters of ecclesiastical rule. They oppose all schools in which the Catholic religion is not drilled into the children's minds. They anathematize all free thought, as sure to lead to perdition. They oppose all real education and independence of intellect, because these cannot be made subservient to Catholic supremacy. They seek to foster and spread public ignorance, that the Church may gain in America the power it had in the Dark Ages, but is losing in Europe day by day.

Now this assault by the Catholics on our free schools, which are almost secular in character, is blindly seconded by most of our Protestant sects. They insist on retaining the Bible in the schools, and have nearly as great a horror of strictly secular education as the Catholics. Even the *Christian Union*, the organ of Henry Ward Beecher, who is surely as liberal an Evangelical preacher as can well be found, thus denounces the exclusion of religious exercises from our colleges:—"If, to avoid offending the Christian denominations, it be necessary thus to minify or dismiss spiritual culture from our higher schools, it were better that each church endow its own school, build high walls, raise its flag bravely, cease to apologize for, and begin to inculcate religion. Colleges that are stridulously sectarian were a less evil than colleges without piety and without God." When the most

liberal of Protestants is thus found echoing the Catholic cry against secular education, what clear mind can resist the conclusion that such education is opposed by the very genius of Christianity itself, and that the secular system of instruction, the only possible system that can be really free, must depend for its defence at last upon those who have practically ceased to be governed by Christianity? I cannot help seeing that the issue is slowly making up between Christianity and ignorance, on the one hand, and Free Religion and knowledge on the other. Men may think me wild and fanatical and absurd in coming to this conclusion but not many years hence I believe that thousands upon thousands will agree with me in it. The great battle between free, universal education and the Catholic Church is growing every day more and more imminent; and it will cleave the Protestants into two distinct parties. One portion must side with the Catholics against our free schools, the other with us in defence of them.

Ignorance, then, is the great foe of republican institutions; and Christianity, whether Catholic or Protestant, is on its side. All that are free and freedom-loving in this nation, all that are in favor of republican principles and republican goverment, will be called to battle with this terrible enemy as never before. Nay, the hour has already come; and if we would not be surrounded and captured, we must grapple the foe to-day. What shall be our tactics—what the plan of our campaign in defence of a commonwealth based on freedom and knowledge and virtue?

The remedy for misgovernment by ignorance proposed by many radicals is the limitation of suffrage by an educational qualification. "Let no one vote who cannot read and write, and let us thus preserve the nation from the vast wave of ignorance that is about to break over it." I am sorry to see that even so able and clear a thinker as Mr. Conway joins in this demand:—"Democracy in America has shown itself to have been the effort of society to pass from an arbitrary to a natural classification. No sooner has the last vestige of the unreal aristocracy disappeared with the slaveholding class, than Radicalism starts forward with the demand for an educational qualification in the suffrage. To demand that every voter shall be able to read is little; but when readers alone are electors, the standard must ascend." [*The Earthward Pilgrimage* p. 393.] If I rightly understand this passage, Mr. Conway favors the reading-and-writing condition of suffrage—not as sufficient, it is true, but as at least advisable so far as it goes.

On the contrary, I consider this supposed demand of "Radicalism" as a very great and dangerous error. I have several reasons.

1. The educational test cures nothing. It does not abolish the great evil of ignorance, or even tend to abolish it. It rather tends to perpetuate it, for no disfranchised class is properly cared for or edu- cated by a dominant class. So long as the ignorance of the masses visibly endangers life and property and the stability of society, as is the case so long as ignorance votes, vast efforts will be made to educate ignorance. But deprive it of all political power, and it will be left to its own devices, to grow more and more ignorant and wretched still. The educational test would have the effect of leaving the cancer to grow unchecked in the body politic until death or violent revolution should become inevitable. The danger of having a disfranchised class in the community is enormous; and it is a great mistake to suppose that the desire of voting would be a sufficient motive to induce the ignorant voters in our cities to learn to read and write. Once having been enfranchised, they would now be embittered and exasperated by subsequent disfranchisement; and a large body of politically discontented people in any community is most perilous to its peace. The limitation of suffrage would not cure the evil of ignorance. At most this would only confine it for a season, oblivious of the certainty of its ultimately wreaking a dreadful revenge for its temporary repression. What is wanted is a radical cure, not a momentary and shallow expedient.

2. The knowledge of mere reading and writing, even if made a condition of suffrage, would not secure us from ignorant suffrage. Millions of ignorant people can read and write, while not a few intelligent people cannot. No conceivable test of intelligence would exclude ignorant voters from the polls, unless you should make it so stringent a one as to exclude a very large *per cent*. of the population—an evil even greater than that which now exists. The impracticability of applying the reading-and writing test in any fair or efficient manner does but enhance the difficulty.

3. The "Radicalism" which fails to perceive that this country is irrevocably pledged and committed to strictly universal suffrage (including woman suffrage in the near future) is not worthy of the name. This country is destined to be ruled by the whole people, and we may as well recognize the fact early as late. Revolutions do not often go back; and to expect a voluntary surrender of political power by any portion of the population is preposterous. Who will be the Sir Archibald Bell-the-Cat to attempt to disfranchise the Irish voters of New York city? All speculations and propositions to limit suffrage in any way beyond its existing limitations are utterly visionary. The tendency is all the other way, and ought to be. Women must vote before very long; and the talk about an educational qualification for the ballot either for men or women is wasted breath. Not thus can the perils to our political future from wide-spread ignorance be averted.

4. All people, in fine, who conduct themselves as well-behaved citizens, whether ignorant or not, have a *right* to a voice in the country's government. The virtuous have no inherent right to govern the vicious, nor the

educated the ignorant; so long as the vicious or the ignorant keep out of jail, they have a right to a share in the government, and we must make the best of it. The injustice of usurpation is a very poor remedy for the evil of ignorance. Those who can read and write are not a divinely constituted aristocracy to govern the rest of mankind. Criminals who break the laws may be disfranchised as a penalty; but the worst criminals frequently escape all punishment, because they cannot be caught or proved guilty. Yet a test of character would be far less unjust than a test of intelligence, as a condition of suffrage. Neither, however, would be just; and we must make up our minds to universal suffrage as the people's right, and therefore as a fixed fact for all time. The strongest argument against the educational condition is its intrinsic injustice; and the next strongest is the absolute impossibility of establishing it.

No—the remedy for the public evils of popular ignorance lies in an entirely different direction. Political power must, by natural justice and the logic of American ideas, be diffused throughout the whole people; but the safeguard against the great perils of its abuse must be sought in universal education. The whole people must be raised to such a level of intelligence that they shall use their power wisely. Suffrage must be universal; but EDUCATION MUST AT ALL COSTS BE MADE AS UNIVERSAL AS SUFFRAGE. Whatever stands in the way of universal education, whether private caprice and selfishness and stupidity or organized hostility from foreign excrescences on our civilization, must be trampled under foot. If the Catholic Church, or the Protestant Church, or both combined, get in the way of the free, universal education of the American people, so much the worse for them. Such opposition is the worst possible treason against the Great Re-public; and whether it attempts to justify itself by the authority of the Church or Bible,—whether it makes its assault in the name of God or man,—it must be put down as sternly as the Slaveholders' Rebellion was put down. And it will be. Once convince the people that they must fairly choose between Christianity and Freedom, between the Church and Education, and the issue is fore-ordained by the nature of things. The contest may be long and sharp; but the result is sure. This continent is sacred to Liberty, to Knowledge, to Virtue; and they will triumph over all their foes.

It may seem that I have had very little to say about "compulsory education" thus far. But I could not really treat the subject till I had dwelt on the great evil of ignorance that threatens us, and the absolute necessity of applying at all hazards an adequate remedy to it. It is popular ignorance that necessitates universal education; and the promised panacea for the mischiefs of ignorant government which is now in high favor with some liberals, namely, limitation of suffrage by an educational qualification, needed first of all to be exposed, it is a quack medicine which has been hastily and unwisely recommended by some of our noblest and best thinkers. What is wanted is not medicine, but hygiene—the knowledge and practice of the laws of national health. The evils of wide-spread ignorance cannot be got rid of by excommunicating the ignorant, but by educating them. Let us have no new aristocracy of brain—no new "divine right" of the cultivated to rule the uncultivated. Instead of this, let us have such a system of education as shall ensure to all but born idiots a degree of cultivation sufficient to make it safe to trust them with the ballot. The experiment of strictly universal suffrage has got to be tried fully on this continent; it is idle vaporing to talk of limiting suffrage now. Let us face the difficulty like men, and, banishing forever all dreams of an educational qualification, abolish all necessity for such a qualification by ensuring the universality of education.

It is no novelty to advocate "compulsory education." Prussia has long practised it—with what results can be learned from Sadowa and Sedan. New Hampshire has passed a "compulsory education" law which requires that every parent or guardian shall send his child to school twelve weeks in the year, six of which must be continuous, under penalty of a fine of $10 or $20. Michigan also has passed a somewhat similar law. The Republicans in California have made the following a "plank" of their platform:—"The safety and perpetuity of Republican institutions depend mainly upon popular education and intelligence. We therefore approve and recommend a common school system that shall not only extend its benefits to all, but which shall be compulsory upon all, and we are inflexibly opposed to any application of the public moneys with any reference to the distinctions in religious creeds." How many other States may have adopted the same policy, I do not know. In at least one very important respect, I regard the New Hampshire law as crude and unwise; and I shall presently propose an improvement. But that a strong sentiment is growing up in this country, as well as in Europe, since the marvellous triumphs of Germany, in favor of "compulsory education," is very plain. It is the most hopeful sign in American politics, for it shows that the quick intelligence of the American people leaps to the only sound solution of the problem of ignorant misrule.

The objection to the "compulsory education" in the minds of many liberals grows out of a theory of government which limits all governmental powers to the *direct* protection of life and property. Herbert Spencer holds this theory. But the same foresight which prompts a government to prevent the outbreak of a threatened riot, instead of waiting to quell it afterwards, should prompt it to forestall ignorance, the cause of all riots. Prevention is the best sort of protection. Here in the United States, according to the last census, are *five millions of children, of school age, who never attend school*. Is there no danger revealed in this fact? What are we about,

to leave such a monstrous peril unprovided against? If the nation has itself a right to "life," it must have the right to save its life by timely precautions against this multiplying and magnifying ignorance. Prof. Huxley, in a recent address at Birmingham, set aside the narrow theory of Herbert Spencer by repudiating "the idea of the functions of a government being confined to those of a protective constabulary." "Even accepting the proposition that the functions of the State might be all summed up in one great negative commandment—'Thou shalt not allow any man to interfere with the liberty of any other man,' Prof. Huxley said he was unable to see that the consequence was any such restriction as its supporters implied. If his next door neighbor chose to have his drains in such a state as to create a poisonous atmosphere which he breathed at the risk of typhus and dyphtheria. it was just as much a restriction on his just freedom to live as if his life was threatened with a pistol. If his neighbor were allowed to let his children go unvaccinated, he might just as well be allowed to leave strychnine lozenges about in the way of his (Prof Huxley's) children. And if his neighbor brought up his children untaught and untrained to earn their living, he was doing his best to restrict his (the lecturer's) freedom by increasing the burden of taxation for the support of gaols and work-houses for which he had to pay."

In short, it needs only to be made apparent that no State can permanently live which permits any large proportion of its people to grow up in ignorance, in order to convince us that the right to educate its citizens is part of the State's right to protect itself from subversion. There can be no free State without universal suffrage; and there can be no universal suffrage without universal education. That is the whole argument I would urge, put into a nutshell.

But the phrase "compulsory education" is very unfortunate. It misleads. It puts the whole subject in a wrong light. The correction of the error out of which this phrase sprang will do much to remove the popular repugnance to the securing of really universal education.

It was the conception of the ancient Roman law, from which modern law has been in a large meas- ure derived, that a father's right over his child (*patria potestas*) was absolute, even including power of life and death. This idea is at the bottom of the objection to "compulsory education." though of course greatly modified. The proposition that the child has a *right to he educated which no parent has a right to infringe or violate*, has probably never occurred to many people. Yet this is one of the propositions by which I ascribe to the State the duty of enforcing universal education. Children have rights as truly as their parents—none the less so because they neither know them nor know how to maintain them. There is need of a "children's rights movement," quite as much as of a "women's rights movement;" and it is the movement in behalf of universal education. The old tyranny of parents over their children, which has nothing to do with the enforcement of a just authority used for the children's good, but only consists in perverting this authority to the children's harm, should be abolished.

The reason why the phrase "compulsory education" offends the American ear is because it suggests the idea of *compelling* parents to relinquish a power they are justly entitled to. The moment it is seen that *parents have no right to withhold education from their children*,—no more right to starve their minds than their bodies,—it becomes plain that the enforcement by the State of universal education is not *compulsion of the parent; but protection of the child*. If any parent violates the child's right to be educated—his right to a fair chance in life—his right to enter on a career which shall not have the jail as its fore-ordained terminus,—then the State has as much right to compel respect for this as for any other violated right. Such a parent is a CRIMINAL. Mr. A. J. Mundella, M. P., of Sheffield, England, says that experience has taught him that "where the education of children is wholly dependent upon the parents, the selfishness, indifference, or intemperate habits of many will cause a considerable number to be entirely neglected or only partially educated." This sentence strikes the nail on the head. Thousands of parents keep their children from school for the sake of utilizing their labor, even of making money out of them at the expense of all their subse- quent happiness in life. But a parent has no right to make a drudge out of his child for his own private advantage. It is his business to support the child till the child has at least received the elements of an education. Nature does not devolve on young children the support of their parents. I repeat it, the parent who so abuses his authority over his child is neither more nor less than a criminal; and he ought to be "compelled" to cease his crime. Let the whole subject be looked at from the side of the child as well as from the side of the parent, and nothing could be clearer than that the State is bound to ensure education to each and every child born into its jurisdiction. Life, liberty, and education—these are the primal rights of man. Let us amend the Declaration of Independence accordingly.

No less has the State a right to secure educated citizens, since ignorance on part of the citizens is death to the State. If the State has a right to exist, it has a right to make sure the conditions of existence. I will not dwell further on this point, having already said enough; but no right views on this subject can be taken which do not contemplate it from the side of the children, on the one hand, and of the State, on the other. The right of every child to be educated, and the right of the State to secure the education of all its citizens,—these are the two pillars on which rests the whole theory of universal or "compulsory" education. In one sense, all education is "compulsory," since no child will work or study if he can play instead; and whoever sends his child to school at all enforces "compulsory education" in this sense. In fact, this is the only proper sense of the word

"compulsory" in this connection; for I scout the idea that it is "compulsion" to guarantee to children their native right to be educated. I would "compel" the parents to respect this right only as I would compel a thief to restore the property he has stolen.

One point, however, of great importance remains to be touched upon; and I have never yet seen it mentioned. It is this. While the theory I advocate would oblige the State to furnish, free of all cost to the parent, opportunities for the best possible education for the child, and thus make it impossible for any one to plead poverty as an excuse for keeping his child from school, I should not approve a requisition that all the children should be obliged to attend the public schools. Make, if you can, the public schools so good that the parents shall use them by preference. But it is the parent's prerogative to choose the mode and means of educating his child. If he prefers to educate him in a private school, or at home, the State has no right to compel him to adopt a different method. All the State has a right to require is the *fact* of education. Provided the parent does not deprive the child of education itself, he has a right to follow his own judgment in determining the manner of it. I think that a clear understanding on this point would obviate many objections to enforced universal education.

As a consequence of this view of the matter, I would suggest the propriety of establishing STATED PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS for all children, under the auspices of the best citizens of each locality, instead of requiring their attendance at the public schools. If a child can pass a good examination in the various branches announced beforehand by public authority, that fact should be enough; he should not be obliged to bring any certificate of attendance at any particular school. If he fails to pass a good examination, let the reason be inquired into, and if no good one can be given, *then* let the child be required to attend the public schools, and the delinquent parent be fined. Some such system as this, I am satisfied, will be eventually adopted, as the best way to secure at the same time the best possible education of the children and the largest possible liberty of the parents. The strict Prussian system can never be imitated in America; larger concessions must be made to individuality of choice. But the result desired—the assurance of universal intelligence—must and will be attained in the United States. As thus explained, I believe that the entire future of this country hinges on the adoption of the system of universal or "compulsory" education; and every lover of freedom, knowledge, and virtue will do his part towards hastening the day of its complete establishment.

The Present Heaven.

A Discourse; by O. B. Frothingham.

The Kingdom of God is among you.

LUKE XVII. 21.

The verse I have taken as ray text is translated in our common Bible—"The Kingdom of God is within you." Either rendering is correct, but the one I give is more significant than the other. To say—" the Kingdom of God is *within* you"—is to say that heaven, whenever or wherever it may be, is a state of *mind* "and not a state of *things* It does not say *when* heaven may be, or in what *sphere* it may be, but merely *what* it may be. It does not say that heaven is not to be looked for a thousand years hence, or in the planet Herschel; but simply that it is in the breast. But to say—" The Kingdom of God is *among* you "—is to say that heaven is here and now; actually present. Jesus says: "You need not be on the lookout for the kingdom. Here it is." *He* was the kingdom. When one child of the kingdom is present, the kingdom is present. He has the kingdom in himself. He is the soul of it. We are very sure that *he* was heaven to the Magdalene out of whom he cast the devils. When Jesus sends out his disciples, he bids them announce, not some future heaven, but an immediate heaven. 4 As ye go, preach, saying, 'The kingdom of heaven is at hand.' If they will not receive you, go out into the streets and say, 'the very dust from your city we shake from our feet.' Nevertheless be *ye* sure of this, ye evil ones and wicked, that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you." And yet more significantly to the same point, talking to Nicodemus about the kingdom, he said—" No one knows anything about the kingdom of heaven but the Son of Man who *is in heaven"* The Son of Man who *is in heaven!* As much as saying—"In heaven the true man always is. For the Son of Man is the genuine man."

Here is a thought that has not had justice done to it either by critic or preacher. The burden of teaching is now, as it has been for two thousand years, and on the authority of Jesus too, that heaven is to be looked for one of these days; that the present state of things, so far from being heavenly, is much nearer the reverse. If this were a mere matter of sentiment or opinion, it might not be of much consequence; but it is a matter of *belief,* and that is of a great deal of moment. These words of Jesus contain one of the most vital ideas that he ever put forth: one of the most original and profound. It is an idea that goes deep down into our common life. Let us try "this morning to get into it.

There are two stubborn delusions in regard to heaven which it is quite necessary that we should outgrow.

The first is that it is in SPACE.

The second is that it is in TIME.

If we could scatter these two delusions, our way would be clear to a truth of inexhaustible richness and force. In the first place, we must hunt heaven out of Space. For until we do, we shall feel under the necessity of going away from where we are to get into it, and of putting all actual existence under the ban. Is it outside of this world (it is always supposed to be); is it up in the air; is it always off in some starry sphere; is it beyond the sun? Then to get there, we must put away our work, drop our tools, break away from our wives and children, say good by to our friends, throw off our bodies, and take flight through the atmosphere, in which we have never learned to breathe. See what this comes to. In order to reach heaven we must abandon everything we know and love—opportunity, privilege, humanity, whatever for the present makes us men and women. And as heaven is a state to be desired, we must wish to do this; we must long, as the apostle did, "to depart and be with Christ." We must feel but a half-interest in our work, and must go through life as pilgrims bound for some distant Mecca or Jerusalem.

Nor is this all. The anticipation of a heaven in another planet will, in almost all cases, involve the idea, that by going to another planet we shall get into heaven; the idea that Death is going to effect the change that makes us happy; that the mere circumstance of physical dissolution will operate an essential change of being—a notion as disastrous to all moral earnestness, as it is absurd in the light of reason. Heaven, whatever else it be, must be a state of Mind. The Mind is the Man. The mind thinks, feels, is conscious; the mind creates the place and the hour; makes the earth a garden or a prison, the moment a paradise or purgatory. To dream that the Mind may be left out of account in this great affair of getting into heaven, to dream that a rearrangement of dust-particles is going to be any substitute for a reconstruction of thought, is about as melancholy a superstition as can be entertained. And yet this superstition haunts all who fancy heaven to, be a place. They catch themselves thinking that the laws of space have something to do with it. That it is a case of chemistry or gravitation. And so the anxiety about it centres in the process by which we escape from this world, not in the relations under which we *live in it*. And what utter hollowness proceeds from this! For if anything in the world be absolutely certain, it is that "we mysteriously carry our own circumference" with us. For who can quit his own centre, or escape the point of view which belongs to his own identity? He who is not with God already can

by no path of space find the least approach; in vain would you lend him the wing of an angel or the speed of light; in vain plant him here or there, on this side of death or that: he is in the outer darkness still, having the inner blindness which would leave him in pitchy night, though, like the angel of the Apocalypse, he were 41 standing in the Sun."

But if heaven be not There, it is not anywhere but where we are. If it be not in a distant star, we are driven to the conclusion that it is on this very spot of ground, in this rocky wilderness where a stone is our pillow; in this house where our children are laughing and crying; in these stores and offices and banks where we buy and sell and exchange money; in these factories where we mix conscience with cotton and woollen and india-rubber and paper and what-not in the manufacture of goods, or evils it may be, for the market.

Let us away, then, with this talk about "going to heaven," and in place of it put other talk about standing in heaven, or living in heaven. The substitution of the one phrase for the other would effect a revolution in life.

But there is another delusion quite as obstinate and quite as mischievous as this I have noticed. It is the delusion that heaven is somewhere else in Time; that it was in Eden, or is to be in the Millennium; that it was a good time past, or is to be a good time coming. Some look back and say—"There was the golden clime; there were the happy people; there were the ages of peace and plenty; how blessed the human lot then! When the angels moved about, and God revealed himself, and the very dust was made holy by the tread of divine feet! When men and women lived simple lives of innocence; and poverty was not, nor pain, nor disease, nor the ceaseless struggle with evil that we have; when men lived their lives out and then fell asleep." Others look forward and say—"Oh! when will the time come, that better day predicted by prophets; dreamed of by poets; promised by preachers? When the night shall have passed, and the struggle shall be over, and the rest shall come!" They count the years; they go over and over again the sacred numbers of the Apocalypse, and fix the date of the coming kingdom, and school themselves in patience until the hour of advent shall strike.

Delusion mischievous and foolish! Mischievous: for while on the one side we deplore a heaven lost, and on the other side long for a heaven not won, what becomes of the instant day and its work? Regrets and yearnings are but wasters of existence. We are so much the weaker as we indulge in them. The utmost concentration is none too much for our immediate needs. The sun-beam must be brought to a focus to make a blaze. But if one portion of our desire is flying off backward, and another portion is flying off forward, there will not be enough in the middle to save us from evaporation. Few men have power in excess of their day. It is only by husbanding all they can get together, that the average men have power sufficient for their day. Yesterday must be yesterday; and to-morrow, to-morrow. And the wall that cuts us off from either must be set up strong and high, if they are draining us of our life.

But see how *foolish* the delusion is. If these people who believe that heaven was in the Past or will be in the Future could go just as they are *into* the Past or *into* the Future, they would find no more heaven there than they find in the present moment. The Garden of Even would be a poor place, sadly needing the landscape artist; no hard roads nor pleasant rambles; no tender grassy lawns nor delicious arbors nor choice shrubbery; rather stingy of fruits and very lonely; an uncultivated forest, where the animals were much too familiar for comfort.

They would find the people in old Jerusalem very much like the people in modern Damascus, as unaware that they had a prophet among them as we should be to day, were a Savior to come and put up at one of our hotels. They would hear the Baptist shouting his "Repent ye! in the Wilderness, and would think Herod quite right in sending his police to watch him and putting him under arrest as a disturber of the peace. They would see a crowd gathered about a teacher in the court of the temple, or in the public street, a crowd of poor people mostly, idlers, country folks who happened to be in town; and joining them would see a young Hebrew enthusiast, with long hair and black, burning eye, discussing the great political question of the day—the probable speedy approach of the kingdom. They would probably see nothing extraordinary about him; would have no eye for his divinity, and no ear for his humanity; and, when he cried, "Hark! do you not hear the heavenly voice speaking to me?" would have said, "Poor man, it was nothing but a peal of thunder. A shower is coming up; we had better be going home. Besides, the police are about; there may be trouble with these ignorant people." Yet that may have been one of the moments in the Christ's experience that now are regarded as divine spots in history.

Let these same repiners over a lost bliss chance to pass by the shop in the narrow street where Paul sat making his tent-cloth. It might be at the very moment when the apostle was having one of his visions, did not know whether he was in the body or out of it, but at all events was in the seventh heaven. What would they see? A man past middle age, roughly clad, with his canvas and the tools of his craft about him, sitting all the forenoon, patiently at work. The incident would not be worth noting in the diary of his dullest day. Yet that moment was one of Christendom's birth hours.

Or give these bewailers of life's barrenness the power to transport themselves into the Future, is there any reason for thinking they would find any more heaven in the Millennium than they found in Eden, or Jerusalem, or Tarsus? Why should they? The grumbler would be still the grumbler. The eye would see no more than it did

before; the ear would hear no more. "Is this all?" they would say.

We are compelled, then, to announce a *present* heaven or none. "The Kingdom of God is among you," is still the cry. "The Son of Man is in heaven," is the word of the hour. Why not? Can anything be more self-evident? Where shall we find the materials out of which to make heaven, if not here? Here at any rate is all there is. Can the stuff whereof the world is made be improved? Is not water satisfactory, and air, and light? What could be more perfect than the constitution of the material universe? What more wonderful than the properties of nature? What more exquisite than the adaptation of means to ends, and the fitness of one thing to another? What more admirable than the laws which govern the atoms and the gasses? The infinite Wisdom enacted them; the infinite Power executes them; the infinite Love animates them. What can there be that is not now? Will God ever love us more than he does at this moment? Will his love ever find better expression? What would we have? Beauty? The world is full of it. Opportunity? There is nothing else. The world is crowded with the elements of happiness. If heaven means rest, here is the divine bosom to rest on—just as warm and tender and broad as it ever was or ever will be. If heaven means action, we are solicited on all sides to engage in it. Do we live in our affections? Here are parents and kindred, wife and children, friends and lovers, people who need us and people whom we need. The heart need not complain of lacking food here; if it does, it will lack it anywhere. There is nothing else in all the universe that can make it happy, but just what it has now. Do we look for something better than friendship; better than parental, filial, or brotherly love? We live in our consciences perhaps; I am sure they have enough to do, and of the very work that interests, engrosses, absorbs, delights, inspires, ennobles. Here is work every day for the gods. Some evil to remedy, some wrong to right, some error to correct, some harm to remove, some good to accomplish, some truth to plead, some nobleness to defend, some cause to advocate, some fine fellowship to join, some triumph to share, some battle to distinguish ourselves in. Why, we may stand in imagination any day, if we will, by the side of those men and women who are the glories of the race, whom all are praising:, or of whom all are confessing the power. Is anything grander than personal worth and dignity? Is anything more celestial than the spotless conscience and the blameless heart? Is anything more beautifying than human esteem, veneration, and love? Is anything more transporting than the sense of communion with those who are nobly influencing public opinion, who are strengthening the bonds of justice, who are augmenting the sum of honorable principle in the community, or who are redeeming the miserable from their misery, the infamous from their infamy? If there be any celestial angels anywhere, they are such as these, and we may have these here as well as elsewhere.

I don't believe the pure-hearted will find anything heavenlier in heaven than they may find here. The peace and quiet that they feel is the best that God has to give; the consciousness of being at amity with all men, of having no enemies, is something the angels cannot improve upon; the qualities of gratitude, of trust, of patience, of confidence, of joy in all that befals, of delight in sympathy, and of rest in solitude are the only qualities of this kind that there are. Seraphs have no others, and will have no others when they are in the very light of the throne. But these qualities may be ours now, just as easily as theirs; just as easily as they will ever be Ours The happiness they confer on them may just as well be conferred on us. For it comes as naturally and certainly when they are present as color and perfume come to the flowers when they open their blossoms to the sunbeams.

Let heaven *come in*, and you will never say that it is far off. It will come in at the door or window, or through a crevice if these are shut. Be reasonable, and it will come in at the gate of good sense. It will come in the feeling of contentment; in the absence of fret and worry; in the kindly allowance for people who make mischief; in the still long-suffering that keeps the heart calm, and the rational wisdom that sees how one thing balances another, and how all things work together. Reasonable people are in heaven in proportion as they are reasonable. Why do the countenances of Quakers wear that expression of calm serenity that is distinguishable wherever you see them? Why are their eyes so dove-like, their voices so soft, their mien so imperturbable? It is because they have schooled themselves to reasonable expectations. They do not expect to find swans in every' puddle, or peaches on every bramble bush, saints in all church-people or angels in all gentle folks.

Heaven will come in through the live senses, will rush in through the pores of the skin, if we will suffer it. What more celestial than the hours of a perfect health, when existence is a boon, and life is a feast; when the light paints every thing with beauty, and the air as we breath it is a perpetual elixir; when the nervous system responds to the influence of the morning and evening; when sleep is light and pleasant, and the food nourishes, and exercise exhilarates; when the golden bowl is full of ruddy drops, and the silver chain that holds it suspended is firm and bright in every link, and we are unconscious of muscle and tissue and nerve, so ready is each to perform its part, and so quick is each to respond to the breezy call of life which thrills the frame with its summons to live and enjoy! We may make a *hell* in our bodies, if we will; but if we go out of this world ignorant of the heaven we may have in them, we shall lose some- thing which Paradise will make no amends for. The idea of getting rid of one's body in order to go to heaven! I can understand why some should entertain it whose bodies have inherited the curse of some ancestor's fall, and for whom there is no natural rescue to be

had through air, light, food, climate, and exercise. But how anybody should entertain the idea whose body is in respectable health I cannot understand; for such, if they do not poison themselves with drink or weaken themselves by excesses, or exhaust themselves by over-work or over-play, may remain where they are and need no heavenly messenger to tell them what blessedness means.

Man is all symmetry,
Full of proportions one thing to another,
And all to all the world besides,
Each part may call the farthest brother,
For head with foot hath private amity,
And both with moons and tides.

Nothing hath got so far
But man hath caught and kept it as his prey.
His eyes dismount the highest star,
He is in little all the sphere:
Herbs gladly cure our flesh, because that they
Find their acquaintance there.

For us the winds do blow,
The earth doth move, heaven rest and fountains flow;
Nothing we see but means our good,
As our delight or as our treasure:
The whole is cither our cupboard of food
Or cabinet of pleasure.

More servants wait on man
Than he'll take notice of: in every path
He treads down that which both befriend him
When sickness makes him pale and wan.
Oh, mighty Love! Man is one world, and hath
Another to attend him.

If an Episcopal priest could write thus two hundred years ago, we ought to be able, at least, to echo his words.

What then is wanting to make us feel that the Kingdom of Heaven is among us? A better organ- ized society? A better regulated state? More order and harmony in human relations and interests? But wherever and whenever heaven may be, it must involve society, and society always involves imperfection and the necessity for curing it. It involves social trust, responsibility, effort. Give the *certainty* that improvement is possible; give the hope that it is coming; give the glad courage to work for it, and you give all the conditions for realizing a state of heavenliness in it. They who fancy heaven to be a state in which there is nothing to *do*, but everything to *enjoy*; no victory to get, but only garlands to wear,—must be people who have never learned how tiresome enjoyment is. The hardest thing to bear long is joy. Men can more easily bear work for years than play for weeks. The heavenliness of existence consists in brave, hopeful effort to gain something to make the world happier. An hour of that will glorify, will make the heart almost leap out of the bosom to get room enough to beat, in.

Now this satisfaction is offered to us, as it never was to people on earth before. Society is in better condition than it ever was. Bad enough no doubt—bad enough to need all the mending it can get; bad enough to give wholesome exercise to all who are disposed to make it better. Faith, hope, and charity have a capital field for practice. Manly and womanly devotion have a brave school. Enthusiasm for humanity may give itself full swing; aspiration may have its transfiguring Mounts in every street. But we know that the world is

—we are sure it is *improving;* we are clear as to the way in which the improvement may be *effected*. We hold the position of advantage, and are confident of victory. We have all the splendid excitement of battle undimmed by the fear of defeat. We have the celestial glow that comes with the consciousness that in one way or in another we are making a contribution to human welfare—are doing what God does all the time, and is God-like in doing. We have all this, whoever we are who have live hearts in our bosoms; and who can long for heaven that has this? "Here we are, and if we will tarry a little, we may come to learn that all is best. Let us see to it only that *we* are here, and art and nature, hope and fate, friends, angels, and the Supreme Being shall not be absent from the chamber where we sit. The Jerseys were handsome ground enough for Washington to tread, and London streets for the feet of Milton."

The world looked dark and evil on the bright autumn morning when John Brown was led out to die. A deed of heroism had seemed to fail; an enterprise for humanity had been thwarted. The old curse was apparently newly and more desperately riveted on the soil. But John Brown, as he mounted the cart that bore him to the scaffold, saw something else; his eye took in the sunshine and measured the landscape; his prophetic glances beheld the sunshine that was streaming down from other skies, and measured the circle of a larger horizon than was bounded by the Virginia hills. As he lifted the black child in his arms and kissed it, he was sure that all her race would receive the white man's blessing. And he caught the glimmer of the distant day when on that very soil the negro should be lifted up by white men's hands. He had fought his fight and was ready to be offered. The old man is not more truly in heaven now than he was in that moment.

The question is not. *what do we see*? but, what do we see with? It is easy to feel that the Kingdom of Heaven is away off; but it is as easy to feel that it is *among us*.

There was much agitation of mind somewhile since on account of the liberation of Mr. Davis, and the way in which it was effected. The facts were all known through the papers; the agitation centred in the judgment on the facts, and that judgment differed so, that while to one set of people the pillars of equity seemed to be giving away and the guarantees of law vanishing, to another set of people the majestic reign of nobleness seemed to be coming in. One said, Chaos is imminent;" and another said, "The Kingdom is at hand." One said treason had been pronounced no crime, and henceforth they who choose to make war against their country may do it with impunity. The other said, "Treason is brought under the cognizance of law, and where the authority of simple law is recognized, treason becomes impossible." One said: "The bailing of Mr. Davis shows a good nature that was little short of criminal in view of the terrible nature of his guilt, and the possible consequences of his immunity." The other said: "The bailing of Mr. Davis showed a generous desire that the government should be simply just—should postpone the *punishment* of a man till he had been tried, and if it was not ready to try him, should release him under pledges until it was." The one said: "So Mr. Davis gets no punishment, and neither justice nor law is satisfied." The other said: "He has already received the punishment of complete and humiliating overthrow; the punishment of an utter defeat, not only of his immediate enterprise, but of his life long purpose and hope; the punishment of popular indifference and public scorn, to a proud man most terrible of any; the punishment of broken health and ruined fortunes, the punishment of knowing that his own slaves will be his masters and will have more political influence than he; the punishment of dragging out the rest of his existence in the obscurity and disgrace that await the defeated; possibly also in the sorrow and remorse that await the guilty, the punishment inflicted upon him by the contemptuous magnanimity of a great people who, having crushed his principle, care nothing about his person, and by the lofty moral sense of all civilized mankind, whose eyes are now fully opened to the stupendousness of his blunders. Even in New York he excites no interest. It was worth while to let him go, if only to prove how dead he was *here*—how corpse-like he could be in his hotel; how completely the waves and billows have gone over him."

In dream I saw a traitor throned; and lo!
Beneath his throne there grew a grievous pit,
That yawning slowly 'gan engulphing it;
All trembling then the sceptred imp cried—" Ho!
Give help!" An army flew and from that woe
Redeeming, set him on a marble plain;
But see! the marble yields! then help was vain;
He sinks, and vengeful floods around him flow;
Then up an Alp they bear him, plant him high
And boast—" Thy throne this granite will uphold,
And make thee king, companion of the sky;
Making the splendors with the morning gold."

The craig's a crater's throat while yet they cry,
And the stern fates their lawful prey enfold.

To such as Mr. Davis the freedom of the earth is simply the freedom of hell; the longer his tether, the wider his perdition; the freer his range, the more multiplied his dangers; compared with his present state, his condition in Fortress Monroe was one of safety and ease. If it is courage that lets him go; if it is self-reliance; if it is confidence in law and principle; if it is the cool magnanimity of power; if it is the subsidence of malignity and revenge: if it is faith that the last result of the civil war will be best secured by the full development of all the agencies of peace; if it-be the conviction that society is sufficiently well organized to rely on its intelligence and its equity for its protection—then we may surely say: "The Kingdom of Heaven is among us," for of all the evidences of the kingdom's presence, none are so conclusive as these, and it is just as easy to believe that the action of last week was due to these great causes as to the mean ones which so many see at work in the business.

Is it said that the power to see the Kingdom of God among us depends on the *disposition* to see it, and that the disposition is not given to all? Of *course* it depends on the disposition, and must always depend on it; will depend on it a thousand years hence as much as now; will depend on it in the Millennium as much as now. You have heard the parable of the excellent but fastidious and exclusive gentleman who, being ushered into heaven, stopped short on the threshold, snuffed the air loftily, and remarked that he was surprised at witnessing so promiscuous an assemblage.

But if the disposition in question be *necessary*, why not get it now? It is as easy to be grateful today as it will be any time; it is as easy to be brave and earnest; it is as easy to be kind and humane; it is as easy to he loyal; it is as easy to be trusting and hopeful; as easy to be believing, is it not? Is there any lack of occasion or of inducement!

Nay, but you tell me this disposition is given to some and not to others: it belongs to a few who have peculiarly happy temperaments, which place them in heaven all the time. Then you believe in the Orthodox doctrine that only the few will get to heaven, after all; that the majority are by their temperaments foreordained to perdition. For if heaven be due to disposition and disposition be a divine gift, what is to be done about it? For my part, I am unwilling to subscribe to this disabling doctrine. I believe the eye to see the kingdom of heaven among us is given to all who wish it. It is given to all temperaments. It is not bestowed by favoritism; it is not bestowed by blood or inheritance; all sorts of men may be in heaven themselves and may see the kingdom of heaven at hand. John Brown, the dark, grim Old Testament man, with his craggy countenance and his lurid heart, was in heaven on his dying day; the transcendental philosopher of New England—intellectual and calm, as far outside of Christianity this way, as John Brown was the other way—has always a serene countenance as if he had just come down from the Mount. "He believes that he cannot escape from his good;" that "the heart in him is the heart of all;" that "the highest dwells with him," and that "the sources of Nature are in his own mind, if the sentiment of duty is there." They who stoned the Greek Stephen, sow his face as it had been the face of an angel. Florence Nightingale in the bloody wards at Scutari put so much angelhood into her shadow that the dying men felt happy when it fell upon them. The heavens are opened to all minds on the same terms. What are the terms?

Trust in God and faithfulness to duty. These are the terms. Believe that all things are well, and all things are well; that is the talisman. Ask the strong ones what makes them strong; the happy ones what makes them happy; the tranquil ones what makes them tranquil; the brave ones what makes them brave—and one and all will give this answer: 44 The belief that all things are well. The conviction, nay, the sight that the best is the true, dismisses all particular uncertainties and fears and makes us sure that our welfare is dear to the heart of Being." Who may not have this belief? Who that thinks can help having it? The sources of it are all open and flowing. The arguments for it lie about on the ground. To look darkly upon the world is to confess one's own darkness. To say there is no heaven here is to say there is no God here; and to say there is no God here is to say there is no God anywhere, and never has been, and never will be.

In finding thee are all things round us found:
In losing thee, are all things lost beside.
Ears have we, but in vain sweet voices sound,
And to our eyes the vision is denied.

Open our eyes that we that world may see;
Open our ears that we thy voice may hear,
And in the spirit-land may ever be,
And feel thy presence with us always near.

To believe in God at all is to believe in the whole of him; to have any God is to have a world full; the smallest atom of God is infinite and eternal; to have him a moment is to have him forever. Where we know the Supreme Being to be, there is heaven. But if we do not know that he is here, then heaven is nowhere. For we are here, and here is all the world there is. It is present time wherever we are; there are no to-morrows or yesterdays; there are only to-days. Believe in God and his eternal Now is ours. Believe in God and the world is instantly full of noble men and women. The hours are loaded with opportunities. Great causes invite us; fellow-workers hold out their hands; providences are new every morning and fresh every evening. The air is freighted with good words and thoughts. Believe in God, and the darkness and the light will be both alike to you as they are to him. Believe in God and evil is a shadow; death a transformation. The sun shine is always getting the better of the one, and immortality is always swallowing up the other.

Cultured Free Thought.

The Impeachment of Christianity.

The Index Tracts. No. 10.
[FROM THE INDEX of Jan. 6, 1872.]

Christianity is the great system of faith and practice which is organized in the Christian Church; and its history is the history of the Christian Church. Such, I believe, is the definition which it has made for itself; and such is substantially the only definition of it which will abide the test of time.

Thus defined, I recognize with gratitude the great good which Christianity has done in the past, and is to some extent doing in the present. Nothing can long endure which has not struck root into the true, the admirable, the everlasting; and Christianity has endured for nearly two thousand years. But it is a product of humanity, and everything human is born to die. Today Christianity is dying a lingering death—to be prolonged until its usefulness to the world shall have been wholly exhausted. To many it is dead already, and the number of these is increasing day by day. For these I speak.

Together with great good, Christianity has wrought great evil in the world. The good is daily lessening, and the evil becoming daily more marked and more pernicious. It is time that some should with sincerity and openness utter aloud what great multitudes are thinking in the silence of their own souls, even though they may be only half-conscious of the real drift of their own thought. The taught are in advance of their teachers. Christianity no longer proclaims the highest truth, inculcates the: purest ethics, breathes the noblest spirit, stimulates to the grandest life, holds up to the soul and to society the loftiest ideal of that which ought to be. It has stood still while the race has moved on. It has become the chief hindrance in the path of man to the destiny marked out for him in the very laws of his own being—the chief obstacle to the realization of those magnificent dreams which are the inspiration of his sublimest endeavor. Thousands are becoming aware of this. For these I speak.

With all seriousness, then, and with intense conviction of the truth and urgent necessity of what I say, I IMPEACH CHRISTIANITY BEFORE THE BAR OF CIVILIZED MANKIND. In the name of all that is best, noblest and divinest in human nature, I impeach it of high crimes and misdemeanors against the peace of the world and the progress of the race towards a freer and holier future. And I summon it to appear before this high tribunal of Humanity, to show good cause why it shall not stand condemned and sentenced by its judge. For it is not I that speak, but the largest mind, the purest conscience, the tenderest heart, and the most earnest spirit of the nineteenth century. They bring no flippant or idle charge, but utter the world's grave declaration of independence of the Power that has become a Tyranny.

These are the leading counts of my indictment.

1. I IMPEACH CHRISTIANITY IN THE NAME OF HUMAN INTELLIGENCE—

Because it is the great organized Superstition of the Western world, perpetuating in modern times the false beliefs, the degrading fears, and the benumbing influences of the Dark Ages—in proportion to its power over men paralyzing their intellectual faculties, keeping them in the bondage of childish fancies, and governing them by means of an utterly irrational religious terrorism.

Because it is the great enemy of science, retarding the spread of natural knowledge, opposing new truths and discoveries as irreligious, perpetuating popular ignorance on all but permitted subjects in order that its own empire may be unshaken, and making blind faith in impossible doctrines the highest virtue of the human soul and the only protection against terrible yet purely imaginary clangers.

Because it is the greatest stumbling-block in the pathway of civilization, inasmuch as it withdraws attention from the natural affairs of this life, concentrates all its earnest thought on a future life that is to be eternal bliss or eternal misery, makes a merit of neglect of this world's riches in order "to lay up treasures in heaven," frowns on active enterprise as a dangerous devotion to "carnal things," and thus unfits men for attention to all those objects of honorable ambition on which the progress of civilization so largely depends.

2. I IMPEACH CHRISTIANITY IN THE NAME OF HUMAN VIRTUE—

Because it appeals to hope and fear as the supreme motives of human conduct, holds out promises of an eternal heaven as the reward of obedience to its commands, utters threats of an eternal hell as the punishment of disobedience to them, makes its appeal to human selfishness as the proper spring of human action, and consequently undermines and destroys the disinterestedness of all high morality, which commands the right because it is right and forbids the wrong because it is wrong, regardless alike of punishment and of reward.

Because it teaches that the virtue of the "Savior" can be a substitute for the virtue of the "saved,"—that the "sinner" can be made pure by the righteousness of another,—that merit and demerit do not belong to the individual, but can be transferred like a garment from back to back. Its great doctrines of "Depravity" and the "Atonement" are a blank denial of the very possibility of personal virtue.

Because it teaches that the natural penalties of wrong-doing can be escaped by "faith in Christ,"—that the consequences of moral evil are neither necessary nor universal,—that the law of cause and effect does not hold in the moral world; and thus weakens the natural auxiliaries of imperfect virtue by fostering the delusion that men can do evil without suffering for it.

Because it enjoins self-abhorrence as the first condition of the "salvation" it offers,—makes the denial of all "worth or worthiness" in mankind the first step in the Christian life, and teaches that Christ will save those alone who have lost all faith in themselves and in their own power to escape the just wrath of God. It thus strikes a deadly blow at the dignity of human nature, extinguishes that noble sentiment of self-respect without which all high virtue is impossible, and smites men with the leprosy of self-contempt. It makes them crawl like reptiles before Christ—" their hands on their mouths, and their mouths in the dust." It is the very abolition of true manliness among men.

Because, by this extinction of self-respect, it enfee- bles the consciousness of human rights, and thus blights the very idea of natural justice, which is the practical recognition of these rights. No man who despises himself can respect his fellows or reverence the rights inherent in their very humanity. Whatever extinguishes human rights before God will extinguish human rights among men. For this reason Christianity has always been blind to justice.

Because, finally, it recognizes no higher law for man than the "revealed will of God." It thus bases all morality on will alone, and says nothing of that necessary Nature of Things which determines all moral relations. If thus confuses men's ideas of right and wrong, and renders impossible that knowledge of true ethical principles which is essential to all enlightened virtue.

3. I Impeach Christianity in the Name of the Human Heart—

Because It recognizes no sanctity in natural human affections, but requires that all these shall be subordinated to an unnatural love of Christ as the Savior of souls. "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me." "If any man hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life, he cannot be my disciple."

Because it extends over myriads of sensitive minds the blackness and gloom of a horrible theology, tortures them with a morbid self-reproach for unreal transgressions, and fills them with excruciating doubts of their final escape from hell,—thus destroying their happiness, and robbing their life of its natural beauty and charm.

Because it commands supreme love to a God whose character is utterly unlovely—a God whose wrath against his own children is a "consuming fire," and who plunges the vast majority of them into eternal agony. It thus degrades the very idea of fatherhood, by teaching the "Fatherhood" of a God whose character and acts are as unfatherly as they are incredible.

Because it proclaims a "Brotherhood of Man" which denies the natural equality essential to all genuine brotherhood—which perverts the natural sentiment of good-will towards all men into an artificial and exclusive bond among Christians themselves, and into thoroughly unnatural condescension or pity towards all others—which is in fact consistent with the harshest injustice and the most frightful cruelty towards those who reject the Christian creed. It thus degrades and lowers the very idea of brotherhood, by calling that the "Brotherhood of Man" which is simply a fellowship of Christian believers, and which has been too often in history a fellowship of thieves and murderers.

4. I Impeach Christianity in the Name of Human Freedom—

Because it sets up a despotic authority which, whether as Church, as Bible, or as Christ, makes man a slave in his very soul—an authority which shuts up the human intellect within arbitrarily prescribed bounds, hands over the human conscience to the custody of clerical keepers, and rules all human life, individual or social, with an iron rod.

Because it has always allied itself with despotism in civil government, joined with the oppressor in keeping the oppressed under foot, and sought to maintain its own supremacy on the ruins of all human liberty.

Because, as Catholicism, to has been an unmitigated spiritual and temporal tyranny, from which many centuries of constant struggle have today only partially emancipated the world.

Because, as Protestantism, it has been an unmitigated spiritual tyranny, and is even now plotting in this free republic to re establish itself as a temporal tyranny also.

Because it is the true heir of the ancient Roman Imperialism, seeking now as ever to establish and maintain an absolute empire over the whole world, and to bind the entire human race not only in political, but also in religious bondage. Wherever Christianity lives, Freedom dies. They cannot both long breathe the same atmosphere.

5. Lastly, I IMPEACH CHRISTIANITY IN THE NAME OF HUMANITARIAN RELIGION—

Because it stands stubbornly in the path of all human progress, blocking the way of every movement, which aims at the enlargement of human life,—opposes, and has always opposed, every genuine reform in human affairs,—consults only the interests of its own creed, and sets its face like a flint against the purely secular education in which, by a quick instinct, it recognizes the most dangerous enemy of this creed.

Because it teaches the impossibility of Humanity's advance through its own natural exertions, and insists that it should rely on supernatural assistance alone—thus extinguishing aspiration and drying up the fountain-head of all progress.

Because it teaches despair of human nature, as rained, lost, and depraved—incapable of all salvation but that which comes from without, and subject to no law of natural development but that of degeneration, carrying it from bad to worse and from worse to worst. It thus denies the great, hopeful doctrine of humanitarian religion, that Humanity tends by its own free efforts to grow better as it grows older, and to emerge from a lower into a higher state in accordance with natural laws.

Because it proclaims ideas of God which would drive every reflective mind acquainted with modern knowledge into absolute atheism, were it not that modern knowledge itself furnishes the elements of a far higher idea of God in universal Nature. It thus appears as the most insidious enemy of the religious sentiment—the destroyer of that pure and ennobling worship which recognizes the Divine throughout all Time and Space, and creates in the soul of man a consciousness of profound spiritual oneness with the vast Whole of which he is a part.

In the name, therefore, of Human Intelligence, of Human Virtue, of the Human Heart, of Human Freedom, of Humanitarian Religion, I seriously and earnestly impeach Christianity before the tribunal of the Humanity it still continues to outrage and enslave. I impeach it in the name of that which is higher than itself, not lower—in the name of Truth, of Morality, of Love, of Liberty, of God; and I summon it to answer at the bar of Humanity, its rightful judge, that it may clear itself of the high crimes and misdemeanors of which I accuse it, or else submit to the sentence of just condemnation pronounced against it by the public opinion of civilized mankind. Francis E. Abbot.

Free Religious Index,

A Weekly Journal
Devoted to Free Religion
Published by
The Free Religious Association,
No. 3 Tremont Place, ... Boston.
EDITOR: William J. Potter.
Editorial Contributors:

Among the regular or occasional contributors are: FELIX ADLER, FRANCIS E. ABBOT, JOHN ALBEE, JOHN W. CHADWICK, Mrs. E. D. CHENEY, ROWLAND CONNOR, GEORGE W. COOKE, GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE (England), FREDERICK MAY HOLLAND, C. D. B. MILLS, MINOT J. SAVAGE, WILLIAM H. SPENCER, Mrs. ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, BENJAMIN F. UNDEKWOOD, and Mrs. SARA A. UNDERWOOD.

The FREE RELIGIOUS INDEX is the continuation of THE INDEX, which was founded and has been for ten years edited by Francis Ellingwood Abbot. Efforts will be made to keep the same high standard, and merit the same honorable distinction. As the late editor expressed it, the paper will still aim:—

To increase general intelligence with respect to religion; To foster a nobler spirit and quicken a higher purpose, both in society and in the individual;

To substitute knowledge for ignorance, right for wrong, truth for superstition, freedom for slavery, character for creed, catholicity for bigotry, love for hate, humanitarianism for sectarianism, devotion to universal ends for absorption in selfish schemes;

In brief, to hasten the day when Free Religion shall take the place of dogmatism and ecclesiasticism throughout the world, and when the welfare of humanity here and now shall be the aim of all private and public

activities.

It may be further stated that, as voice of the Free Religious Association, the FREE RELIGIOUS INDEX will endeavor fairly to represent all the phases of the movement, in all their breadth, for which that Association stands. Whatever pertains to its threefold object—"the practical interests of pure religion, the increase of fellowship in the spirit, and the encouragement of the scientific study of man's religious nature and history"—will here find a fitting place. The relations of Religion to Modern Science and to Social Science and Philanthrophy, the relations of Universal Religion to the Special Religions, and the relations of Religion to the State, will receive particular attention. Book Notices and Correspondence will be secured from competent writers. As a

Special Feature,

which will commend the paper to many new subscribers, the FREE RELIGIOUS INDEX is to publish a lecture by Dr. FELIX ADLER, before his society in New York, once a month during the season of his society labors. The Editor will also print within the year several of his discourses.

Terms.

The price of the FREE RELIGIOUS INDEX is Three Dollars a year, payable in advance, which includes postage, and at the same rate for shorter periods. All remittances of money must be at the sender's risk, unless forwarded by check, registered letter, or post-office money order. The name, with address in full, must be accompanied with the money in each case. Address

Free Religious Association,

No. 3 Tremont Place Boston, Mass.

The Boston

Sunday Afternoon Lectures for 1872.

Social Ideals.

By David A. Wasson.

Fourth Lecture in the Course of Eleven "Sunday Afternoon Lectures," given in Horticultural Hall. Boston, under the auspices of the Free Religions Association, January 28, 1872.]

There are great common or social ideals which arise in the world, are diffused, gain supremacy, and remain, it may be, for many centuries, ruling men at the very roots of their souls. The coming of such into existence and power is perhaps the most important kind of event that ever occurs on the earth. Compared with this, the rise of a kingdom like Prussia, or of a republic like the United States, is, to speak moderately, an event of secondary importance. Such an advent there was in the rise of Christianity; and all that Christianity has done in the world, all its effect upon minds and morals illustrates the power of a common ideal to make, unmake and transform. If you would understand the past, study its ideals; history is unintelligible without them. If you would know your own age, study the "spirit of the age," its ideal, that is. And especially if there are tokens that we live at the opening of a new epoch, when ancient ideals are dying, and another sovereign, not of the same blood, is coming to the throne, an inquiry into the nature of the change thus going on must be of surpassing interest.

We do indeed live at one of those turning points in history. From the fourth to the fifteenth century one ideal, represented by Catholic Christianity, but enclosing within it from the eighth century another, embodied in the feudal system, reigned with undisputed sway in the occidental world. Copernicus, Columbus and Luther,—the first giving to the human mind a new heavens, the second a new earth, the third a new moral poise,—put an end to that period, already disturbed by the crusades, the Black Death, and the flight of Greek learning from Constantinople to the West; and two centuries later,—for profound alterations of the human mind are manifested but slowly,—the guiding imagination of the mediaeval world was gone and irrecoverable. No sooner had it disappeared than the institutions it had given rise to, and which to a large extent remained,—as always happens in such cases,—lost on the one hand the genius that had made them wholesome, and on the other the explanation that had made them seem reasonable; at (nice they appeared anomalous, grotesque, monstrous, the product of imposture and violence.

Partly, therefore, through the reaction against these institutions, there arose, to replace the old, a new ideal,

that of Liberty. Liberty—what a word to conjure with has that been for a hundred years! And yet during the space of some twelve centuries—centuries that wrought out for us all the elements of our civilization,—it was scarcely, or but faintly, pronounced; even a class of reformers like the Puritans, honest, brave and high-souled as any the world has known, cared not a button for liberty in the more modern sense. Time was that the words "obedience" and "service" made music in men's ears. Then it was the ideal of religion to have no will of one's own; then the proudest nobleman professed, and made it matter of pride, to "serve his fief," that is, his system of relations with all above and all beneath him; then courtesy crowned itself with the title of servant, and the modern gentleman, following the verbal forms of a departed ideal, may still subscribe himself the "obedient servant' of another. Strange!—the title that raw Irish "help" may now refuse as degrading, was once worn as a plume by the very men who made pride a grace, if not a virtue. The "fag" system of Eton, Harrow, Rugby, &c., is a relic curious to American eyes, of that old world in which service, whether the word or the thing, was not esteemed degrading, but the door to honor. How foreign is all this to what we boast, and without boast may reasonably esteem, as the "spirit of the age!" For good or evil—for good *and* evil—another ideal has arisen; it has dominated civilization for a century, and is only now beginning to be displaced by a second, of which also, in its turn, I shall have occasion to speak.

The ideal of liberty has its bright side and its eminent use in modern civilization; but unhappily it was formulated in a spurious way,—chiefly in the last century and by Jean Jacques Rousseau; and in this vicious shape has come down to our age. The doctrine that thus got into vogue was substantially as follows: That each individual has by gift of Nature an unqualified property in himself; that he is born to be absolutely his own master, and to dispose of himself at his own sovereign pleasure; that his individual will is therefore his proper guide and supreme law; that this natural liberty, so called, has but one limitation—it should be so adjusted by each to the like liberty in others that he may enjoy his own without encroaching on theirs; that government is a purely defensive expedient, designed to secure to each his perfect possession and disposal of himself, and that it borrows the right to accomplish even this limited task only from the voluntary consent of the individual parties to it.

This doctrine, it may be observed, would be quite as suitable to rats as human beings. Your rat is quite as much attached as a human creature can be to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—would be nothing less than absolute owner of himself, would make his private inclination his supreme law, and dispose of himself at his own sovereign pleasure; and rat government, could these assiduous rodents arrive at such, would undoubtedly be designed to sustain each in the liberty so dear to him. That order of doctrine, however,—spawned in Europe, not America, and made public in Europe at a time when Massachusetts was as loyal as London to the British crown,—was to be imported into this country, and to have a notable career. To please and propitiate Virginia, Thomas Jefferson was chosen to write the Declaration of Independence. Jefferson, who as late as November 29th, 1775,—five and a half months after the battle of Bunker's Hill,—wrote thus in a private letter, "Believe me, dear sir, there is not in the British empire a man that more cordially loves the union with Great Britain than I do"—a "love" that included allegiance to the British crown,—had in the months intervening between that November and the June following blazed out as a political philosopher of the newest school. Seizing the opportunity to air his neophyte-faith under auspices so uncommon, he proceeded, after the fashion of his teachers, to select certain ordinary descriptions of self-interest, common to nits and men, to endow these with "inalienable" rights, and to announce that civil society exists to no end but to assure the said rights of self-interest. This screed of doctrine became a resource, and was much endeared to many good men, during the struggle against slavery; it is now a sacred scripture, much more sacred to numbers than the scriptures commonly so-called. One might compare at, in its actual relation to the spirit of the nation, to a dry bone under ground, around which the rootlets of a vine have wound and woven themselves in a myriad-fold complexity of filaments; the vine could well live and flourish and bear fruit without it, but cannot be disrupted from it without injury. Every community has its dry bones so embraced; and, whatever the rude agitator may think, the real thinker knows that it is a serious business to meddle with them. But when in the hollow of the bone poison is hid, and the rootlets have penetrated to it, and the leaves begin to wither and the fruit to rot by effect of it, then the time for root-pruning has come, and the knife should be taken in hand. The feeding roots of this nation have now, it is manifest, struck through to the poison in Jefferson's doctrine. This doctrine is to-day furnishing the logic of "free love," and, if the premises be admitted, an unanswerable logic. It is propagating to-day a putrid ferment to destroy not only the most sacred of social institutions, but the very grounds of social duty.

Under these circumstances, everything admonishes us to return and resume the sober, constructive spirit of Washington, Adams, Jay, Hamilton, Ames, Osgood. During the gallant, but alas, ineffectual struggle of the Federalists against Jacobin politics, Rev. Dr. David Osgood of Medford, Mass., delivered a number of political discourses, so replete with sound judgment and just sentiment, and marked by so high an order of grave eloquence, that the author was honored with a share in that secret, cowardly vituperation which Jefferson

poured out so prodigally upon the best men of his time. That certificate of character should entitle him to remembrance. Over this, Jefferson's style of political speculation triumphed in what he himself vaunted as "our second great revolution, not inferior to the first, that of 1800,"—a revolution of which himself was the hero and himself the eulogist. The hour has arrived when we should reverse the triumph, and, instead of finding a foundation in isolating self-interests and rights of self-interest, should find it where eternal wisdom laid it, in connecting and commanding obligation,—the hour when rat-liberty, or such as consists in pursuing in one's own fashion whatever one esteems happiness, should be recognized as proper only to beasts, and only to the wild among beasts, while it is at once the privilege and the imperative vocation of human beings to put this unequivocally away, that, through the duty of all, and the discipline of all and productive restraints submitted to by all, men may create for themselves a chartered and fruitful freedom, to liberate and empower them in head, heart and hand.

It is undoubtedly a function of civil society to protect individual rights, that is to say, the rights of individual self-love. Had Jefferson said just this, and with the due qualifications, he would, so far, have done well. But in the first place, he ran to an absurd excess by announcing these rights as "inalienable." Inalienable! If the right to life is so, this nation did a murder with every rebel shot on the field in our great civil contest. The right to liberty,—if that is inalienable, the State commits a crime with every thief sent to jail. Not only are all such rights qualified, conditional, alienable, but it is the express office of the commonwealth to affirm personal responsibility by treating them accordingly, extending over them the sovereignty of moral law. Inalienable! The statement is preposterous, and only as practically set at naught by the common sense of the community, can it fail to be mischievous.

Again, it is not the sole function of the State to protect individual self-interest and rights of self-interest; and in restricting it to this, Jefferson betrayed the one exceeding, fatal vice of his political philosophy. Above all that, civil society has a *productive* function; it is to embody and exact the duty of all men to concur in Doing unitedly whatsoever is necessary to an honorable, fruitful, progressive social life,—as, to take familiar examples, in establishing courts of justice, making roads, providing for education, &c. Farther, and more comprehensively, it is to make a field and climate for the virtues of civilization, such as constitute its life-blood, as industry, honesty, chastity and the like. In fine, its grand function is, in duly protecting the rights of self-interest, to hold them in perpetual correlation with the social principles and social' duty which are sovereignly imposed upon humanity by its civilizing genius.

Take this point of view, and you have an answer to the disintegrating doctrines now getting abroad; assume Jefferson's point of view, making private rights inalienable and exclusive, and you have no answer but a fetch. Does some one, male or female, come forward to cry from the housetops, "Hear, O heaven, and give ear, O earth! my pursuit of happiness is interfered with by the State!" My distressed friend, I would say, if you are not willing to pursue happiness in subordination to social duty, that is, to the great, necessary laws of air human welfare, then are you one of the very persons to whom civil society should supply a will wiser than their own.

But instead of proceeding with mere criticism I will try to sketch very rapidly and briefly what approves itself to my judgment as a sound doctrine,—finding in the end what there is of wholesome and useful in the modern ideal of liberty.

1. Man has, as I often say, a *pregnant* genius, by the law and promise of which he is bound. That is his distinction. Nature has endowed him with the functions of her own maternity; to bring forth civilization, with all the wealth, material and spiritual, that belongs to it, he is brought forth by the universe. That function *gives a supreme law to his being;* all his duties, rights, hopes, with his entire privilege and price as a human soul, are rooted in it and inseparable from it. To subserve that civilizing genius, to distinguish and enforce the obligations implied in it, and so to make the necessary basis of civilization, government is instituted and civil society exists.

2. The matrix of civilization is social. What we are to each other makes us to be what we are in ourselves. The individual nature, taken strictly as such, is utterly sterile, an inhuman nature,—is what a seed buried in the soil would be, were the sun blotted out of the heavens. Isolate from earliest years a creature born from the loins of humanity, and of the fruition of humanity there will in him be nothing; he can become by his physical growth only a beast, wanting even articulate speech. Thoughts, morals, manners, arts, industries, language, everything that distinguishes human beings, comes of the relation between human beings. Could anything be more irrational than to put all this out of sight in stilting the grounds of civil society—to set out with absolute individualism, absolute individual liberty,—to limit social duty to the one point of properly letting each other alone, that each may pursue happiness, rat-fashion, according to his own inclination—and to regard civil society as instituted only in order that the right to be let alone may be respected and sustained? And yet that is the doctrine which, having long dominated in politics, is now coming to be applied to the most intimate and vitalizing of social relations—and it is even accepted by some as the type of true "radicalism."

3. Man being born and bound—bound by everything human in him—to make for himself such a kind of

life as he has not by mere gift of Nature, it is important to notice that his first act, at the outset of his human career, is to put his natural liberty away, and to accept in place of it a system of productive restraints and imperative duties, and with these *measured* liberties, always submitted to law, while determined in their measure by considerations of genera1 utility. Natural liberty! Why, the institution of property alone takes the very ground from beneath its feet, leaving it not a spot to alight on. Inaliena ble natural liberty! And yet every human being born in this community comes into the world to be deprived *in toto* of his liberty of self-disposal for the space of twenty-one years, two thirds the average life of a generation. One half of all human beings die, and never, by any legal allowance, touch that liberty with so much as the tip of the finger. The first lesson set to each, and the one at which each is kept so long, is the lesson of obedience; and if many were kept at it longer, it would be much better for them. Every child, again, in being taught honesty, veracity and the like, is instructed to put that liberty away, and substitute for it fixed obligations. You *must* do this, and you *must not* do that, we say; and until he has got that *must* by heart, and learned to make it steadfastly predominant over his natural liberty, he is fit for no liberty whatever. And so it is that all civilization and all culture mean the sovereignty of obligation over inclination, and the submission, rather than the supremacy, of the casual, private will. If, therefore, you wish to get a principle the most vicious possible, take that "natural liberty" for a principle; and if you would turn the world upside down, emptying all civilization into the abysses of beastly nature, reason from that, and apply it with uncompromising logic, as a principle.

The limit of liberty is this: Every man *has* a right to do what is right, and no other. We have been told of late that a class of our "sisters," inhabiting-certain "filthy localities," have a right to pursue happiness in their own way,—"as good a right" as others to live chastely and decently. The sufficient answer would be that, if it is right for any woman to profane her womanhood, then she has a right to do so; but neither woman nor man nor any other creature can have a right to do harm and wrong, any doctrine of liberty to the contrary notwithstanding. True, that strange judgment was reasoned cogently enough from the original and indefeasible liberty, of which there has been so much and so unwise talk; and one anight say to the indignant democratists,—You have prostituted the franchise, and the sentiment is more respectable than the logic which forbids you to do the like by your homes. If every barbarian in New York, because his "natural liberty" must be compromised with, has a right to vote, even though his vote will tend only to sepulchre the city in infamy, then I see not but the said "sisters" have a right to do *their* kind of mischief,—which is perhaps little worse for themselves, while it does not necessarily involve others, and threaten the hopes of the nation, at all in the same, nor even in a comparable degree. I, however, recognize a liberty to do right, not wrong, and to do good, not mischief; and recognize no right to liberty as taking precedence of our common right and duty to make a healthy society, a well-ordered life, a productive and honorable civilization; and any liberty not held in submission to the laws of welfare, and made serviceable toward welfare, is one that has only a vicious imagination and spurious ideal for its support.

4. One has a right, I have said, to do what is right, and to get it done for himself and others. We are bound, everyone of us, to put away our irresponsible liberty as beasts, and to put obligation in the place of it; and every life is inchoate save as this is done. How shall it best be effected? Shall the wisest, assembled in Congress, say, determine for every man, and in all particulars, what he ought to do? Yes, if human life will best profit by that. I have no right to desire anything but the best law for my life, and no liberty to reject such law, no matter how or by whom it is got at. But here some considerations of great importance come in, and here we reach the wholesome side of the modern ideal. Social regulation, it has been discovered, may be overdone, while too much of it makes barrenness rather than fertility. In the first place, there is an important class of ac- tions not properly under the control of the will. No man can rightfully choose what he will think; and in the degree that he attempts to do so, his mental action becomes vicious and destructive. Thought is not thought unless it is a law to itself. The practical recognition in modern times of this truth, though partial as yet, has been of incalculable profit to civilization, and is rightly regarded as at once a token and means of progress. Again, the corporate community is fallible, it also like the individual; and when all the ignorance and barbarism of the land is held to have the same title with knowledge and civilizing mind to political function, the amount of fallibility exhibited by it is likely to be liberal; a certain frugality of civil regulation is therefore discreet. Farther, general and peremptory rules can never be flexile and adaptive enough to anticipate all the fine elections of character; an excess of them would therefore tend to suppress character, converting men into animate machines. Once more, spontaneity is precious. Spiritual, like physical, productivity is inseparable from it; room must be made for this, ample room. Hence social regulation, effected by government and law, is sane only as it is wisely sparing,—making thorough work indeed so far as it goes, but carefully not going too far. The modern mind is much impressed with the need of that wise abstinence; and so far its ideal is good.

On the other hand, suppose one should deny the jurisdiction of the corporate community altogether, and make that of the individual exclusive; suppose he should lay it down for an absolute and universal principle that each is privileged to determine for himself, and in all particulars, what is right. That were wild. Men have a life,

a welfare, a productive function in common; they exist as moral and intelligent human beings, they have articulate speech even, only through the effect of their relations, their interdependence, their social complexity; and the last violence is done to the truth of Nature by him who would regard each of them as rounded completely in his separate self, and endowed with an invincible independence. There is no such independence; interdependence is a first law of human life; and it is only by the recognition of this, and the regulation of it, and an ordered integration of society, that the productive function of humanity is otherwise than abortive. We *must*—Nature has said that we must,—have fixed common understandings, fixed for all, and obligatory upon all, in order that the soul of any man may have its proper fruition. There can be, therefore, no right of a jurisdiction exclusively individual—no principle in Nature to that effect.

No exclusive jurisdiction, then, of the social body, and none of the individual. Either of them practically asserted as exclusive would make human nature barren and prohibit civilization. What then? The jurisdiction must be composite, partly social, partly individual. With respect to our broadest and strictly necessary relations of interdependence, it should be conceded to the corporate community; while with respect to all others, where the interdependence is less strict, and to which invariable rules could not well apply, it should be assigned to the individual. In general, the best modern sentiment inclines to say,—Leave as much to the discretion of the individual as may be without compromising social integrity and health. Spontaneity is so valuable, so essential, to the finest essays of genius and the ruddiest energies of enterprise and invention, that to make ample room for it is the part of wisdom. We hold, therefore, that it is well to simplify the functions of civil society, and by getting just enough done thoroughly, surely, seasonably, to make it safe that the conceded jurisdiction of the individual should be liberally extended. But just in proportion as social powers are yielded to mindlessness and barbarism, this liberality becomes unsafe; there must be more governing in quantity to make up for the defect of quality; the functions of government are at once over-done and insufficient; and a fluctuating, confused, desultory mass-despotism sprawls over the whole field of human action, covering all, and usefully occupying no part of it. Are there no signs of a tendency to just this in our community? Such a plethora of laws, and never enough effect of law! The statute-books bursting with fulness, and private usurpations grown to enormity! Interferences with what should be the allowed liberty of individual action, such as no European people would endure, and the right effects of civil order too imperfectly attained!' Our democracy is like a full bowl in unsteady hands, always slopping over upon floors and garments, and giving us in that way a great deal too much of its contents, while for this very reason it never brings enough to the lips. Our reformers, some of them, wish to vote everything, and run to the ballot-box as a little boy to the imagined omnipotence of his papa, to ask for all things, possible and impossible; and meantime, with continued excess, we have continual deficiency.

Time now to rectify our ideal. To do so, one truth, one grand truth, should be recognized; all men are justly bound by the end for which all men exist, to wit, an honorable, productive, progressive life. That fact goes before liberty; it is true *princeps*. Our "wagon is hitched to a star." Jefferson, Paine and Company undertook to cut the traces, and make the wagon "free."

Bound by that end, all men are bound to the means, adjustments, principles and applications of principles necessary to its realization. Of the things thus necessary, the two first and broadest are strictly correlative; first, social law, social integration,—as necessary to the end for which man is created as individual existence even, and to be reasoned from, as ordered by, its own principles; secondly, the spontaneity, the initiative, of the individual. Neither of these without the other; neither to be borrowed from the other. As the effect of their just correlationr honorably maintained, there will come an *upward* liberation, which consists in man's higher use at once of himself and of what the world offers him for use—in the flowering and fructification of his life. That liberation, that flowering and fruiting of his life, that higher use of himself and his conditions, is freedom, *real* freedom. For this the State exists, and for this the conceded jurisdiction or "liberty," of the individual exists; both for their uses, both for the same use, and both by the same right—the right, duty, imperative vocation, of man to bring out of his life the just fruit of it.

Now, all this has been pushed aside. We have been beguiled into setting up individual "natural" liberty, as an exclusive, absolute principle—against the primary law of social inter-dependence, against the commanding obligation of that high end for which man is created. So isolated, this liberty becomes beast-liberty, rat-liberty. Everything, however, it is thought, must hinge upon that. And be-cause it is no true human principle, the doors are tumbling off their sham hinges, the tempest sweeping in, and we a nation of Mrs. Partingtons trying with busy broom to sweep the tempest out: quite in vain; it pom's through the halls, through the rooms, to the marriage chamber, to the marriage bed; and if we are not to be swamped, it is necessary that we come to a better understanding, beginning with Duty,—social duty, to be socially defined and enforced, for the broad necessary relations of inter-dependence, and individual duty—duty still—for so much as may wisely be entrusted to that: thus, through duty done and discipline established, we shall arrive at all the richest effect of social integration, while enabling ourselves to secure also the richest effect of spontaneity, by making it not only safe but profitable to allow the discretion of the individual large room and function. Cherish liberty, then;

'tis a treasure; but do not make it a first principle, for then it is no treasure. Duty for the first principle, and liberty only and always under the sovereignty of Obligation.

But we have another ideal, which also has its good aspects, but which long since began to become spurious by excess, while in the doctrines of the International Association, it is just now arising in a shape of the last extravagance to claim supremacy in the modern world. It is the ideal of Equality, which in its excess becomes that of uniformity, or universal sameness—the same function, the same fortune, the same of everything, as nearly as may be, for all. It is plain that the term *equality* has made a vast impression upon the modern imagination, has become one of the magic words, words to conjure with; we roll it as a sweet morsel under the tongue, and it is like wine to exhilarate; the sound of it is music in the ear; it seems to assure the goodness of all that comes under its patronage, while everything looks black and cruel which is dissociated from it. Forty years ago De Toequeville, in his remarkable chapter entitled, "Why Democratic Nations manifest a more ardent and enduring love of Equality than of Liberty," wrote as follows: "Everybody has remarked that in our time, and especially in France, the passion for equality is every day gaining ground." He speaks of this passion as "ardent, insatiable, incessant, invincible," and ventures the statement, certainly important, if true, that the communities possessed by it will sooner choose "equality in slavery" than liberty without it,—will purchase equality, if need be, at the price of "poverty, servitude, barbarism." These surprising words, emanating, be it remembered, from no lover of monarchy, though from one who carried France in the eyes some what too much to detect the finer shades of sentiment in other lands, were penned while Red Republicanism was yet in the egg. The brood has been well hatched since that day. If the statement were true then, it is thrice true now. I do not doubt that this penetrating observer saw justly what was before his eyes in his own land; and as little doubt that Renan, in that wondrously prophetic essay wherein before the late war he predicted the down-fall of France, as the necessary result of internal decay, was right in attributing that decay chiefly to the inflamed egotism which will sooner embrace barbarism than frankly acknowledge a superior.

Now this sentiment, though vicious and destructive, implicates a measure of what is true and good. As our admirable Fisher Ames said at the beginning of the century, "Most of the democratic articles of faith are blended with truth, and seem true." (He added: "And they so comfortably soothe the pride and envy of the heart that it swells with resentment when they are contested, and suffers some spasms of apprehension even when they are examined.") There is a sense in which equality of rights ought to be affirmed and maintained. The benefits produced by a system of social order may be, and ought to be, open to all impartially. The right to personal protection, the right to hold property, the right of inheritance, should be maintained for all in the same sense; access to the courts of justice, the use of public schools, public roads, public conveyances, and the like, should be assured to all with the same restrictions and the same freedom. There is a certain public inheritance, a wealth produced by the system of social order, to which of right every citizen is heir on the same terms with every other. Observe, this is no right of every unclean or incapable individual to be reckoned personally the equal of the wisest and best; nor is it an equal right of function in the state or elsewhere, irrespective of capacity and fitness; for all right of function must be conditional strictly—conditioned upon the ability and disposition to make the function serviceable, that is, to make it real *function* rather than obstruction; it is simply a common privilege of ac- cess, on the same equitable terms, to the benefits produced by political function, that is, by a system of civil order.

That is the sane, republican doctrine of citizen-rights,—the same for all citizens who do not forfeit them by misbehavior. There has been occasion to assert it with emphasis in. Europe, against a system which, upon no equitable ground, made over the best fruits of civil order to a preferred, hereditary class; and there has been occasion to assert it with no less emphasis in our country, where a provincial prejudice would exclude Frederick Douglass from public tables, forbidding him to take food beside men, not one of whom but were honored to be reckoned his peer. This republican doctrine of citizen-rights is as dear to me as to another. Call them equal rights, if you will,—provided always that an enthusiastic, passionate, purblind imagination of equality as universally necessary, and even as a universal fact in nature, does not creep in under that word *equal*, to run away with your wits. Numbers, as every one may see, have in fact been deported thus from the domains of common sense, and cast away upon the quicksand-conceit that in the political institution character and capacity should go for nothing, since, forsooth, "all men have equal rights." Said Fisher Ames—to quote him again:—" If the philosophers among the democrats will restrict the word equality as carefully as they ought, it will not import that all men have an equal right to all things, but that to whatever they have a right, it is as much to be protected and provided for as the right of any persons in society." This, however, was only good sense, while what the "democratic philosophers" craved, and the only thing to content them, was a blown imagination.

The "passion for equality" first over-stepped the bounds of sound sense, and manifested its character as a passion, unreasoning and irrational, by asserting the personal equivalence, the equal personal *value*, of all men. It no longer said simply that citizen rights, properly discriminated, are the same for all citizens who do not alienate them by misconduct, but quite struck beyond this and said broadly, with Thomas Jefferson, "All *men*

are equal." This violent and absurd imagination was at first applied only in politics, and in our country has never gone very much farther. Indeed, and as it might seem, strangely, it was felt to be *true* only in politics. All men are equal, we were told; but even in the minds of those who said so with greatest gusto, this meant only that all are equally entitled to the elective franchise. For as a man will on Sunday, and in the Wednesday evening prayer meeting, believe fervidly in the dogmas of total depravity and eternal damnation, while for the rest of the week he will perhaps cherish as his dearest friend one of the very persons whom his Sunday-belief proclaims a child of the Devil, doomed to everlasting burnings, so it is with all formalists; they have all their box-truths, true inside the box and not at all so outside. Never was this sectional and cooped belief better illustrated than by the democratists who proclaimed all men equal. The box that defined the space of their "great truth" was the ballot-box.

Rousseau formulated this dogma, as he did that of natural liberty. According to him, we have seen, each man's will is his supreme, only law. Each, accordingly, being absolutely independent, is the equal of every other, just as all perfect circles are equal in the sense of being equally circles. As, therefore, from the absoluteness of the individual will, he argued that no man can owe, or be required to acknowledge, any social obligation but such as he chooses to make for himself, so from the personal equivalence of all, he argued that each is entitled to an equal function in the State with every other. This conceit became that of his nation, and with this it is that the modern career of France began.

And here it was that opened the contrast and chasm between French democracy and our ancestral republicanism. The latter, as represented, for example, by its illustrious martyr, Algernon Sidney, had the infirmity to choose plain, sterling good sense as against inflated imagination, quite false to be sure, but then so big and so enticing to heads of a certain quality! Sidney says: "That equality which is just among equals is just only among equals; but such as are base, ignorant, vicious, slothful or cowardly are not equal in natural or acquired virtues to the generous, wise, valiant and industrious, nor equally useful to the societies in which they live: *they cannot therefore have an equal part in the government of them;* they cannot equally provide for the common good; and 'tis not a personal but a public benefit that is sought." Our ancestral republicanism had an honorable purpose to make citizenship, under the conditions of good behavior, a ticket of admission to the benefits of a sound social system: Rousseau, and France with him, flew away from this good ground to perch upon a crazy conceit instead; and Jefferson, spreading his new-found French wings to the airs of a great occasion, flew to the same roost.

Limited, for the most part, in our country to the field of politics, though always growing and encroaching, as such moral fungi will, this conceit, this imagined equilibrium of egotism, had in France at the outset the aid of a passionate reaction from old manners and institutions, has had a longer period there than here, and has not been resisted by a characteristic sobriety of mind in the nation. There it has for some while prescribed the customary attitude of men toward each other; and the result is a moral atrophy, a dry-rot of the higher sentiments, a debility of character, an impoverishment of natures through their mutual relations, a death of discipline at the root, a destruction of authority, a shrinking and shrivelling of capacity, an incapability of any better alliance than such as may be found in the lumped egotism of classes, and in tine, a deterioration of the national spirit more rapid than was ever seen in history before,—all of which may serve for a warning, and cannot fail, one would say, to warn none but those who are blind and deaf and dead to instruction. France has beautiful capabilities,—the brightest, most vivacious genius, the most charming manners, in the world; and I could do anything sooner than exult over her misfortunes; but to be bewitched with spurious ideals was her first misfortune, upon which the others have followed; and one must take his instruction where it is offered.

"By no weak pity might the gods be moved;" and man, though moved by pity, should at least not suffer it to blind his eyes.

All those effects might have been anticipated. A nation is not in a good way if it does not invite and nourish superiorities by grateful recognition, and by offering them a proper field and function: but a nation jealous habitually of them, habitually intent on making a bad climate for them, purchases the mediocrity it desires. A nation filled to the lips with an impassioned, intolerant conceit of equality does just this; and is punished by obtaining what it imagines, actual equality, to wit, an equality in universal littleness. France has gone a long way in this direction. During the war she had no general, and after it no statesman. She has passed through her great struggle without showing one trace of great character—unless a certain elevation and amplitude of mind in the writer, Renan, furnish a solitary exception. Admirable litterateurs she has; but even in literature her best is burnished silver, not gold. Meantime, the levelling passion, having always for its ideal an equilibrium of egotism, destroys all that gives depth, fertility, richness to the social spirit,—reciprocal reverences, reciprocal, glad recognition of special superiorities, honorable, fructifying exchanges of de- ference and obedience, and the like. The "three reverences" of Goethe are precisely and pre eminently what this spirit can not endure; and therefore it cannot endure that which above all ennobles character and gives dignity to human life. The nation, accordingly, has continual agitation without silent, long-breathed, fruitful activity—that "distressing small

motion," of which De Tocqueville speaks; and its life is likely to be polarized, as that of France has been so largely, between the narrowest, disintegrating egotism and the painted quackeries of sentimental politics. A peculiar aversion to discipline becomes a national trait, because discipline implies obedience; and if the individual must obey, he will by preference obey some one whom he does not at the same time feel painfully compelled to respect,—some little man, easily seen to be a pigmy perched high, easily felt to be an "equal," or else one who, if possessed of ability, atones for it, and reduces himself to the required level, by defect of character. The representative of public authority must maintain himself either by purchased adhesion and military force, like Napoleon III, or by pouring out floods of flattery upon caitiffs, with Trochu, whose fulsome eulogies of troops that got under fire only to scamper away were exacted by the "passion for equality." It is to be observed that the one general who had the manliness to rebuke insubordinate and cowardly regiments, compelling them for a moment to feel their beloved equality pretty thin stuff, was murdered the moment the communists got him into their hands. And the communists had to reassert their sense of equality by shutting up their own leaders in jail once a fortnight or so,—Assi for example.

It is the last result of this spirit that genuine, sterling self-respect becomes an all but impossible virtue, being displaced by that self-conceit which lives only in comparisons. Self-respect, a sentiment without which men were of no more worth than frogs in a pool, is wholly simple and positive, like the growth of herbage or the shining of stars: it does not feed upon comparisons, is incapable of envy or mean jealousy, and is nourished rather than depleted by its association with deference and reverence. Nothing is more foreign or more fatal to it than the spirit which says, "I am as good as another, and will never acknowledge a superior;" it dies before that base self-assertion can go from the heart to the lips.

I remember the powerful and significant impression made upon me years ago by Toschi's engraving from the St. John and St. Augustine of Correggio. The apostle, a little elevated above the other, is instructing him; his face radiant with intelligence and benignity. Augustine stands with his head slightly bowed, listening with ear and soul. His serious, noble countenance expresses profound reverence, purest thoughtfulncss and incorruptible self-respect, not opposed and contending, but united to make by their union the indivisible majesty of character and manliness. He receives every word as the coined gold of heaven's truth, yet does so with a mental poise and self-possession no less than perfect; and his vast docility lends itself with untold enhancement to all that which makes his spirit masterly. No upstart conceit there to squeak, "I am as good as you!" One imagines how that noble aspect of the man would be cheapened and degraded by the slightest access of this self-assertion, jealous and pert. And partly, it may be, because this is quite wanting, there is no arrogance of superiority in the face of the apostle,—no line there to say, "Stand apart, I am better than you." The conceit and blurt of equality, the arrogance and exclusiveness of caste,—of neither is there a vestige.

It occurred to me while looking on that picture why it is that the modern artist must leave men aside, and turn to landscape, in order to produce what may finely affect the beholder. A noble form of human relation can no longer be imagined with artistic clearness and simplicity. The typical modern must be "independent" to be manly, indocile to be sincere, and jealous of superior qualities to preserve the equalizer's substitute for self-respect. The passion for equality, after debilitating all productive social principles, has swarmed like a plague of moths upon the human mind itself, to prey upon its blossoms. Well for Correggio that he was not born in modern France! He would probably have found in himself a genius to paint only horses, boar-hunts, or spectral impossibilities, like those in which Gustave Doré revels with the pencil and Victor Hugo with the pen.

But every ideal, genuine or spurious, must of necessity go on developing itself, to bring forth all of good or of evil there is in it. Thus that of Catholicism is compelled, even in its decrepitude, to produce new dogmas, new pretensions, more and more alien to sincere modern intelligence. So in the present instance: the ideal of equality, long since become spurious, advances upon itself, rejects its own past, developes new designs, and becomes more exacting and intolerant as it becomes more extreme. It has of late generated the demand for an artificial, constrained equalization of conditions, to be established and maintained at the expense, and to the utter displacement of all liberty whatsoever; and a powerful, widespread organization, vaunted publicly in the present Congress, as comprising "the leading minds of all civilized lands," has arisen, and is secretly, inexorably at work, to effect that purpose. Time fails me, however, to discuss this branch of the subject. In one or two remarks your patience will perhaps indulge me.

This equality has no room, and knows that it has no room, and means to have no room in fact, for liberty, whether the natural liberty of Rousseau, on Which I set no value, or the chartered and fruitful freedom of individual action in civilized communication, which every man ought to value greatly. Now it is well known that Jefferson in his famous preamble put equality before liberty; probably, however, it is not generally known that his first draught of that paragraph revealed his point of view more explicitly. In that first draught he expressly represented the right, not only to liberty, but to life itself as borrowed from, and contingent upon, his great first truth, equality. He wrote thus: "We hold these truths to be self evident: that all men are created equal and independent; *that from this equal creation they derive* certain inherent and inalienable rights, among which

are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." The right to life "derived" from natural equality! He drew his pen through that: but there must have been a strange speculative bias in the man who could indite such a statement at all. It was a bias, however, in what was coming to be "the spirit of the age;" and this spirit, continuing and producing itself, has already become in some quarters a Turk that endures no brother near the throne.

With good enough warrant, too, if the "great truth" of equality be indeed a great truth. Suppose we had been fervidly saying for a century that all horses are equal,—proclaiming this as the grand fact about horses. Well, one day a fellow rides up to my stable (I have none), takes out my blood horse, puts his own half hipped, spavined nag in the stall instead, mounts and coolly rides away. I have him arrested for robbery; whereupon he proves from my own lips that all horses are equal, therefore that I had suffered no loss! A just lesson for a loose tongue, I should say! Somewhat in this fashion it is that the new equalizers have taken up the talk of democratic politics, to proceed upon it in dead—and killing—earnest. I imagine them addressing the astonished democratists on this wise:—

"Equality is a fact in Nature: you confess it such; we are about to make it a fact of civilization. Think no longer to put us off with mere ballot-box equality; that little game is played out; we have been at school for a century, and are not to-day the green heads you gulled so easily once. You baited your hook with liberty, and caught your gudgeon; we know the smell of the bait now, and are not the gudgeons you take us for. You got up for us a little, special, formal equality at the polls, as an expedient to cheat us out of the real thing; you did cheat us, to our shame be it said, but see if you can do it again! All men are equal of right; we have sworn that they shall be so in fact. They can be so in fact only if conditions are equal; and conditions will be made equal only when personal liberty and private property are done away,—only when the collectivity, centred in an efficient head, shall own everything, dispose of everything, prescribe everything, take the weanling from the cradle, put the defunct into his grave, and between cradle and grave appoint him his place, function, provender and all the rest. Understand then, once for all, that we do not care for your democracy, would not give a pin to choose between one and another of your systems of government; all of them throw a tub to the whale, and all do it with the same interested design; and we—we no longer swim in those waters."

This in substance is said, and this is but the logic of equality carried to its conclusion. In this spirit it was that a leading communist of Paris, hearing talk of liberty, said with cool scorn, "Liberty, what have we to do with that? It is equality we are going to have, equality, not liberty." In a similar spirit *L'Internationale*, an organ of the International, said in February last,—I quote from an article in a recent number of the Edinburg *Review*:—

"Raspail and Rochefort, however sincere they may be, do not know the first word of the revolution to which they are marching. They have not even a, socialist programme. They would be socialists, but cannot, because, like all middle-class democrats, they start *from a point of view absolutely false—that of individual liberty."*

It is not, I repeat, Rousseau's liberty merely that is repugned, but the liberty of the good citizen to choose his own occupation, own and bequeath property, and the like. The former is indeed discarded; and so far well; it is a sign of recovery; but the latter is discarded with it, and so one extravagance exchanged for another. Only an iron system, wherein each man shall be fastened down as with a spike driven through him, can secure real equality; and real equality these men are sworn to have.

Well, the democratism have been proclaiming equality, exalting equality, furnishing tools to Tammany, or to a swarm of adventurers, out of their faith in equality, seeing in the light of their great truth equality, how indispensable to the commonwealth are the wisdom of fools and the virtue of scoundrels; and now if they shall have to drink of the beer they have brewed, I, who like the beverage as little as they, and have earned it less, shall observe the consequent wry faces, not without a certain grim satisfaction. Besides, I feel myself in a degree indebted to those crazed heads. They are bringing to the test this loose talk of the modern world, and not an hour too soon. Enough of painted half-truths, held up to glitter and entice, but in application deftly slipped aside into some special sphere, where it is supposed that we may safely indulge that sort of sincere make-belief, of which human beings, conservative or radical, are more capable than could be wished: enough of these, and thanks even to the insanity that forces upon them the test of an unsparing application. Moreover, these new Mahometans of the International have this merit, exceptional in our times, that they are not fiddling at formal politics. They mean *effects*, these men do; and I, who also mean effects, and have a disesteem not less than theirs for political formalism, with the minds that run only and always in the grooves of political formalism, am half ready, if not more than half, to welcome anything which promises to break the domination of this,—this, that has blinded eyes and tied hands far too long. Liberty and equality, supposed to consist in the privilege of incompetence to be the puppet of knaves at the polls; subjection to "despotism," supposed to consist in living under good and wholesome laws without going to town-meeting;—if so be that only the satans can sweep these entangling and choking cobwebs away, I submit to the hard necessities of history, and say, "Let the satans come!"

Nevertheless I show you a better way. There is a good liberty, without which life is infertile, sterile, hardly worth having; it is *that* which you democratists are taking away, while you tie us down to a dependence upon barbarous impulses and chaotic natures. There is a generous social equality, which pours out benefit upon a land as the sun pours light—such an equity as led the Puritans of Massachusetts (no democrats they), there in their wilderness, enduring the utmost privation of pioneer life, to endow the politics of the world with the richest gift these have received in the space of some centuries—with the recognized duty, namely, of the republic to educate the whole people: it is this that you are making less, while you press your mechanical or supposititious equality into its place. Daily through affection for a false liberty we are robbed of the true; daily a false conceit of equality, hugest he ever yet flung in the face of Nature, stints the munificence of republican equity; and meantime each of these spurious ideals is generating its own peculiar craze, the one running to "free love' and chaos, the other to such a system as would make all men but equal cogs on a wheel; and if we are not to wait, as I *will* hope and trust we are not, until craze shall crush craze, and sanity arise from their ruin, we have just this to do; to put Duty before liberty and Quality before equality. Through duty and discipline make Freedom, to which the conceded liberties of the State and those of the individual shall alike conduce: be *that* freedom your ideal. On the other hand, say not—All men are equal—in other words, that whatsoever makes worthiness in men is to be thrown out of account: say rather—Worth is the fountain of equity, and that fountain it shall be our purpose, for the behoof of the whole people, to unseal.

The Boston

Sunday Afternoon Lectures for 1872.

The God of Science.

By F. E. Abbot.
[Sixth Lecture in the Course of Eleven "Sunday Afternoon Lectures," given in Horticultural Hall. Boston, under the, auspices of the Free Religious Association. February 11, 1872.]

A year ago I had the honor to read in this Course a lecture on "The Intuitional and Scientific Schools of Free Religion." Its main purpose was to point out the failure of what might be described as the intuitional philosophy of religion, and to show that modern religion must, so far as its intellectual method is concerned, frankly plant itself on the basis of modern science. It would have been going out of my path to criticise the principles of intuitionalism in their metaphysical or rather psychological aspect, which could not have been done without discussing at great length questions usually considered to be of a very arid and tedious nature. I was obliged to limit myself to a more practical treatment of the subject, and to deal with issues less abstract. But that the problems of God and Immortality have received no accepted solution by the method of intuition, and that they still await solution by the method of science, were points that I endeavored to make especially prominent and clear. The present lecture is in some sort a continuation of the former one; and it will be my object to contribute something towards an answer of the question—"What does science teach about God?"

"Science Has No God.

The first thought, perhaps, that may occur to you in connection with this question may be that science teaches nothing whatever about God. Scores of scientific men and hundreds of dabblers in science will vehemently assert this. Multitudes of Christian clergymen will echo the assertion, and add that the Divine light shines only from the sacred pages of the Bible. I do not at all dispute the truth of these assertions, taken in the sense in which they are made. If there is no God but that preached in the majority of Christian pulpits even at the present day, I admit unreservedly at the outset that science knows nothing, and will know nothing, of any such God as that. Thousands affirm him, believing themselves to be theists. Other thousands deny him, believing themselves to be atheists. But in all ages and lands there have been men whose ideas of God have been as high above the popular ideas of him as the Alps are high above the flats of France. Socrates, you remember, was arraigned before the Athenian dikasts for atheism, but he replied:—"Should I by my entreaties persuade or force you to break your oath of impartiality, I should teach you to believe there are no gods, and, even while making my defence, should accuse myself of not believing in the gods. But this is far from the truth,

for I believe, O Athenians, as none of my accusers believes." Philosophy has long cherished thoughts about the Divine by the side of which the teachings of Christian theology stand no higher than the barbarian notions of which Sir John Lubbock gives an account:—"When Burton spoke to the Eastern Negroes about the Deity, they eagerly asked where he was to be found, in order that they might kill him; for they said, 'Who but he lays waste our homes, and kills our wives and cattle?' . . . . An old woman, belonging to that Arab tribe [Eesa,] having a toothache, offered up the following prayer: 'Oh, Allah, may thy teeth ache like mine! Oh, Allah, may thy gums be as sore as mine!'" [*The Origin of Civilization*, p. 131.]

When, therefore, narrow-minded people blame me for using the word God in a higher than the popular sense, and attribute it to an unworthy desire of evading the reproach of atheism, I reply that I judge it right to let the great philosophical believers or all ages define it for me, rather than the little clerical believers of the day,—just as I let the great savans define the meaning of the word *sun*, rather than the ignorant people who know nothing of the revelations of science concerning its true physical nature. If the word God represented to my thought nothing that is really existent, I would discard it; and if the word sun represented nothing that is really existent, I would discard it also. But so long as both words stand for what I believe to be great and glorious realities, I must retain them both, and not permit the ignorance of the many to extinguish the knowledge of the few.

Scientific men, it is true, are very shy of the word *God*, and usually turn it over to the Church as exclusively ecclesiastical property. The Church has so long claimed a monopoly of religious ideas, and made such a bad use of them too, that scientific men have-hitherto been nearly unanimous in declaring that, they find no place in science. When, therefore, I speak of "the God of science," I would be understood distinctly as not meaning "the God of scientific men." Each of these must speak for himself, or, if he prefers, keep silence for himself. I intend only to draw forth from the great treasury of scientific truth a few gold coins which have been strangely mistaken for copper—to show, if I can, that science itself has already made discoveries which possess an unadmitted religious value, and to point out that the present tendencies of science are in the direction, not of atheism, but of an enlightened theism.

The Philosophy of Science.

In that singular compound of pompous pedantry, whimsical and erratic speculation, and genuine philosophical genius, the "Primary Synopsis of Universology" by Stephen Pearl Andrews, which claims to have discovered the universal philosophy of science, Prof. Agassiz is quoted as using the following language:—

"I believe in the existence, in the nature of things, of just such a science as you claim to have discovered: and in this I differ from most scientific men who seem as yet to have no conception of Unity of Law, and who would therefore regard your whole pretension as Utopian. Farther than this, I believe that we are, just in this age on the verge of making the discovery; and that somebody will make it. Whether you have it or not, I am of course unable to say. The presumption is strongly against any individual claimant . . . . . Indeed, I doubt whether, if you have all you claim, the scientific men, so-called, will be" the first to appreciate it. We arc, he added, all intense specialists and when the Unitary Science comes in the world, it will be something so entirely aside from our fixed habits of thought, that I think it will find its first appreciators, pro- bably, among men of enlarged and general culture, rather than among specialists in science."

There is, I believe, in these words of Prof. Agassiz, the true spirit of prophecy. Out of science itself must be developed the philosophy of the future; and not only do I agree with him in thinking that its first *appreciators* will be found outside of the circle of scientific specialists, but I further think that its authors will be also found outside that circle. No thorough specialist fits himself for taking comprehensive and genuinely philosophical views of science. But the world for half a century has been groping blindly to find this greatly needed Philosophy of Science. Auguste Comte believed that he had found it. Herbert Spencer believes that he has found it. Stephen Pearl Andrews (last and least) believes that he has found it. All are mistaken. That philosophy has not yet come. But when it comes, as come it must and will, it will embrace the totality of all "known facts in the unity of an intelligible system, doing exact justice to each and ignoring none, organizing the sciences as one harmonious whole, and including under a single yet complex method all departments of human thought. When it comes, it will create sooner or later throughout the civilized world a unity of intellectual convictions which has never yet been paralleled, even in the boasted "Ages of Faith,"—not, of course, a unity of all opinions, but a unity of fundamental principles and methods of thinking. And when it comes,—a Philosophy of Science whose basis shall be solid truth and whose law shall be unfettered reason,—then, I most profoundly believe, will the enlightened idea of God be so firmly fixed in the human mind that Christianity and atheism shall become alike mere traditions of the past. By this I mean that, if I misread not the signs of the times, and above all the signs of science itself, the Christian religion, all other special historic religions, and the various forms of atheism which these have polarized into existence, will be all educated by ever advancing and

enlarging science into an interpretation of Nature which shall do it equal justice both in its spiritual and its physical aspects.

The Method of Science.

But this philosophy, based on all known truth and vital enough to assimilate all truth that shall from time to time be discovered, must be dominated by a single method. What is wanted is not the discovery of a new method, but the expansion and universal' acceptance of the method already crowned with such magnificent and triumphant laurels—the method of science itself. Observation and experiment, induction and deduction,—the recognition of all facts, inward and outward, and the application of every mental faculty to interpret them and discover all their bearings,—this is the method, already organized and of unquestioned authority in physical investigations, which is destined to become supreme also in every province of human thinking. The conquest of one dogmatic system by another is of trivial consequence; the pathway of philosophy is white with the bleaching bones of such systems. But the establishment of a new method is of vast moment, for it means the determination of a new road for the human mind.

We are now in the midst of a great conflict of methods. The "transitional period" of which we hear so much vague and vaporous talk (nobody seems to know *from* what or to what we are passing) is in fact the period of struggle between the old method of Christianity and the new method of science. Dogmatic authority, the Divine revelation of truth which must be accepted without doubt or question as the Divinely authorized basis of belief,—that is the old method once supreme throughout Christendom in the "Ages of Faith;" and it still holds sway to a greater or less extent throughout the entire Christian Church. On the other hand is the new scientific method, only two or three centuries old, which submits every fact and every theory to the severest tests, first objectively by experience, and then subjectively by reason; and this new method is daily gaining ground upon the other. Nearly every great conflict of ideas in modern times, I care not how disguised by superficial issues, can be shown by thorough analysis to be the same eternal conflict of these two principles,—Authority or the Christian method, and Reason or the scientific method. The substitution of the latter for the former is the great reform now going on, and not to be completed until the last trace of dogmatism is wiped out from the human mind.

The Half-Way House of Intuitionalism.

The intuitional philosophy, which assumes God as a given fact, an original datum, a first principle-from which all religion is a deduction, marks the border-land between these two conflicting methods, It is the last refuge of dogmatism. Granted its one premise, intuitionalism obeys in all else the scientific method, or professes to. But this premise must not be questioned. If this is overthrown, it sees no escape from atheism. The being of God must be guaranteed to it by an immediate revelation, differing in kind not at all from the revelation claimed by the Church. The only difference is that this one, fundamental revelation is interior, made to the private soul by a transcendent or supernatural experience, rather than exterior, made to the whole world by a supernatural revealer. Thus the intuitional philosophy retains the Christian method in establishing its one great premise, and adopts the scientific method in all other respects. It is thus "a house divided against itself," and it must fall. That I am not unfair in this criticism, will be apparent to any one who reads carefully the remarkable article on "Theism—Desiderata in the Theistic Argument," contained in the *British Quarterly Review* for July last. I will quote some passages from this article, which I regard as the ablest and most philosophical defence of the intuitional philosophy that I have ever read:—

"Finally, there is the argument which, when philosophically unfolded, is the only unassailable stronghold of theism, its impregnable fortress, that of intuition. . . . It is simply the utterance or attestation of the soul in the presence of the Object which it does not so much discover by searching, as apprehend in the act of revealing itself. . . . It is nor an argument, an inference, a conclusion. It is an attestation, the glimpse of a reality which is apprehended by the instinct of the worshipper, and through the poet's vision as much as by the gaze of the speculative reason. . . . The object of which we are in search is not a blank, colorless abstraction, or necessary entity. Suppose that a supreme existence were demonstrable, that bare entity is not the God of theism, the infinite Intelligence and Personality, of whose existence the human spirit desires some assurance, if it can be had. . . . It [the condemned teleological argument] can never assure us that those traces of intelligence to which it invites our study proceeded from a constructive mind detached from the universe. [In this expression the old Christian idea of a God outside of or above Nature is clearly assumed, without which, indeed, there could be no idea of intuiting him as an isolated "object."] . . . . For the theist merely to proclaim, as an ultimate fact, that the human soul has an intuition of God that we are endowed with a faculty of apprehension of "which the correlative object is divine, will carry no conviction to the atheist. Suppose that he replies, 'This intuition may

be valid evidence for you, but I have no such irrepressible instinct; I see no evidence of innate ideas in the soul, or of a substance underneath the phenomena of Nature of which we can have any adequate knowledge we may close the argument by simple re-assertion, and vindi-[unclear: And] principles there can be no farther proof. . . . The very existence of the intuition of which we speak is itself a revelation, because pointing to a Revealer within or behind itself. . . . . This, then, is the main characteristic of the theistic intuition. It proclaims a supreme Existence without and beyond the mind, which it apprehends in the act of revealing itself. . . . . The intuitionalist, on the other hand, perceives that a revelation has been made to him, descending as through an opened cloud, which closes again . . . . His knowledge is due not to the penetration of his own finite spirit, but to the condescension of the infinite. But we admit that this intuition is not naturally luminous. . . . When not lit up by light strictly supra-natural,—because emanating from the object it discerns,—it is dull and lustreless. . . . It will be found that all who deny the validity of our intuition either limit us to the knowledge of phenomena, or, while admitting that we have a certain knowledge of finite substance, adopt the cold theory of nescience. [This is untrue, and shows a total ignorance of the grounds of scientific theism.] . . . The assertion, therefore, that Nature, of which the physical sciences are the interpretation, does not reveal God by its phenomena, is as strongly asserted by the [intuitional] theist as by the positivist. . . . The God of [intuitional] theism is no inference from phenomena, but, if we may so speak, a postulate of intuition."

On these passages, I wish only to say here that I object chiefly to the *method* they illustrate, as entirely irreconcilable with the method of science. The writer has no conception of scientific theism. For one, I frankly admit that I have no such intuition as he (or she?) describes, as the subjective revelation of a supernatural object; yet I should be loth to possess a feebler religious sentiment. The difference, I think, lies in the intellectual analysis and interpretation of experiences by no means monopolized by in-tuitionalists, who usually express great respect for science, yet seem to feel that it would be a degradation to rest their belief in God on a scientific basis. They disparage "observation," forgetting that intuition is itself only another name for "observation," and that, if they have an intuition of God, they must observe" him. But a God that can be "observed," or (if the word is preferred) intuited, as an "object," must be an object of sense,—the internal sense, it is true, but none the less of sense. In what respect is the internal sense, or the supposed intuitive faculty, superior in dignity to the external senses or common perceptive faculties? If God is an "object" of intuition, he is by that very fact an object of sense. The special intuitive faculty, admitting it to exist, is of a lower grade than the' rational faculty by which scientific theism believes itself to know God. To me it seems a mere species of idolatry to worship a God that can[*unclear:* And] ous faculty, whether dignified by the name of" intuition" or disparaged by the name of "observation"—both names really signifying the same thing. The understanding is decried by intuitionalism as lower than the reason: but intuitionalism reduces the reason to the level of a passively receptive faculty, a mere capacity of receiving sensuous impressions, and thus puts it far beneath the understanding, which is the active faculty of intellectual comprehension, the manifestation of mental vitality, the power of pure-thought. I regard it as a nobler thing to comprehend than simply to behold,—a higher act to exercise-the pure intellect than to receive impressions by any intuitive faculty, whether of outward or inward' sense.

Is it possible that intuitionalism suffers itself to-fall into the perilous vanity which seems always to accompany the conceit of special private revelations? Not always, at least. But there is danger of it. The method is bad, radically bad; and it marks the confusion which now prevails between the Christian and the scientific method. Revelation has not yet given: place to reason, but in intuitionalism it has concluded a temporary compromise. In the end, however, this half-way house between the Christian method of supernatural revelation, and the scientific method of' natural reason will be deserted, and stand only as a monument of half-developed thought. I feel more and more convinced that modern religion must, with a courageous faith, throw itself into the arms of science. In fact, science itself is meeting religion half way, by the confession of some of its most distinguished promoters. For instance, Mr. Alfred R. Wallace, referring to certain organic characteristics which he holds could not have been produced by Natural Selection, and which he thinks point to "the-action of mind" among the forces which have produced them, says:—"I would further remark that this inquiry is as thoroughly scientific and legitimate-as that into the origin of species itself. It is an attempt to solve the inverse problem, to deduce the existence of a new power of a definite character, in order to account for facts which according to the theory of Natural Selection ought not to happen. Such problems are well known to science, and the search after their solution has often led to the most brilliant results. In the case of man there are facts of the nature above alluded to; and, in calling attention to them and in inferring a cause for them, I believe that I am as strictly0 within the bounds of scientific investigation as I have been in any other portion of my work." [*Contributions to the Theory of Natural Selection*, p. 335. Compare preface, p. viii.]

Without expressing an opinion on the particular cases referred to, I fully believe that Mr. Wallace-rightly includes such problems within the legitimate domain of scientific inquiry; and I rejoice in the fact. So also Prof. Huxley, in his admirable little work just reprinted by Appleton & Co. with the title" More Criticisms on

Darwin, and Administrative Nihilism,'" says:—"By science. I understand all knowledge which rests upon evidence and reasoning of a like character to that which claims our assent to ordinary scientific propositions. And if any one is able to make good the assertion that his theology rests upon valid evidence and sound reasoning, then it appears to me that such theology will take its place as a part of science." [p. 25.] if faith in God is good for anything—if it is based on *truth*.—I fear no harm to it from the broad daylight of science. But if, like the owl, it is a night-bird, and can thrive only in the-gloom of a mystery that science cannot penetrate, then I want none of it. "The prayer of Ajax was-for light." I know no better prayer.

Nature and Supernature.

Inquiring, then, what is the first great result of the-scientific method as applied to the idea of God, I think we shall find that the old distinction between the natural and the supernatural, between Nature and Supernature (if I may use the word), which has been ploughed so deeply into Christian thought, is fading-into indistinctness, and will ultimately disappear. The old abhorrence of matter which once made men even ashamed of having bodies, and created so profound a contempt for the whole material universe that it was counted blasphemy to attribute to God any immediate control of it, was the true root out or which this distinction grew. Nature was held to be matter, and matter was held to be undivine—or, as the phrases were, "inert," "brute," and "dead." This debased conception of matter, though pushed to extravagant lengths by Christian theology, is not confined to it. Even Plato, the "greatest of the Greeks, made it part of his philosophy.—" Those, therefore, who say that Plato thought that 'Evil was inherent in matter,' though expressing themselves loosely, express themselves on the whole correctly. Matter was the great Necessity which Intelligence fashioned. Because it was Necessity and unintelligent, it was Evil, for Intelligence alone can be good. [Lewes' *History of Philosophy*, I, 262.] So also Plutarch:—"Matter is that first being which is subst rate for generation, corruption, and all other alterations." [*Plutarch's Morals*, III, 122.] But the dynamical theory of matter, which reduces all material properties (extension alone excepted) to manifestations of force, dissipates the crude notion that matter is "inert" or "brute" or" dead." Difficult as it is to arrive at any exact definition of matter, the belief that it is the source of all evil holds no place in modern thinking; and the decay of this superstition is the decay of the ancient distinction between Nature and Supemature. The tendency of science is wholly in the direction of that conception of Nature which identifies it with *all that is real;* and if God is real, he can no longer be regarded as a reality *outside of or above Nature*. This I believe to be the necessary, though not as yet universally accepted, conclusion to which the growth of science is leading the human mind. I have been especially struck with this fact in reading Prof. Haeckers recent and most masterly work, the "Natürliche Schopfungsgeschichte." In this the protest is strong and pronounced against the idea of a "personal" (*i.e.* a supernatural) Creator or God; yet I find very little really *in conflict* with the idea of God to which I believe science is tending. Haeckel believes in the identity of all substance, advocates the doctrine of Monism, and declares himself willing to share the reproach of "pantheism" with Bruno and Spinoza, Lessing and Goethe. He even advocates the idea of a "spiritualization of matter" [*die Beseelung der Materie*]; and his work is a striking illustration of the modern reaction against all forms of supernatural ism.

The best thought of to-day regards Nature as the All. There is nothing outside of or above it, any more than there can be something outside of or above infinite Space. To insist that God is supernatural is to doom the idea of all Divine Being to a slow but inevitable extinction. Such appears to me to be the irrepealable decree of modern science. I accept the total abolition of the old dualism of Nature and Supemature as the first step in the advance of mankind from the theological to the scientific idea of God. This radical revolution or "change of base" in religious thinking is demanded by the substitution of the scientific for the Christian method. Its consequences must be indeed profound. But if any one declares that it is a suicidal step for religion to take,—that the abandonment of the distinction between Nature and Supernature is the death-warrant of all high faith in God,—I reply that it is a step from lower to higher thought, an advance from superstitious to educated faith. Not to take this step is to ensure the triumph of atheism in the not distant future. Such, at least, is my firm conviction. But even if I am mistaken in welcoming this step, I see no help for it. The educated world is actually taking it, and coming more and more to regard Nature as all in all—as containing within itself the totality of all being. Whether I am able or not to perceive the ultimate results of this passage from the Christian to the scientific standpoint, the passage is inevitable; and without taking counsel of fear whether the increase of human intelligence may not bring old truths into perpetual eclipse, I address myself to the nobler task of learning what new truths I can by this added light.

The Two Great Discoveries.

The present age has witnessed the establishment of two great principles in scientific investigation,—the

principle that, whenever force disappears in one form, its reappearance must be looked for in some other form,—and the principle that, no matter what changes, or events, or developments take place in the universe, their causes must be sought *within* Nature, and not *outside* of or *above* it.

The first of these principles is implied in the great discovery of the "conservation and correlation of forces," or, as Herbert Spencer more aptly names it, the "persistence of force." Through the labors of Rumford, Grove, Joule, Mayer, Helmholtz, Tyndall, Carpenter, and the other powerful minds whose combined genius has brought to light this grandest of all known laws of Nature, the great truth that the universe is a unit, long held by philosophy as a speculation, has been inductively established by science as a fact. Various as may be its manifestations, there is but one Power in Nature, uncreatable and indestructible, omnipresent, infinite, and eternal. Incapable of augmentation or diminution, appearing and disappearing and reappearing, it is the One in the Many, the Permanent in the Transient. Thus the old dream of a "creation" either vanishes altogether or merges[*unclear:* And] sis of the uncreated; and the birth of Nature, celebrated in all cosmogonies as a momentary supernatural event, becomes in modern thought an eternal natural process. If thus the miraculous "beginning of all things," so much relied on as a pet proof of the Deity, slips from the fingers of theology forever, none the less is the history of all things rescued from the contempt heaped upon it by those who see nothing divine in the common. Rash and eager theologians, like James Martineau [*Essays, Philosophical and Theological*, "Nature and God," 1866] and the writer in the *Quarterly Review* already quoted, have leaped to the conclusion that this one Energy pervading the universe is reducible to Will. But science disallows such hasty reduction. The analogies of the human will, like arrows shot at the sun, fall back without reaching the mark. Nature refuses to lend herself to such anthropomorphic interpretations, and insists that the débris of the old supernaturalism shall not be emptied into her domain as into a vacant city-lot. Nevertheless, in this magnificent truth that the universe is a unit,—that Nature is the eternal self-expression of infinite and omnipresent Power,—I cannot but discern the first grand element of that idea of God of which science shall yet be the architect.

The other great principle I referred to is implied by the law of Evolution—more particularly the law of genealogical descent which Mr. Darwin has shown to include, not only individuals, but also species. The nebular hypothesis of Laplace and the uniformitarian theory of Hutton were incomplete till supplemented by the Darwinian theory in biology. Sociology, history, ethics, philosophy, religion, all illustrate the same great law of evolution, as treated by all the best and latest writers; but the origin of species was the stronghold of supernaturalism until Darwin and Wallace had scientifically formulated the law of Natural Selection. The luminous vindication of the unity and universality of natural law which science owes to their labors in a region previously haunted by the nocturnal depredators privileged to prey on the common sense of mankind, has been the heaviest blow struck of late years at the effete theology of the past. The philosophical and religious value of the Darwinian theory lies in this fact, that it throws the light of reason into a corner of science itself whither the bats and owls had betaken themselves, fancying it sacred to darkness forever. A brave flapping of wings and ruffling of plumage and blinding of eyes has there been, since the daylight streamed unexpectedly into that nook! Henceforth science shall shine there also, and the surprised marauders shall stand as stuffed specimens in some museum of extinct superstitions. And no one shall mourn save those who believe that light is irreligious, and taxidermy a sacrilege.

The law of evolution brings into harmony the facts which had been disrupted by the belief of miraculous interventions in the course of Nature. The creation of the universe, the cataclysmal epochs of the earth's history, the birth of new species, had been the strongholds of supernaturalism. Now they are all razed to the ground. Not only is unity of Power a fixed fact hereafter, but also unity of Law. In the favorite phrase of Alexander von Humboldt, universal Nature is "ein lebendiges Ganze"—"a living Whole." That conception is the glory of science. It marks the triumph of intellect over its environment. It gives to human life a sublime ideal, and converts the Stoic's grand aspiration of "living according to Nature" into the highest law of civilized man. To bring human society and the human soul into unity with the great Whole of which these are parts becomes thus the chief end of the religion based on science; and when Bryant concludes his "Forest Hymn" with these elevated lines—

"——Be it ours to meditate.
In these calm shades, thy milder majesty.
And to the beautiful order of thy works
Learn to conform the order of our lives,"—

he expresses with great dignity and beauty the innermost spirit of the faith which, under the influence of science, is silently shaping itself in the heart of the modern world.

The Fading Polytheism of Science.

From these two great discoveries, namely, the unity of all natural forces as varying manifestations of one infinite, omnipresent, and eternal Force, and the unity of all natural events as parts of a universal process of cosmical evolution, two great truths are deducible which must powerfully affect the development of the philosophical science of the future. The first of these truths is that science is gradually passing out of the polytheistic into the monotheistic stage.

The main thesis of Materialism is that all phenomena whatsoever, whether in outward Nature or in the human consciousness, are explicable by the ultimate "properties of matter." These properties are eternal and underived; they exist in and by themselves as inseparable from the various forms of matter; they constitute all that we know of matter, and must be accepted as ultimate facts, explaining everything else, but remaining themselves unexplained. "Nitrogen, carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, sulphur, and phosphorus," says Moleschott, "possess their inherent qualities from eternity." "Matter," says Dubois-Rey-mond, "is not a coach, to which you could fasten or from which you could remove forces as if they were horses. A particle of iron is, and remains, the same, whether it crosses the horizon in the meteoric stone, rushes along in the wheel of the locomotive, or circulates in the blood-globule through the temples of the poet. These qualities are eternal, inalienable, and untransferable. So Prof. Haeckel, of Jena, explains all phenomena as "the necessary consequence of active causes which inhere in the chemical combinations of matter itself and in its physical properties." In a very remarkable lecture [translated in The Index, Nos. 42 and 43], Prof. Hering, of Vienna, includes *memory* among the inherent properties of organized matter, and refers to it the wonderful phenomena of the reproduction of parental forms; which, considering that memory is a purely intellectual function and cannot be classed among physical properties at all, is a strange begging of the question. His theory reminds me of the Swabhâvika school of Buddhists, one of whose opinions, according to Abel-Rémusat, is that "matter is eternal as well as its properties, which possess not only activity but intelligence." [Melanges Posthumes, p. 156.] This conception of matter as the only substance, and all natural forces as the mere properties or qualities of it, is the essence of Materialism in all its thorough-going forms.

Nor is this conception of ultimate properties of matter confined to consistent adherents of the materialistic school. A semi-materialistic philosophy is indicated in what has been until recently the prevalent opinion among English scientific men, namely, that the "Creator" imparted to matter at the "creation" all its present properties by means of which all natural phenomena are to be explained. Dr. Buckland, for instance, speaks of "the properties adopted by the elements at the moment of their creation;" and the author of "Vestiges of the Natural History of the Creation" says:—"The Eternal Sovereign arranges a solar or an astral system by dispositions imparted primordially to matter." [p. 104 and 106, eleventh edition.]

Now this reference of all events in Nature to the properties of matter as ultimate causes constitutes what I might call the *polytheism of science*. It splits up primal Being into a multitude of independent, though unintelligent, powers, and attributes to their blind, hap-hazara conjunctions or collisions the production of the universe as it is. Between these various properties no relationship can be detected, because each is conceived to bean ultimate fact, isolated and unrelated. That carbon happens to have one set of properties, chlorine another, and so forth, cannot be explained on this materialistic hypothesis: but by the properties as they exist must all facts be explained. The only fundamental difference I can discern between this theory of the universe and that, for instance, of the Greek mythology, is that the latter makes the world ruled by a group of semi-intelligent powers, while the former makes the world ruled by a group of wholly unintelligent powers. The contrast seems to be in favor of the Greek mythology. Against materialists as such I have no prejudice-whatsoever; and against philosophical materialism itself I have no objections on moral grounds. But against materialism as a philosophy of Nature I have the strongest objections, since it appears to me not to be a philosophy at all, but rather a degeneration of mythological religion. It is neither more nor less than polytheism in the only form possible in modern times. It renders impossible any high conception of the unity of the universe, any true appreciation of Humboldt's "living Whole," any deep insight into the real drift and tendency of modern scientific thought. I expect to be bitterly assailed for saying this, and absurdly charged with all manner of assaults on materialists as men, although I respect them according to their individual character, and have found them as noble as any other class but none the less is it true that materialism attributing all phenomena to disconnected properties of matter as ultimate causes, and making these the only gods it recognizes, is neither philosophy nor science, but rather a system of polytheism in which the deities have sunk into mere metaphysical entities or abstractions. I object to it only on intellectual grounds, as failing to satisfy the philosophical demand for unity. Instead of recognizing the One in the Many, it sees the Many alone, and therefore contents itself with purely superficial explanations.

The Nascent Monotheism of Science.

Out of this bewildering and baffling confusion of independent, unrelated, and ultimate properties of matter, which for long seemed the only alternative to Mosaic cosmogonies and arbitrary supernaturalisms, the great discovery of the persistence of force opened a door of escape. The *properties* of matter were metamorphosed into *affections* of matter, or "different modes of Motion," as Grove called them in 1842. All forces were resolved into one Force. A new view of matter itself was involved in this great change, which has been thus expressed by Alfred R. Wallace:—"It is surely a great step in advance to get rid of the notion that matter is a thing of itself . . . . that force or the forces of Nature are another thing, given or added to matter, or else its necessary properties . . . and to be able to substitute . . . the far simpler and more consistent belief that matter, as an entity distinct from force, does not exist." [*Natural Selection*, p. 369. I omit some parts of this passage which may admit of more doubt.] In the great principle of the conservation or persistence of force, and the consequent metamorphosis of the old-fashioned "properties of matter" into "modes of motion," I believe that modern science has laid the foundation for a *natural idea of God*. No longer will it be necessary to seek him outside of Nature, or above it; science itself, in this overpoweringly sublime conception of a unitary Power commensurate with time and space, is becoming our guide to him. Henceforth the study of Nature in its entirety must be that "searching of the scriptures" from which so much has been hitherto hoped in vain. A principle of unity has been discovered that links the pebble at your feet to the remotest nebula of the galaxy, and the beating of the human heart to the twinklings of the stars. I am very far from saying that the simple unity of force throughout the universe is enough to constitute the idea of God. But this I do say, that the discovery of this unity has first made possible the development of a monotheism based exclusively on scientific grounds. I cannot follow even so cautious a thinker as Dr. Carpenter when he says that the "sense of effort" is the "form of Force which may be taken as the type of all the rest;" for I hesitate to push human analogies too confidently. It is easy to frame plausible theories, but harder to discover truth. I can only say now that the great discovery of the unity of all forces as modes of one Force sweeps away the foundation of materialistic polytheism, and points the deeper scientific thought of the age in the direction of monotheism.

The Intelligibility of Nature.

From the second great discovery of modem science to which I referred, that of the law of evolution, it appears that, at least so far as it lies open to human eyes, the history of the universe is a connected whole. The course of events is not an endless repetition, the tiresome and everlasting spinning of a top about its own axis. Studied by intelligence, Nature becomes intelligible. From the fiery chaos of the limitless nebulosity, beyond which science cannot penetrate, to the cosmos of universal beauty and use which surrounds us, there has been an orderly and gradual progression. It is as if there had been in the whole process a regular inarch of thought—the development of a universal idea. I say as *if*; for it would be unbecoming to say more, however strong may be my own assurance that the appearance is a reality. Supposing that Mind had forecast the history of Nature with the intent to bring about the present order of things, it is impossible to conceive a more magnificently successful execution of the plan. It may be impossible to demonstrate this; but he would be as rash a man as king Alphonso of Castile who should fancy that he could have designed a grander or more admirable fulfilment of the purpose to evolve a universe. I think it to be in harmony with a rigidly scientific method to attribute the existent result to the only cause that will really explain it—namely, the ever-present activity of Mind. How the one Force of the universe should have pursued the pathway of evolution through the lapse of millions of ages, leaving traces so legible by intelligence to-day, unless from beginning to end the whole process had been dominated by Intelligence itself, it passes my ingenuity even to conjecture. To say that it *must* have been as it *has* been, is to evade, not answer, the question. The question may be indeed unanswerable; yet when an answer lies ready to our hand,—an answer which, if accepted, would illuminate so much that is dark,—it deserves at least the most respectful consideration from science itself. I ask no concession to sentiment, which should follow, not lead; for every mind of virile power must acquiesce in the treatment of purely intellectual problems by purely intellectual methods. But viewing the universe as the result of a process of evolution stretching back into eternity, and finding this process grow daily more and more intelligible, I believe that science will sooner or later recognize the fact that, in the nature of things, no better proof of the intelligence of the cause could be conceived than the intelligibility of the effect. The more law science discovers in Nature, and the more clearly it perceives the tendency of all natural law to ultimate in a higher evolution of the universe, so much the stronger must this proof become. Every new adaptation that is brought to light strengthens the argument; and when the last seeming anomaly shall have been resolved into harmony with the great whole, the argument "will have become demonstration.

Moreover, so sure has modern science become that the system of Nature as a whole is thoroughly intelligible that conspicuous instances can be cited in which pure à-priori deduction has led to the discovery of facts previously unobserved. When, for instance, from the general analogies of the mammalian

skeleton, Goethe inferred that the intermaxillary bone must exist in man as well as in the brutes, and found his anticipations verified by the fact; or when, from the law of gravitation and the perturbations of Uranus, Leverrier inferred the existence of an undiscovered planet, and directed the telescope of Galle towards the very spot in "the heavens where it was found; or when Sir William R. Hamilton, from the mathematical consequences of the undulatory theory of light, inferred the existence, at four points, of luminous conical envelopes whenever light is transmitted through crystals having two optic axes, and thus led Dr. Lloyd to the discovery of conical refraction,—in all these cases the intelligibility of Nature was assumed and experimentally proved. That is, admitting that genuine facts are taken for premises, it is to be anticipated that the deductions of pure reason will be born out by experience, even in hitherto unexplored regions of natural phenomena. Science will not always be blind to the enormous theistic value of such a principle as this. It shows 'that the laws of thought are also laws of being,—that Nature is intelligible because it is itself intelligence,—that man can comprehend the universe because both he and it are equally permeated by immanent mind. The moment that science fairly fronts the great problems of religious thought, which will never be solved again to human belief until science solves them, the unspeakable importance of such cases as I have cited will be duly recognized.

Teleology.

If what I have been saying is of real value, it will appear that the two great discoveries of modern science, the conservation of force and the law of evolution, must eventually give to it a vast impulse in the direction of religious inquiry. The one establishes the unity of the universe in respect to Force; the other establishes the unity of the universe in respect to Law. One Force rules throughout Space; one Law rules throughout Time; and the Force and the Law are themselves explicable as *one* only as *Mind*. To this conclusion I believe that modern science is cautiously but surely approaching.

But I shall be met at once with the rebuff that these two discoveries, and especially the evolutional theory as applied to biology, have forever disposed of the old argument from design. Prof. Huxley, in his "Lay Sermons" [pp. 301—3041 argues that "teleology, as commonly understood, had received its deathblow at Mr. Darwin's hands." I admit it; for the argument from design is usually limited to the special adaptations of organ to function, for which a non-teleological cause is found in the law of Natural Selection. But the adaptation of the universal environment to the evolution of universal organic life admits of no such explanation. No cause has ever been assigned why the net result of all events taken as a whole should be what it is,—why all Influences should so wonderfully conspire to *develop* a cosmos out of chaos and a magnificent fauna and flora out of protoplasmic sameness,—why the system of Nature should work thus undeviatingly in one continuous direction. If it is said that this *must* have been, and could not have been otherwise, I reply that this must is the very thing to be explained. Nature *might* have been forever, for aught we know, a huge seething cauldron of warring elements, tending to no peace and productive of no result. Why must it have been what it is rather than that? Scientific men cheat themselves if they swallow that must as an antidote to the discomfort of puzzling queries. The queries[*unclear:* And] not mousing about in petty details nor aiming to prove God piece-meal, but sweeping over the whole field of thought, which finds an answer to those queries in the idea of Infinite Mind. In a later paper quoted by St. George Mivart [Genesis of Species, p. 273], Prof. Huxley himself says:—" It is necessary to remark that there is a wider teleology which is not touched by the law of evolution, but is actually based upon the fundamental proposition of evolution. . . . . The teleological and the mechanical views of Nature are not necessarily mutually exclusive; on the contrary, the more purely a mechanist the speculator is, the more firmly does he assume a primordial molecular arrangement, of which all the phenomena of the universe are the consequence; and the more completely is he at the mercy of the teleologist, who can always defy him to disprove that this primordial molecular arrangement was not intended to evolve the phenomena of the universe." The larger teleology, however, in which I believe, has nothing to do with "primordial arrangements of matter," and rests on dynamical rather than on mechanical conceptions. If the mechanist assumes "primordial arrangements," he occupies what the Germans call a "conquered stand-point." The teleology I would urge is the *unity of plan* which must result from, *unity of force* and *unity of law*, if these two are made one in *mind;* and this unity of plan I hold to be a far truer explanation of the evolution of an orderly universe out of chaotic nebula than the arbitrary *must* of the pure mechanist.

Not Less but more than Person.

The question may be put in your thought—"Is this God of science, admitting that science is indeed tending towards the recognition of God, to be regarded as Person, or otherwise?"

A difficult question. Yet the difficulty is chiefly one of language. I find the word person so differently used that it involves one in misapprehension either to affirm or deny that God is personal. For this reason I hesitate

to use the word at all with reference to him. In a strictly philosophical use of it, or at least in my own use of it, I should answer the question affirmatively; for I find the essence of personality, not in limitation, whether physical or mental, but rather in intelligence. Dr. Mansel well says:—"Personal, conscious existence, limited though[*unclear:* And] man can dream, for it is that by which all existence is revealed to him; it is grander than the grandest object which man can know, for it is that which knows, not that which is known." [*Limits of Religious Thought*, p. 104.]

Yet if I am asked whether I believe in a Divine *centre* of intelligence, I should answer *no*. The intelligence of Nature cannot be centralized or localized; it is boundless. *Infinite Mind and finite minds*—I would never lose sight of that vital distinction, nor sutler either term to elude my thought. If I read science aright, both terms are equally real; and to ignore either is to destroy the grand simplicity, the profound truthfulness, of the idea of God to which the world is tending. We cannot rudely sever Man from Nature; for Man is a part of Nature, and all that is in him is in Nature too. It is not a rational question whether intelligence is found in Nature,—or conscience, or love; for these are all in Man, and if Man is not in Nature, where is he? But the question is this—is all the intelligence in Nature concentrated in Man? There are many who affirm this; but I have tried to-day to show that science is learning to recognize a universal Intelligence in Nature of which the most resplendent souls of men are but tiny sparks. "All science," says Baden Powell, "is but the partial reflection, in the *reason of man*, of the great all-pervading *reason of the universe*. And thus the unity of science is the reflection of the unity of Nature, and of the unity of that supreme reason and intelligence which pervades and rules over Nature, and from whence all reason and all science is derived." The All is conscious as the All; the part is conscious as the part; and between the two exists the most real of all relations. It is to me no empty figure of speech to breathe the words—"O Thou!" Nor can I believe that they are launched forth into unresponsive vacuity. If it be truthful to say *thou* only to a person, then do I believe in a personal God. Yet the thought of personality is to me so inadequate that, I confess, the word grows distasteful to me as applied to him. The utmost that we know of personal being is so trivial when we speak of Being itself, that I can find no statement so satisfying as this—GOD IS NOT LESS, BUT INFINITELY MOKE, THAN PERSON.

It is but just, when you hear one deny the personality of God, to ask for which reason he denies it,—whether he believes God to be lower, or higher, than himself.

To me the thought grows continually richer and more fruitful that the very highest manifestations of humanity, even thought, conscience, will, and love itself, are to God what the merest muscular contractions or unconscious organic processes are to us,—that modes of being infinitely above these pertain to him. It was a great insight of Spinoza that thought and extension, the Divine attributes to which he reduced all others known to man, should be reckoned as only two out of an infinite number of attributes, otherwise unrevealed. Modes of being as much higher than thought or will or love as these are higher than the mere cohesion that holds the molecules of a stone together, must belong to the infinity of God. Yet these human powers must be, not reversed or extinguished, but realized in him in absolute plenitude. Impossible as it is to draw a line between the Infinite and the finite consciousness, the truth of Nature is marred and broken if either is ignored—if either the Many is sacrificed to the One or the One to the Many. Science, which aims ever to do justice to both, must, I believe, come ever to a fuller and fuller recognition of them both in our human thought.

Born out of a fathomless mystery, surrounded and engulfed in mystery all our days, returning to a mystery like that whence we came, the great "thought of God is a flash of light in thick darkness. The mystery of Nature is not evaded by atheism, which only shuts its eyes to what theism but dimly sees. In the silence of lonely thought, in the hard experiences of life, it is to some of us a renewal of strength to recognize that there is that in Nature which commands the reverence and fealty even of moral being. Our own innermost life is shared with the All. Nature is no stepmother to her children. Whispers and hints of the love she bears us reach our hearts in our own best aspirations and endeavors. Dreams and visions of the poet, true to the soul as are the rigorous demonstrations of science to the intellect, awaken a consciousness of the unity between our own restricted life and the Universal Life that overlaps it all. Well did the ancients speak of the Earth as "Mother." Between the heart of Nature and the heart of Man is a unity so profound that the mere thought of it is music of sweetness unsurpassed. The song is of a Love feebly shadowed forth by human ties,—of a oneness infinitely higher even "than that of love,—and of a destiny too vast ever to be revealed in advance of the great reality. Science will never seal up the fountain-head of this inward melody, but rather open new channels for its blessedness through the whole mind of man. I care nothing for the name of the great Eternal Fact of Being. Call it Nature, or God, or what you will; it is, and will be forever, the ultimate goal of all that is best in humanity. It is the study of this infinite Reality, not "unknowable" but truly known to the extent of our knowledge of universal Nature, that gives origin to the Idea of God; and perish what may from the world's perfected thought, I believe that this Idea of God, the grandest product of the human brain, will survive forever.

Cultured Free Thought.

The Index Association,

With offices at 90 St. Clair Street, Toledo, O., and 22 Vesey Street. New York City, has been organized with a Capital Stock of One Hundred Thousand Dollars, for the purpose of publishing Tracts, Books and

The Index,

A Weekly Paper devoted to Free and Rational Religion.

It is the object of The Index to give public utterance to the boldest, most cultivated and best matured thought of the age on all religious questions. The Index is edited by Francis E. Abbot, with the following list of Editorial Contributors:

O. B. Frothingham, of New York City.
Thomas W. Higginson, of Newport, R. I.
William J. Potter, of New Bedford, Mass.
Richard P. Hallowell, of Boston, Mass.
J. Vila Blake, of Boston, Mass.
William H. Spencer, of Haverhill, Mass.
MRS. E. D. Cheney, of Jamaica Plain. Mass.
REV. Charles Voysey, of London, England.
Prof. Francis W. Newman, of Bristol, England.
Rev. Moncure D. Conway, of London, England.

Every Liberal should subscribe for The Index, as the best popular exponent of Religious Liberalism.

Every Christian minister and every thinking church-member should subscribe for it, as the clearest, most candid and most scholarly expositor of the differences between Free Thought and Evangelical Christianity, and as the best means of becoming well informed of the arguments which the Church will have to meet in the future.

Almost every number contains a discourse or leading article which alone is worth the price of one year's subscription.

Send $2.00 for one year, or 50 cents for three months on trial.

Address

The Index.

Drawer 88, Toledo, Ohio.

pointing handThe series of "Index Tracts" (No. 1 to No. 10) will be sent postpaid on receipt of sixty cents. These include "Truths for the Times" (of which Mr. Charles Darwin, author of "The Origin of Species," says:—"I have now read 'Truths for the Times,' and I admire them from my inmost heart: and I agree to almost every word"): "Lecture on the Bible," by Rev. Charles Voysey; "Christian Propagandising by F. E. Abbot; "God in the Constitution." by Rev. A. B. Bradford: "The Sabbath," by Parker Pillsbury: "The Present Heaven," by Rev. O. B. Frothingham; "The Christian Amendment," by F. E. Abbot. This scries contains in the aggregate two hundred pages of closely printed reading matter. Address The Index, 90 St. Clair street, Toledo, Ohio.

Roman Catholicism:

Is it a Corruption or a Development of Christianity?

Romanism a Corruption of Christianity.

By Professor F. W. Newman.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE INDEX:
Dear Sir—

You send to me your little pamphlet, "Truths for the Times," and invite me, if I understand you, to say whether I agree with it. I am sure you desire that every one will speak his mind out, and therefore I say, shortly, that I agree *substantially*, and in all that is properly *religious*; but I do not agree in all that is historical and critical, concerning which I think there is danger that *you* may dogmatize, as in the past other religionists have dogmatized. Moreover, it crosses my mind (but I say it diffidently and under correction), that the element called *odium theologicum* may unawares sway you. Of course you understand this phrase. Theologians are charged with hating most those who, without entire agreement, come nearest to them, and enduring more easily an extreme enemy than an almost-friend. So, it is my surmise, you ill endure Unitarian Christians, and are better inclined to admire Romanists. I regard your opinions concerning Romanism to be unhistorical, unjust and pernicious. This is the point to which I address myself. My text naturally consists of the paragraphs which you number twenty-six and twenty- seven. In twenty-six you say that the process which developed the Catholic Theology and Hierarchy "was not, as is claimed, a corruption, but a natural and logical development." Here, I maintain, there is a false contrast. Grant that it was "a natural and logical development;" it will not thence follow that it was not a corruption. Nothing is easier than that it should be both.

If indeed a system is perfectly harmonious within itself, all *truly* logical deductions from parts of it will forever be in harmony with it, and cannot be corruptions. Yet even so, a disproportionate dwelling on one side of a moral system may so distort its practical results, as to have quite the effect of positive error. But if (as happens to all human systems) inconsistencies are admitted into a religion unknown to the founder, then the most logical developments may be most unjust and disastrous corruptions. John Wesley firmly believed in ghosts; Jonathan Edwards in reprobation; Calvin in the right and duty of religious persecution; Paul saw nothing in slavery that needed a religious protest. If you choose to select the weak points of great and good men, and "logically develop" them, you may produce portentous and hideous errors, which they would have been the first to disown and denounce; which also are violently opposed to their most cardinal teachings. This, I maintain, is to *corrupt* their doctrine. Their sound sentiment kept a control over their erring intellect; the mere logician who "develops" their errors overthrows the balance. He may do good service in confuting them; but if he pretend that his "developments" are what the preacher intended, he is false and absurd.

Next, the pretended logical developments which produced Romanism are in the most vital points utterly illogical. Coleridge admirably said that the worst errors of the Church of Rome were generated by mistaking rhetoric for logic. "This bread is my body; this cup is my blood." If Jesus ever actually used these words (which is not to me a historical certainty), he undoubtedly meant it as a strong metaphor. The author of the Fourth Gospel, apparently wishing to reprove the very gross interpretation already rising in the church, represents Jesus as saying it on a wholly different occasion (John vi: 33, 51, 53, 54) and as reproving the material literalism (vi: 63) with which he was understood. Although the Catholic Church has accepted the Fourth Gospel as the writing of the Apostle John, and as preenadnently valuable, nay, as the sole sufficient basis for Trinitarianism, yet with the grossest stupidity, if not base policy, it has built up Transubstantiation on the texts in the first three gospels.

Again, the worship of the Virgin, and her elevation to an almost divine position, is a logical development out of their other development, which had made a God of Jesus; but it has not a shadow of foundation in Biblical Christianity. I surely need not argue this point.

Then, Trinitarianism took nearly four centuries to elaborate, and nothing can be more illogical than the rocesscs used. First a "Canon" of Scripture is aritrarily settled, and every part pronounced of equal value and certainty. Books wholly anonymous, and claiming for themselves no special dictation by God, are pronounced to be the divine handiwork; and then are commented on and interpreted in the illogical spirit of Rabbinism. The plainest words are forced out of their sense to make them agree with other texts somewhere else. The Hebrew Scriptures are pressed into the service, and all their rhetoric is accepted as logic, *whenever convenient*, and applied quite uncritically, and, as every Jew will say, falsely. The most positive texts which declare the human nature of Jesus are set aside by the most *illogical* assumption that contradictions can be and must be simultaneously believed. Human ignorance and weakness (it is pretended) do not exclude Divine omniscience and power. Read the "Athanasian" creed, and ask whether it is "logical." That spurious creed is pre-eminently the creed of the Latin Church of Catholic Rome; the Greek Church was never so frankly illogical. How any opponent of Rome can praise her for her consistent logic, I have never been able to understand, except in the sense of our acute Scotch divine, Dr. Campbell, of Aberdeen, (author of "Lectures on Ecclesiastical History"), who says that Rome, with eminent consistency, in a long series of ages, always took that side in every

controversy which would best aid in building up her *Power*.

When you say (paragraph twenty-two); "Christianity is the historical religion taught in the Christian Scriptures and illustrated in the history of the Christian Church," I find a double fallacy. First, you assume that the history of the Christian Church *illustrates* the religion taught in the Christian Scriptures. I judge, on the contrary, that it most certainly *obscures and depraves* it. Next, you speak of "the religion" taught, as if a consistent system were taught. I allow and maintain that much was held in common; but the most prominent doctrines held by James and Paul in common hare been thrown over entirely by the Christian Church for sixteen centuries. (To this I shall return.) Also there were strong diversities between James and Paul. Here the Catholic Church and the Roman Church have laid hold of just so much as they pleased, to incorporate and develop. Moreover the Historical Church, since the second century, stands on a totally different foundation from the Apostolic Church—I might perhaps say from the Church of the first live generations. Spiritual freedom and absence of an authoritative letter was the apostolic basis; a Canon and an authoritative Hierarchy are the Catholic basis. The religion preached by Jesus, by James, by Paul, by Peter, by John, so far as we can learn what is genuine, was above all things a *personal* religion, addressed to, and to be judged of by, the individual conscience; a religion in which the human soul came into direct and personal contact with the divine. The Catholic religion is essentially a *corporate* religion, in which the individual soul is receptive of what the priest or "Church" says or does. According to its theory the individual in himself has no spiritual life, or judgment, or contact with God: all depends on sacerdotal intervention.

I say, one has but to read the New Testament, however cursorily, to sec that the religion preached by Jesus and by every apostle was a strictly personal religion. Individuals were called on to listen with their own ears, to judge by their private judgment, to cast aside the creeds or ceremonies in which they had been educated and as it were born, and devote themselves to a nobler morality. Judaism and Christianity alike attracted converts by purer and higher doctrines presented to their intellects and consciences: and nothing can be more opposed to this than to pretend with the Church of Rome that private men must not judge of doctrine, but must look for an external body which is to judge in their stead. No such submission was made to apostles in their lifetime as has been claimed after their death. The first preachers of Christianity called their hearers to believe in God or in a *heavenly Christ*; the Romish preacher calls on them to believe "in the Church." (I shall say more of this afterwards.) Paul invited men to spiritual freedom and counted it his main business "to minister the Spirit," "the Spirit (as he calls it) of wisdom and revelation;" that is, to develop in them a power of spiritual judgment. On the contrary, the Church of Rome invites us to become spiritual slaves, dependent on the priest or director. Paul looked with extreme scorn on hereditary ceremonies, and declares that even those of Mosaism; which he believed to have been from God, are carnal ordinances and are repealed by the mere fact of a Christian's higher spiritual teaching. The Church of Rome loads us with ceremonialism and every kind of frippery, from a Cardinal's gold brocade to the Holy Coat of Treves, which, with the apparel of the Hierarchy, was in our recent memory carried in procession, accompanied by the solemn cry, "Holy Coat, pray for us!"

Paul did not preach to his heathen auditors about any sacred book. The books of the New Testament were not written; those of the Hebrews were not held out by him to the Gentiies as authoritative. The Church of Rome grounds her pretensions on two or three misquoted texts of the New Testament, and, having thus established her right over the hearer's conscience, kicks the book away, as far as he is concerned. Moreover, however dogmatic in form and tone the precepts of Jesus are as now handed to us, it is certain that Jesus never intended those precepts to become a sacred letter to future and distant nations; else he must inevitably have taken precautions that his words should be accurately committed to writing and revised by himself. He evidently never thought of providing us with *a new authoritative code*; for he has left us to guess, as we best may, who wrote what has come to us, and when, and with what means of knowledge; and nothing can be critically clearer than that much presented to us is variously erroneous. The Unitarian Christians, who discern the great inaccuracy with which the words of Jesus are reported, seem to me more logical, more just, more reverential, in sifting and rejecting and holding much with a loose hand, than Catholics and Bibliolaters who insist on sticking to the letter. The Church system, built up on the New Testament, ever since the last quarter of the second century, is necessarily quite different in spirit and in basis from that which prevailed before the books of the New Testament were written. Paul's rule (1 Cor. xiv: 29) is: "Let two or three prophets speak [at a single meeting of the church] and let the rest [the private members of the church] *judge between* [them]. Even prophecy, which he so extols, was not intended to supersede the individual judgment. 'Try the spirits, whether they be of God, is the doctrine ascribed to John.

I said that the Church of Rome grounded her pretensions on *two or three misquoted texts*, in contrast to the statement of paragraph twenty-six, which calls her development "logical." I must verify my words.

The first weapon in her armory is the text—"Hear the Church,"—utterly, absurdly and ridiculously misquoted from Matthew, xviii: 17. Jesus is speaking of two men who have quarrelled, and the authority here vested in "the Church" is not that of pronouncing upon religious doctrines, but of adjudicating in suits at law.

He did not speak in Greek, but in the vulgar Hebrew, and it is even possible that by "the Church" he meant the Jewish Synagogue; as James in his epistle (ii: 2) calls the Christian Church—"your synagogue." I say, it is *possible* that Jesus was teaching the Jewish hearers not to go to law before the Roman tribunals, but to be satisfied with the decision of the synagogue. However, the compiler probably thought that Jesus spoke prophetically of the Christian Church which was to be, and that the precept was practically idle and useless to the immediate hearers. Let us admit that Jesus did speak it, and that the narrative as we have it is correct (though both maybe doubtful); what then follows? Why, that in the celebrated formula of the verse immediately following—"Whatsoever ye shall bind in earth shall be bound in heaven,"—Jesus meant simply that the verdict of the Church in worldly quarrels between her members ought to be received as ratified by God; the "Church" being not a hierarchy, but the *ecclesia*, which means a democratic congregation. Catholics have perverted the meaning of the Greek word *ecclesia*.

And now for the second cardinal text of the Romanists: "Thou art Peter; and upon this Rock will I build my church; and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, &c., &c." (Matt, xvi: 18, 19). Suppose that Jesus really uttered this extravagance; to whom did he give this supernatural power? Clearly to Peter. Does he say anything of Peter's *successors*? Nothing. There is, then, no basis here for any continued hierarchy, even if the Church of Rome could make out (which she cannot) that she is Peter's heiress. I find nothing whatever "logical" in this attempt to step into Peter's place.

Besides which, logic ought surely to criticize. To vest in any man the keys of the kingdom of heaven is in violent contrast to the entire teaching of Jesus; and in the Apocalypse (i: 18) Jesus is represented as saying—"I have the keys of Hades and of Death;" and again more pointedly (iii: 7)—"I am he that hath the key of David, he that openeth and *no man shutteth*, and shutteth and *no man openeth*." The Apostle John, whose genuine writing this is, can have had no suspicion that Jesus had given this key to Peter. Also in the "Acts of the Apostles" it is abundantly manifest that no one, at the time of its composition, had any idea that Peter held this wonderful supremacy over all the apostles, and that the church was built upon him, any more than that Jesus was a person of the Divine Trinity. And how does Peter himself speak in his first epistle (which I suppose to be genuine)? Does he assume any special authority? Nay, but he says—"The elders who are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, not to be lords over God's heritage, but ensamples to the flock." And of the Christian people collectively, he says: "Ye are a chosen generation, *a royal priesthood*, a holy nation, a peculiar people, &c." No single element of sacerdotalism appears throughout. If it be denied that this epistle is genuine, yet at any rate it is very ancient, and contains the doctrine received by the Church as Peter's in the second century certainly, earlier than the subjection of the Church to any hierarchy or code.

These two texts, "Hear the Church," and "Thou art Peter," are the foundation stones of the Roman Catholic Church. Grant her the authority of these texts, and her interpretation of them, and she wants no more of the New Testament. Thenceforward she is supreme arbitress and has sufficient resources from the Holy Spirit within herself. It may be necessary for me to confirm what I said above, that Rome does not demand belief in God or Christ or indeed in any definite doctrine, but only belief in the Church. This is most clearly seen in the doctrine of *Implicit Belief*, which few Protestants understand. It was fully discussed in the Council of Trent. The difficulty to be met was this. Some doctrines of the Church are so puzzling that pious Catholics are liable unawares to fall into heresy. A man means to be a good Athanasian, but unluckily he is so stupid as to receive the Nestorian or the Eutychian heresy—or something else which the Church has anathematized—supposing himself all the while to be a pious Athanasian. Will he then fall under the awful curse of the Church and of God? The reply is, "No; for although he has not explicit faith in the true doctrine, he has implicit (or *virtual*) faith, inasmuch as he *means* 'to believe what the Church believes;' and this gives to his implicit faith all the *merit* of explicit faith." Thus we have the doctrine laid down, that it does not signify what pernicious heresy, cursed by the Church, a man believes, if he do but believe in the Church. Naturally, therefore, I deny your twenty-seventh paragraph, which calls the Romish doctrine the most *perfect* form of Christianity.

I have yet to remark on one grand and cardinal doctrine, characteristic of the whole early Church, which the Catholic Church has rejected. It was the kernel and heart of Christianity with James, Paul and John—the belief in the speedy return of Jesus in the clouds of heaven, to set up the kingdom of God on earth and overthrow all the heathen royalties. The first resurrection of saints was to take place at this crisis, who were to be joined with their heavenly Master in judging (*i. e.* governing) the world. This doctrine kept the first Christians in great indifference to all political events and all attempts to improve the course of the world. To take *out of* the world a people chosen for God was their sole and sufficient task. To live looking for and hastening unto the coming of that day of God, to keep the faith until Christ's appearing, to wait for God's Son from heaven, to be patient unto the coming of the Lord, to love his appearing—were perpetual exhortations of the apostles; and were enforced by the declaration so often attributed to Jesus, "Behold, I come as a thief." It was inculcated that those were "the last days," "the last time;" that "the time was short." The doctrine pervades the whole New Testament; and most efficacious it was to string up the early Christians into an unearthly exaltation, in which they should live for

religion alone, be indifferent to kinsfolk, to country, and to life—take joyfully the spoiling of their goods, and even covet the crown of martyrdom.

But such a religion was not made to hist. It was disproved and worn out by the mere passage of time. In the third century it began to yield; in the fourth the millennium, the first resurrection and the reign of the saints, was exploded, though so clearly taught in the Apocalypse and assumed by Paul. No modems can recover the state of sentiment, judgment and be- lief, which actuated the Church of the first two centuries. Our very astronomy and geology suffice to make it impossible. But I think it very unjust to deny that of all Christian sects the Unitarians come nearest to the Church of Jerusalem in its general doctrine. The epistle of James and Acts of the Apostles suffice to prove it. The Unitarians do not much agree with Paul; but the doctrine of Paul was vehemently, indeed violently, rejected in the primitive centre of Christianity, which was for a while most influential; and it ought not to be forgotten, especially considering how prominent and important the doctrine of an eternal Hell has been with the Catholic Church, that the Unitarians were the first in modern times to renounce this, and that, according to any just interpretation of Romans xi: 25—36, the doctrine was no part of Paul's belief. From not understanding this, Augustine, Luther, Calvin and those who are called Calvinists, have done great injustice to Paul's doctrine of election. Paul believed in universal salvation, in the last result, though in the earlier stage there was arbitrary election.

I fear I have been rather diffuse in expounding the ground of my difference from you on this historical question. I think it very mischievous that we, who stand outside of Christianity and seem to be impartial judges of Christian sects, should give moral aid to the most pernicious by far of them all, by avowing that its system is a legitimate development and the perfect form of Christianity. Perhaps you esteem Jesus more than I do. I could not use the language of your paragraph 18. Yet I writhe with a sort of indignation at the assertion that the Church of Rome logically carries out his doctrines. I judge much of his moral teaching to be exceedingly mean, and much of it fanatical and mischievous; all of which Rome has greedily appropriated. His claim to be Messiah has drawn after it results which he did not foresee, and cannot have wished. I do not palliate the gravity of his error. But to regard a hierarchy, a corporate religion, an outward ceremonial, an earthly kingdom and enslavement of the mind to a code, to be the legitimate development of the religion of Jesus,—does seem to me a great injustice to his memory and in the present state of the Christian mind a hurtful error.

Yours,

Francis W. Newman,

Emeritus Professor of University College, London.

CLIFTON, BRISTOL,

Jan. 29, 1872.

Romanism the Natural Development of Christianity.

By Francis E. Abbot.

"It is necessary here to guard against a twofold error. There are some who perceive in every new mode of representing Divine truth, in every change of phraseology, an alteration or corruption of the doctrine of the Church; "they erroneously suppose that none but Biblical terms are to be introduced into dogmatic theology, and would make the history of doctrines a mere history of corruptions. There are others who will admit nothing but a progressive development of the true doctrine within the pale of the Church, and seem to forget that disorder and disease often make their appearance in a strong and healthy body. True science has to consider both these conditions; religion, too, advances, comes to a stand, and goes back: it has its excellences and its defects, its stages of purity and its stages of corruption. Thus it would be incorrect to reject the doctrine of the Trinity, of original sin, the sacraments, etc., because those terms are not used in Scripture; but it is our duty to examine whether anything extraneous has been mixed up with thorn, and how far the development of a doctrine may become dangerous to the truth of the gospel."

HAGENBACH. Compendium of the History of Doctrines, Vol. I, p. 8. [Ed. 1850.]

The distinguished author of "A History of the Hebrew Monarchy," and other liberal works of the highest reputation, Professor Francis W. Newman, of England, has been so kind as to write for THE INDEX a letter of

considerable length on a question of great importance to the liberal cause, namely, whether Roman Catholicism is a *corruption* or a *development* of Christianity. [This letter is contained in full in THE INDEX, No. 123.] I am exceedingly glad that this question has been treated so ably by one who is respected on both sides of the Atlantic for his scholarship and his character alike. So much depends on the answer to be given to that question in determining the befitting attitude of liberals towards Christianity, and so difficult is it to interest the public in a question which is seemingly (but only seemingly) remote from immediate practical issues, that the publication of such a letter from such a source can scarcely fail to awaken a great deal of profitable thought in the public mind. Prof. Newman's article is, in form, a criticism of some statements contained in the "Truths for the Times;" and I think he will not consider me as failing in the respect which is due to his eminent services, and which I most unfeignedly entertain, if I attempt to sustain by argument the position I have there simply stated. In fact, I shall thus best prove the correctness of his own belief, when he says:—"I am sure you desire that every one will speak his mind out." There is nothing that I desire more than that; and, with sincere thanks to Prof. Newman for frankly calling in question an opinion for which I have been quite sufficiently exclaimed against, but of which I have until now seen no thoughtful examination, I will reciprocate by speaking my own mind as frankly as he has spoken his.

Before approaching the main question, I wish to reply briefly to a few minor points in the article under consideration.

"I think there is danger," says Prof. Newman, "that *you* may dogmatize, as in the past other religionists have dogmatized." Yes, there is danger of it. Every one is in danger of dogmatizing who holds strong convictions. But since dogmatism is simply *assertion without reason*, he who avowedly bases his convictions on reason alone, and never shuts his ear to any objections that reason may urge, is no dogmatist. The "Truths for the Times" is a condensed summary of results, unaccompanied with arguments or processes; and one who does not perceive or appreciate this fact may naturally think the statement dogmatic. Every one of the "Truths for the Times," however, is the product of close study and patient reflection, and is built on what I regard as solid reasons; as I hope to show in the case of the opinion now controverted.

"Moreover," says Prof. Newman again, "it crosses my mind (but I say it diffidently and under correction), that the element called *odium theologieum* may unawares sway you. Of course you understand this phrase. Theologians are charged with hating most those who, without entire agreement, come nearest to them, and endure more easily an extreme enemy than an almost friend. So, it is my surmise, you ill endure Unitarian Christians, and are better inclined to admire Romanists."

Not to prolong a merely personal statement, which of course can have very little interest to the public, I would say briefly that this "surmise" is incorrect. I was born and bred among Unitarian Christians, and have formed many close and highly valued friendships among them: and I have yet to learn that a single one of these friendships has been broken, or even cooled, by anything I have ever thought, felt, said, or done concerning Unitarianism. True, I have said and published severe things about Unitarianism as a phase of thought; but I have always remembered what too many forget, that the thought and the thinker are never to be confounded. Surely, I "hate" no one; and I refuse to have "enemies," if it takes two to keep up enmity. I believe that every one of my Unitarian friends acquits me of all *odium theologicum* towards the Unitarians, and does me the justice to believe that what I say concerning Unitarianism has no personal application whatever. There my duty towards my friends ends, and another duty—the duty every man owes to the truth—begins. In the terrible struggle between the North and the South which so many of us have cause to remember with grief to the end of life, I believe that the long protraction of the war, with its awful waste of precious blood, was caused less by the determined and open warfare of the rebel officers than by the half-heartedness and equivocal allegiance of many of our own officers. Not till the conduct of the war was put into the hands of men who believed in smiting the rebellion with the edge rather than the flat of their swords, without a particle of tenderness for the rebel cause, did the victory become ours. So it is in this new warfare between Christianity and Freedom. More hindrance and positive harm results to the liberal cause from the intellectual blindness and languid zeal of its "almost friends" than from the most desperate efforts of its open foes. That is why I "ill endure" Unitarianism. I want to see the issue made plain, that the conflict may be short and sharp. I want to see the liberals on one side and the Christians on the other, that the victory of Freedom may be speedy and complete, politically, socially, intellectually, and spiritually. From the Unitarians, not only from those who are personal friends, but from those also who know me only by name and who hate my views most cordially, I do not remember any treatment that has been other than courteous and kind,—very often generous in the extreme, as once in the case of Rev. Dr. Bellows. There is no body of men and women in this country more delightful to associate with than the Unitarians; and it was with great pain that I found myself obliged at last to withdraw from their associate fellowship, in order that I might not be false to my convictions. Unpalatable as my strictures upon Unitarianism have been since that day, I believe that in their hearts the Unitarians themselves respect me for making them, and think that, *with my views* of truth and duty, I could do no less. In every way that I can, by argument, appeal,

or sarcasm, I mean to do my best to show to the world how utterly untenable is the Unitarian position; I mean to use every legitimate weapon to expose every attempt at compromise between Christianity and Freedom; and I mean to do it without malice, without unfairness, without anything that shall intentionally wound the feelings of a single man, woman, or child. If this is to be imbued with *odium theologicum*, I must plead guilty to the charge; but I believe that no open and honorable, even if mistaken, warfare on error and superstition ought to be thus characterized. I have said, however, more than I intended on this point, and will now at once pass to the main thesis of Prof. Newman's article.

The particular paragraphs in "Truths for the Times" which he thinks unsound are as follows:

26. The Christian Confession gradually created on the one hand the theology, and on the other hand the hierarchy, of the Roman Catholic Church. The process was not, as is claimed, a corruption, hut a natural and logical development.

27. The Church of Rome embodies Christianity in its most highly developed and perfect form, as a religion of authority based on the Christian Confession.

The general ground here assumed is that Roman Catholicism is the natural and logical development of the Christian Confession.

The ground assumed by my honored critic is that Roman Catholicism is a corruption—he does not precisely specify of what, but the context shows that he means—of the cardinal teachings of Jesus.

Now you will notice that Prof. Newman does not deny the proposition I make, but another one which is by no means identical with it. He does not argue to the same point. I affirmed that Catholicism is the natural outgrowth of the Christian Confession—the confession that Jesus is the Christ of God, the divinely appointed King and Savior of men. Prof. Newman denies that Catholicism is a natural outgrowth of the cardinal teachings of Jesus. I refer only to the Messianic claim of Jesus; he refers apparently to his other teachings.

There are only two ways of escaping my conclusion. It must be shown that the Messianic claim, whether made by Jesus or for him, is not the great fundamental idea of Christianity; or else it must be shown that this claim is not logically developed into Catholicism. My ground is that the Christian Confession is the very foundation of Christianity, and that this Confession is naturally and logically developed into Roman Catholicism. If my ground is falsely taken, it must be either because the Christian Confession is not the foundation of Christianity, or else because it is *not* logically developed into Catholicism. I cannot see that Prof. Newman has appreciated my position,—much less overthrown it.

If I correctly judge my critic's thought, not only in the present article, but also in his other writings (especially in his fine essay on the "True Temptation of Jesus, published in The Index, No. 99), he admits that Jesus himself did sooner or later claim to be the Christ, the Messiah, but that this claim was incidental and at variance with his "cardinal teachings"—a mere "weak point" or "inconsistency,"—in fact, the "temptation" to which he yielded, and the yielding to which entirely changed the whole character of his work as a religious teacher. But even if this change took place, and if we are to concede that at first Jesus was purely a moral reformer and was tempted to his own fall by the ambition almost forced upon him by his followers, this would not at all affect my position that the Messianic claim, once made, became the foundation of Christianity. It is of very little consequence how the claim was made, or when, or by whom—of very little consequence whether Jesus made it himself, or whether his disciples misunderstood him to have made it. The fact remains that the claim itself became the great, central, dominant idea of the Christian religion, naturally created the Christian theology and the Christian Church, and necessarily led to the development of the Roman Catholic hierarchy under existing circumstances. That is the really important point. If the Christian religion, as a great fact and power in human history, owed its existence primarily to the Messianic idea, and if this idea naturally and logically led to the formation of the great Roman Catholic organization, with its creed and ceremonial and priesthood and pope, then it is true that Catholicism is itself Christianity in its most perfect form, and that all Protestant sects are merely so many branches, dying but still green, lopped off from the parent tree. Whether Jesus foresaw all the remote consequences of his claim to be the Christ, is not of the slightest import- ance. I do not blame him for it or its results. He planted the acorn, and the oak grew up in due time. Our concern is with the tree, not with its planter. So far as Christianity itself is concerned, the veritable character and teaching of its founder are of only biographical interest; what his own age believed about him, and what effect this belief had on succeeding ages, and what was the actual development of it among the living forces of history, and what are its character and influence as it exists to day under the venerated name of Christianity,—these are the real questions that concern mankind here and now. The moment it becomes clear that Christianity has always been identical' with submission to a personal Lord, and can never without destruction be emancipated from this submission, that moment will the eyes of all free men and women be opened to the necessary and baneful influence of Christianity, in all its forms, on the natural development of mankind; and the beginning of the end will have come.

That the Christian Confession is the great, essential doctrine of Christianity, and that it necessarily creates

at last institutions identical with or analogous to the Roman Catholic Church,—these are the fundamental points I maintain; and I am very sorry that Prof. Newman has not addressed himself to these points, rather than to points aside from the main question. Doubtless much can be said in opposition to my opinion, especially by so keen, thoughtful, and highly educated a disputant as he; and I should be much gratified to learn his views on the real question at issue, and to publish them in THE INDEX. Meanwhile, I will comment very briefly on various points in his present article, premising that I do so because of their intrinsic interest rather than because of any direct bearing on my own disputed thesis.

There is no true contrast, he argues, between *corruption* and *development;* the same process may be both one and the other at the same time. This is urged as if I had taken a contrary position; but I did not. The natural development of an organism, for instance, is not a corruption; but the natural development of a disease, as of a cancer, is the corruption and ultimate death of the organism itself. Prof. Newman evidently intends to suggest that the Messianic claim was a cancer in the body of Christianity, and was developed ruinously into the Catholic Church, which thus appears as at the same time a natural development and a corruption too. I respectfully reply, however, that this is to beg the question at issue, which turns on the truth or falsity of my statement that the Christian Confession is the foundation of Christianity. *Is the Messianic claim the organism or the cancer?* That is the question. My critic assumes without discussion that it is the latter; but this is the very thing to be discussed. I have by no means "chosen to select the weak points of good and great men, and logically develop them;" on the contrary, I have selected the Messianic claim because it is the strongest and most pronounced feature of the Christian gospel, and have passed over unnoticed all the minor and derivative features. If this claim is indeed to be regarded as a mere incidental error, a "weak point" of the Christian gospel, an "inconsistency," I must respectfully insist on the evidences of an opinion which would be rejected unanimously and indignantly by every Christian church on the face of the globe.

That real corruptions have occurred in the history of Christianity analogous to the diseases of an organic body, I do not deny; and many of the practices of the Church of Rome are undoubtedly of this description. Transubstantiation, Mariolatry, celibacy, the confessional, and so forth, are in one sense corruptions, since they have been fearfully abused; yet in another sense they are legitimate consequences or remote corollaries of strictly logical deductions from the Messianic claim. Transubstantiation is only a sensualization of the Christian idea that the soul's eternal life is dependent on the death of Jesus as the universal Savior or Christ. The worship of the "Mother of God" as immaculate follows naturally enough from the idea that God was born in the flesh from a woman, who must needs have been miraculously holy to be thus honored. The doctrine of the Incarnation and of the Trinity follows naturally from the idea that all souls are saved by the death of one man, who must needs have been God also to do such a stupendous work. And so on. The Catholic faith is one vast network of affiliated thoughts; and the Catholic hierarchy is a most wonderfully ingenious organization for the propagation of this faith. To perceive the logic of either, however, one must contemplate the intricate system from the heliocentric stand-point of the Christian Confession. From that false fountain head, what but a continuous si ream of falsehood could flow? But the law of intellectual gravitation—of logic—must determine the stream's channel. Chaos would come again, were it otherwise.

It is true, as Prof. Newman declares, that the primitive Church and the Catholic Church present many points of difference. But this fact tells in my favor. The one could not otherwise have been developed out of the other. The differences are only those of the same organism at different stages of growth. Paul, it is true, summoned men to "freedom" as he understood it—freedom from the old ritual of Judaism; but it was not freedom in any modern sense. It is not true that "the Roman Church invites us to become spiritual slaves," for its invitation is still, as always, in the *name* of freedom. But neither Paul nor the Pope really invites to freedom, but only to a change of servitude. The "yoke of Christ" is a yoke too heavy for any freeman's neck; and this yoke from the beginning Christianity summons all its followers to bear.

I am surprised, I confess, to see so inadvertent a statement as the following made by so learned a man as Prof. Newman;—"These two texts, 'Hear the Church,' and 'Thou art Peter,' are the foundation stones of the Roman Catholic Church." If this were true, Catholicism, like Protestantism, would rest its whole claim on the Bible; whereas, in point of fact, it rests the authority of the Bible itself on Tradition. The Catholic Church is far too shrewd to commit suicide by conceding the Protestant doctrine of the supreme authority of the Bible. When it condescends to urge these or any other texts in defence of its claims, it is only as an *argumentum ad hominem*—as a turning of the enemy's guns against himself. No—it haughtily demands submission from the world in its own name, with no credentials but its own assertion of a Divine Authority from God. I am the more surprised at the statement in question because Prof. Newman immediately afterwards admits, to quote his own words, that "Rome does not demand belief in God or Christ or indeed in any definite doctrines, but only belief in the Church." This supreme self-assertion of the Church is but the reflection of that of her Lord, who rested his Messianic claim on no texts or arguments, but rather on the Divine Authority of God. Representing him on earth, how could she do otherwise? What more striking proof than this could be asked for my statement that

Rome rigorously carries out the logic of the Christian Confession?

I cannot admit that the religion taught in the Christian Scriptures is a purely "personal one. The great burden of the gospel was the speedy approach of the "kingdom of Heaven." What was it? The simple purification of the individual character? Far from it. It was the universal reign of the Messiah, the establishment of a new empire of Heaven on earth; and although Jesus proclaimed, as the fundamental laws of his kingdom, a moral code in many respects of unsurpassed excellence, the gospels never lose sight of its public character. Here was sown the seed of that "corporate religion" of Rome which claims universal dominion and appears to Prof. Newman so irreconcilable with the "personal religion" of the primitive Church. Why, one of the first acts of the primitive Church was to abolish all private property, and lay the combined wealth of the whole body of believers at the feet of the apostles. For withholding only a part of their property from these more than bishops, Ananias and Sapphira are said to have been struck dead by God. Did Rome ever require such total surrender of individual rights to her "corporate religion?" She might inherit, but she could not in this point better, the instruction of the early Church.

Again, the claim of holding the keys of heaven, made by Rome, seems to Prof. Newman to have no logic in it, because Jesus, in promising the keys to Peter, said nothing of Peter's successors. Rut he himself quotes the Apocalypse to show that Jesus declared the keys to be in his own possession. If, then, the *Church* is the true representative of Jesus on the earth, Peter being only the first chief representative of the Church, the claim seems impregnable in logic. The Church did not die when Peter died, nor, on its theory, were the keys his private property; they passed merely into other hands, like the crown,—"The King is dead—long liye the King!" All turns on the reasonableness of supposing that Jesus is still represented on the earth; and this follows naturally from the Messianic theory. If he is still King of this earth while invisible in the heavens, his authority must be delegated, or else it vanishes into nothingness, practically, in the administration of human affairs. Hence the Church, the priesthood, the pope, are the natural consequence of the Messianic idea in history.

Lastly, reference is made to "one grand and cardinal doctrine, characteristic of the whole early Church, which the Catholic Church has rejected. It was the kernel and heart of Christianity with James, Paul, and John—the belief in the speedy return of Jesus in the clouds of heaven, to set tip the kingdom of God on earth and overthrow all the heathen royalties." But *has* the Catholic Church ever rejected that doctrine? Has it no doctrine of a Last Judgment, with the Christ in the clouds and all the paraphernalia of the "second coming?" Has it no solemn Judgment Hymn—

"Dies iras, dies ilia,
Solvet sæclum in favilla.
Teste David cum Sibylla"

Has it abandoned any part of that old belief, except the intense expectation of its *immediate* fulfilment? That fearful dream still haunts the imaginations of the faithful, holds its place in the creed and the catechism, and remains still the "kernel and heart of Christianity" with the whole Catholic Church. The fear of the unannounced approach of the Last Judgment has always existed, and still exists, in the Church of Rome; and modern Millerism, which has its weekly organ to day in the *World's Crisis,* published in Boston, is only a Protestant degeneration of it. Towards the close of the tenth century, a universal apprehension existed that the end of the world and the second advent of Jesus would occur in the year A. D. 1000; and in that century ecclesiastical endowments frequently began with—"*Appropin quante mundi termino* [the end of the world being now at hand]." In fact, the intense terror that then prevailed gave a great stimulus to the building of the grand cathedrals of Europe, those at Strassburg, Mayence, Treves, Speier, Worms, and so forth, being erected at that period. The Catholic Church lias never "rejected" that doctrine of the second advent of Jesus in the clouds of heaven; and it teaches to-day that this awful event may happen at any moment"

I care not what doctrine of Christianity is selected,—it will be found in its unadulterated form in Catholicism, and Catholicism alone. All that Protestantism, as a phase of Christianity, has done is to weaken and disintegrate the great Christian structure until in Unitarianism scarcely a fragment of it remains. So far from "denying that of all Christian sects the Unitarians come the nearest to the Church of Jerusalem in its general doctrine," I said explicitly in paragraph twenty-nine of the Fifty Affirmations that "Liberal Christianity [Unitarianism] . . . . is a return to the Christian Confession in its crudest and least developed form"—that is, as held by the primitive Church. But this very Christian Confession they are now evaporating away into a vague and general admission that Jesus is their "leader" in some incomprehensible sense—what, they do not themselves know, or, if they know, cannot tell.

The views which I advocate of this whole subject are based rather on the genetic connection and historical evolution of *ideas,* rather than on partial analyses or textual criticisms. No one can recognize the relationship of

a fallen brick, taken by itself, to the architectural design of a great building; neither can any one recognize the relationship of the separate doctrines or practices of Rome, taken by themselves, to the general system of Christianity. The only way to do justice to any system is to study it as a whole, to trace out the connection of the parts in this whole, and to go over again in thought the actual process of growth realized in history. To any one who will take the trouble to do this, I think my view will seem the only philosophical one that can be taken of Romanism.

Even to the ordinary mind, it must surely be enough to arrest attention and compel a revision of all former opinions, when the questions are plainly put—"How comes it that, if Catholicism is the cancer and not the man, the history of the man for fifteen hundred years was only the history of the cancer? How comes it that the cancer survived after eating up the man? How comes it that Christianity has been nearly nineteen centuries in the world, and yet was never understood until the last of them arrived? How comes it that the whole world was fooled so long? How comes it that the great intellects of Christian history have always accepted substantially the Catholic theology, even while protesting against the Catholic hierarchy? How comes it that the tendency of all Protestant sects is towards the gradual relaxation and abandonment of the ancient doctrines of Christianity, as if to detach oneself from the Catholic ecclesiasticism were tantamount to detaching oneself at last from the Catholic theology? How comes it that to day the Protestant Church is throughout the world a mere 'hollow shell,' which the new Sherman of Free Religion is crumbling in its grasp? How comes it that, the moment the Catholic defini- tion of Christianity, accepted by nearly two hundred millions of believers, is abandoned, that moment the faith of the protesting world is shivered into innumerable conflicting definitions, and no man can accept his neighbor's? In fine, how comes it that Prof. Newman himself, though (as he says) he 'writhes with a sort of indignation' at the assertion that Catholicism is the true Christianity, *can nevertheless find no other Christianity within whose pale he is willing to stand?"*

These questions, friends, and countless others like them, will yet force an intelligible answer from the reluctant world. The answer is anticipated already by the thoughtful few. The decree has gone forth, and the flaming sentence is already written on the palace wall:—"MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN." And this is the interpretation of it:—"ROMANISM IS CHRISTIANITY, AND CHRISTIANITY IS DOOMED."

The five great points of my argument are these:

- The Christian Confession was the foundation-stone of the original Christian gospel.
- The Christian Confession is the heart and core of Christianity to day.
- The Christian Confession necessarily and naturally developed into the theology and the ecclesiasticism of Rome.
- Roman Catholicism is therefore the most genuine form of Christianity, all Protestant forms of it being degenerations and corruptions.
- Roman Catholicism, and all other forms of Christianity in proportion to the degree of orthodoxy of their doctrines, being grounded on the Christian Confession, are based on a great superstition, obstruct more and more the advance of mankind, and must perish accordingly.

I hope to see these positions first *appreciated* and then *tested*. Perhaps Prof. Newman will not dissent from me, when he perceives the real drift of my reasoning. But in any case I shall be glad to see the main question discussed on its merits, and settled on its merits. Especially would I say to all Christian opponents that, until they show some symptoms of comprehending the real grounds of my protest against Christianity, they waste their breath in attempting replies. It is as tiresome as it is profitless to discuss side-issues. If it can be shown that genuine Christianity is Catholicism, and Catholicism is a stumbling-block in the path of humanity, then all liberals will perceive that the sources of modern civilization must be outside of Christianity; they will perceive that Protestantism is better than Catholicism, not because it is *more* Christian, but because it is less so, and that it will be best of all when it has ceased to be Christian altogether.

That is my answer to the closing paragraph of Prof. Newman's letter. He thinks my position a "mischievous" one, as "giving aid to the most pernicious by far" of all "Christian sects," *i. e.* the Catholic Church. It is welcome to such aid as I give it. I concede that it has the true poison, and has it in its most concentrated and dangerous shape. But so long as the Protestant sects, which all dread and denounce the evils of Catholicism, are unconsciously propagating the very poison which has produced these dreaded and denounced evils, I would fain open their eyes to what they are doing, and show them that they cannot strike at the spiritual tyranny of Home without striking at the Christian Confession winch is its warrant. That is the serpent's fangs whence the poison is distilled. Is it more mischievous to dig up the roots of an error, than it is to clip its leaves? Prof. Newman abhors Romish ecclesiasticism, and with good reason. Trace it down to its root in the Messianic idea, which is the burden of the Protestant gospel also; show that this Messianic claim of one man to be Lord over all men has borne fruit in tyranny and persecution from the very beginning; and prove that Protestant intolerance and Catholic intolerance, springing from one and the same root, are to be cured only by uprooting this Christian Confession, this one great and common article of all Christian creeds. Where this

autocratic principle prevails, there is small chance for the growth of human freedom. In vain is the protest made against Popery, when every Protestant Christian "crooks the pregnant hinges of the knee" to the Pope's Pope. Teach him that all Christianity is based on Popery, his own included; and that the Pope principle governs in his own Methodist or Baptist or Congregational meeting-house just as truly as in the Cathedral or the Vatican. No teaching could be less "mischievous," unless everything is mischievous that dissuades from abject submission to authority. If spiritual freedom is indeed the path to virtue and true happiness, it is the most beneficent teaching of the times.

Index Tracts

No. 1.—Truths for the Times, OR REPRESENTATIVE PAPERS FROM THE INDEX, contains the "Fifty Affirmations"' and "Modern Principles." It gives a bird's-eye view of' Free Religion as conceived by the Editor of THE INDEX, and states the "irrepressible conflict" between it and Christianity. Mr. Charles Darwin, author of "The Origin of Species," says, in a letter to the Editor not originally Intended for publication, but subsequently authorized to be used:—"I have now read Truths for the Times,' and I admire them from my inmost heart; and I agree to almost every word." Price—One hundred copies for One Dollar, or a less number at the same rate, namely, One Cent a copy

No. 2.—Fear of the Irving God, an eloquent and beautiful discourse by O. B. Frothingham, exposes the debasing character of the popular notions of god, and presents concentric is of him that are worthy of the nineteenth century. Price—Single copies Five Cents; Twelve copies Fifty Cents.

No. 3.—lecture on the Bible, by the Rev. Charles Voysey, of England, who has recently been deprived of his benefice by the ecclesiastical courts on account of his bold and outspoken heresies, is an overwhelming demonstration of the imperfections and errors of the Bible, both in the Old and the New Testaments. Passages sustaining the argument are copiously quoted, with references to chapter and verse in every instance; and no abler, fairer, or more high-toned treatise on the subject can be found in the English language. Price—Single copies Ten Cents; Sir copies Fifty Cents; Twelve copies One Dollar.

No. 4.—Christian Propagandism, by F. E. Abbot, is a complete exposure of the weakness, costliness, and inefficiency of the System of Foreign Missions. *Full of Figures, Facts, and Interesting Extracts*. Also, a very remarkable article by a Siamese Buddhist is appended, giving an account of a spicy conversation between himself and a missionary. Price—Single copies Ten Cents; Six copies Fifty Cents; Twelve copies One Dollar.

No. 5.—"God in the Constitution Would it be right to Incorporate Religious Dogmas into the United State Constitution? By Rev. Arthur B. Bradford. A very clear, pointed, and able argument against the Proposed Theological Amendment to the United States Constitution, which ought to be circulated throughout the country. Price—Single Copies Ten Cents; Six Copies Fifty Cents; Twelve Copies One Dollar.

No. 6.—"The Sabbath," by Parker Pillsbl'Ry, is a scathing denunciation of Sabbatarian superstition. *New Edition*. Price—Single copies Ten Cents; Twelve copies One dollar.

No. 7.—"Compulsory Education," by F. E. Abbot, maintains the right of every child to be educated, and the duty of the State to ensure it an education. Price—Single copies Five Cents; Twelve copies Fifty Cents.

No. 8.—The Present Heaven, by O. B. Frothing-Ham, is a singularly felicitous treatment of a subject that interests everybody. Price—Single copies Five Cents; Twelve copies Fifty Cents.

Address,
The Index,
90 St. Clair Street, TOLEDO, OHIO.

Cultured Free Thought.

The Index Association,

With offices at 90 St. Clair Street, Toledo, O., and 22 Vesey Street, New York City, has been organized with a Capital Stock of One Hundred Thousand Dollars, for the purpose of publishing Tracts, Books and

The Index,

A Weekly Paper devoted to Free and Rational Religion.

It is the object of The Index to give public utterance to the boldest, most cultivated and best matured thought of the age on all religious questions. The Index is edited by Francis E. Abbot, with the following list of Editorial Contributors:

O. B. Frothingham, of New York City.

Thomas W. Higginson, of Newport, R. I.

William J. Potter, of New Bedford, Mass.
Richard P. Hallowell, of Boston, Mass.
William H. Spencer, of Haverhill, Mass.
MRS. E. D. Cheney, of Jamaica Plain, Mass.
REV. Charles Voysey, of London, England.
Prof. Francis W. Newman, of Bristol, England.
Rev. Moncure D. Conway, of London, England.

Every Liberal should' subscribe for The Index, as the best popular exponent of Religious Liberalism.

Every Christian minister and every thinking church-member should subscribe for it, as the clearest, most candid and most scholarly expositor of the differences between Free Thought and Evangelical Christianity, and as the best means of becoming well informed of the arguments which the Church will have to meet in the future.-

Almost every number contains a discourse or leading article which alone is worth the price of one year's subscription.

Send $2.00 for one year, or 50 cents for three months on trial.

Address
The Index,
Drawer 38, Toledo, Ohio.

pointing handThe series of "Index Tracts" (No. 1 to No. 10) will be sent postpaid on receipt of sixty cents. These include "Truths for the Times". (of which Mr. Charles Darwin, author of "The Origin of Species," says:—"I have now read 'Truths for the Times,' and I admire them from my inmost heart: and I agree to almost every word);" "Lecture on the Bible," by Rev. Charles Voyaey; "Christian Propagandism." by F. E. Abbot; "God in the "Constitution." by Rev. A. B. Bradford; "The Sabbath," by Parker Pillsbury; "The Present Heaven," by Rev. O. B. Frothingham; "The Christian Amendment," by F. E. Abbot. This series contains in the aggregate over two hundred pages of closely printed reading matter. Address The Index, 90 St. Clair street, Toledo,. Ohio.

On the Vision of Heaven.

By Professor Francis W. Newman.

In the present state of philosophy and science, of belief and unbelief, it is not at all easy to learn what is the conception, the scene, the pictorial view concerning a future state of existence, which any particular Christian, whose professed creed we know, practically and really entertains; but we can hardly mistake, in a broad and historical view, the outlines of thought and imagination which have prevailed. As certain rude tribes have believed in a world where hunting ground is plentiful and full of game, and the hunter has no lack of dog or horse; as Moslems have pictured to themselves a Paradise peopled with black-eyed and beautiful nymphs; as the intelligent Greek (with less vivid and constant assurance indeed) believed their chief heroes and wise men to dwell in certain isles of the ocean, rid of human cares and quarrels, but free for martial sport and majestic dance, for converse with sages, or listening to music, song and science,—even so surely have Christians for near eighteen hundred years prevalently upheld certain definite conceptions of a future world, on which we can speak in some detail. It is not necessary to dwell on that detestable side of the question, the "Tartarus" which they derived from Greeks and Romans, if not rather from an Egyptian or Asiatic fountain, and certainly did not improve. The hell of Virgil was a mere pur- gatory, an infliction salutary and restorative; by which "ingrained wickedness was washed out or burned out." Christians also admitted this idea, but coupled it with a far more horrible alternative, which numbers of Protestants, happily, are now resolutely disowning. But I pass to the Christian ideal of *heaven*. It is built primarily on the assumption that the worship in the church is a type of the celestial world. Dr. Watts' hymn puts into the mouth of a good child the correlative comparison of the church-worship to heaven:

"I have been there [to church]. and still will go;
Tis like a little heaven below."

God Almighty sits aloft, listening to his own praises from the mouth of his angels and saints, who (as the Apocalypse expresses it) have no rest day or night, but harp and sing forever. But besides the hymn to the thrice holy Lord God Almighty, a second object calls for praise,—the Lamb, who is in the midst of the throne of God. Here is an eminently new conception, and one characteristically Christian. Jesus, now glorified as the Lamb, is the ideal of pure, saintly, affectionate manhood, who, though no longer flesh, yet retains human features and

human voice, so that his redeemed can read his sentiments in the play of his countenance, as well as receive instruction from his words. He is believed to love every saint, and to have loved him before the foundation of the world, with a love that surpasses the human not in intensity only, but also-in wisdom and purity; having accepted them from his Father as the reward of his labors, and having therewith undertaken the task of *training them to perfect holiness*.

This is the cardinal point of the high Christian thought. Sin is the saint's daily vexation, worse by far than suffering, while suffering, in whatever form, is most harassing as the occasion of sin. The great mass of men and women, in subordinate stations and having to sustain life by labor, are liable to frets from wrong or insult, ordinarily petty but sometimes severe, besides trials various in kind and countless in number from the calamities or misconduct of those either near and dear, or assuming to be near, when not dear. Each Christian subjected to the wear and tear of constant struggle, and trying to maintain gentleness and dignity, sweetness of spirit and serenity, thankfulness to God and love to man, is daily made conscious of a sad falling below his sincere efforts, and sighs out perpetually—"Oh for more grace!" Neither more prosperity nor more celebrity nor more ease nor more freedom (however highly such things may be valued) is the burden of "his heart's cry to God, but more "grace." Such is the conventional phrase for more moral ability to bear the unreasonableness or cruelty of man and the casualties of life, as God and one's conscience would have us bear them. Hence the primary idea of heaven is a place and state of *rest from sin and suffering;* a place where we shall not be agonized by the sight-of woes which we are unable to relieve, nor stung in conscience for possible selfishness when we turn away from them in despair; a place where no tyranny frets us into unamiable retaliation, no want goads us into unworthy compliance or cowardly silence, for a righteous rule is universal. The Sun of Righteousness has risen with healing in his wings. There our hungering and thirsting after righteousnese shall be fully appeased; for the Lamb himself, the centre of God's grace and goodness, shall lead us to living fountains. Neither sin nor the occasion of sin shall remain, but holiness shall be perfected in all. No sin of others shall afflict us, no sin of our own shall separate us from communion with God; but Peace, the fruit of righteousness, shall make our union with the Almighty Source of Holiness constant, conscious and fertile in unutterable joy.

Let me for a moment contrast this Christian anticipation of heaven with the ideal future state which Cicero puts forward in the first book of his very elaborate Tusculan Disputations: and Cicero, on many very solid grounds, deserves high honor in the historical chain of European moralists. From his other writings we know that he was unable to maintain any fixed belief concerning future existence, and, as he puts his thoughts into the mouths of others, these cannot in any case be quoted as his convictions; yet it is evi- dent that he is trying to elevate the conception, and put forth a worthy ideal. He professes inability to receive the gross opinion that the soul is the blood or the heart or any of the vitals, and he cannot understand what is meant by saying that it is the harmony of the physical actions, which seems to be only a metaphor: he believes it to have a substantive existence, but to be very subtile; at least as subtile as inflamed air. Hence, when released from the body by death, it rises aloft through the atmosphere until it reaches a stratum of its own density. There it rests, and feeds on the same etherial food which supports the life of the stars; and delights itself perpetually with intellectual contemplation. (I have not Cicero's works within reach, and must quote from memory; but I think that he names three sciences as his ideal of contemplation.)

The action on the mind produced by any vision by no means wholly depends on the scene being believed to be real. The nature of the scene itself may greatly impress us for good or evil. How delicious, how much coveted, is the view from our windows of some beautiful distant landscape, some lake, some bay of the sea shut in by hills, some horizon on which the colors of sunset may be seen! How pleasant to see the blue sky; how impressive, awe-striking and calming is a clear view of the stars by night! Whether there is any personal relation between us and these distant scenes, is quite a secondary question. The sight of a nook of lofty mountain,—say, of some craggy region embosomed by snow—is not the less delightful because we are never to inhabit it, nor because we should shudder to ascend to it. We are often aware that the beauty would be greatly impaired by nearness. The picture landscape on our walls does not the less soothe the spirit and perhaps exhilarate as, though we happen to know that it is a fancy composition of the artist, with no true original. So, too, when we see in the clouds magnificent structures, silver and purple domes, and mountainous forms, it is true that we should admire them still more if we supposed them to endure perpetually in their present aspect; yet their tendency to calm, cheer and steady the mind is not destroyed by our knowledge of their evanescence.

When we consider all these phenomena, it becomes clear that, in proportion as the imagination of any people dwells upon the vision of a future state, it will be affected for good or evil by the nature of the scene contemplated, and that, out of proportion to the fixed certainty of belief. Hence, if an ancient Greek imagined that the prowess of an Achilles, however selfish, proud, vindictive and cruel, entitled him to a place in the Islands of the Blessed—though the belief were poetical and unsteady—it might give baneful impulse (as it is said to have done) to the warlike ambition of an Alexander. If it be true that the Mohammedan, in proportion to

the fervor of his faith, regards the company of black-eyed damsels to be the chief enjoyment of Paradise, and death in battle against infidels to be a sure title of admission to Paradise; then such a vision of the future must have a sensual and ferocious tendency.

Now the peculiarity of the Christian vision (of course, I mean, excluding hell) is, that it has no form nor comeliness to the worldly mind, the fierce or hard heart, the meanly ambitious, nor to any who are absorbed in self and contented in sin. Many a scoffer (long before my excellent friend, M. D. Conway, was born) has said of it:—"It is tiresome enough to sing long hymns at church; I should not at all like to be harping and trumpeting day and night on a cloud." No doubt the idea is puerile: church ordinances cannot be made the whole of a life without utter moral ruin, nor can they reasonably and wisely become the sole ideal of a future scene. But no Christian really makes them such. The scoffer does *not* go on to confess, yet it is none the less true, that he has no pleasure in anticipating a land of universal holiness, where every eye looks up with love and joy to the guiding countenance of a righteous Lord. It needs a heart essentially in love with holiness, whatever its sins from bursts of uncontrolled passion, to make the Christian heaven seem desirable; and even if, as Virgil says of Æneas, one "feed the heart on a vain picture," the nature of the picture is here such as to improve the heart which feeds on it. Those who have never been Christians in a spiritual sense, perhaps ill understand how it combines unselfishness with a sense of the communion of saints and union with God in Christ. A young Christian who, perhaps for the first time, receives the "Lord's Supper" in what he supposes to be a choice collection of saintly communicants from the hands of a peculiarly saintly minister, has an inexpressible delight by mere presence in so select an assembly. No one of them knows him; he does not desire to be known; he seeks no introductions; but he feels that everything around him is sacred. No profane heart mars his conscious sympathy with those whom he believes to be in close spiritual union with the Almighty and the thrice Holy. A thrilling sense of joy which may mount into transport suggests to him what will be the blessedness of that state where all hearts are in harmony with God, and thereby with one another. To impute as *selfishness* the desire that such a "kingdom of God" may "come,"—the desire to see its realization—is surely a very great mistake. The desire was plainly uttered, long before the Christian Era, in the Hebrew Psalms:—"Remember me, O Lord, with the favor that thou bearest unto thy people: O visit me with thy salvation; that I may see the felicity of the chosen ones and rejoice in the gladness of thy heritage."

There is here no vulgar notion of thrones and crowns and sitting on an upper seat, which, scattered here and there in the New Testament, damages the doctrine, and does but gratify ambition; there is no exaltation of self; but, as a mother desires to see the happiness and honor of her son, most unselfishly, so does the spiritual Christian aspire to see the reign of righteousness and holiness triumphant. Faith in such a Paradise, *just in proportion as it can be sustained*, seems to me undeniably sanctifying and ennobling.

One of the compensating advantages which the rude in mind have over the cultivated and logical is that, where a belief has moral excellence combined with logical weakness, the rude-minded can appropriate and retain the moral good, unaware of the intellectual difficulties. The intellectual man often earns clearness and definiteness of thought at the expense of warmth, and, if this is inevitable, the price must be paid. It is a first principle of genuine faith that falsehood and error are not so good as truth, however edifying they may seem. As beautiful *visions*, they may have an ennobling tendency; yet, if they be confidently accepted as *true*, while they are *not* true, the falsehood is sure to propagate evil. I am inclined to believe that many Christians who are still in their own consciousness true believers in this heaven, yet, as they grow older and more thoughtful, and seek to realize more definitely the glorious picture of that which is to be, by their very effort to possess their minds with it, dissipate it as a gorgeous mist. It occurs to them to ask:—"Will the Lamb, with whom we are to walk in the Paradise of God, be, like Jesus of Nazareth, of the size of a man? How, then, can the myriad millions of the redeemed be in local nearness to him? Or if he is to be, like the sun in the heavens, a vast, distant and brilliant object, what would his human features avail us? After all, is it not a materializing of Deity to ascribe to it the form of man? Is not faith, in its very essence, higher than sight,—the one being spiritual and characteristic of the holy, the other external and common to the spiritual and unspiritual? If we must maintain this now, is it not eternally true? Must we not then accept as *metaphor* only all about the Lamb on Mount Sion, equally as the jewelled city of New Jerusalem, as lofty as it is broad and wide,—the cubical city, of which the same Apocalypse talks?" By such doubts and queries the simple and hearty faith of youth is undermined in mature age.

When we look at the subject in the free light of unbiassed inquiry, it is obvious to add that such a being as man can have no room for holiness in a world which has no room for action. Intellect, affection, action, sympathy, make up that morality of which holiness is the tender glorification. While the heaven of Cicero was all intellect, the heaven of the American Indian all action, the heaven of historical Christianity is all devout sentiment. But no one of these separately can be the true heaven. A careless reader of this paper might suppose that the writer is recommending the Christian belief concerning heaven to be absolute truth; but on the contrary it seems to him that at the utmost it can only be a fragment of truth, inasmuch as it is one-sided,—to waive all

other objections and questions hard to answer. Action must have an object: it implies unsatisfied desire, wants that are felt. It may reasonably be doubted whether a total absence of pain, an impossibility of suffering, is compatible—we need not urge, with a frame susceptible of pleasure from without, but—with care for others, and with sympathy. The idea that pain is totally excluded from heaven assumes that pain in itself, and in whatever degree, is an essential evil; which certainly casts censure upon the Creator of this world, and is in many ways refuted by moral considerations. When pain conduces to moral advancement, it must be accounted a good; and it does most visibly exercise and cement affection, and excite gratitude and love so eminently as to suggest that, if the higher moral attachments of one finite being to another are to exist in heaven, occasional *pain* and want and feebleness cannot be excluded. Nay, we may go further, and doubt most seriously whether, in a modified and milder sense, sin is not essential to the finite being. The writer of the book of Job says boldly—"God putteth no trust in his servants, and his angels he chargeth with folly." So John in the Apocalypse makes the heavenly host say to the most High—"Thou only art Holy." For to moral perfection, in its absolute sense, perfect knowledge and wisdom of judgment, and an all-powerful will, seem to be essentially prerequisite. Man's virtue, as known to us, is progressive; and to imagine that by death the human being can leap into absolute divine perfection, is certainly very implausible. Higher and higher progress is all that can be rea- sonably hoped for; and progress implies that the present state is imperfect. Only, imperfection needs not to be *degradation*, as in the case of a young man who falls below the virtue which may be reasonably expected of him; it may be comparable rather to the errors and weakness of a good child, who is as wise and virtuous as his years will allow.

For these reasons I do not think that the most spiritual idea of heaven which is strictly Christian can justify itself to sober thought, nor can be long maintained in energy by thoughtful Christians: but those who wish to refute it must first do it justice.

Cultured Free Thought

The Index Association,

With offices at 90 St. Clair Street, Toledo, O., and 22 Vesey Street, New York City, has been organized with a Capital Stock of One Hundred Thousand Dollars, for the purpose of publishing Tracts, Books and

The Index,

A Weekly Paper devoted to Free and Rational Religion.

It is the object of The Index to give public utterance to the boldest, most cultivated and best matured thought of the age on all religions questions. The Index is edited by Francis E. Abbot, with the following list of Editorial Contributors:

- O. B. Frothtngham, of New York City.
- Thomas W. Higginson, of Newport, R. I.
- William J. Potter, of New Bedford, Mass.
- Richard P. H. Allowell, of Boston, Mass.
- William H. Spencer, of Haverhill, Mass.
- MRS. E. D. Cheney, of Jamaica Plain, Mass.
- REV. Charles Voysey, of London, England.
- Prof. Francis W. Newman, of Bristol, England.
- Rev. Moncure D. Conway, of London, England.

Every Liberal should subscribe for The Index, as the best popular exponent of Religions Liberalism.

Every Christian minister and every thinking church-member should subscribe for it, as the clearest, most candid and most scholarly expositor of the differences between Free Thought and Evangelical Christianity, and as the best means of becoming well informed of the arguments which the Church will have to meet in the future.

Almost every number contains a discourse or leading article which alone is worth the price of one year's subscription.

Send $2.00 for one year, or 50 cents for three months on trial.

Address
The Index,

Drawer 38, Toledo, Ohio.

pointing handThe series of "Index Tracts" (No. 1 to No. 10) will be sent postpaid on receipt of sixty cents. These include "Truths for the Times" (of which Mr. Charles Darwin, author of "The Origin of Species," says;—"I have now read 'Truths for the Times,' and I admire them from my inmost heart: and I agree to almost every word);" "Lecture on the Bible," by Rev. Charles Voysey: "Christian Propagandism," by F. E. Abbot; "God in the Constitution," by Rev. A. B. Bradford; "The Sabbath," by Parker Pillsbury; "The Present Heaven," by Rev. O. B. Frothingham; "The Christian Amendment," by F. E. Abbot. This series contains in the aggregate over two hundred paces of closely printed reading matter. Address The Index, Drawer 38, Toledo, Ohio.

Index Tracts

No. 1.—Traths for the Times, OR REPRKSENTATTVE PAPERS FROM THE INDEX, contains the "Fifty Affirmations" and "Modern Principles." It gives a bird's-eye view of Free Religion as conceived by the Editor of The Index, and stores the "irrepressible conflict" between it and Christianity. Mr. Charles Darwin, author of "The Origin of Species," saws, in a letter to the Editor not originally intended for publication, but subseouently authorized to be used:—"I nave now read 'Truths for the Times,' and I admire them from my inmost heart; and I agree to almost every word." Price—Ten Cents (*New Edition*.)

No. 2.—Fear of the living God, an eloquent and beautiful disccurse by O. B. Frothingham, exposes the debasing character of the popular notions of God, and presents concelticls of him that are worthy of the nineteenth century. Price—Single copies Five Cents; Twelve copies Fifty Cents.

No. 3.—Lecture on the Bible, by the Rev. Charles Voysey, of England, who has recently been deprived of his benefice by the ecclesiastical courts on account of his bold and outspoken heresies, is an overwhelming demonstration of the imperfections and errors of the Bible, both in the Old and the New Testaments. Passages sustaining the argument are copiously quoted, with references to chapter and verse in every instance; and no abler, fairer, or more high-toned treatise on the subject can be found in the English language. Price—Single copies Ten Cents; Six copies Fifty Cents; Twelve copies One Dollar.

No. 4.—Christian Propagandism, by F. E. Abbot, is a complete exposure of the weakness, costliness, and inefficiency of the System of Foreign Missions. *Full of Figures, Facts, and Interesting Extracts*. Also, a very remarkable article by a Siamese Buddhist is appended, giving an account of a spicy conversation between himself and a missionary. Price—-Single copies Ten Cents; Six copies Fifty Cents: Twelve copies One Dollar.

No. 5.—"God in the Consultation:" Would it be right to incorporate Religions Dogmas into the United States Constitution? By Rev. Arthur B. Bradford. A very clear, pointed, and able argument against the Proposed Theological Amendment to the United States Constitution, which ought to be circulated throughout the country. Price—Single Copies Ten Cents; Six Copies Fifty Cents: Twelve Copies One Dollar.

No. 6.—"The Sabbath," by Parker Pillsbury, is a scathing denunciation of Sabbatarian superstition. *New Edition*. Price—Single copies Ten Cents; Twelve copies One dollar.

No. 7.—"Compuisory Education," by F. E. Abbot, maintains the right of every child to be educated, and the duty of the State to ensure it an education. Price—Single copies Five Cents; Twelve copies Fifty Cents.

No. 8.—The Present Heaven, by O. B. Frothingham, is a singularly felicitous treatment of a subject that interests everybody. Price-Single copies Five Cents; Twelve copies Fifty Cents.

Address
The Index,

Drawer 38, TOLEDO, OHIO.

The Boston Sunday Afternoon Lectures for 1873.

A Study of Religion: The Name and the Thing.

By Francis E. Abbot.
Fifth Lecture in the Course of Six "Sunday Afternoon Lectures," Given in Horticultural Hall, Boston, Under the Auspices of the Free Religious Association, February 9, 1873.

If there is one word above all others which articulates in a breath the supreme sublimity and the most melancholy abasement of human nature,—which carries imagination up to the heights of a heroism so pure and lofty that common lungs gasp for coarser air, and then plunges her into dungeons of superstition so foul with blood and filth that the choke-damp of the coalmine seems innocuous by comparison,—it is assuredly the word Religion. The page of history is lighted up by it, now as by a flood of golden sunshine, and again as by the glare, lurid and smoky, of infernal fires. All that is sweetest and tenderest, bravest and truest, most inspiring and most inspired in the human heart, has been sunned into living beauty by religion; all that is most dark, wrathful, false, crafty, cruel, has been nursed into bloody and deceitful deeds by her influence. Religion, and religion alone, has had skill to sweep the entire key-board of humanity, evoking alternately the thunders of the hoarsest and harshest bass and the silver melodies that sing to us all we know of the angelic and divine.

The Study of Religion.

Politics, trade, industry, literature, art, philanthropy,—there is no human interest that has not been "moulded or shaped by religion; and no study so comprehensive or profound awaits the future historian as that which is busied with the religious development of man. The *future* historian, I say; for, although I have been so venturesome as to entitle my lecture "A Study of Religion," I am painfully aware that no study of it can at this day be otherwise than fragmentary and crude,—that in their very best investigations this present generation are but dabblers and babblers in a matter too high for them. The materials for building up a true science of religion (science must be herself the historian and the analyst) exist to-day uncut, nay, unquarried even, in the traditions and annals and poems and bibles and philosophies, the cultus and the customs, the social systems and the countless institutions of many and diverse nations, of some of which even the names are as yet scarcely known; while the constructive task of planning and executing this great master-piece of intellectual architecture can fall to the lot of those only who shall inherit the results of whole generations of mighty minds. The great structures of the existing world-religions eclipse wholly, to the common observer, the very possibility of such a science; they stand for religion itself to the common intellect; they fill the field of vision; and their magnitude, which is as nothing beside the boundlessness of the slow-coming religion of man, is quite as much as even our best scholars can appreciate to-day. In what I have presumed, therefore, to call a "study of religion," I beg to be acquitted of the pretence of anticipating the proper task of succeeding centuries.

The Clew of an Idea.

Yet, while stumbling and groping my way, as it were, amid the ruins of decaying world-religions, and consciously devoid of the light which is needed to illumine the path of escape, I do indeed believe that the clew of an idea is given which even in the dark shall serve as a guiding-thread. These vast tottering temples of faith in which the worshippers still congregate by millions, unlike as they appear to careless inspection, betray, notwithstanding, a far profounder unity than can be detected in mere similarity of moral precepts or identity of special beliefs. Such similarity or identity, though in itself a comparatively recent discovery, appears to me to be a quite superficial fact. Moral precepts and special beliefs, mere rules and mere opinions, never yet made a religion; they do not contain the vital principle essential to the organic existence of every world-faith. Deeper than to ethical codes or to theological conceptions must we look, if we would discover the vast arterial system of spiritual life which makes all religions one. What we want to discover is the common blood of them all, not the likeness of fingers or toes. The "sympathy of religions," as the phrase has been happily coined, is a great and fruitful truth; but there is danger lest we seek it in surface characteristics. When it is seen that moral precepts and theological beliefs are never the real bond of union even among the adherents of the same religion, we shall be cautious how we proceed in taking them as the bond of union among different religions. Without "unity of spirit," churches are ropes of sand; without unity of spirit, different religions, bristling as they all do with conscious hostility, could never be one in substance as they really arc. It is something, then, to be warned against going off on a false scent in the search for unity. It is something to be aware that moral precepts and theological doctrines, whether shared or not shared in common by different religions, do not and cannot constitute the essence of religion, but are simply the various forms of manifestation assumed at various times and under varying circumstances by a permanent force in human history. Opinions in ethics and in theology change from age to age; what is held to be right and true in one stage of development is seen to be wrong and false at a later stage. But the deep and powerful impulsion to seek for the right and true, without which these very changes could never have taken place, is an abiding element of human nature; and it is in this direction that we must look, if we would indeed discover that common essence which is the real nexus of unity among the diversities of law, creed, and cultus.

The Prejudice Against Religion.

In the study of religion, however, one great cause of mistake and injustice should be scrupulously eliminated,—I mean, the preconception or prejudice which pronounces beforehand that religion is pure superstition. Whoever enters on this study with a bias so unscientific as this will arrive at no results. Religion must be studied as one of the greatest facts of human history, if not the very greatest. It must be studied with the previous conviction that every fact of history, even the most trivial, has its proper place and deserves to be studied with scientific impartiality. The blind fury of the partisan, whether turned in this way or that, is a complete stoppage of ear and eye, disqualifying for all valuable research. The anti-religion rage which makes the very name a red rag to be rushed at with all the violence of a mad bull, and which is by no means an uncommon phenomenon of the day, should be as carefully guarded against as the most submissive superstition. Criticise without scruple the mischievous perversions and abuses of religion; acknowledge without palliation all the evil it has done; but avoid the mental obfuscation of confounding a permanent force with a transient form. This the adherents of the various religions do, conceiving the favored form of religion to be religion itself, and therefore condemning all other forms as false and abominable; but this the scientific student can never do, who sees that the evils done by religion in the world's history are due to the misapplication of a force whose intelligent direction must be most beneficial.

Religion as Fire.

When I say, therefore, as I must, that I believe in religion, the case is the same as when I say that I believe in fire. Of all agencies employed by man, fire is perhaps the most useful and the most terrible. It will warm your house, and cook your steak; but it will just as readily burn them up, aye, and you too. If it escapes the governance of your mind. Without fire civilization would be impossible; but the great wilderness of blackened ruins within a stone's throw from this Hall, marking the spot where the conflagration raged with frightful fury through your stores and warehouses, shows how remorselessly fire will unmake the very civilization it has made. So it is with religion. Without it human life would freeze into the desolation of an arctic winter; without it the tender flush on the face of humanity, looking upward and forward in the rocky path she climbs, would fade away and the golden aureole of a divine purpose would vanish forever from her head; without it the suffusing glow of hope and reverence would die out from the world of men, and the hard lines of care and stolid selfishness would be ploughed by the hand of Time where now he traces the marks of noble thought and earnest aspiration and grand enthusiasm for the true, the beautiful, the good. Yet the same mighty force which, if only guided by intelligence, makes each human heart an altar, has made it, and will make it again, under the guidance of ignorant folly, a lazar-house of superstition and a torture-chamber of cruelty. Let reason lose her mastery of the inner impulse of religion, and the fire which should warm, comfort, and preserve, will with all-devouring flames turn into ashes every costly product of civilizing mind. Truly, a fearful friend is this fire of the human soul,—the greatest of all blessings or the most terrible of all curses! I repeat it, I believe in religion as I believe in fire; for, notwithstanding the incalculable evils that result from their abuse, mankind could dispense with the one as little as with the other.

The Name and the Thing.

Believing that words are vitally connected in human thought with that which they represent, in studying religion I would consider first the *name*, and afterwards the *thing*.

The Name:

I. Derivation.

The popularly accepted derivation of the word religion is from the Latin word *religare*, signifying "*to bind bach* or *behind, to bind fast*." If this derivation is correct, the word would seem etymologically to contain the idea of *bondage*, as its root-meaning; and consequently the use of it in connection with any word suggesting *liberty*, as in the phrase "Free Religion," must be condemned, as one of those attempts to put new meanings into old theological words against which every true radical instinctively and on principle protests. Should ripe and impartial scholarship ever pronounce in favor of this derivation, I for one should be disposed to abandon the word religion altogether, while still cleaving to that which to my mind it now fairly and fitly expresses. Far be it

from any intrepid thinker to seek to avail himself of the prestige of any word to which his honest and unbiassed thought does not justly entitle him! Let him trust the cause of truth to itself for its final vindication in the eyes of mankind.

At the same time it should be noted, in any thorough discussion of the subject, that the verb *religare* not only means *to bind fast*, but also, in poetical and past-classical Latin, *to unbind*, as in the line of Catullus [lxiii. 84]:—

"A it hæc minax Cybebe, religalque juga manu."

It might be not unreasonably urged that warrant could be found, even in the vulgar derivation of the word religion, for its appropriate conjunction with the word free.

But there is no occasion to rest the case on any doubtful or questionable grounds. The best authorities are in favor of deriving the word religion, not from *religare* at all, but from *relegere* or *religere*, signifying "*to go through or over again* in reading, in speech, or in thought that is, to review carefully and faithfully, to ponder or reflect with conscientious fidelity. If this derivation is the correct one, then there is nothing in etymology to forbid or discourage the application of the epithet free to religion,—nothing to suggest, even, the idea of bondage or arbitrary obligation. The root-meaning of the word would be *the application of the intellectual faculties under direction of the conscience* to any subject in general, or more especially, by popular association merely, to the subject of man's relation to God or the gods.

Now this question of the true derivation of the word religion is so closely connected with the profoundest problems of modern religious thought, and particularly with that of the real relation of religion as an historical phenomenon to the belief in God, that I beg your indulgence for presenting to you some of the most important evidence on both sides of this question. At the risk of being dry and uninteresting to a popular audience, I wish to give in some detail such testimony as my note books furnish concerning the verdict of modern scholarship on the true derivation of the word under discussion.

The Derivation From "Religare."

Lactantius, the distinguished convert to Christianity who in the first quarter of the fourth century taught and wrote at Nicomedia, in Bithynia, was the first [*Divin. Instil.*, iv, 28.], so far as I know, to derive the word religion from *religare*, referring to "the bond of piety by which we are attached and bound to God [a vinculo pietatis quo Deo obstricti et religati sumus]." Augustine, one of the most influential of the early Church Fathers, who flourished about a hundred years later, adopted the derivation of Lactantius. ["Uni Deo religantes animas nostras, unde religio dicta creditor." *Retract.*, i, 13.] It was also adopted by Servius, in the fifth century, in his annotations on Virgil [*ad Æn.*, viii, 349]; and it has been sanctioned by later writers who, in my judgment have either given too little attention to the subject, or have been biassed by theological preconceptions to acquiesce in what chimed in with their own dogmatic systems. For instance, J. A. Hartung [*Die Religion der Römer nach den Quellen dargestellt*: Iter Theil, S. 140. Leipzig: 1836] assumes it apparently without investigation as the true derivation; as do also the Rev. Samuel Real [*Catena of Buddhist Scriptures from the Chinese:* p. 152. London: 1871] and other writers. But the secret of the predilection for this derivation shown by many scholars is very aptly exposed by Bretschneider, who says: "Lactantius rejected Cicero's etymology, not on philological, but on dogmatic grounds. Religion was to him dependence upon God, unconditioned subjection under his law and revelation; therefore he hunted up the derivation from *religare*, which for similar reasons suited Augustine also." [*Handbuch der Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherische Kirche:* Prolegomena, p. i. footnote. Leipzig: 1838]. This judgment by Bretschneider I consider as just as it is penetrating. The derivation from *religare* at once assumes that belief in God, and explicit recognition of a supernatural Revelation as the rightful Law of the human soul, constitute the very essence of religion. It has therefore been espoused by the vast majority of Christian theologians, and defended as important testimony, rendered by philology itself, to the truth of their system. They argue, and in my opinion justly, that, if the very word religion expresses the submission of mankind to the will of a personal God, the scientific spirit which refuses to submit to anything but the intrinsic truth of things, and claims the right to decide for itself whether there is a personal God whose will must be accepted as the law of the human mind as well as of the human heart, is wholly outside the sphere of religion, and hostile to it.' They declare, and rightly, that this idea of religion is incompatible with freedom; and they thus indissolubly bind up the destinies of religion with the destinies of their own supernaturalism. Whether the word religion, consequently, is to be the banner under which the great battle of free thought against superstition is to be fought and won, or whether it too, like the word Christianity, must be surrendered to the devotees of a dying faith, will depend mainly on the truth or untruth of the claims by which they seek to capture it for their own uses. Let us, then, inquire further into the etymology of the word.

The Derivation from "Relegere."

Cicero, the greatest of Roman writers, who flourished three hundred years and more before Lactantius, and who certainly should be regarded as no mean authority on his native language, has a passage which I should translate as follows: "Not philosophers alone, but also our own ancestors, distinguished superstition from religion. For those who were wont to offer prayer and sacrifice, during entire days, that their children might survive them [*superstites essent*], were called superstitious; a word which was afterwards applied more widely. But they who carefully meditated and, as it were, considered and re-considered all those things which pertained to the worship of the gods, were called *religious* from *relegere* [*De Nat. Deor.*, ii, 28.1 Now it is true that the derivation of the word superstition here given is at least dubious; and this fact justifies suspicion of the other derivation. But even he who mistakes once should not therefore be immediately set down as mistaking always. There is other evidence, very strong evidence, showing that Cicero was right in his second derivation. There is a participle *religens*, signifying religious, which cannot possibly be derived from *religare*, but must be referred to *relegere* (or *religere*, as sometimes spelled.) This participle is contained in a verse quoted from an old poet by Aulus Gellius, author of the *Noctes Atticæ*, who lived more than a century before Lactantius:

"Rellgentem esse oportet, religiosum nefas."

That is, "it is right to be religious, wrong to be *religiose*, or superstitious." Such evidence as this must have immense weight with scholars who are free from prepossession. Furthermore, the use of the word *religio* itself was quite com- mon at Rome in the simple sense of a "scruple," conscientious or otherwise, implying the consciousness of a natural obligation wholly irrespective of the gods. For instance, the comic poet Terence, who flourished nearly two hundred years before Christ, makes one of his characters exclaim: "I scruple (or am ashamed) to say that I have nothing—nam nil esse mihi religiost dicere." [*Heaut.*, i, 228. Teubner's ed., 1857.] Faithfulness, sincerity, veracity, honor, punctiliousness, conscientiousness—these were frequent popular meanings of the word; and it is evident that they mark its original, radical signification far more clearly than the use made of it as applied to worship of the gods. They point directly to *relegere* as the true root.

Not to rest the case, however, on any assertions or arguments of my own, let me cite the direct testimony of the highest authorities.

The *Universal Latin Lexicon* of Facciolatus and Forcellinus [Bailey's edition, 1828], the *Wörterbuch der Lateinischen Sprache* of Dr. Wilhelm Freund [Leipzig, 1840], and the *Latin-English Lexicon* of Dr. Andrews, which is better known in this country than the great lexicon of Dr. Freund on which it is based, all give the weight of their authority to the derivation from *relegere*. No better authorities could be adduced.

Dr. Ramshorn, whose *Latin Synonymes* is a work of the highest reputation, derives the word religion from *relegere*, and gives as its fundamental or root-meaning—"conscientiousness, scruple of conscience, scrupulousness." ["Etwas bei sich wiederholen, iminer wieder überlegen; daher die Gewissenhaftigkeit, der Gewissenscrupel, die Bedenklichkeit." *Lateinische Synonymik*. Leipzig: 1831.]

Dr. John William Donaldson, one of the finest of English scholars, referring to the same derivation, says very emphatically: "There can be no doubt that it is perfectly true. It is clear from the use of the word, that it is not derived from *religare*, 'to bind back,' but from *religere*, 'to gather over and over again,' 'to think perpetually and carefully on the same subject,' 'to dwell with anxious thought on some idea or recollection.' . . . . Hence, practically, *relligio* signifies, (1) 'religious worship,' considered as scrupulous obedience to the exactions of conscience, and with especial reference to the act of worship; etc." [*Varronianus: A Critical and Historical Introduction to the Ethnography of Ancient Italy and to the Philological Study of the Latin Languaqe*. p. 407. London: 1852.]

Lest I should transgress beyond all hope of pardon by my citations, permit me simply to refer here to Dr. Paulus [*Der Denkglaubige*, i, 50]; to Dr. Klotz [*Handwörterbuch der Lateinisclien Sprache*]; and to Pott, the great philologist [*Etymologische Forschungen*, ii. 161]. These scholars are unanimous in favoring the derivation *relegere* and rejecting that from *religare*. So far as my very imperfect studies have gone, they have led me wholly in the same direction; and I venture to think that no one who sits down faithfully to study the subject in the spirit of pure scholarship, regardless of all dogmatic bias, can come to a different conclusion. I took up the investigation two or three years ago, in order to satisfy my own mind whether radicals ought to discard the word religion as I believe they ought to discard the word Christianity, and with perfect willingness to do it myself, if necessary; and the conclusion has forced itself upon me with irresistible force that the word most certainly belongs to us by its etymology, and, as I hope to show, quite as much by its usage and by its essential meaning.

I would only add that Doderlein, who proposes a third derivation for the word religion, namely, from *re* and a Greek verb signifying *to look to, to have a care for*, assigns to it the same radical signification: "*Pictas* is the natural feeling of innate love; *religio*, the feeling of a sacred duty come to consciousness. . . . Furthermore, *religio* rests on an inward obligation by conscience; *fides*, on the other hand, on an outward obligation by a promise." [*Lateinische Synonyme und Etymologieen*. Leipzig: 1838.] It will be seen, therefore, that Doderlein, differing from the foregoing in point of derivation, strik- ingly agrees with them in point of fundamental

meaning.

Of the two chief derivations which are assigned to the word religion, I think I have shown conclusively that *religare*. is not, and that *relegere* is, the true root. The former implies the idea of bondage, and assumes the belief in a supernatural God, whose simple will is the rightful law of human life, as the very essence of religion itself. The latter assumes the great fact of duty, of conscience, of moral obligation to a natural law of right, and implies not the faintest restriction upon any human faculty other than the natural obligation of right and truth, So far, then, as etymology is concerned, the pretence that the phrase Free Religion contains an inherent contradiction is seen to be based either upon philological ignorance or dogmatic narrowness.

II. Usage.

Trusting that the importance of the subject will still secure to me your indulgence for some inevitable dulness, I wish to dwell a little further upon the word religion with reference to its *usage;* and I would broadly distinguish between two different use of it as respectively *provincial* and *cosmopolitan*. They Correspond to the two derivations already stated, but of course can be' considered quite independently of them. Under each of these two uses, the provincial and the cosmopolitan, I would point out a minor distinction of the *vulgar* and the *scholarly*.

The Provincial Use.

The vulgar provincial use of the word religion is that which confounds religion in general with the special form of it which is dominant in any particular place and time. For instance, the Catholic believes that there is no religion at all, properly so called, but Roman Catholicism. His own faith is all the faith there is; every other pretended faith is unfaith, more or less pernicious, and as absolutely hateful to God as all falsehood must necessarily be. This enormous complacency of the Catholic Church is shared to a degree by every Christian, whether Evangel- ical or so-called Liberal, who cannot or will not concede that Christianity stands precisely on the level of all other religions, as a natural outgrowth of humanity rather than as a supernatural revelation of God. The idea of religion it presupposes is not only provincial, but vulgarly provincial, savoring of nothing but ignorance or conceit. There is nothing about it that a large heart or well-furnished head can view otherwise than with pity for its narrowness, or contempt for its assumption. It will pass away inevitably together with the general dialect of superstition.

The scholarly-provincial use of the word religion is that which, while recognizing all the diverse forms of religion as standing precisely on the same level, all natural and none supernatural, yet confines the application of the word strictly to theistic systems of belief. It is willing to reckon Judaism, Mohammedanism, Parseeism, and so forth, as religions, because they are all monotheistic; and it is willing to include also Buddhism, Confucianism, Positivism even, provided these can be shown to have some sort of belief in a God or gods. At present it stoutly contends that these latter faiths do have such a belief, and it therefore does not deny that they are religions. But if ever it becomes settled by scholarly investigation beyond reasonable doubt that any one of them is nakedly and baldly and incontrovertibly atheistic, then the provincial scholar will be forced either to deny that it is a religion at all, or else without reserve to abandon his own provincialism. There is no escape from this dilemma. If there is no religion without a belief in God, and if Buddhism, for example, should be proved to have no belief in God in any intelligible sense, then one of two things must be true: either Buddhism is not a religion, or else there can be an atheistic religion. The provincial scholar, therefore, is bound to deny that Buddhism is atheistic, that Confucianism is atheistic, that Positivism is atheistic (if this is conceded to be a religion at all, although in this case the other horn of the dilemma is usually seized). The essence of scholarly provincialism consists in the assumed principle that nothing can be a religion that does not believe in a God or gods; and it exacts this belief as the one great postulate which religion, at least, must never question. Whether it can ever be reconciled with absolute freedom of thought, is a question whose answer seems to me very plain.

The Cosmopolitan Use.

The vulgar cosmopolitan use of the word religion is that which loosely classes all religions together on equal terms, without making any inquiry as to their various doctrines. This is a very common Use of the word among people who have given no particular thought to the subject, but who are free from all narrow prejudice. It is so very common that I claim it as a strictly popular use of the word; and I therefore deny that the radical who thinks Buddhism is atheistic, and yet continues to call it a religion, is guilty of any use of language which is a violation of its natural and current meaning. If questioned, most people would say without reflection that religion always implies a belief in God; yet, if convinced that Buddhism has no such belief, most people would refuse to attempt (he impossible task of extruding it from its established place among the greatest religions of

the world. To speak, then, of atheistic religions as at least a sposibility, is not to tamper with words at all. The vulgar cosmopolitan usage warrants it, even on an appeal to the common people.

The scholarly cosmopolitan use of the word religion is that which carefully distinguishes between *religion*, as a permanent force in human history, and the *religions* which have been or are its various special forms. It lays down no *à priori* principle as to what all religion must be, but applies the term impartially to everything which proves itself to be a religion by doing religion's work in the world. It exacts no theistic or atheistic belief as a condition of admittance into the family of recognized religions; it seeks the unity of them all in something deeper than any belief; it treats them as all equally natural, all more or less imperfect, all amenable to the reason of mankind for their influence on charac- ter, life, and society. This usage of the word can alone be considered scientific, or become acceptable to the spirit of science; for it is the only usage which frankly concedes to science her right to sit in judgment on all human opinions. And it is the only usage which can justify the phrase Free Religion, by construing religion in a way which thoroughly respects and conserves freedom.

"Which of these four usages we adopt, is a matter far broader than it seems; for as we use the word, so also do we conceive and treat the thing. I would not take a narrow, provincial view of what is certainly a ubiquitous and permanent fact of human history, nor knowingly cramp myself by that uncultured dialect, that mere vulgar *patois* of the soul, which has no words for ideas of universal import. Let our thought and our speech be alike cosmopolitan, large, and elevated, not unworthy of the profound and sublime realities with which they deal. Let us look for the meaning of that word religion in the light of universal human experience, and find it in that which is common to men of all times and climes, of all races and all phases of theological thought. Religion means something which is common to monotheistic Judaism and tritheistic Christianity,—to polytheistic Paganism and pantheistic Brahman ism and atheistic Buddhism; and this something must be discovered in depths of human nature far beneath the region where diverging thoughts appear. Despite the vast speculative chasms which yawn between these varying religions, there must be something shared by them all alike, or they would never have been classed together by the quick judgment of mankind. Nor is this something to be sought for in common beliefs or in common moral rules; these are simply products, not the productive principle itself. It must be sought for as a creative force in man, from which have proceeded all theological beliefs, whether alike or unlike, and all moral rules, whether identical or not. Not in the branches, not even in the trunk of the tree, but rather in the common sap, the common life, the common idea and law of the whole organism, must be at last discovered that secret of unity which pervades and dominates the growth of all religions. What is it?

The Thing:

Three Popular Conceptions of IT.

There are three chief popular conceptions of the essence of religion. All three consist in laying a special emphasis and stress on some one department of human nature, to the virtual neglect of other departments equally important. It is man alone that is religious in the common sense of the word; and therefore no one denies that religion is a manifestation of humanity. But whether it is fundamentally a manifestation of thought, feeling, or will, is a question on which there is a divergence of opinion. I believe that, although nobody perhaps would make religion consist either in thought, feeling, or will *exclusively*, yet most persons unduly emphasize the part in it played by some one of these three factors of human nature. Hence arise three theories of religion which err by disproportion; and this initial error becomes the root of vast subsequent mischief.

Religion as Thought.

It is the characteristic of all dogmatic systems to make opinion or belief the essence of religion. While also insisting on certain sentiments and actions, they nevertheless make Orthodoxy the principal matter. Mr. Lecky has pointed out that "salvation by belief" has from the beginning been the fundamental principle of Christianity, as exhibited by its history; that this supreme emphasis laid on mental belief has been the root of persecution and countless gigantic evils. From Christianity a considerable number of free thinkers have accepted the idea that belief essentially constitutes religion, even while they reject religion itself as mere superstition; and they thus fail to comprehend the true nature of religion as completely as the narrowest and most bigoted churchman. But the day of a larger criticism and more thorough philosophy is dawning; and the notion that religion rests mainly on belief will sooner or later pass away.

Religion as Feeling.

It is the characteristic of all forms of mysticism to make religion consist primarily in feeling. Certain phases of Christianity, such as Moravianism and Methodism, will at once occur to your minds as illustrations of this, requiring as they do above everything else a peculiar "state of the affections," even to the comparative disparagement of orthodoxy of opinion. While less interesting to the thinker than the elaborately constructed systems of dogmatic theology, this mystical species of religion is more cheerful, more genial, and more free from the persecuting or intolerant spirit, than its harder-featured sister, dogmatism; and it is easy to see why Methodism, appealing chiefly to emotion and not rigorously exacting clear-cut opinions on doctrinal matters, should spread with great rapidity in an age when belief in Christian doctrines is either dying or dead.

Closely allied to mysticism, or the religion combining a maximum of feeling with a minimum of thought and action, is a species of modern radicalism for the historical influence of which I have profound respect and a large measure of sympathy, but which I regard as quite inadequate to take the lead to-day in the march of progress. I refer to New England Transcendentalism. It plants itself fundamentally on what it calls the "religious sentiment," as a distinct and special faculty of the human soul,—combining the quite unlike functions of intellectual intuition and emotional sensibility, and fitted, not only to apprehend supersensuous truths by direct vision or special illumination, but also to respond to them by an exalted range of feelings quite unlike all other sentiments in kind. For the great names which are most illustriously associated with this splendid movement of New England thought, and for the great good they have accomplished, I can yield to no one in point of admiration or gratitude; they are fixed stars in the galaxy of our age, and their light has come with divine cheer to great multitudes of darkened minds. But, however reluctantly, I am constrained to think and to say that their theory of religion is inadequate to meet the demands of the future, or even of the present. With all its mystical beauty and sweetness, it lacks a solid basis in thorough psychological analysis; it is a radiant dream, glorious and lovely, but not competent to till the wants of humanity in this opening era of scientific thought. That there is indeed such a thing as "religious sentiment," I most certainly believe. But that it is a special faculty, a special power of reception of the highest truths which is not possessed by the pure intellect as such, I must as certainly deny. The primary and well established division of faculties is into thought, feeling, and will; or, in more technical phrase, the cognitive, sensitive, and conative faculties. What is called by Transcendentalism the "religious sentiment" is really a complex manifestation of the former two, thought and feeling; it does not constitute a fourth division, and can only be regarded as doing so in the absence of a scientific psychology. Thought is thought; feeling is feeling; and their union in consciousness cannot at all destroy their elemental nature. In a right use of language, the "religious sentiment" signifies *the feelings or sentiments which accompany, or result from, the purely intellectual contemplation of the idea of God, regarded as an objective truth*. It is not an intuitive faculty; it is not a distinct faculty at all; it is simply the play of feeling excited by religious thought. As well might we consider love towards parents as a faculty distinct from love towards children; whereas love is essentially love, whatever its objects, and however various may be the coloring given to it by the varying nature of its objects. Awe, veneration, love,—all the sentiments which enter into the so-called "religious sentiment" are of universal application; and when Transcendentalism builds upon the conglomerate as if it were a simple and original basis in human nature, it does but found its house, fair as are its proportions, upon the sand. A new phase of thought is succeeding to Transcendentalism now, which, while gratefully honoring its predecessor, must carry forward "independently the same great work in the name of science.

Religion as Action.

It is the characteristic of all formalism, legalism, ritualism, and so forth, to make religion consist in certain external observances, rites, or acts, which are supposed to be of saving efficacy. Dogma is of importance; emotion is of importance; but ceremonies loom up practically as supremely important, eclipsing even feeling and thought. This is not only the religion of fashion, which is naturally glad to escape the duty of living faith, but also of a very sincere and earnest set of people in whom the practical overbalances both the intellectual and the affectional nature. It is so much easier to go through a routine than it is to think hard or cherish exalted sentiments, that they come to rely on the performance of external actions as the substance of religion. Of course they soon come to be mere machines, losing heart and mind in a merely mechanical externalism.

There is also another and much more respectable class of persons who, being equally feeble in intellect and emotion, yet possess a vigorous moral nature. To them religion consists in the compliance with moral rules, the unreflective and uninspired doing of active duty. They are most excellent people, going through life with credit to themselves and usefulness to others, yet notwithstanding devoid of much that beautifies and ennobles existence. Correct in deportment, assiduous in duty, and exemplary in all relations, they deserve and receive unfeigned respect by giving themselves up to practical work as the main business of their lives, and by concentrating all their religion in action. Far be it from me to utter a word of disparagement where I so truly

admire; but this idea of religion, omitting all that concerns the highest culture, the expansion and refinement and beautification of character in its more delicate aspects, leaves out much that is of incalculable value, and mistakes the part for the whole. Religion is more than moral ism, though including it; and the emphasis on ethics which is practically neglect of intellectual, æsthetic, social, and spiritual culture distorts religion and belittles it.

The Evil of Disproportion.

There is a great deal of truth in each of the three conceptions of religion which I have briefly sketched, and to which almost all others may be Ultimately reduced. The dogmatist, for instance, asserts the superlative importance of a true belief; and this it is almost impossible to overestimate. Yet the danger lies in assuming too hastily that a belief is true, and thereby putting all the energies of humanity under the guidance of falsehood, perhaps very cruel and noxious falsehood. If reason, and not revelation, is taken as the judge of truth, no harm ensues; for reason never assumes the prerogative of infallibility. But all history shows the terrible mischief of letting revelation pronounce that to be certainly true which reason pronounces to be doubtful or false. When this has happened, zeal for the safety of a creed has caused men to stifle mercy, and strangle freedom, and ride roughshod over every large interest of humanity. This is the evil of emphasizing belief unduly, and elevating dogma to the throne. Other and lesser evils result whenever mere feeling or mere outward activity receives the supreme and excessive emphasis.

Dogmatism values particular thoughts rather than thought; mysticism values particular feelings rather than feeling; formalism and moral-ism value particular actions rather than action. That is to say, they all value the definite and completed products of human faculties rather than the free play of the faculties themselves; and this over-valuation of the products, which is under-valuation of the faculties, is a natural consequence of the one-sided views of human nature implied by the defective views of religion just described. The finest and fullest thought ever conceived by the human mind will in due time be surpassed by its successors; and so will the noblest sentiments and the purest acts. It Is a fatal error to prize the water you have drawn above the fountain from which you have drawn it. First in value is that in man from which all high thoughts and feelings and deeds proceed. While we love the truths we have won let us love truth itself better, and be not unwilling to confess that what we once held or even now hold to be truths may yet turn out to be half-truths,—possibly even untruths Whoever conceives religion in the one-sided manner I have depicted is unable to discern its true nature, or to protect himself from the costless brood of evils engendered by disproportion.

The Unity of Though, Feeling and Action.

From what i have said you may perhaps infer that I should Urge the symmetrical development of thought, feeling and action, as equally essential to religion. .This is true. The highest perfection of our humanity in its aspects no solely by individual but also by social effort is, If I mistaken religion's true end and aim. Conceding to each faculty the fullest and freest, play consistent with the natural hegemony of reason and conscience, "religion lays an equal emphasis on them all. Thought must lead; but it is no more important than feeling and will. It must decide all questions of duty or truth in the last appeal; but if it pours Contempt on any one of its followers, it violates its high trust. Feeling must follow thought, adapting itself (as it always does in the end) to what thought declares to be the truth; although it stimulates thought to activity, it is itself the proof of that activity, and is indispensable to the whole and rounded character. But its place is not to govern. In every healthy mind, feeling takes care of itself, and in time will always twine itself about mature convictions as closely and as naturally as the vine clings about the supporting trellis. Hence it is unwise to borrow trouble or cherish anxiety, if new truths or beliefs produce disturbance of the feelings, or even distress. Be patient. Give the sentiments ample time to adapt themselves to what your deliberate reason ac- cepts as true, and be sure that in the long run the truth will vindicate itself even to them. Whoever has a whole-souled devotion to truth, and cherishes the certainty that nothing else can permanently bless or benefit, will be willing, even while seeking to feed the sources of all noble feeling, to endure the temporary discord of heart and head in order to realize the higher concord that is made possible thereby. "Be simply true to truth," is the dictate of religion, "and the happiness that flows from consenting heart and head will only tarry; it is sure to come." This is the freedom that is needed: let the mind freely search for the priceless prize of truth, and let the affections freely follow in its wake to crown the victor with delight.

But this is not all that religion demands. The will is the centre of the personality. What thought decrees to be right, will must accomplish. It is the executor of a wisdom not its own; and the wisdom it executes is shadowy and unsubstantial till will has put upon it the royal seal of action. The stress laid on overt deeds by the mere moralist is none too great, if equal stress is also laid on feeling and thought. The tree is known by its

fruits; the faith is known by the life. Pitiable indeed is the being whose religion does not create conduct in harmony with the highest conviction and the noblest sentiment. Only in the full-orbed symmetry of a character in which thought, feeling, and will are balanced and harmonized, can religion behold her work complete. To evolve out of crudity and malformation the perfect man and the perfect woman, is her task and glory. Three in one and one in three,—this is the real trinity of thought, feeling, and will, which constitutes the essence of every individuality; and religion has no other function than to fill the world with great and noble individuals.

The New Conception of Religion.

Perhaps you will now say: "This, then, is the essence of religion—perfection, or symmetrical development of thought, feeling, and will; of head, heart, and conscience."

Not exactly that. The perfection of humanity is indeed the *object* of religion, but it is not religion itself. Deeper than thought or will or feeling in its origin, religion appears in its universal aspect as the decree of Nature that her own ends shall be achieved, and hence as that inward impulsion of the soul towards the right and true which makes itself objective to thought in the IDEAL of humanity; while in its personal aspect it appears as the total and voluntary self-devotion of humanity to the realization of this ideal. Nothing is religion which does not include this profound impulsion of man's whole being to the conversion of ideal excellence into actual character,—this profound endeavor, partly within and partly beneath consciousness, to push forward the development of humanity in the direction of its natural and ideal goal. All religion implies these two things, an ideal and an effort to realize it. Herein it differs from simple morality. Morality proclaims a law, and commands obedience to it; religion is the inward impulsion of Nature, seconded by the conscious effort of the individual, to conform to it. It is owing to no man's choice that he has an ideal of what he ought to be ever before his eyes; Nature has provided this. Nor is it owing to any man's private thought that he feels bound by it as a sacred law; Nature, whether he thin Its it or not, creates a sense of obligation which he cannot shake off even if he would. Am I wrong, then, in conceiving religion as something more than thought or feeling or will, and deeper than all these? As something ever active and creative in the very depths of man's being, impelling but not compelling him to a higher stage of development? Am I wrong in conceiving that this interior force, dwelling and operating in the very core of our humanity, holding up the everlasting ideal before our eyes, and laying upon us a sense of obligation to realize it which is a joy to the virtuous man and a knotted scourge to the vicious, is but an utterance within us of the one great law of the universe—*evolution?* If I am right in these surmises and in this conception of the essence of religion, many obscure questions seem to be illuminated by a sudden light.

For instance, the development theory, whether as presented by Mr. Darwin or by Mr. Spencer, has caught no glimpse of any internal cause operating to impel organisms in the path of continuous evolution; they have discovered real external causes at work in this direction, but that is all. Supposing that religion is an actual internal force, impelling man upward in the career of moral evolution—a force not purely voluntary on his part, but also at work within him beneath his consciousness, creating an ideal for his guidance and by a natural sense of obligation stimulating him to pursue it,—then here we detect Nature in the very act of evolutional causation, at least in a single case; and it becomes by fair analogy at least an occasion for suspecting that in all evolution some similar cause is operative. The apparent absence of any such interior cause, distinct from the action of the outward environment, has been and is the greatest deficiency in the evolutional philosophy. But if I am right in my conjectures, an interior force has been discovered in the moral evolution of man which directly operates to improve the species, and which involves the co-operative action of the universal whole. Reasoning backwards from this case to other cases, it becomes at least a legitimate scientific hypothesis to imagine that Nature is not a blind or random worker in that process of universal and continuous evolution which is the great miracle of modern science.

Again, if my view of religion is sound, the phenomena of conscience become more clearly intelligible. Why is it that right-doing produces happiness and wrong-doing misery? No cause has been hitherto discoverable. If Nature, however, ordains the faithful but free pursuit of the moral ideal by each individual, as her chosen means of ultimately improving the human species as a whole, then we discover a reason for the connection of spiritual peace with faithfulness and spiritual pain with unfaithfulness. These consequences of our moral action would become her admonition to us, her encouragement to co-operate with her by virtue, and her rebuke for our refusal to co-operate. To render strict obedience to our ideal and to pursue it with unquenchable devotion, would be to harmonize our private wills with the great dominant and evident purpose of the universe, and would necessarily create in our consciousness a sense of harmony with it which could be only a pure delight,—nay, the purest of all delights; while our wilful disobedience of the ideal would be to place ourselves in direct opposition to the general current, to thwart to the extent of our puny power the universal purpose, and inevitably to create within us a consciousness of discord and disharmony with Nature which could be nothing but pain. In this manner a reason becomes visible for the constant association of pain

with vice and of happiness with virtue which otherwise seems not discoverable.

This, then, to recapitulate, is the conception of religion that I would urge, as something far deeper and sublimer than any special belief that could be mentioned: namely, a permanent creative force in human nature, partly voluntary and partly involuntary, which prompts an active effort to perfect human nature itself by constant and increasing conformity to ideal excellence in all directions. Is not this conception so vast and grand as to mark a palpable advance in religious philosophy? Does it not carry forward, and, as it were, consummate, the magnificent movement made by New England Transcendentalism in the history of thought? Does it not leave absolute freedom for the intellect to investigate all problems, even including the questions of a personal God and personal immortality, without pledging it beforehand to arrive at any particular conclusion; and thereby to lay solid and deep the foundations of a true science of religion? And does it not plainly subserve the highest interests of religion itself, by creating a complete reconciliation between it and science, and thereby obviating the most threatening danger of religion at the present day; namely, the revolt of modern scientific thought against her claims? For myself, I can answer these questions in only one way; and I have availed myself of this opportunity to make a more thorough explanation than I have been hitherto able to make of the definition of religion offered in the Fifty Affirmations: "Religion is the effort of Man to perfect himself." I trust it is not too much to ask that those who are really interested in the great questions of religious reform will give at least a thoughtful and candid consideration to the views here presented.

Gradations of Religion.

What I have said thus far, however, may not be wholly clear, unless something further should be added. A profound interior impulsion to seek the complete realization in character and in society of the highest idea of human excellence constitutes, as I have endeavored to show, the true essence of religion. But the direction taken by this interior force must depend, so far as it is affected by the human will, on the degree of intelligence at any particular time developed in the human mind. If man is ignorant and uncultured, his religion will reflect the fact; his ideal will be low and imperfect, and scarcely appear to deserve the name of an ideal at all. When the savage construes religion to include the slaying of his prisoner of war at the altar of his gods, and perhaps even the eating of his flesh in a solemn sacrificial feast, the civilized mind revolts with horror from the spectacle, and exclaims that this is not religion, but pure superstition. Yet cannot we discern, even in these horrid rites, the stirrings of a feeble sense of duty, which needs but to be enlightened to echo instantaneously the protest of civilized man? Superstition itself is a conglomerate of utterly irrational notions with this germinal principle of true religion. Education and culture, long continued through many generations, will suffice to rectify the evils of superstition by fostering the development of the divine seed it contains. Through numberless stages "must ignorant and superstitious man patiently pass, before his savage religion can become civilized, emancipated, and purified. But it concerns us all to do justice even to superstition itself, and to perceive that it is only the crude, perhaps vile and disgusting, commencement of what all the world shall at last unite to reverence. The thread that shall guide us through the tangled labyrinth of historical religion, notwithstanding the frightful sights and sounds that assail us on every hand, is the clearly conceived and firmly held principle that religion is essentially Man's effort to perfect himself according to the light that is in him; and that, in proportion as his light increases, his religion becomes purer and nobler. With this principle to guide us, we shall be ourselves amazed to see how plain grows the path we are to tread.

Religion and the Belief in God.

But it may be a source of disquietude to some gentle and reverential natures that it should be even proposed, explicitly and directly, to divorce the idea of religion from the idea of God,—to the extent, at least, of leaving the existence of God an open question to be answered by scientific thought. Let me say a few words on this point.

The inevitable consequence of adopting the conception of religion here sketched is certainly to make the spiritual evolution of humanity towards truth and right the direct object at which religion must aim; and to leave the mind at perfect liberty to determine, according to the fixed laws of thought, what truth and right are, and what the spiritual evolution of humanity requires. It is true that religion, thus conceived, cannot assume beforehand even that God exists; and the devout spirits that find the very breath of life in their faith in God, and have never felt the enormous pressure of modern science against the ancient bulwarks of this faith, may not unnaturally shrink back from thus putting in peril the dearest conviction of their souls. For all such I can but feel a sympathy as tender as it is sincere. It is to these very ones that I would say, Be brave and strong enough to rest your faith in God on faith in truth and right! If religion shall be consecrated solely to truth and right, as its just, natural, and necessary object, and shall waive frankly and avowedly the one *dogma* of God's existence

to which it has hitherto convulsively clung, have you any cause to fear? Do you dread lest truth and right may possibly, after all, not lead to belief in God? Do you cherish a faith in him so feeble and unsound that you dare not trust it to the sentence of truth and right? Or would you wish to retain any faith against which the decision of truth and right should prove to be ad verse? If these things are so, then your faith in God is only scepticism in disguise: you do not really believe in him at all; you cherish a belief whose basis you suspect to be' rotten and false, and therefore will not suffer to be examined even by yourself. In such a belief as that, there is nothing noble, nothing that will not break and suddenly give way beneath the weight of unexpected disaster. No! It is because I do believe in God that I am willing to submit my belief in him to the sharpest and most searching scrutiny of science. I am willing to do with this my dearest belief what the Christian clergy dare not do with their own professed faith in prayer,—submit it without reserve to scientific tests, promising to abide by the result. If science can kill my faith, let it die! I want none that is not immortal. Trust me, it is no secret desire *to get rid* of belief in God that moves me to espouse this larger conception of religion; I desire only truth and right. If they confirm my belief, well and good; it shall then be infinitely more dear and precious than ever before. But if they destroy it, then, also, well and good! I shall but have been freed from an unsuspected superstition. Surely this is a manlier, a nobler, a freer, a more inspiring conviction, than the secret thought that belief in God cannot be trusted before the bar of truth and right! If indeed it cannot be trusted there, what is it worth? Or who would want it? Or why should any one weep when it is cast out in dishonor? But if before this august tribunal the belief in God shall receive the seal of truth itself, and rest no longer on childish guesses or traditions or scriptures, what believer in God could do otherwise than rejoice? It is time the world well understood that, in all questions of truth and right, the ultimate appeal must he to the educated intelligence of the human race,—in one word, to science; and whoever has at heart a real belief in God will not hesitate to submit it to this or any other test. What could be clearer than that they who dare submit it have a mightier faith than they who dare not?

The Future of Religion.

In fact, the destinies of religion are bound up, as I believe, with the possibility of broadening the popular conception of it in some such way as I have tried to show. The common people are little aware of the nature of the intellectual influences that are now acting upon them, and do not suspect the slow changes thus wrought in their own ideas. Hut it is true that the cultivated mind of to-day has broken with Christianity, and, for lack of the very conception of religion I urge to-day, is breaking with religion too. Deny it or disguise it as they please, the watchful and intelligent observers of the times know this to be the fact. Science has been compelled to assume an attitude of hostility towards religion which is indeed justifiable, considering the claims made by religion itself, but which is none the less injurious both to one and to the other. If forced to choose deliberately between the two, mankind mast decide for science; they cannot help themselves. The knowledge of facts never gives way to anybody or anything; and that is what science is. Unless, therefore, religion can prove itself to be other than it has allowed itself to appear, its doom is sealed, and its very name will survive only as a part of history.

It is with utter earnestness, therefore, that I declare my own conviction to be that, unless religion has been described with substantial accuracy in what I have said to-day, it will wholly vanish from the world's life. If it is not substantially the effort of Man to perfect himself, unrestricted by the obligation of arriving at any foregone theological conclusions, the world will have no use for it hereafter. Whatever perishes, freedom of thought must survive. Yet I cannot frame any other conception of religion which shall utterly and unreservedly concede freedom of thought. In urging it, therefore, I believe that I not only defend science, but religion too, patching up no wretched compromise between them, but pointing out the common ground on which both may stand erect, as natural allies instead of foes. Now, as ever, radicalism is the true conservatism; and if I had no other design but simply to conserve religion among men, without the least interest in the truth as such, I should most certainly urge these views of it as the only ones that could save it from destruction. Let that pass for what it is worth; I speak now as one who *believes* in religion, thus conceived, from the sole of the foot to the crown of the head,—without apology either for the name or the thing, and without the smallest concession to the prejudice that assails either the one or the other. To-day I speak only to the large in heart and broad in mind,—to those who must accept science and would fain accept religion too. To these I say that science itself would lose her fearless love of truth, were it not that religion fed its secret springs; that social reform would lose its motive and inspiration, literature and art their beauty, and all human life its sweetest and tenderest grace, did not religion evermore create the insatiable hunger after perfection in the soul of man. Bright, cheerful, ennobling, stimulating, emancipating, religion is the greatest friend of humanity, ever guiding it upward and onward to the right and the true; aye, and to all we yearn for, if, as we believe, the right and the true are indeed the pathway to God.

Cultured Free Thought.

The Index Association.

With its Principal Office at No. 142 St. Clair Street Toledo, Ohio, and Branch Office at No. 36 Dey Street New York City, has been organized with a Capital Stock of One Hundred Thousand Dollars, for the purpose of publishing Tract?, Books, and

The Index.

A Weekly Paper devoted to Free and national Religion.

It is the object of The Index to give public utterance to the boldest, most cultivated, and best matured thought of the age on all religious questions, and to apply it directly to the social and political amelioration of society.

Every Liberal should subscribe for The Index, as the best popular exponent of Religious Liberalism. Every Christian minister and every thinking church-member should subscribe for it, as the clearest, most candid, and most scholarly expositor of the differences between Free Thought and Evangelical Christianity, and as the best means of becoming well informed of the arguments and movements which the Church will have to meet in the future.

Professor Max Mueller, of Oxford, England, in a letter to the editor published in The Index for January 4, 1873, says: "That the want of a Journal entirely devoted to Religion in the widest sense of the word should be felt in America,—that such a journal should have been started and powerfully supported by the best minds of your country,—is a good sign of the times. There is no such journal in England, France, or Germany, though the number of so-called religious or theological periodicals is, as you know, very large."

Essays, lectures, and other papers of a thoughtful and liberal character; editorial articles; foreign and domestic correspondence; book reviews and notices; communications, selections, and other miscellaneous matter; in short, whatever can best promote the general cause to which The Index is devoted, will be found regularly in its columns.

Also, a highly interesting Rationalistic Story, entitled "Paul Gower," is now appearing serially in The Index, and will run during the year.

Send 83.00 for one year, or 75 cents for three months on trial. All Mail Subscriptions must be addressed to

The Index,

Drawer 88, Toledo, Ohio.

The Index for 1873.

The Index,

A Weekly Journal Devoted to Free Religion.

Published by The Index Association at No. 142, St. Clair street, Toledo, Ohio, with Branch Office at No. 36, Dey street, New York City.

Editor:

- Francis Ellingwood Abbot.

Associate Editor:

- Abram Walter Stevens.

Editorial Contributors:

- O. B. Frothingham, New York City.
- T. W. Higginson, Newport, R. I.
- W. J. Pouter, New Bedford, Mass.
- R. P. Hallo Well, Boston. Mass.
- W. H. Spencer, Haverhill, Mass.
- MRS. E. D. Cheney, Jamaica Plain, Mass.
- F. W. Newman, England.
- Charles Voysey, England.
- M. D. Conway, England.

The Index begins its fourth volume under the most flattering auspices. The capital stock of the Index Association has been subscribed nearly to the full amount of One Hundred Thousand Dollars. The circulation of the paper has more than doubled within the past year. It is doubled in size, and must soon be more than doubled in power. It will address itself more earnestly than ever to men and women of all grades of culture who desire to share the best life and thought of the age and to impart it even to the indifferent, the superstitious, and the enslaved. It already wields a great influence, which must grow greater every day, as brave men and pure women flock to the standard it upholds.

In addition to its general objects, the practical object to which The Index will be henceforth specially devoted is the Organization of the Liberals of the Country, for the purport; of securing the more complete and consistent secularization of the political and educational institutions of the United States. To accomplish this object, the Liberals must make a united demand, and present an unbroken front; and the chief practical aim of The Index will be henceforth to organize a great National Party of Reform. Let every one who believes in this movement give it direct aid by helping to increase the circulation of The Index.

TERMS.—The price of The Index is Three Dollars a year, payable in advance; and at the same rate for shorter periods.

AGENTS.—Local Agents for The Index are wanted in every city and town throughout the country. The most liberal terms are offered. Send for circulars at once.

Address
The Index,

Drawer 88, Toledo Ohio.

The Religion of Humanity.

Service for the Festival of Humanity

INVOCATION.

Love the Principle.
Order the Basis.
Progress the End.
Live for Others.
Live Openly.

READING

From the "Imitation of Christ," by Thomas à Kempis.

Great Power, whom we here acknowledge as the Highest, Humanity, whose children and servants we are, from whom we derive everything, and to whom we are bound to render everything, may we all seek to know thee better, that we may love and serve thee better; and to this end may our affections become more pure, true, and deep, our thought larger and more vigorous, our action firmer and more energetic, that so, according to our

measure, in our generation, we may hasten the time when thou shalt, visibly to all, take to thee thy great power and reign; when all kindreds and nations, all the members of the human family now so torn by discord, shall, by the power of the unity of thy Past, place themselves under thy guidance, the living under the government of the dead, and bound together by mutual understanding and affection, each take their due part in the work of human advancement, in peaceful union moving forwards through the coming ages to a more and more perfect state, to thy glory and the common welfare of the countless generations of men and man's dependents, who shall in succession possess this thy beautiful Planet, the Earth, which is thy home.

In communion with thee, in communion with thy Past and with thy Future, may we keep this great aim ever in our sight, to strengthen and ennoble our whole life and work. *Amen*.

ADVENT COLLECT.

Thou Power Supreme, who hast hitherto guided thy children under other names, but in this generation hast come to thy own in thy own proper person, revealed for all ages to come by thy Servant, Auguste Comte, we praise thee that under his teaching we are enabled to see the early dawn of thy glory brightening towards the perfect day; and we pray that, drawing inspiration from thy Past and Future, we may be strong to proclaim thy advent to the world around us, so that each successive year devoted to thy service may bring more and more disciples of thy faith, avowed adherents of thy holy church. *Amen*.

Holy and Glorious Humanity, on this thy High Day, at the beginning of a new year, we are met in praise, in prayer, in thanksgiving, to celebrate thy coming, in the fulness of time, for the visible perfecting of thy as yet unseen work.

Priest—We bow before thee in thankfulness,
People—As children of thy Past;
Priest—We adore thee in hope,
People—As thy ministers and stewards for the Future;
Priest—We would commune with thee humbly in prayer,
People—As thy servants in the Present.
All—May our worship, as our lives, grow more and more worthy of thy great name.

THE SERMON.

Praising thee, Holy Humanity, as is most meet, for all the blessings which thy past has accumulated for us; for the rich treasures of knowledge, beauty, and wisdom which it has handed down; for its long roll of great exemplars, our cloud of witnesses, which ministers comfort, support, and guidance in our need, and in particular for him who has interpreted and justified thy Past, taught us to use aright its treasures, rightly to honour its examples; lastly, as we are here more especially bound to do, for the full liberty to speak and .act which we enjoy; we pray that we may not be found unworthy of such benefits, but that, day by day, in all humility and singleness of purpose, with all boldness, and yet tenderness for others, we may magnify thee, and attain for ourselves, and help others to attain, the great blessings which only communion with thee can give: Union. Unity, Continuity. *Amen*.

BENEDICTION.

The Faith of Humanity,
The Hope of Humanity,
The Love of Humanity,

Bring you comfort, and teach you sympathy, give you peace in yourselves and peace with others, now and for ever. *Amen*.

PRAYERS FOR SPECIAL OCCASIONS.

THE SACRAMENT OF PRESENTATION.

Great Power! whom we adore as the source of all good to men, Humanity, we, thy servants met for the consecration of a new life to that service, humbly and earnestly pray that the child by this Sacrament presented and consecrated, may be lovingly, faithfully, and wisely trained; that, under all wholesome influences of affection and submission and reverence, she may grow up to be in her turn rich in such influences for others, taking her part in thy continuous work. We pray, moreover, for ourselves, that, whatever our share in this

celebration, we may all alike use it rightly to rekindle our devotion, and as an occasion for renewing our dedication of ourselves to thee; that it may leave us at once humbler and better—humbler from the sense of our great shortcomings, better by the resolve to use more carefully the opportunities still left us for improvement, self-sacrifice for others, zeal and activity in thy cause—so glorifying thee for thy Past, and preparing for thy more glorious Future. *Amen*.

THE SACRAMENTS OF ADMISSION AND DESTINATION.

Gracious Power! in whose name and by whose inspiration, in dutiful obedience to thy Past, thy great Servant and Interpreter, Auguste Comte, giving full expression to the earlier instinctive aspirations of man and completing what was defective in their later satisfaction, has instituted for thy Church a ninefold series of sacraments which in their whole sequence and right use, as in other days will be seen, will bind the family union to the social, and link in close connection the successive generations of mankind, thus forming to order and beauty our otherwise imperfectly-ordered existence, strengthening our union, imparting unity to our individual life, and drawing forth into more vivid consciousness our social continuity—may we, thy servants here met for the administration of one of the series (*the Sacrament of Destination or Admission*), bring home to ourselves by meditation the benefits of this institution, opening our lives to the influence of the conception where no more is possible, or, where it is yet possible shaping them by following the example set this day, so evidencing our gratitude for all that we have received, manifesting the power of our faith to our mutual support and to the glorifying of thy name, and thereby furthering that in which alone the trouble of the race can find its end—the religious unity which nothing but thy advent, Humanity, can offer to all thy children. *Amen*.

COLLECT FOR ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI.

In another time and with another belief, we, who on this day reverently honour the memory of this eminent Saint of the older dispensation, St Francis of Assisi, pray that his example may not be lost upon us, but that his seraphic love for the object of his devotion may teach us a like love for the suffering and wounded Humanity, whom we preach and serve; that in the force of that love we may catch some portion of this Saint's great humility, of the richness of his spirit of renunciation, of his unfunded simple affection for all his fellow-men, for all living beings, for all outward objects; lastly, of his patient and loving resignation—so by our lives glorifying our service, as he glorified his—so spreading, as he spread his faith, the nobler and more enduring faith into which that of mediaeval Europe has in our times been transfigured. *Amen*.

FOR THE FESTIVAL OF ALL THE DEAD.

Supreme Power! in whom we most truly live and move and have our being, who hast risen from thy primaeval weakness and ignorance to thy present strength and knowledge through the services of the countless generations of thy children—thy known and unknown dead—we who are here met on this closing festival of the year to commemorate all those generations, and gratefully to acknowledge that it is by their labour and suffering that we have been enabled to witness thy final advent—we pray that this our act of homage to the dead, as it awakes in us a lively sense of the greatness of the past sacrifices, may kindle our love to thee and strengthen our devotedness, that so in our turn we may be ready to continue the work of self-sacrifice in humility and confidence—confidence, as we see what great things have been done for us—humility, as we look on the imperfection of those whom we now honour, and know ourselves to be like them;—in all things striving to be a worthy link between thy Past and thy Future, thus strengthening that government of the dead, only in dutiful submission to which can the troubled society of mankind arrive at the peace of thy kingdom. May that peace come speedily. *Amen*.

CONCLUDING PRAYER.

May the thoughts and feelings awakened by this day's celebration remain with us all after it is over, passing into our hearts and minds with a lasting influence, and bringing forth a harvest of good fruit, to the praise and glory of Humanity. May our faith in her be the stronger for it, our hope more confident, our love more fervent, our devotion and our service more complete and unreserved, our union felt to rest on more assured foundations.

The peace of her slowly dawning kingdom be' upon you, the blessing of Humanity abide with you, now and for ever. *Amen*.

NOTE.—*Upon the Reading from the "Imitation of Christ," by Thomas a Kempis*.

We read the "Imitation of Christ," by Thomas à Kempis, so strongly recommended by our Founder, as the most universally received manual of devotion and of a holy life; but it may be wise here, in order to avoid

ambiguity or any doubt as to our use of it, to say that, in using it, we substitute Humanity for God; the social type for the personal type of Jesus; our own inward growth in goodness for outward reward; the innate benevolent instincts for grace; our selfish instincts for nature. So used, its lessons of devotion and humility, of intimate communion with the type we adore, of unceasing moral culture, of self-denying service, of the service not of ourselves but of others, are not the less available because they are clothed in the language of an older faith, and sanctioned by the experience of many generations of faithful and devout men.

The Early Date and Consequent Truthfulness of the Four Gospels.

By Archdeacon Stock, *Wellington*.

"Certain also of your own poets have said, 'For we are also His offspring.'"—ACTS xvii. 28.

"The Apostles in the memoirs written by them which are called Gospels."—JUSTINM, *Apology*, 1, p. 98, B.

Third Editiox.

Price Sixpence. 1879.

THIS Lecture, delivered in the School-room of St. John's Church, was written with the desire to give, in short compass, some of the Historical proofs of the early existence of the Four Gospels, and therefore of their truthfulness. If their truthfulness be proved, then were miracles wrought, notwithstanding any assertions respecting the improbability or impossibility of a miracle from a supposed unvarying order of nature. Seekers after truth should especially notice the argument from the early publication of St. Paul's Epistles, p. 18.

A. Stock.

The Four Gospels.

decorative border

TThe task before me is a pleasant and yet an arduous one. I wish to show in short compass why it is that the Christian Church accepts the Four Gospels as part of the Word of God; and that it is right in so accepting them. It is a task from which any one, who holds that these Books are inspired, might well shrink, lest he should fail in convincing others that his own belief is well grounded; not as the marsh light, only a snare to the weary traveller, but as the light from some well-built lighthouse, shining bright alway in the darkness, pointing out the haven where the mariner would be. He might well fear, too, lest by some mistake of his, others who think not with him, might be the rather confirmed in their unbelief.

The Christian Church holds, then, that these Books are the very foundation of The Faith. If they are false; if they are but the fond imaginings of some one or other, magnifying a faint, far off mythical story; if they are not truly written by men of God, and of men inspired of God to write; then are we left in almost darkness—our Christianity is well-nigh gone—we of this day have scarce anything to tell of Jesus that is worthy of acceptance in comparison with this loss—we must walk on sadly as those who are unknown and uncared for, wanderers in a wilderness without a guide.

This result is well put by one who has always endeavoured to prove that the Gospels are false. He sees clearly the result of his labour, and then shrinks from it terror-stricken. The late Dr. Strauss writes:—"The loss of faith in Providence is, in fact, one of the most deeply-felt deprivations which are connected with the giving up of the Christian beliefs of the Church. In the enormous machine of the Universe—amidst the incessant whirl and hiss of its iron—toothed wheels—amidst the deafening crash of its ponderous stamps and hammers—in the midst of this whole terrible commotion, man, a helpless and defenceless creature, finds himself placed, not secure for a moment, that, on an imprudent motion on his part a wheel may not seize and rend him, or a hammer crush him to powder. This sense of abandonment is at first something awful." The writer has well understood the matter at issue. Nowhere more plainly than in The Four Gospels do we learn of the Providence of God. The coming of the Lord is proof that God careth for the world. And thus He speaks:—"Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow. They toil not, neither do they spin, and yet I say unto you that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed as one of these. If then God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, how much more will He clothe you? * * * Behold the fowls of the air, for they sow not, neither do they reap nor gather into barns, and yet your Heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they.

See remarks below on J. Martyr's quotations from The Gospels.

If, then, our Gospels are not what we profess them to be, there is no longer any such comforting sense of GOD'S providence tenable—we must live aided by our own power only. They are but human compositions, and of little value—pleasant, perchance, to read, but not speaking with any authority.

I.

Our first step will, clearly, be to ascertain what these Books say of themselves upon this point.

1. St. Matthew's Gospel,

St. Matthew's Gospel was written in Greek by the Apostle. The word in The Lord's Prayer for "daily" was, Origen writes, formed by St. Matthew. Probably he wrote another edition in Hebrew.

said to have been written by a constant follower of the Lord Jesus, describes the Jewish Temple as standing in all its magnificence, unscathed yet by the Roman fire and sword. In the 23rd chapter Jesus saith, "Behold your House is left" unto you desolate. "The Disciples, understanding well His meaning, call His attention, as if in utter astonishment, to the buildings of the Temple, to the strength of the walls, as if such a ruin could not be. St. Mark, in his account, is still more particular." Master, see what manner of stones and what buildings "are here," is his version of the words of the Disciples. St. Luke, in the corresponding chapter, in his Gospel, makes the Lord to foretell accurately the coming destruction of the city. We know that Jerusalem was taken A.D. 70. Thus these three Gospels claim to have been written before that event. There is not a single word to tell of the desolation of the city, and of the consequent fulfilment of our Lord's words, as, we feel sure, would have been the case had they been written by man only, and after the city's overthrow. An event of such importance to a Jew, could not then have been by any possibility altogether ignored. Some mention would have been made by him of the bravery of the Jews in the war; of the fierce determination of the Romans, and of their success. He most certainly would have spoken of the noble stand of his people against all the might of their foes, thus casting, in their utter ruin, a light upon the darkness by this remembrance of their courage. The belief of the Christian Church is that these Scriptures are not mere human compositions; that the narrators of facts which themselves witnessed, or of which they could have been informed by eyewitnesses, were always directed of God what to write. But if these Gospels are not inspired, and of late date, then most certainly a Jewish writer would not have passed by the destruction of Jerusalem, or have lost the opportunity of magnifying his nation from the very magnitude of her distress.

2. St. John, who was, as St. Matthew, a constant follower of Jesus, writes his Gospel at Ephesus nearly at the close of the first century. Eusebius tells that the Bishops of Asia brought to him the Three Gospels; that he declared them to be Scripture; and that he wrote his own Gospel to supplement the omissions of the other Evangelists, and to oppose the Gnostic heresy of the day. Generally speaking, he rather narrates what Jesus said than what He did. But St. John most distinctly asserts that he saw what he describes. When the dead body of Jesus is pierced he writes, "Forthwith there came out blood and water;"—and he continues, He that saw it bare record, and his record is true, and he knoweth that he saith true." Again, appealing to his known character amongst the Ephesians, he writes in the last chapter, "This is the disciple which" testifieth of these things, and wrote these things, and "we know that his testimony is true."

3. In the Acts of the Apostles, which Book was often considered to be but a continuation of St. Luke's Gospel, the writer places himself in the midst of his narrative. He writes of things which had passed before him. It is especially noteworthy that St. Paul, in his defence before King Agrippa and the Roman Governor Felix (*Acts* xxvi. 26) appeals to this publicity of the Christian history. "The King knoweth of these things, before whom also I speak freely: for I am persuaded that these things were not hidden from him; for this thing was not done in a corner."

The belief of the Church is, as I have said, that these Gospels are GOD-inspired, that they therefore are true;—that three of them were written early in the first century, and narrate truly facts which were well known. It is not necessary to our present object to prove carefully that they are GOD-inspired. It is quite sufficient to show that they were written in the very life-time of many who had witnessed the miracles of Jesus; who had shared in the events narrated; who could easily therefore have disproved any falsehood, if there had been any. The whole story is thus of miracle, and it is but a very little step onward to hold that the writers share in this miraculous energy; that they wrote not what they chose to write, but as men directed of GOD to write. We believe that we have this double security. But it is enough for the establishment of our faith to show that these Books were published in the midst of those who themselves were well acquainted with what was written. No after narrator could write, without inspiration, as the Evangelists have written.

Thus the three first Gospels claim to have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem. St. John claims to have written his Gospel as an eye-witness of what he describes. We have now to search why it is that these Three Gospels are ascribed to St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke;—why they are believed to have been written at an early date;—and to see whether St. John's claim is just, and not that of a forger, writing thus to gain an appearance of truthfulness for his manufacture.

II.

We have, as testing points of the times at which the Gospels appeared, in the Books themselves many points of agreement with what is narrated by other writers.

1. St. Matthew tells that Herod, disappointed in his expectation that the Magi would conduct him to the King of the Jews, gives orders that the young male children at Bethlehem should be slain. Josephus tells how ruthlessly he committed greater cruelty than this—that he swept away every opposer to his rule, not hesitating to slay his wife and child because of some fancied treachery.

2. We find in the Gospels a curious and complicated Government Herod is King of Judea. We read of Roman Governors ruling in part of the land, while members of Herod's family reign in another part. In the very midst of this double Government there is a Jewish Government with very large powers of administration, and, stranger still, having authority to collect tribute for the Temple service. This tribute is that referred to when the fish is caught by St. Peter to pay the sum required for himself and Jesus. (*St. Matthew* xvii. 24.) But, strange as this admixture of ruling powers may seem, we know from Josephus that while the Romans were the real rulers in the land, they permitted these Jewish forms of Government to exist, taking only away the power of life and death.

3. St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, call the Lake of Galilee by various names, as the Sea, the Sea of Galilee, the Lake of Gennesaret, the Lake. And these titles are used indifferently. But St. John calls the Lake the Sea of Tiberias—a title which is used by him only. Now, we know that the titles used by the three first Evangelists were in common use before the Roman war; but afterwards, as the City of Tiberias had been spared by the Romans when they destroyed the other cities of Galilee, and had grown quickly into great importance, the Lake was called by the title which St. John uses. Had, then, the three first Evangelists used St. John's title, or he theirs, all would have been wrong; a very grave mistake would have been committed. But late writers could not have been so exact, or so truthful, in a point apparently of so little consequence.

4. Again, from Josephus we know of the bitter contempt in which the Samaritans were held by the Jews. We read in these Gospels the words of envy and hatred spoken by the Pharisees against Jesus—" Say "we not well that Thou art a Samaritan?" St. John records that when Jesus, sitting by the well of Sychar, asks the woman who had come to draw water to relieve His thirst, He is answered, not rudely, but in utter astonishment that He could condescend to ask, "How is" it that Thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, which "am a woman of Samaria?"

5. One other instance only would I give. When St. Luke narrates the circumstances that led to the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem, he writes—"There went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be taxed. And this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was Governor of Syria." It is well known that he was Governor some ten years afterwards, and those who would disprove the authority of the Gospels caught eagerly at this discrepancy. Here, at least, was a manifest mistake—a mistake quite sufficient to prove the untruthfulness of the Gospel. Many explanations of the difficulty have been given. One of these is satisfactory enough; that the taxing was ordered by Augustus, and the census for the taxing was at once made; but, Herod dying, the tax was not collected until Cyrenius was Governor. The true explanation is, as was discovered by Zumpt, that Cyrenius was twice Governor. St. Luke, whether the word taxing refers to the census or to the collection of the tax, was, after all, exactly right.

Many other instances could be given of similar import. They can easily be found in such books as *Paley's Evidences*, or *Home's Introduction to the Scriptures*.

I believe that we might fairly enough rest the matter here. There is in these exact narrations sure proof of truthfulness, the more valuable because found in unimportant matters, just in those places where any forger would not have been so exact; or if he had, by giving like detail, sought to throw an air of reality about his imposture, he would most certainly have been readily detected in some misstatement. This exactness could not have been in a late writer, writing in the second century, unless he were inspired of God to write. And this claim for inspiration is utterly disallowed by those who object to the faith of the Christian Church concerning the Gospels. I would yet add that if there be this thorough exactness in places which can be tested, surely the same truthful, exact writer may be trusted when he is speaking of matter which cannot be thus inquired into. We may believe him still, even if his narrative involve a miracle. He is still narrating, as exactly as before, what was done miraculously.

This, then, is our second point. The Gospels themselves contain many proofs that they were written in the first century.

III.

We have next to inquire for external evidence of this early date for their publication.

1. The most eminent of the present school of opposers of Christianity, in Germany and in France, confess that many of the Epistles of St. Paul were undoubtedly written by him. M. Rènan (I allude to him as his name is familiar to the most of us), in his *Life of St. Paul*, thus summarises St. Paul's Epistles:—1. Those which are indisputable and undisputed. 2. Those which are certainly authentic, notwithstanding some objections. 8. Those

probably authentic. 4. One, a doubtful Epistle. 5. Those that are falsely ascribed to St. Paul. In the first class he places the Epistle to the Romans, the two to the Corinthians, and that to the Galatians. Thus, four of the Epistles of St. Paul are confessedly, to use M. Rènan's words, undisputed and indisputable. No one would dream of objecting to these Epistles that they were not written by him. It is further certain that St. Paul was put to death at Rome, when Nero was Emperor, about A.D. 68. But this can be proved from these Epistles:—That Christianity was firmly established in the Imperial City of Rome;—that it was as thoroughly established at Corinth, another centre of that day;—that this had occurred in about twenty-five years after the death of Jesus;—and that the facts of Christianity were thoroughly accepted as true by very many in the Roman Empire at that early date. Even then supposing for an instant that our Gospels were written later than we assert, still the main facts given in those Gospels had already won their way. I would quote a well-known passage to remind you of the particularity of the facts to be gathered from St. Paul's Epistles. "I," he writes to the Corinthians, "delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures. And that He was seen of Cephas, then of the Twelve. After that He was seen of about five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that he was seen of James, then of all the Apostles." Thus the Death and the Resurrection of Jesus are here established. But if He hath thus lived, Who was dead, then is our Faith not vain; then were the Apostles not false witnesses of GOD, when they testified of GOD that He raised up Christ. I cannot, I confess, see how this argument can be shaken. If these Epistles of St, Paul are true, then is our Faith true. Then are the Gospels true, for they but give fuller accounts of what St, Paul has summarised. Let men object as they ever have objected, as they ever will object, they cannot disprove that in a very few years after the public condemnation of Jesus, at the sentence of a Roman tribunal, the assertion that He had risen from the dead was firmly believed by very many:—and that a very large number of them could have disproved the story had it been untrue. The thing was not done in a corner.

Amongst these, the evidences of our Faith, St. Paul's Epistles, acknowledged to be his by men who would rather have proved them to be falsely written, and based, as they evidently are, upon a widely spread acceptance of Christian doctrine, occupy the first place. They could not have been thus written had there not been this spread of Christianity. And this is the especial point we are insisting upon, the early spread of Christianity, while the facts upon which Christianity rests had but lately occurred: and that the Gospels are but the early records of these facts.

2. We pass on to later writers; and from out the number of names that could be given of Christians who mention the Gospels I purpose to select two only, partly because of the well-known character of these two, and of the value, therefore, of their testimony. I mean Justin Martyr and Irenæus.

Justin, surnamed Martyr, as having suffered death for his faith, was born A.D. 90 at Sichem, in Samaria, in the very land in which Christ preached. He was converted to Christianity A.D. 138. Of his writings, the two *Apologies for Christianity*, and his *Dialogue with Trypho*, are still extant. In the Dialogue he tells that he had carefully studied the then prevalent forms of Heathen Philosophy, and had at last embraced Christianity as the only safe philosophy. Justin teaches that Christ was miraculously conceived, and born of a Virgin in Bethlehem, in the time of Cyrenius; that He lived for thirty years an ordinary life, being regarded as a carpenter and a carpenter's son; that He was baptized of John in Jordan, when the Holy Ghost descended upon Him like a dove; that He was tempted of Satan in the wilderness; that He established the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; that He was crucified under Pontius Pilate; that He rose again from the dead on Sunday; that He will come again to judge the world. He records many of the sayings of Christ; quotes His prophecies; and mentions His miracles.

In the Dialogue he thus bears witness to the spread of Christianity:—"There is no race of men * * * * among whom prayers and thanksgivings are not offered up to the Father and Maker of the Universe in the name of the Crucified Jesus." He tells that new converts were continually added to the Church through the admiration excited by the virtuous practices and enduring constancy of the Christians.

But, further, Justin was acquainted with our Gospels. His exact words on this matter are—" The Apostles, in "the Memoirs written by them, which are called Gospels." And of these Memoirs he says that two were written by Apostles, and two by companions of the Apostles; that these Memoirs, or the writings of the Prophets (writings acknowledged by all Christians to be part of the Word of God), were read in the assemblies of the Christians every Sunday. Sometimes he quotes from these Memoirs exactly. Sometimes his quotations are given somewhat carelessly. Sometimes he only alludes to passages in them. But in what he was doing there was no especial need for exact quotation. He was not writing for Christians, but for the enemies of the Christian Faith. He is desirous to give them an outline of Christianity, and his purpose would be as well served by this general reference as if he had given the very words of writings which were not valued by others than Christians. But if he does not refer to our present Gospels—which are read in our churches, just as these Memoirs were read—there were then, at that day, some other Scriptures giving exactly the same account of the Gospel facts as

do the Gospels, which were held in highest esteem by the Church, and which yet have, in some most unaccountable way, vanished utterly; while these spurious Gospels of ours have, in some most unaccountable way, occupied the very position of the old writings, which are lost. Those who say that Justin did not use our Gospels only create a difficulty which is insurmountable. We have only, to get rid of the difficulty which they have professed to find, to surmise that Justin, when he quotes inexactly, is quoting from memory; and that he has done what every writer is likely to do when he does not think it necessary for his purpose to put down the very words of Scripture. I have found, when correcting my first manuscript, that in quoting from the Sermon on the Mount, familiar as that Scripture is, I have done much the same thing. I have purposely left the error uncorrected, as an illustration of my meaning; and I do not think that I am likely to be charged with not accepting the Gospel of St. Matthew as the writing of the Apostle.

The second writer that I would select is *Irenæus*, made Bishop of Lyons A.D. 177. He wrote many books, of which his work against Heresies remains to this day. Irenæus declares that in his youth he had been well acquainted with Polycarp, who is known to have been the disciple and intimate friend of St. John. Thus his testimony is especially valuable, not only as coming from a learned man, from one who has written largely upon Christianity, and the heresies that had so early arisen in the Church, but as reaching through Polycarp so far backward. In his writings he then repeatedly mentions the Four Gospels. He ascribes them to St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, St. John. And as if to make the matter the more certain, he gives many fanciful reasons why these Were four in number only. In short, testimony more explicit there could not be to the writings of the Evangelists;—to the estimation in which they were held;—to the dates at which they were written. It is difficult, indeed, to imagine how any one can gravely urge that the Gospels were not written until the beginning or the middle of the second century, when Irenæus, so competent a witness, directly asserts the very contrary.

This, then, is our third point. Early Christian writers have quoted the Gospels. And of those the testimony of *Justin Martyr* and *Irenæus* is especially valuable.

IV.

Other proofs of the early existence of the Gospels are found,—

1. That *Tatian*, about A.D. 170, wrote a book in which he endeavours to harmonise the various accounts of the Lord's actions given in the Gospels. This work is called a Diatessaron: literally a work concerning the Four. But clearly such a work would not have been attempted had not the Four Gospels been generally received and valued by Christians. It is again certain that Tatian used our Gospels, for a Greek manuscript in the British Museum has a note in which a different reading is supported by the authority of Tatian.

2. The same argument applies to the Syrian version of the Scriptures, called *The Peshito*, that is the Literal Version, which in the opinion of learned men was made very early in the second century. A version implies, of very necessity, that the books translated have already become famous. The difficulty for an objector would be to show how books, arising as he would have it the Gospels have arisen, could in about twenty years have won such acceptance as to require that a version should be made of them into another language from that in which they were originally written.

3. Another curious proof has been lately discovered, that of the *Muratorian Canon*, or *List of the Books of Scripture*, found by Muratori at Milan, in the Ambrosian Library. It had been brought thither from a convent in Pavia by Columbanus, an Irish monk. The compiler of the Canon has fixed its date when he thus speaks of another book as written "just lately in our times, when Pius was Bishop of Rome." This was A.D. 150, and thus the Canon cannot be later than that date. That such a list should have been made shows, as did *The Peshito*, that the books thus catalogued had been long held in highest esteem. The beginning of the Canon is imperfect. It commences, "In the third place St. Luke." Then St. John, the Acts, and all the other books of the New Testament are named except the Hebrews and one of St. John's Epistles.

4. From the early adversaries of the Faith, as witnesses for its truth, I would select Celsus, an Epicurean Philosopher, who wrote against Christianity at the middle of the second century. He mentions that the Gospels existed in three forms. He accepts all the prominent facts of the Gospel History, but endeavours from the facts themselves to overthrow the Christian Faith. In no one instance does he cast any discredit upon the narrative. But if, as it is said, the Gospels were but of recent date, so learned and acute a writer would at once have seized upon the late date as the very proof that the professed history could not be true.

It never seems, indeed, to have been imagined in the early days of Christianity that the Gospels were of late origin, when the truth of the case could have been so readily discovered. It has remained for modern criticism, in the face of all evidence against the supposition, to make this assertion. The objectors believe that they have discovered this or that insuperable difficulty—that this Gospel cannot be reconciled with that—this statement with that statement. I read but a short while ago an elaborate magazine article on the Gospel of St. John, in which the writer thus persuaded himself of its late date. But as I read the thought again and again occurred to

me, "How very easily St. "John would have cleared this matter." In truth, most of the objections against the Gospels would be readily removed could we but ask the writers how these things were so; or if we were in possession of every possible detail, of all the surroundings, in each case.

V.

Other arguments are to be found,—

1. From the numerous sects which arose very early in the Christian Church. David, in the 70th Psalm, writes—" Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee." And many an illustration of this truth is to be found in the history of the Christian Church. Justin Martyr tells how he and many others were won to embrace the Faith by noticing the holiness of life of the Christians, and their patient endurance of persecution. Again, men began soon to tamper with God's truth, and to add to it their own fancies. Jesus had said that the enemy would quickly sow tares amongst the wheat. And quickly thus appeared the Gnostic heresy. These Gnostics were many in number, and multiform in tenets. They agreed only in hating the truth. But the truth has gained largely by their error. Except for these heresies we should not have had the clear, distinct, unanswerable testimony of Irenæus in favour of the Gospels. Again, these heresies prove the incorruptness of the Gospels. All, whether Christian or Heretic, appeal to them to establish their own views; and so we are sure that the Gospels could not have been altered in any way. Had any wished to alter a Gospel to suit their peculiar views, the alteration would have been at once detected and refused by the rest.

2. The manuscripts of the Gospels were very rapidly multiplied. It would very soon have been manifestly impossible for any one to have altered every one of the manuscripts in existence. All the manuscripts are the same, wherever they are found. They still give the same truths without any change. There are variations in the readings of these manuscripts, but these variations are chiefly in unimportant matters. The Faith is never in any way injured by any variation. From any manuscript, let it be one that is most corrupt, could be learnt the way of Salvation.

3. But after all the argument that seems to be the most weighty is from a common-sense view of the matter. The Gospels exist. We have the very same Four Gospels as had the Christian Church of the time of Irenæus. No one has yet dared to dispute that. Even if it be said that they first appeared in the middle of the second century, they have remained unchanged from that time. But why should they have been written at that particular time? It would be an utter absurdity for any one seriously to assert that Jesus Christ did not live during the Governorship of Pontius Pilate. Christian apologists appeal to the accounts of his Governorship kept at Rome. We are as certain of His life and death, at that time, as we are of the life and death, say, of Julius Cæsar at a certain period of Roman history. Had not, then, our Gospels been written at the time when we say that they were written, what possible motive would there have been for any one afterwards to have written such books? Good men, loving the Lord Jesus, would not have penned such falsehoods. Evil men would not have cared to do it. Or even if such a thing had been done from some strange, undiscoverable motive, how could they, bad men as they must have been on this supposition, and writing falsely, have gained for their falsehood, so quickly, so universal an acceptance? How, if they had been written, say, about A.D. 120, could the writers have persuaded Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Celsus, Tatian, to have believed as they did concerning them? I often judge that this common-sense view of the question is but too much lost sight of. Christian defenders of the Faith have laboriously followed objectors into every detail of their objections, without sufficiently attending to this broad view of the whole question;—a method of reply which has this especial advantage, that it needs nothing but common sense to understand it. The youngest child can at once see how utterly impossible it would have been for a late writer to have persuaded the whole Christian Church that his writings, utterly unknown before to the Church, had yet been written by St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, or St. John. The Christian, the heathen objector to Christianity, would at once have exposed the cheat. Any one can understand that no one would have dreamt of so manifest an impossibility. The instant reply would have been, "If Jesus, as you say in these writings, did such wonders, how is it that no one has heard of these things till now? So great a marvel could not have been so strangely hidden. Such a thing could not have been done in a corner. Such a thing could not have been hidden in a corner until now."

VI.

In drawing this Lecture to a close, I would briefly allude to the chief objection against the Gospels. There are very many; but that which seems to be the favourite one at this time is that a miracle is an impossibility, and that these Four Gospels, containing so much of miracle, are of necessity untrue. This is the argu- ment adopted by a late writer, who, while assailing the Faith, that which is held in the utmost reverence by very many, has not the courage to place his name upon his title-page. Christian writers have boldly met this new assailant, He has

been shown, by Professor Lightfoot, especially, amongst other grave errors, to have utterly misunderstood the intention of one Christian writer whom he has largely quoted; and, when his work required an exact knowledge of the Greek language, to have made a mistake in translating the words of another, in a most important passage, which even a school-boy should not have made.

This argument—the impossibility of miracles—is no new one, but was long ago brought forward by Hume. In its present shape it is—"The Order of Nature is so unvaried and invariable that miracles cannot be. Or it is most improbable that there could have been any. This is absolutely or almost proved by the advanced Science of the day. If there be miracles, Science must be blotted out. Those who believe in miracles are opposed to Science." It is strange indeed that an assertion should be made so rashly. Newton, Faraday, Herschel, believed in the Four Gospels; and their names are not unknown to Science. It is still stranger that this ground should be taken, because Science teaches the very opposite:—that the Order of Nature has not been always unvaried, but that there has been constant change, constant interference. The bone-covered, ground-feeding Fish of the Old Red Sandstone die out, to be succeeded by the Fish of the Coal Strata—fish of a very different form and manner of life. Then suddenly appear the Flying Reptiles of the Oolite; then the huge Mammals; and then Man. Many speak, indeed, as if these differing forms have been all evolved from their predecessors in due order, but they have not advanced one proof to establish this assertion. They can only show variety occurring in some particular form of life. They cannot show any change of one species into another. To use the word of *Genesis* i., the "kind," whether of animal or of vegetable, is unchanged. But if one kind appears, and another succeeds, there must have been some One who hath filled with new life the blank which would otherwise have been left. Change of the Order of Nature from an outside force is not improbable—is not impossible. There has been such change.

But I firmly hold that we can see proof that there is not any unvariable Order of Nature in our very midst. In 1818 the cholera, that most terrible disease, which had been always known in India, became epidemic. It then left India, slowly and steadily advancing over Asia, Europe, and America. I well remember, when it appeared in London in 1849, that Mr. Glaisher, of the Royal Observatory at Greenwich, in a letter to *The Times*, mentioned the appearing of a bluish-coloured mist amongst the trees of the Park as an accompaniment of the attacks. It was also then said that a magnet at St. Petersburgh, which usually supported 80 lbs., became weaker as the cholera increased; that it lost all its strength at the worst of the disease; that it recovered gradually its power as the cholera abated. Yet there was no intensely marked change in the world—no especial cause in 1818—to invite the cholera to desert its old haunts. Things then were pretty much as they had been before, when all suddenly there is a dread, mysterious impulse given to Death. If, then, the Order of Nature is unvaried, cholera should not have left India, but have remained there alway. It must not, too, be forgotten that previous to one visit of the cholera appeared the strange, hitherto unknown, potato disease, which, between 1847-1850, destroyed two million lives in Ireland. Yet here again all the surroundings of Irish life remained the same as before, when all suddenly appeared this new vegetable death. To those who believe that GOD ruleth and ordereth the world there is no difficulty in these things. He can interfere when and how He wills. The difficulty is with those who deny the constant presence of this overruling. They must, on their theory that Nature is unchanging, explain this change. Here is no orderly working of an old force, but a new force is introduced. But if Nature is not unchanging, the favourite objection to a miracle is gone.

The late Dean Mansel has well written that while some have taken occasion from the advancement of Science to deny the possibility of miracles, this advance tends rather to prove their probability, inasmuch as it shows how utterly impossible it is now, with all of present skill or experience, to do what Jesus Christ did day by day;—that there is no agent which can repeat, in our times, with all our wonder-working powers, such wonders as these, as when a Man standing at the tomb of one who had been dead four days speaks the few words only, "Lazarus, come forth;"—and he that was dead came forth.

Yet if some have found difficulties in the Gospels, and, as I have said, profess themselves unable to believe because of the difficulty, many of these difficulties afford a very sure proof of the truth of the Gospels. Whence, it may be asked, came the sponge used at the crucifixion of Jesus? What possible reason can be given for the soldiers having it at that time? Or why, again, should the soldier who gave the sponge to Jesus have understood, and have joined in the mocking cry, "Let be, let us see whether Elias will come to take Him down?"

Or why, again, should Jesus have been pierced after that the Centurion, convinced by the words, "It is finished," and by the earthquake, had said, "Truly this was the Son of God?" Yet all these difficulties are at once removed if we suppose that the women had brought the sponge, the vinegar, and the stem of hyssop, with the vain hope of giving some relief to the Sufferer; and that, when they see the willingness of the Centurion that His thirst shall be quenched, they at once proffer what they had brought;—or if we suppose that it was a Jewish recruit in the Roman band who gave the sponge to Jesus, in obedience to the orders of the Centurion, but cannot help uttering his inward conviction of the imposture of the Nazarene, and mocking Him with the by standing Pharisees;—and, further, that this man, when his comrades are breaking the legs of the crucified thieves, in an

ungovernable rage, and without orders, thrusts his spear into the Saviour's side. I say that a late writer, inventing the detail of the history, would not have inserted these difficulties, or if he had, carefully would he have given some hint of the true explanation. But here the difficulty is stated without any thought that there is a difficulty. Nor was there any, in truth, to the writer, who knew all the details of the matter, and who simply described what had happened. The difficulty exists only for us because of our ignorance of these details. So, again, no impostor would have inserted the apparent impossibility that the Disciples did not recognise Jesus after His Resurrection, when He had been separated from them for two days only, without some attempt at explanation. But hero all is simply given. We are left to conjecture why it was that there was no recognition, because, perchance, of the utter confusion of their minds; the breaking up of all their long-cherished expectations at His crucifixion; or espe- cially because of the changed, restful expression of the Lord's face, which once had been "marred more than any man;" and of the peace now visible in One Who erst was "the Man of sorrows and acquainted with grief."

I have thus sought to put before you the reasons which have convinced me of the Reasonableness of our faith in the Four Gospels—Reasonableness, I say, for the Christian is not to believe with a blind, unreasoning faith, but should be able to give an answer for the Hope that is in him. We are to love God with all our mind, as well as with all our strength. I have endeavoured to show that the Gospels were written at the time and by the writers named; that we have followed no cunningly-devised fable.

Then, although some may say that miracles are impossible, or improbable, they have been wrought; and our Faith, which rests upon the constant interference of God's will, is surely based.

I confess that the difficulty with me has always been to understand the position of the objector. No one doubted of these Gospels at the very time when, if they had been false, doubt must have arisen. He, living so long after the events therein narrated, would still have us to believe that Books, containing the loving, merciful invitation to all who were in sorrow to find rest in the grace of Jesus, came from a Jew, who firmly believed in the salvation only of those who held his shibboleth, in an age of fierce disquiet at the Roman yoke:—or that men could have discovered such a doctrine as that which Jesus taught, in an age which allowed so much unholiness of doctrine: or have imagined, or perchance have taken from the life of Krishna (of whom it is said by his worshippers none but a God could have been so sinful) such an One as Jesus; so holy, and yet so merciful to sinners; so pure, in the midst of all temptation; so zealous, when day by day His steps were dogged by envy; so patient, notwithstanding three years of neglect; so pitiful, in all the agonies of the Cross; so mighty, and yet so quiet in the exercise of that might. Man could not, by himself, have pictured such a Saviour. The life of Jesus Christ of Nazareth stamps these Gospels, wherein that Life is written, as True. And as we reverently and lovingly read there of His love, and—as He hath taught us to do—seek of His Spirit that we may be guided into all Truth, are we drawn the closer unto Him. We find the Peace which He hath promised. We look onward with a new hope to the day when we shall see Him as He is. We have now no shadow of doubt. If there be this or that in the Gospels which we cannot explain, it disturbs not our Faith one whit. We but wait for the fulfilment of the promise, when we shall understand all, for we shall be "filled with all the fulness of God." We are doing the Lord's will, and we "KNOW THE DOCTRINE THAT IT IS OF GOD."

The Science of Correspondences or *The Relation of Spirit to Matter, considered as a Means of Scriptural Interpretation*

A LECTURE DELIVERED IN THE NEW JERUSALEM TEMPLE, TORONTO, NOVEMBER 25 TH, 1878

BY THE HON. W. C. Howells

United States Consul at Toronto.

James Speirs London 36 Bloomsbury Street, 1879

By the Rev. Chaucey Giles

The Nature of Spirit, and of Man as a Spiritual Being: Lectures. Foolscap 8vo, cloth, 1s. 6d.

The Incarnation, Atonement, and Mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ: Lectures. Foolscap 8vo, cloth, 1s.; boards, 6d.

Our Children in the Other Life. Foolscap 8vo, cloth, is.; sewed, 6d.

Heavenly Blessedness: What it is and How attained. In a Series of Discourses on the Beatitudes. Crown 8vo, cloth, 3s.

The Church of the New Jerusalem: a New Dispensation of Divine Truth. 2d.

Who was Jesus Christ? 1d.

The Lord's Blood, 1d.

The Resurrection of the Lord. 1d.

The Resurrection of Man. 1d.

The Lord's Supper, 1d.
The Mission of the New Church, 1d.
"Thou shalt not:" Man's First Spiritual Duty. 1d.
The Business of Life: its Capital and Ways of Increase, 1d.
What is Inspiration? ¾d.

Works for the Inquirer.

Great Truths on Great Subjects: Six Lectures delivered at Brighton. By the Rev. Dr. Bayley. 34th thousand, foolscap 8vo, cloth, is.; boards, 6d.

Emanuel Swedenborg: a Short Sketch of his Life and Writings. By the Rev. John Hyde. Third edition, foolscap 8vo, cloth, is.; boards, 6d.

Outlines of the Religion and Philosophy of Swedenborg. By Theophilus Parsons, LL.D. Small crown 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.

An Appeal on behalf of the Doctrines of the New Church. By the Rev. Samuel Noble. 9th edition, crown 8vo, cloth, 3s

The True Christian Religion; or, The Universal Theology of the New Church. By Emanuel Swedenborg. 815 pages, 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d.

LONDON: James Speirs, 36 BLOOMSBURY STREET.

The Science of Correspondences.

In the last chapter of the Gospel of Mark (verses 15-18) are these words: "And He said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that helieveth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe: in My Name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover."

These words were spoken to His disciples by the Lord at their last interview, when He gave them their commission to teach His Gospel. Indeed, these words constituted their commission—being His command to go, and the promise of what should follow as the result of their labours. The injunction to preach this Gospel to *all* the world and to every creature was given that it might be presented to all alike, the 'spirit of Divine Love knowing no distinctions in its direction, but extending everywhere, and embracing *all* in its limitless arms. All nations, kindreds, tongues, and peoples are in the sight of the Universal Father alike called to the fold of His Gospel, alike to the full enjoyment of its rich inheritance, on equal terms, with equal opportunities to do His will and fulfil the whole law of love.

Like all expressions in the Divine Word, this text will bear unfolding; for though when first spoken to the Apostles its application may have been *literally* and *externally* true, it is at this day applicable as a Divine injunction, and its promises are as certainly (though in a higher degree) fulfilled to-day as they were eighteen centuries ago. It contains a deeper meaning than was understood at that period, one that was to outlast the intelligence of those to whom it was immediately spoken, and is at this moment applicable to all places, as it will be to all times. To-day those who really *believe* are baptized; they cast out devils; they speak with new tongues; they take up serpents; and they drink deadly things unharmed.

No text has been more frequently misread, or oftener quoted in support of false theories, than this. It is confidently cited by the Church of Rome; while the various fanatical sects quote it in support of their claim to the power to work miracles. I have seen it tauntingly flung in the face of Christians by unbelieving scoffers; while the clause "he that believeth," etc., is the staple authority of those who believe in salvation by faith alone. And in the midst of this misuse of the text the sincere Christian often closes the sacred volume with an air of perplexed doubt, as he reads these promises and remembers that he has seen none of them as the signs that follow them who believe. Taken in its literal sense it confounds us; and it is one of the most striking verifications of the assertion that "the letter killeth, but the spirit maketh alive." He who reads literally "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" is dumb when the unbeliever asks him to show him the signs that follow them that believe; for who, they ask, takes up serpents and drinks of deadly things without hurt?

We must therefore resort to some system of interpretation by which to read this passage of the "Living Oracles;" or we must set it aside as either unworthy of our belief or beyond our comprehension. And yet this text is the great commission of the Gospel of Christianity, at once the mandate to its missionaries, and in the signs of their success the rule by which to test their converts.

We know that Protestant Christendom has explained it by saying that it applied only to the Apostolic Age when miracles were wrought literally; but they have never successfully shown the limit to that age of miracles, or the time when the signs which indicated a believer to the Apostles ceased to mark them that believe in later periods. These are insuperable difficulties which admonish us, that while the text may have had its literal application in the beginning, when men were so external that truths could be enforced by miracles, if the Scriptures are of universal application they must be read by some system of interpretation that will serve to convey their real meaning, through all time, to all grades of intellect, and will make certain to us the constant use of either a literal or spiritual rendering of all parts of the Sacred Word.

My present object is to show that there is at hand a *system* which can be used as a key for the uniform interpretation of the Divine Word. In doing this I shall assume no originality of invention, nor affect the possession of advantages over others. I would merely invite my friends to examine for themselves, and avail themselves of the advantages of a system of scriptural interpretation that indeed amounts to a science, whose rules are unvarying and yet simple, and of easy access to those who would study them, and to be acquired with very little labour.

This science—for such it really is—is not new, as I have said, for it was in use in the earliest ages. But it has recently been presented to the world as a part of the theological system taught by the celebrated, though much misunderstood, Swedenborg, who calls this system the New Jerusalem, mentioned in the Revelation of St. John. This theological system embraces a series of doctrines drawn from the Scriptures, setting forth the truths that constitute the foundation of the Church of the New Jerusalem. This Church, though presenting a system of theology extending to all the minutest details of faith, has this prominent doctrine, to which I would call particular attention: that those who live good lives, according to the faith in which they were born and educated, from love to the Lord and charity towards the neighbour, will be saved; and conversely, none can be saved who do not love the Lord and the neighbour. With such a belief those who accept this theology will not insist very rigidly upon a detailed confession of faith. Those who have organized societies for the advancement of that faith and for the exercise of religious rites according to it, are in the habit of presenting to such as ask admission among them this short Confession of Faith, as fundamental to the true Christian Church. They say in substance: We believe that God is One, who is the Lord Jesus Christ, in whom is a Divine Trinity of character, known under the terms Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; that the Holy Scriptures are Divine, and contain all instruction necessary to our salvation; that we are to do good and live good lives, as of ourselves, acknowledging that all power to do good is of the Lord; that evils are to be shunned because they are sins, and forbidden in the Divine Word; that love to God and charity towards the neighbour embrace the all of religion; and all who sincerely do such acts, and live such lives as they understand to be good, from love towards God and charity towards their neighbours, will be regenerated and saved, of whatever nation, Church, or persuasion they may be.

With this Confession of Faith it will be seen that we leave very little room for intolerance towards others, inasmuch as we acknowledge every man who lives a truly good life as of this Church. We impose no conditions of faith in our fraternal relations of the Church, but accept every sincere person who lives a life of purity, acting from an affection for the good and the true, as of this New Church, let them belong to whatever persuasion they may, or however they may have been educated on the subject of religion. With this very catholic platform, we may be indulged in the claim, that in matters of speculative faith we have some light to which we may invite the world—*especially* since we do not require them to accept our views, *unless they see them to be true and good*.

The doctrines of this New Church teach that all things in the universe have a spiritual origin. That the spiritual world is the world of causes; and that all the existences of the natural world are the outgrowth of some principle, quality, or form existing in the world of spirits; and that all the natural things around us represent the principles that give them birth, from which they spring, or around which they grow. That there exists a permanent correspondence, or relation between the forms of thought and affection belonging to the spiritual world, and the things in the natural world that have been caused by these thoughts and affections.'

To illustrate this doctrine of correspondence: Suppose I have in my mind an end to perform—a house to build, for instance; I have in view the purposes of the house, there- fore in thought I conceive of all its parts and details. Every room, the size, arrangement, etc., will be established in my mind as completely as if already built. There it exists—a house in the world of spirit or world of mind. If I were merely a spiritual being, such a house would serve my purpose; but as I am also an inhabitant of this natural world of matter, I must bring my spiritual house down into the natural world; and therefore I call about me the agencies of this natural existence, and build it of wood, stone, iron, glass, etc. It still exists in my mind a permanent house, as before it was built of matter, while it also has come to exist in the natural world. Between the house in my mind and that on my building lot there exists a perfect correspondence in all their parts, when the workmen and the materials are adequate to my ends; because the mental or spiritual house gave birth to the material one. Any one who has

built a house or constructed a machine to which he has given much thought will be sensible of this correspondence; and so well will he be acquainted with that mental or spiritual form, that his house or machine will not appear new to him when completed, but will seem to be an old affair. In the same way each and every part of a good machine corresponds not only to the mental idea from which it is born, but it also represents the use it is intended to perform and from which it was conceived. By it, in a thousand years after its construction, the intelligent mechanic can read in the machine the purposes and thoughts of the inventor. The forms of all the parts are so expressive of every conception in his mind that it is impossible to misread them.

This is *correspondence* as it appears in its finite range between man and matter. But when we come to trace it in the works of the Creator, the Infinite, it grows into a study as grand as infinity. We see in the whole world of nature a complete revelation of the Divine mind, and creation becomes "that elder Scripture" in which the whole universe may read the Divine plan through all times and ages. He who looks upon the surface of the earth contemplates its structure and its productions, sees in them all the purposes of the Divine Father to provide man with habitation, sustenance, and the means of developing the man in industry and works of charity and usefulness to his fellows. No part of the Bible can tell more plainly than the earth itself that it was made for man, as a means to promote the great sum of happiness throughout the universe—to enlarge heaven by peopling it with properly-developed humanity.

We see this correspondence illustrated very strikingly in the Universal Creation, where every creature represents some spiritual principle of importance connected with us, and corresponding to some of our moral qualities; and, while promoting our natural comfort or convenience, they exhibit in their peculiar traits of character the idea from which they spring. Thus, when the Creator would provide for man among the lower animals one that would supply his wants of food and clothing, which should multiply rapidly, and subsist upon vegetation, He created the *sheep*, a creature whose usefulness, gentleness, and innocence most plainly represent the best qualities of the regenerated human mind. When He designed to assist man with the means of locomotion and progression He made the *horse* and similar animals of burden. So of every other creature. Each being created for a certain end, and each springing from a certain moral idea, or spiritual principle, they necessarily represent these ideas and principles; and he who will look at them from this standpoint will see that their very forms and natures express the Divine purpose in the natural world, and are, so to speak, so many *letters* of a written revelation, which can be read in all times and by all peoples, conveying the *same* ideas to all with absolute certainty, whatever tongue they may speak.

We call this the *Science of Correspondences*. Like other science, it must be learned—studied—when it will be found to contain all the elements of a science, and to be applicable to the purposes of mental development. Swedenborg tells us that it was once well known to the ancient world, but was afterwards unused and lost; like the Egyptian hieroglyphics, unreadable because of disuse. He tells us that a leading feature of his mission was to *re*-present to the world this lost science, and make it available to us as the means of reading the Divine Word in its *full* meaning. He maintained that before this science fell into disuse, and men habituated themselves to looking at everything from a material point of view, the mysteries of the various ancient theologies were simple and easily understood; and that they only came to be called mythologies or fables when this means of interpretation was lost. It was only after the Greeks had so lost this science of correspondences that they came to regard Minerva as a personality, that it was wrong for them to say that she sprang from the brain of Jupiter; for nothing could have been so strictly as well as poetically true as that the personification of wisdom should be born from the mind of the Supreme Deity. This was the case with most of the ancient theosophies. They came to be mythologies only when the people who received them sunk into such profound materialism that they could no longer conceive of the invisible to material eyes from the material representatives before them.

Here let me remark to those who may not be aware of it that Swedenborg claimed to have been instructed, from the spiritual world, in this science by the Divine Providence, and commissioned to present it again to the world. I need not stop here to establish that claim by argument. To those who obstinately say there is no spiritual world, and never can be any spiritual revelations; or those who as obstinately insist that all revelation or spiritual instruction has ceased, I do not present this claim for him, because it would be useless labour. But to the earnest man who is prepared to receive truth for its own sake I submit a view of the application of this science, according to Swedenborg, in reading the Scriptures; and I shall be content to trust it for its intrinsic value, knowing that "Wisdom is justified of her children."

As all spiritual principles are represented in the natural world by the forms to which they have given birth, and as those forms are expressions of spiritual ideas, as an essay or a drawing is the expression of an idea in the mind of the writer or the artist, this system of correspondence is the best suited, as the most natural style of language for Divine revelation; because it is less liable to the mutations to which other forms of language are subject.

The Scriptures were written for our *spiritual* instruction and moral improvement through all ages; therefore they could not be expressed in ordinary changeable language; and they were written in the immutable alphabet

established by the Almighty Himself in the work of Creation. So that the book which is to direct our lives is a composed exhibit of all that was created around us in the spiritual world for our happiness there, brought down into the natural forms that fill the universe to prepare us for that happiness. For this reason the more certain system of embodying ideas in symbols is used; and the created forms are given to express the idea of their origin.

Many of these expressions are very readily conceived of, while others are more remote. The idea of innocent simplicity is very clearly expressed in the *lamb*—so much so, that throughout the world, in all languages, that word alone expresses the moral quality of truthful innocence. But though equally true, it is not so apparent that the grown animal represents the same idea, only matured and strengthened by years. This correspondence of animals is very generally recognised and appreciated. The habits of the creatures, their living motions, exhibit the internal originating quality so plainly that the poets of all times and nations have used the names of animals to express in the most intensified manner the ideas they represent. Indeed, it is a noticeable fact that the best poems are susceptible of an analysis in a general view by this system of correspondence, like the Scriptures themselves. We are also in daily use of this style of speech in our ordinary conversation. Thus, if we wish to say of a man that he is grovelling, sensual, and greedy, we shorten and intensify the expression by calling him a *hog*. If he is rapacious, we call him a *wolf* or a *shark*. In these expressions we have reference to the man's internal *quality*, and we express it by naming the *creatures* that *represent* the qualities predominant in the man. If we would describe a perfect man, our strongest term would be *a man*, meaning that he possessed the qualities pertaining to him as the likeness of his Creator. But as this science of correspondence is so comprehensive that it embraces everything, and is made up of details that are overlooked by those who have not made it a study, it is very natural to inquire, How can it be made the medium of conveying that exactness of expression proper to the Divine Word? An acquaintance with the science will answer this question. But to those who have not become acquainted with it I will present a few examples to show the operation of the system; though I have not the time now to explain the *why* of every correspondence that I quote. But I can show you that they work out a consistent explanation of the passage of Scripture illustrated; while I assure you that a thorough knowledge of the system will convince you of its power to work out *certain* results in *every* case. I will quote a few.

You have no doubt heard many a sincere and affectionate Christian, whose piety would not allow of a doubt of the sanctity as well as the truth of the Bible, wonder how it was that things were there spoken of as proper, which anywhere else would have severely shocked his moral sense. Who has not read that beautiful 137th Psalm, describing the Israelites in captivity: "By the rivers of Babylon we sat down; yea, we wept when we thought of Zion. We hanged our harps upon the willows, in the midst thereof," etc., and closing with, "Happy shall he be that taketh thy little ones and dasheth them against the stones," and has not felt that something was wanting to supply the true meaning of that sublime hymn? Let us read this last jarring verse in the ight of this system of correspondence. Babylon signifies false doctrines and the evils arising from them. The Jews were led captive there, and enslaved by the Babylonians themselves as well as by the evils represented by the Babylonians. When suffering from these evils, in their despair they exclaim, "Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones." The little ones of false doctrines and their evils are the beginning of error and temptations—the children of heresy. Stones represent truths in the lowest sense, as rocks do in a higher sense,—as shown in the expression "On this rock"—the admission of the Divinity of the Lord which Peter had just made—" I will build My Church." "A man built his house upon a rock," which conveys the idea of permanence. In this light we read the Sweet Singer of Israel exclaiming, "Happy shall he be who takes the incipient errors and evils about him and dashes them against, and breaks them with, even the lower forms of truth."

In the Revelation of John we are told of a judgment when the "books were opened," and men were judged according to what was written therein. Many in their simplicity understand this to be a general judgment, where account-books, or records kept by some recording angel, are to witness against those judged. Perhaps it may do no great harm for them to understand it in this manner. But how much more rational does this appear when we understand that a book corresponds to the memory, and that it is the memory of the man that is to be opened, that he may be judged by what is there,—where every act and every thought of his life has left its indelible impress, to be read by those spirits who are to search out the quality of his character! In passing, let me remark that the true idea of a future judgment is not to see how much punishment a spirit being judged deserves, but to find out what he is fit for, and assign him association accordingly.

We also read in the Apocalypse of a book, and *horses* coming out of it. This is impossible even in a dream. But if we understand that *horses* represent intelligence, or the knowledge of and means for advancing in truths, the expression is seen at once to be rational and very forcible. We expect to find intelligence and knowledge in the memory, but not horses in a book, till we know what horses and books mean. The reason why a horse corresponds to intelligence is that he is an aid to the traveller, and an invaluable means of progression. By this

same analogy roads and paths and chariots all have a relative correspondence to knowledge and truth, and the means of their acquirement. There is a woe pronounced by one of the prophets against those who put their trust in horses—who go down into Egypt for help; that stay on horses—which is a woe to them who trust merely in what they *know*. Egypt signifies *natural science*, which is the first step in intellectual progress. Those who use their horses (knowledges) to go down into Egypt (mere natural science) are retrograding, and justly incurring woes. In this interpretation of Egypt, as meaning science, we see the propriety of the command to the Israelites to borrow from the Egyptians their jewels and ornaments, and carry them away with them. For a people being instructed in spiritual things to obtain and keep the jewels and ornaments of natural science, is consistent with our highest standard of morality and justice.

The Bible abounds with passages that are either wholly unintelligible or repulsive in their literal meaning, which when read in the light of this system of correspondence present the most rational ideas, and truths glorious as the noonday sun—harmonizing perfectly with our sense of right and the science of the age.

The first chapters of Genesis have been understood by the world generally (and there is no particular danger to the simple-minded of spiritual death from the belief that I see) to be a history of the creation of the physical world and the solar system. Scientific men have always stumbled over this part of the Divine Word. But since the science of geology has been brought to its present perfection the difficulty of harmonizing the literal reading of these chapters and the facts of science has been so great that ingenious and candid minds have despaired of its accomplishment; while the account of the flood literally read has set all attempts at such harmony at absolute defiance.

But suppose we read those first chapters as a sacred allegory, under the form of Creation, exhibiting the spiritual history of mankind in the complex, and each individual in particular, showing the commencement and progress of evils and their accompanying falsities, and man's redemption from them. The first chapters of Genesis tell us of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. By this system of correspondence the *man* signifies the judgment or understanding in the human mind, while the *woman* represents the associated affections; and this representation is remarkably natural and significant to the most careless observer. Here these two leading qualities of the mental or spiritual man are exhibited, as placed in a garden—a situation for culture—innocent and pure, surrounded with all the sources of happiness, good because just from the hand of the Creator, and not yet acquainted with evil, and true because unused to falsehood. Man thus represented as to his understanding or judgment by *man*, and his affections by the *woman*, is told that he must not eat of (acquire) the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, though of all other trees he may eat; and this injunction, comprehending in itself all that is necessary as such, is his law. While *man* and *woman* represent the two leading qualities of the mind, every other animal represents some of the subordinate qualities of man's nature. Of these the *serpent* represents his *sensual* principle. It dwells in his appetites and near his passions; and they, being the lower portion of his nature, are likely to be first assailed by the blandishments of evil; and they also are the first to be led astray. Our sensual appetites are good in their sphere; but they are to be *ruled* and not to *rule*. Here then we have an exhibition of the progress of the whole human race into evil, and likewise of ourselves individually. Every man has his Garden of Eden and his fall; while every man must have his regeneration from it or remain fallen for ever. In the beginning the *serpent*, the sensual principle, glides into excess and learns to delight in undue indulgences. It tempts the *woman*, or affections, with these delights. It presents the fruit of experience in good *and* evil, gathered from the tree of *knowledge* of good and evil, as delightful to the appetites, to the eye, and to the taste. The affections are drawn down and fixed upon these sensual experiences of good and evil. The *woman* in this way eats (appropriates) this forbidden fruit at the solicitation of the serpent. These corrupted affections thus delighting in sensual indulgences, appeal to the judgment; the *woman* tempts the *man*, and he eats also. Thus the judgment, led by the affections, which had been corrupted by the appetites, yields its assent, *and approves* of the *love of sensual delights;* and both these qualities of the mind, the *man* and the *woman*, are involved in the eating of the fruit of this tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Then the fall is complete. The sensual appetites, the affections, and the judgment all delighting in the experiences of evil, man is necessarily removed from the garden or state of innocence and purity.

Since man fell into evil by progression he must return from it by retracing the steps that he took. Cast out from the garden, but not from the Divine care, he is given the means of redemption. From the judgment (the man) and the affections (the woman) is born a son, Cain, who represents *faith*, or *confidence in truth*, and the power to believe. As the judgment yielded to the temptations of evil *after* the affections, in the retrogression or return from evil it must *lead* the affections and *govern* the appetites; and in this state we see the *woman* placed in subjection to the *man*, while the *serpent* is condemned to go upon his belly in the dust. Then Cain, this principle of faith, born of the fallen judgment and affections, is succeeded by Abel, representing *charily* and the good of life. Here is described a step towards redemption. After faith is born into the human household we find charity soon appearing. But to show how readily we pervert all good gifts another scene is introduced. These brothers, faith and charity, are in the field together, guarding the flocks, the gentler useful qualities represented

by sheep and cattle,—and they worship. Cain, the faith principle, which delights in studying doctrines and forming theories, brings an offering of the fruits of the earth—his self-derived intelligence. It is scattered by a blast of wind. His loving brother, Abel, or charity, offers up the firstlings of the flocks, the tender, gentle, and useful qualities represented by the lamb. This is accepted of Heaven. The self-reliant Cain is enraged because the simple offering of gentle good affections is received, while his lofty theories are scattered to the winds, and, overcome by jealousy, he smites his brother to the earth. Then the next grand downward step is taken. The faith principle being unduly cultivated, and being corrupted, it makes offering of its fancies and theories, cultivated from the earth, of the earth earthy, and the sweet and loving qualities reared and tended by charity are discarded; charity itself is slain at the altar; and faith is placed to rule alone in the individual and in the Church, guided only by the light of its self-derived intelligence, of which we have examples all around us—where the fine-spun theories and doctrines of some cold head are insisted upon as essential to salvation; while the spirit of brotherly love and charity, and simple-hearted, tender, and pure affections towards God and man, are set aside as of minor importance, or treated with contempt or neglect. Then it is expected that much will be forgiven to those who *believe* much, rather than those who *love* much.

Under this allegory we have a rational history of the development of evil in the human race, and of the fall of the first Church, under the name of Adam, which lasted or lived nine hundred years, and then died, or fell into that state of evil where charity or love of the neighbour was extinguished and doctrinal tests set up in its place. Then it was, as we often find it now, when the Church does not ask respecting a man, Does he love God and his neighbour? but, Does he believe our particular doctrines? And good men are condemned for want of faith in some dogma or logic that they do not understand.

Other Churches or dispensations succeeded the Adamic, and in their turn became corrupt and falsified, and perished; till in later times these false doctrines and the evils resulting from them spread over the whole earth as a *flood*, deluging and drowning out all that was manly and humanizing among men, covering the whole earth of humanity, even to the highest mountains, or most elevated portions of the mind, leaving only a few pure principles and truths, represented by Noah and his family, and the qualities represented by the animals in the ark, of which there were seven of all the clean, and only pairs of the lower orders.

It will be readily seen that we do not therefore understand the first chapters of the Bible to be a history of the physical creation or the first times of the world. They are only an allegory illustrating the introduction and progress of evil in the first ages of the world, and the fall into evils experienced by every individual in *all* ages. Of course, then, Adam and Methuselah and Enoch are names of Churches, or epochs of the first ages, and *not* the names of individual men.

After the period described under the figure of the flood and Noah the Scriptures become the history of the Jewish Church, in which they were written; and as such they detail actual occurrences as well as the progress of principles; while these actual occurrences are representatives and types of *after* and *higher* spiritual matters,—the Hebrews being a representative people, and their whole course a grand life-drama, so to speak, containing and representing the great work of redemption. The scenes they enacted, and the language in which these scenes are related, are all correspondent to interior principles, and may be read and interpreted by this system, as I instanced in the Psalm.

But I shall be excused for introducing here another reading of the Bible by this system of correspondence, wherein we have an explanation of a text in which the literal reading is almost reversed, and that so strikingly that it cannot fail to arrest attention, while it relieves some torturing doubts.

When the Israelites were starting upon one of their expeditions against the Canaanites they were directed to exterminate those idolaters, and not spare any of the males of any age, nor the women who were married or attached to any of the men; but the young women they were to spare and *keep for themselves* (Numbers xxxi. 17, 18). Here is indeed a monstrous order of proceeding as literally read. But let us analyze it. The Canaanites were the representatives of all false or falsified doctrines. The *men* among them represented the judgment perverted and corrupted by false teaching, and also the *falsehoods* themselves, which the Hebrews were to exterminate, to kill. The *women* married to them were the affections for the *false*, the *corrupted* affections, from which would be born evils of course, which evils were the *male* children. But the *young women*, unattached to and uncorrupted by these falses, the pure, natural affections for good and truth, they were commanded to spare and appropriate to themselves. Here is indeed beauty for ashes!

So it would be with any of the knotty texts in the entire Bible if read by this system. Without it they are dark, mysterious, and often repulsive; but with it they are lucid, beautiful, and holy. But the text I quoted when I began most eminently furnishes an example of the advantages of this method of interpretation.

He that believeth and is *baptized* shall be saved. Of the term *believe* we are to understand of course that kind of belief which is carried out into acts, that *living* faith which makes men *do* as well as *think* the truth—*with a heart unto righteousness*. To believe in this case signifies to act, as to hear sincerely implies obedience, not merely to receive the truth, but that deeper act of the affection, to love and to do it. From this

belief men are baptized, washed, cleansed, purified. He that believes and is *baptized* by that belief will be saved. It does not say in the converse part of the text—he that believeth not *and is not baptized;* because he who does not believe in this higher sense never can be spiritually or really baptized. When the belief extends to and invests the heart or affections that purity of life follows which is symbolized by the right of baptism.

Then we are told that these signs shall follow them that believe. "In My Name they shall cast out devils"—from themselves, from their own hearts, where evil spirits previously ruled. They shall speak with new tongues, for from the abundance of the heart, from which the mouth speaks, the utterances of their hearts will be true and good.

They shall take up serpents; those sensual appetites that tempted the woman, or affections, in the Garden of Eden shall be made pure and elevated to the position they occupied before the fall—taken up from the dust, reduced to order and applied to use; for all our appetites are good when taken up or elevated above evil desire.

If they *drink* any deadly thing it shall not hurt them. Pure water represents truth, and hence the significance of baptism. If water is rendered impure, it represents truth falsified. If poisoned, it contains deadly errors. To drink any deadly thing would signify to receive grievous errors and false doctrines; but they who have cast out devils (evils) from their hearts, and from the abundance of their hearts speak with new and regenerated tongues, and have taken up their serpents; if they *should* drink some deadly thing, accept some false doctrine, it shall not hurt them; because, loving and doing what is good, they are not led into evil *acts* by the false views which they may receive into their understandings, as we see daily, men holding very erroneous doctrines and yet living good lives.

They shall lay hands upon the sick and they shall recover. Those qualities in us which are diseased and disordered by evil are properly called the sick. The hand represents power and guiding strength. With the good man it would be the power of righteousness, which is potent to heal the sick on which it is laid.

If, at the time of the Apostles, when a few miracles were wrought to arrest the attention of the very sensual men of that age, these signs *literally* or physically followed some of the believers, that was no reason that the signs, in their deeper spiritual sense, should not always follow true faith. For though the outward appearance may not now be present, so far as the great work of spiritual regeneration is concerned, the signs *still* follow, and the promise still holds good. He that sincerely and heartily believes and is baptized—purified in heart and purpose—his sensual nature, the serpent, shall be lifted up; he shall speak with new tongues; the understanding will be enlightened by true faith; the affections will be purified and led by that true faith; his sin-sick soul shall be healed; "and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them," "for they shall not hurt nor destroy in My holy mountain, saith the Lord."

Muir and Paterson, Printers, Edinburgh.

The Spiritual World The World of Life and Cause

A Lecture

By Robert Jobson

A man can receive nothing unless it be given him from above."—JOHN ii. 27

James Speirs London 36 Bloomsbury Street 1878

The Spiritual World,

The World of Life and Cause.

In this address we purpose showing that all things in the world of matter derive their existence and subsistence from the world of spirit. For the better elucidation and comprehension of the subject, we shall first show that a man has not life in or from himself, but that he receives it from the Creator, who alone is the source of all life; and next, we shall proceed to prove that all things in outward nature exist in matter, because they first exist in spirit; in other words, that the material creation is the body of an inner spiritual world or soul, that world being the abode of men when they depart from this.

First, then, let us endeavour to show that man's existence is derived, and God's underived, that man is the recipient, and God the fountain of life.

Now, if we reflect for a moment, our experience will tell us that we, either as to our souls or as to our bodies, have not existence in or from ourselves; but that we depend for life, every moment of our being, on our connection with the worlds of mind and matter. We assert that our life is neither self-derived nor self-supporting; and to prove this let us look at ourselves first in reference to our physical nature. We came into the world, not from our own power, but through the instrumentality of our parents, while they again did the same through

the instrumentality of *their* parents; so that if we go back and back we must of necessity come to a time when there were some *first* parents. You may take the Mosaic account, and call them Adam and Eve, or not; but of this we are certain, reasoning from effect to cause, or from son to parent, that there must have been a time when man had a beginning. Man, therefore, did not create himself. That is a fact so plain that no one we think will venture to dispute it; and that is the first point we wish to establish.

Now, when we are born into the world, we find ourselves possessed of eyes to see, ears to hear, a tongue to taste, hands to feel, and a nose to smell; and in order to the full use and enjoyment of all these senses, we require to have connection with the five different spheres or worlds around us, namely, beauty and colour, music and sound, taste, touch, and fragrance; and you will notice that the senses in us are so perfectly adapted for the worlds *out* of us, that they are far more perfectly made to fit each other than the glove is made to fit the hand; so that in the adaptation of man for the outer world, and the outer world for man, you have a striking instance of that love and wisdom, that goodness and providence which first created and afterwards sustains him. For the full use and enjoyment, then, of all our different faculties, we require to have connection with the various spheres around us; and the five senses form so many different avenues through which the spiritual being within enters into and dwells in the material universe; and if we destroy the connection between the two, we immediately destroy the pleasures of our existence. Looking at ourselves, then, in this respect, we can plainly see that we are not independent, but dependent beings.

But let us look at the subject from another point of view, for there are many ways by which we can trace it, and all leading to the same conclusion. First, for instance, we possess lungs wonderfully adapted for breathing—exhaling and inhaling; but what a helpless being does man become when the common air is cut off from him, as the accidents in our coal mines too often terribly exemplify—he immediately gasps and dies! Again, we find ourselves possessed of heart, stomach, and teeth; but of what possible use could these organs be to us did we not receive from the world without a plentiful supply of good wholesome food and drink?

Now the same facts are as true of man as a spiritual or intellectual being, as they are true of him as a physical one. Just let us briefly examine this part of the subject. We possess a soul or spirit as well as a body. We know that we ourselves did not create that spirit; consequently for it to continue to exist it requires to have connection with the source of life from whence it originally came. This fact must be evident to any rational being, to any person gifted with the smallest modicum of common sense; and the teachings of nature fully confirm this spiritual truth.

The rivulet depends for its existence on its mountain springs, and the river on its source; cut them off and they immediately cease to flow. Or look at the beautiful sunlight, and you will find it conveys the same simple practical truth. The golden rays that dance around shed light and warmth wherever they fall; but where would they be were it not for their connection with their inexhaustible source, the sun? And exactly so is it with man as to his mental nature. Truly speaking, he is a most helpless, dependent being. Every moment he breathes he depends for his life in having connection with the world of spirit for the support of his soul; and if we could destroy that connection we should immediately destroy our existence. We can realize some faint idea of this, for instance, if we cut ourselves off from society, deprive ourselves of all friendship, conversation, books, and intercourse with the outer world; in short, inflict upon ourselves the punishment of solitary confinement—our existence would become to us a most intolerable burden, one which, as maintained by some writers, is even worse than death itself. And why so? Because we are depriving our minds of that pure and healthy mental atmosphere and exercise which are as necessary to the wellbeing of the soul as the air of the atmosphere is requisite to the health of the body; in such a case we would be choking and stifling the very breath of our spirits: and it would indeed be a greater mercy to put an end to our existence at once than to keep our hand continually on our windpipe, grasping or relaxing .it at our own cruel pleasure. A man, therefore, is a dependent being. That is the second point we wish to establish. Now, keeping these facts and arguments fairly before us, remembering in the first place that man did not make himself, and in the second place that he does not sustain himself after he is made, we are led to the conclusion that there must be some first cause, call it what you will, that first created and afterwards sustains him. This first cause we call God.

Oh, stop a bit, says the atheist; don't come to that conclusion too fast. You say a man requires a maker; and I say with equal reason that God also requires a maker.

Granting the atheist his position, what does it lead to? Cannot you see that it involves him in this difficulty, that he makes Creation spring from a succession of causes, and which in reality means that everything comes out of nothing. This conclusion has within it the very essence of absurdity; for *you cannot get anything out of nothing*, far less everything, so that atheist and deist are alike compelled to admit that the being who created man must of necessity be self-existent, uncreated, and underived.

But further, it is a truth which cannot be disputed, "You cannot get out of a thing that which the thing itself does not contain." Now let us look for a moment at ourselves, and what do we find? We find we are possessed of the faculties and powers of thinking, willing, reasoning, reflecting, forming opinions, and drawing

conclusions; in short, that we are possessed of all the varied powers of love and wisdom, developed in ten thousand different ways and forms, so that it was no exaggeration when the Psalmist declared, "Man was created only a little lower than the angels." We know that we did not create these faculties and powers. We also know that we did not receive them from nature; for we cannot get love and affection, thought and reason, out of trees and stones, nor do we get them from the animal world. True, animals are possessed of instinct in some cases to all appearance very nearly allied to human reason; but the mental powers of animals differ both in quality and degree from those of men. We have never yet heard of an animal versed in science, politics, and literature, and capable of composing an orthodox sermon, or writing an epic poem. When such a wonderful specimen of a four-legged divine and poet is discovered, I would propose that he be presented to Professor Darwin to be by him duly examined and reported on. Possibly that grave and learned doctor may find in this still graver animal the missing link connecting the lower with the higher creation, and of which he has been so long in search. Well, then, as we do not get these powers and faculties from nature, where do they come from? Where? But from Him who created us. We have them because He has them; and since He possesses them, therefore we most reasonably conclude that our Creator must be a living, wise, and intelligent being; and as man the creature is finite in his love, wisdom, and intelligence, so God the Creator must be infinite in all His glorious powers and attributes; in other words, man is human, God divine; the truth of which conclusion receives additional confirmation from the fact that God has created, not one single human being only, but millions, and that in all probability other earths of the universe, like our own, are all teeming with human beings, every one of whom, like each ray of the sun, depending for existence on the great first Cause.

Having got thus far rationally to perceive that there is and must be a first cause to all things, let us now advance a step further by endeavouring to acquire a proper idea of the Personality of the Creator. Many persons, for want of this, really have no proper idea of God at all; and instead of worshipping a Divine Being, a Heavenly Father, they worship "they know not what." They will, for instance, tell you that God is a being of love and wisdom, and in the next breath will inform you that He is not a divine person at all, but only a something, as the first of the Thirty-nine Articles has it, "without body, parts, or passions," diffused throughout all space. This, however, is not the God of the Christian but of the Pantheist; and we might just as well worship the atmosphere as worship a Deity of this kind. This part of the Articles ought to be expunged from the Prayer-Book, for it gives rise to the most contradictory ideas of God. At one time He is represented as a divine person seated on a throne, coming to judge the world, and to whom, and before whom, the heavenly hosts are engaged in giving utterance to their strains of heavenly music and hallelujahs; while at another time His Personality is completely destroyed, and the mind of the worshipper deprived of a proper object of worship before whom it can bend the knee and raise the voice of prayer. Yet such are the monstrous absurdities and contradictions generated in the very midst of the Church itself by the articles of its own creed. From this false and pernicious notion has arisen the idea that nature is God. Nature, however, is not God.

"Nature is but a name for an effect
Whose cause is God,"

and he that worships nature worships the effect, and not its cause, and a thing as incapable of hearing and answering prayer as the wooden idol of the most benighted heathen.

Now when we speak of a man as a human being, we do not understand him to be a formless essence, a being "without body, parts, or passions;" but we think of him as we ought to think of him, as a human form, containing within itself love, intelligence, and power. That is the true and proper idea to entertain of a man; and the moment we surrender it, and begin to think of the human attributes separated from their subject, and to call them the man, then we only involve ourselves in confusion. Love, intelligence, and power have no real existence, and are mere abstractions unless embodied in a subject or entity. When, therefore, we think of the human attributes, never let us lose sight of the form that contains them.

Again, when we think and speak of the angelic attributes, we do not, nay, we cannot, conceive of them, save as existing in and coming forth from the form or spiritual organization of the angel.

And in like manner, when we think and speak of the Divine attributes, we ought to concentrate our thoughts on the Divine Personality, as containing within itself all those glorious powers and perfections which the man and the angel contain within themselves, only with this vast difference, and, as before stated, in the man and the angel they are human and finite, in God they are divine and infinite. True, the divine influence which proceeds from God extends throughout all space, and is to be found wherever creation exists; but this influence, emanation, or spirit is one thing, and the Divine Personality or form another, just as the rays of the sun of the material creation are one thing, and the sun itself another.

This, then, we humbly, but confidently, submit to be an intelligent and rational conception of God; and this idea is just the one presented in and confirmed by Divine Revelation. It tells us, as you will read in John (i. 3), "All things were made by *Him;* and without Him was not anything made that was made." Now, who or what is meant by the "Him" that made "all things"? Are we to understand the "Him" to be, as the Article declares, a

being "without body, parts, or passions," or as the Pantheist asserts, a formless essence diffused throughout all space? Most assuredly not. The "Him" there declared to be the Creator of *all things*, is none other than the Lord Jesus Christ, the one and only Divine Man; in whose glorious form resides all the powers and perfections of Deity, or as He is described in another part of His Divine Word," the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last, the Almighty." Unlike the god of the pantheist and the heathen, He can hear and answer prayer; because He, and He only, is the one *living personal* God.

Viewing the subject, then, in this light, we can see that God is the beginning of all things, and man the effect. It is said in the Gospel of John (iii. 27), "A man can receive nothing unless it be given him from above;" and again our Lord declares, as you will read in John (xv. 5), "Without Me ye can do nothing." And what is the meaning of these words? They evidently teach that all pure and heavenly principles and power descend from God like the rays from the sun, passing through the angelic heavens until they reach the minds of men on earth. Now the mind of man is a spiritual organ or receptacle of life from heaven; and if the mind is good the heavenly influx will be reflected in all the works the man performs. If, on the contrary, the mind is in an evil state, the divine influx will be perverted. We can thus see that both good and evil men, both angels and devils, derive their life from the selfsame source, just as the rose and the thorn, the flower and the poisonous weed, the diamond and the charcoal, derive their life and colour from the selfsame sun. The same influx enters both classes of existences; but in both it is differently manifested, by reason of the difference in the receptacle. So in the one class of minds the divine influx is used and applied to proper purposes; in the other it is abused and perverted.

And here allow me to touch on the nature of Spirit and Matter. How often are we told that Matter is everything and Spirit nothing; that Matter is all substantial, and Spirit non-substantial. So reasoned the serpent principle in the golden age; so reasoned the infallible doctors of Rome on Galileo's discovery; and they proved their fallibility by declaring that the earth was an immovable flat plane, round which revolved the sun, moon, and all the starry heavens; and so reasons the materialist at this day; for, judging everything by the corporeal senses, he has to his own satisfaction reasoned God out of existence, and a future state out of existence, and were it not for the flesh and blood that hang about him, he would reason away his own existence too. But all this is only reasoning from appearances, and appearances are very apt to mislead. The reverse is the true state of the case; for Spirit is prior, and therefore superior, to Matter; and the closer we examine this part of the subject we shall find that Spirit is by far the more substantial, though the less tangible, of the two.

The sculptor, for instance, determines to produce a work of art, it may be a Hercules reflecting the mightiest of human strength, or a Ganymede expressing all that is beautiful in the feminine form. But before the figure can be chiselled it has first to be conceived in the sculptor's mind. It, therefore, exists in mind before it exists in matter; and in the mind it becomes a real, substantial, though spiritual entity; while the statue in marble or stone is only the reflection, and sometimes a very imperfect reflection, of the mental creation within. If you had no conception, you could have had no statue. The conception, then, is the cause, and the statue the effect. And which is the greater—the cause or the effect?

"Oh! but," says the materialist,

"In the language of physical science, which by the nature of the case is materialistic, the actions of men, so far as they are recognisable by science, are the results of molecular changes in the matter of which they are composed."—*Professor Huxley in Fortnightly Review*.

"the mind of the sculptor consists of the finest, the subtlest, and minutest parts of the material body; these act upon the grosser parts and organs, and thus produce the form in the stone."

Now, supposing in answer to this that the sculptor, in a moment of generous enthusiasm for the conversion of the materialist, were to submit his body to the dissecting knife, do you think you could find the form there? You might examine the brains, the heart, the lungs, the liver, and the spleen, or the bones, the flesh, the muscles, the sinews, and the nerves even to their finest tissues, but your search will be all in vain. And yet you are certain that the form was in the artist, for the most certain of all reasons, because it came out of him. But now comes the question—In what part of him? In his body? Most certainly not. In his spirit? Most certainly yes. While the sculptor stood erect before you the glorious conception of his work existed in all its beauty and perfection in his mind; but when his body lies prostrate in death, the conception has vanished, as if unable to outlive the spirit that gave it birth. The spirit departs, and so do its beautiful ideas. And what is the conclusion, the only conclusion one can draw from this fact? Is it not that the ideas and conceptions of the mind belong to the spirit; are mental, not material; and that when the spirit quits the body, it takes its ideas with it? And is not this simple fact a clear convincing proof that the spirit, although united to the physical frame in the closest and most wonderful manner, is nevertheless a substance separate and distinct from the body, having a form and organization of its own, with laws peculiar to itself?

Now, the conclusions to which we have just arrived, are strengthened and confirmed when we come to examine other parts of man's mental nature. Take, for instance, that of the Memory. The Memory is indeed a

most marvellous faculty. By it, old age can recall to life scenes and circumstances which have occurred in early youth. Time may perhaps have dimmed the eye, and whitened the hair, and rendered the step slow and tottering, but the spirit within is above and beyond the touch of "decay's effacing fingers." The forms of the departed will oftentimes come trooping up and pass in review before us. Some there are, like old Marley's ghost, that haunted the flint-hearted Scrooge, whom we would gladly be without; others, again, whose faces are ever fresh and green in our recollections, and on whose memories we delight to dwell. Now mark this. These circumstances are not impressed on the material body. You cannot find the faintest trace of them in the flesh, blood, or bones, but they are written with a point keener than the pen of iron on the spirit within; and thus, again, you have evidence that the spirit, though not material, is nevertheless most really substantial.

But, perhaps, the materialist will ask us to define "spirit." Well, we answer by asking him to define "matter." He tells us that it is a thing which he can see, feel, touch, weigh, and measure. That is his definition of matter. Very good. Well, our definition of spirit is, that it is the thing by which we are enabled to see, to feel, to touch, to weigh, and to measure; for, deprive the body of its life or spirit, and where will be your sense of seeing, feeling, touching, and your power of weighing and measuring? Spirit, then, is the active, matter the passive, substance; because the one is living, and the other dead.

Again, the body cannot think, reason, or will. It cannot reflect, draw conclusions, and form opinions. And why not? Because these are operations of a spiritual nature, and can only be performed by a spiritual subject. The body which clothes our spirits, or to speak more correctly, with which our spirit clothes itself, is made up of the common articles of food, such as bread and butter, beef and mutton, these, converted by the most wonderful chemistry, into flesh and blood, skin and bone, and they are, *per se*, no more capable of thinking, willing, reasoning, and acting after their transformation into head and trunk, arms and legs, than they were .when lying on the dinner-table. When, therefore, physical science tells us that "the actions of men, so far as they are recognisable by science, are the results of molecular changes in the matter of which they (the men) are composed," it tells us, what must be evident to all, a plain, palpable, naked absurdity. But we do not believe that physical science tells us anything of the kind. On the contrary, we have the strongest hope that when man's physical organization is examined and understood in connection with the true nature of his spiritual being, then will it be seen that the teachings of physical science are in harmony with those of revealed religion.

But supposing that the materialist is unable to give a satisfactory solution of the essence of matter, and that we are equally unable to solve the nature of spirit, does it therefore follow that neither matter nor spirit has any real existence? Most certainly not. Scientific men cannot agree as to the essence of the sun, and they do not quite understand the nature of electricity; does it therefore follow that there is no sun or no electricity? Besides, we are not bound to prove the existence of a thing by defining its essence. Science cannot define the essence of heat and light; but it fully acknowledges their existence from the many evidences it has of their effects. Science cannot define the essence of magnetism; yet it fully admits its existence from the fact that by it this planet of ours, weighing millions of tons of solid matter, is held in its own proper orbit, revolving silently and swiftly through boundless space. We cannot weigh, measure, and grasp this unseen power; but it most assuredly exists; and the deeper you examine this part of the subject, you will find that the farther you depart from dead, gross, inert matter, and the nearer you approach the confines of the invisible world, the less material substances become the most powerful and life-giving, until you arrive at that which has nothing in common with matter, namely spirit, the most wonderful and powerful of all.

And exactly so it is with the existence of spirit and of the spirit world. Although we cannot define their essence, we have nevertheless many conclusive evidences around us of their existence from their effects. Let the materialist, for instance, look into the face of a good man, and then into the face of a bad man, and there will he discover evidence of the existence and power of spirit. For what is it that gives to the good man the noble look, the genial smile, the clear, honest, penetrating eye? What, but the spirit within? Such a one has allowed his mind to be formed by true and noble principles; and these have had the powerful effect of even moulding the very matter to their own expression. On the other hand, look upon the face of the man that has become a slave to his own evil passions, who has reveled in debauchery and vice, and there you will have a faithful picture of the inner spirit. You see the very devil peering through his eyes, those "windows of the soul." The spirit in this case has been its own artist. True to life, it has made an excellent photograph, and produced a striking likeness. Or take the case of an infant, warm from its mother's breast, and wrapped in its peaceful slumbers, before it has yet reached the age when the hereditary propensities of evil in its nature are developed, and in that little sleeping face you will see heaven's influence reflected in its dimpling smiles. The chords of that infantile spirit, like the strings of some heavenly Æolian harp, though untouched by human hands, are nevertheless moved and vibrated by the gentle breathings and whisperings of the angelic world.

And why is there so great a difference in the features in all three cases? Because the spirit is different in each one.

We have thus seen that man's life is derived and God's underived; and we have dwelt thus far on the

substantiality of spirit, in order that we may be the more fully prepared to understand the second part of our subject, namely, that all things in outward nature exist on earth because they first exist in the spiritual world; in other words, that the material creation is the body of an inner spiritual creation or soul, and into which world the spirit of man passes immediately on the death of his body. And here, I know, it will excite the surprise, if not the contradiction, of some, when we assert that the soul has a form as well as the body, and that things in heaven have forms as well as things on earth. Of those who object to this, however, allow me to ask, You say the soul exists while in the body, and exists still after the death of the body. Well, then, if it exists, it must of necessity have a form, otherwise it can have no existence. Existence implies form; for a thing that has no form is not anything: it is nothing. To admit the existence of the soul is to admit its form also; and to deny its having a form is in reality to deny its existence. There is no escape from either of these two conclusions. If you say the soul exists, then you admit its having a form. Or if you say it has no form, then you deny its existence.

And what form is it likely to have? or what shape is most suitable and most becoming for it, but its own shape, the shape it gives to the body, the human form. The form of humanity is of all forms the most beautiful, noble, and godlike. Search creation through from the starry expanse above to the earth beneath, and the waters under the earth, through the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms, and you will find no form to rival it. It is the most perfect, and most marvellously constructed of all forms, and man being the highest and most perfect of all the Creator's works, therefore he, and he alone, possesses it.

But perhaps it will be asked, Why does the body take this form and no other?

The body, as we all know, is composed of the various articles of food and drink, why then do these not assume a different shape? Why? Because it is the spirit that moulds and fashions them, and not they the spirit. Do not for one moment suppose that the food we eat can of its own unaided power convert itself into bright intelligent eyes, sweet lips, and smiling faces. To believe so would be as erroneous as to suppose that the stones and mortar can of their own power, without the aid of the architect and builder, raise themselves into the form of a noble building, or that the paint can of itself convey to the canvas all the beautiful touches of the picture without the aid of the artist. Our food is to our spirit what the stones and mortar are to the builder, what the paint and canvas are to the artist, what the clay is in the hands of the potter. It is fashioned, moulded, and built up in the human form, because the spirit pervades every part of the body, appropriates sustenance to every part, and thus our flesh and blood take the human form, because the spirit imparts to them the form peculiar to itself.

Now the same law that gives form and beauty to the human body operates also on all things in the material universe. Outward nature, such as the trees and flowers, the hills and dales, woods and forests, and everything around us, animate and inanimate, are the outward covering or body of a beautiful, unseen, spiritual soul within. It may reasonably be asked, But where is the spiritual world? We cannot see it. Where is it? We answer, It is *here*. It is within the material world, just as our souls are within our bodies; thus there are spiritual forces within every created thing. This truth is finely expressed by the poet Cowper when he says—

"There is a soul in all things, and that soul is God.
The beauties of the wilderness are His,
That make so gay the solitary place
Where no eye sees them, and the fairer forms
That cultivation glories in are His.
Not a flower
But shows some touch or freckle, streak or stain,
Of His unrivalled pencil. He inspires
Their balmy odours, and imparts their hues,
And bathes their eyes with nectar, and includes,
In grains as countless as the seaside sands,
The forms with which He sprinkles all the earth."

What the poet here expresses are really sound philosophical facts clothed in the language of poetry. Just let us look at the subject a little closer, and we shall find that it really is so.

The material world is continually changing. Winter is succeeded by spring, and spring again by summer, and summer followed by autumn, each season bringing with it its own particular fruits, and displaying its own peculiar charms. From whence, then, .proceed all the beautiful varieties of nature in the four seasons? Are they pro- duced by the earth itself? No, because matter of itself is inert and dead. Are they produced by the sun? No, because material heat and light cannot create form. It is true the seasons are in a limited sense produced by the position of the sun to the earth. Its presence or absence produces a certain state in outward nature which we call summer and winter; and influences from the spiritual world being always and everywhere present, and pressing

into and upon the material creation, mould outward nature into such forms as it is at the moment best capable of receiving. A simple comparison will here explain what we mean. If we take a piece of wax and apply heat to it, it becomes soft and plastic, and capable of receiving and showing the impression stamped upon it. You will notice the impression is not produced by the heat. All that the heat can do is simply to melt the wax, and render it capable of receiving the impression. The heat cannot form the wax into a flower, any more than it can give to it the impress of the coin of the realm. And exactly so is it with the forms impressed on outward nature. The earth is as the wax, the sun as the heat, and the unseen spiritual forces within nature are the stamp. When the gentle rains of heaven descend to moisten the soils and clods, and the sun pours upon them its warm and genial rays, then these unseen forces from the spiritual world flow in, and stamp upon outward creation all those varied beauties of flower and tree, of bud and blossom, of garden and landscape, which we see around us. And if earth, the shadow and rough and faint reflection, is so beautiful when thus arrayed in all the loveliness of summer's fairest charms, what must heaven, the cause and substance, be?

We assert, then, that heaven must of necessity contain, even in a greater degree, and to a much fuller development and perfection, all those things which charm the soul, and delight and gratify the senses of man on earth, only they are spiritual not material. There shall we find beautiful flowers, gardens, groves, landscapes, rivers, and lakes. These things exist here, because they exist there. Many people treat heaven as they treat the soul. They admit its existence, but deny its form. If you ask them, Has the soul any form? they answer, "Oh, no." Have things in heaven any form? "Oh, no." So, then, there are no beautiful landscapes to please the eye, no delicious fruits to delight the taste, no music to charm the ear? "No, nothing whatever." Well, then, if heaven has none of these, what has it? "It has nothing." So that those who profess to believe in heaven, the soul, and a future state, when you come to probe them a little deeply, do not believe in anything; or if they do, their notion of a future life amounts to this: the soul is a spark, or shadow, or airy nothing, and after death it goes to a world something like itself. That is what they call a future existence and glorious immortality. Why, you might just as well put the man into a large glass globe, and ask him to be happy there, as to place an immortal being into such an empty heaven as that. You may call it a state of heavenly bliss; but after a very short experience of his new abode, he will beg to differ from you, and be as glad to return to earth again as you perhaps are desirous of going to heaven. Such a belief in a future state is very nearly allied to infidelity. It is very like the sceptic's unbelief. When probed, examined, and placed side by side, they are as like as two peas and resemble each other so closely, that we can fairly pronounce the belief to be the parent of the unbelief.

But such crude notions of heaven and the immortal nature of man, are altogether unworthy of the subject; and they are still more so when we remember that we are not left destitute of information on those momentous questions. We have the light of Reason and Nature to illumine our darkened path; and what is of far higher importance still, we have the light of Divine Revelation, which, if properly read and understood, will guide us to sounder views and more glorious perceptions of the life after death. In a former part of our remarks, we pointed out, that when the spirit leaves the body it takes its senses, ideas, and memory with it; and if it takes all these with it, the presumption is that it also takes its powers of willing, thinking, and reasoning; consequently the spirit retaining all these, though out of the body, must be still a man, the only loss it has suffered by death, if indeed a loss it can be called, being the loss of the material body. The death of the body, however, is not the death of the man. The body is simply the instrument of the unseen, but living, thinking, and immortal being within; and we are men by virtue of our spirits, and not by virtue of our bodies.

The man loses nothing by death. He takes with him his real nature and self, and lives out to fuller perfection the life he had begun while here. Thus the next life is a continuation of the present, and death is but the passage from the one to the other. This sublime truth is beautifully expressed by the poet Longfellow in his poem on Resignation—

"There is no death! What seems so is transition.
This life of mortal breath
Is but a suburb of the life Elysian,
Whose portal we call death."

The poet does not use a mere figure of speech or metaphor when he says "there is no death." He announces a plain, simple, literal fact; for there is really no such thing as death as commonly understood. The body cannot die, for the simple reason that it never lives. It only appears to live, just as it appears to think and reason; but the real fact is, that the soul or spirit has all the life, and it gives to the body the life it appears to possess, and which afterwards it appears to lose. So that it is much more correct, when referring to those who have gone before us, to speak of them, not as being out of existence, but as having departed this life.

The body, then, is no more the man than the chrysalis-shell is the butterfly, or the husk is the ripe grain; and

when death takes place, it is only putting off the frail tenement of clay, in order that the immortal spirit may enter that world of spirit to which it more properly belongs. At death, then, there is no cessation of life even for one moment, far less for hundreds and thousands of years. Let us once realize this great truth and the reality of the spirit world will follow as a matter of course.

Now, just turn for a moment to the Divine Word, and you will see how fully this view is there corroborated. Take, for instance, the parable of Dives and Lazarus (Luke xvi. 27). It is there said, "The rich man died and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, and cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame." This language is not used of the rich man's body; for that evidently was mouldering in that earth on which his five brethren were then living, but of his spirit. He had eyes and a tongue, consequently he must have had a head. Lazarus had a finger, consequently he must have had a hand; and if a hand, an arm; and if both had arms, eyes, and heads, they must have had bodies: so that we are here informed that the spirit, though out of the material body, has nevertheless a real existence, and possesses a form, that form being the human form.

Again, when Moses and Elias appeared at the transfiguration, they were seen by the eyes, evidently of the spirits of the apostles, as "two men." And mark this very significant fact, they were recognised and addressed as "Moses" and "Elias," thus showing that they still retained their identity and individuality in the spiritual world, but which would have been impossible if they had only been mere sparks, or vapours, or airy nothings. Again, in every instance in the Divine Word, where angels or departed spirits were seen in heaven or appeared on earth, they were in every case, without exception, seen as men, that is, in the perfect human form. Now all this is related in order to convey to us this great lesson, that the soul, or spirit, or the man, lives after death in that form most appropriate to himself, namely, the human form. Now, if the man still retains his senses and faculties, and all those organs by which he is capable of realizing happiness or enduring misery, is it not evident that he must of necessity be in a world where his faculties can be used and gratified? For where would be the wisdom of the Creator in endowing the spirit with eyes if there was nothing to see, or ears if no music broke the stillness of the hour? hands, if nothing to touch? or a tongue, if no delicacies to delight the taste? or a nose, if no frag rance to gratify the smell? Is it not evident that if the angels and the "spirits of just men made perfect" have all their senses and faculties in the other life it must of necessity follow that the world in which they live must possess the means for their use and gratification? It would be folly to give the angels eyes if heaven is an eternal darkness; ears, if all is hushed in solemn silence; hands, if there is nothing to do, except hang dangling at their sides; nay, more, it would be a cruel mockery to endow them with such faculties and senses, and place them where they could never be gratified. But can you believe that the Creator has acted in such a cruel and extraordinary fashion? Just reflect for a moment, and see how He really acts in His creation. The little bird, for instance, when the proper season comes, bursts the walls of its prison shell, and issues forth into a world—of what? Of emptiness, or nothingness? Oh, no; but into a world of beauty, arrayed in all the loveliness of summer's fairest charms; and it there finds an atmosphere on which it can stretch its downy wings, and soar from branch to branch and tree to tree, warbling its simple note of joy and gratitude for its new-found home of light and liberty. While cooped up in its shell, the little bird never dreamt—if little birds ever dream—it was so near another world; and we, older and wiser birds, while cooped up in our bodies, as little dream of our having an even more glorious world within and around us.

But take another instance of the Creator's wisdom. He wonderfully and wisely arranges that when the babe, the infant man, comes naked and helpless into the world, everything is provided to supply its wants and gratify its appetites. The little stranger requires milk for its sustenance; and the current of life flows not a moment too soon, nor a moment too late, from the mother's breast. It requires air for its delicate lungs to breathe; heat, and light, and clothing for the comfort of its little body; and all these are provided in the most wonderful and bountiful manner. Now, that is the mode in which the divine love and wisdom act when man comes into the world; and can we for one moment suppose that the Divine Unchangeable changes, and acts very differently when he goes out of it? Or can we believe that God would be so mindful of His creatures on this side the grave, and so forgetful of them on the other? Most assuredly we cannot. Such a belief would run counter to the clearest dictates of enlightened reason, and would be equally repugnant to the highest aspirations of our better nature. We feel certain, then, that the same divine care and provi- dence will still follow us when we quit this world below for the brighter and better world above. Well, then, we assert, and we have sound enlightened reason, the light of nature and divine revelation, to support the assertion, that the spiritual world is not a vague, shadowy, empty sort of place; but that it is a real world, everything existing there being as real, tangible, and useful to its inhabitants as the things of the material world are to us.

Such, then, is the teaching of the Gospels on this important subject, and it harmonizes with the dictates of clear rational thought. Turn, now, for a moment to the Apostolic writings, and you will there find the same doctrine taught. And the reason why it has been so long overlooked is, because men have lost sight of the fact, that while on earth they have not only a body of flesh and blood, but also a spiritual body, and that on the death

of the one the other rises. The Apostle Paul teaches this very plainly. He says, as you will read in First Corinthians (xv. 40), "There are celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial;" and then he tells us, "There is a natural body, and there is"—mark the words and tense—not "there will be," but "there is," at this very moment, "a spiritual body;" and all through this remarkable chapter the Apostle strongly argues for its resurrection. He tells us (ver. 50) that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, neither can corruption inherit incorruption." And why not? Because it is contrary to the laws of divine order for a material body to enter into and exist in a spirit world. Flesh and blood can no more be intromitted into that world than our bodies can be turned into our souls, our legs into our affections, or our arms into our thoughts. Matter cannot exist within spirit; but spirit can and does exist within matter.

Again the Apostle tells us that "it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." It is commonly supposed that the sowing time here referred to is the time when the body is buried in the grave. That, however, is not St. Paul's idea. The seed when sown in the ground contains within it the germ of life from which another plant shoots forth; but not so the dead body. It contains no germ of life whatever. It is simply a dead and decaying mass of putrid matter. The sowing time meant by the Apostle is the period of our birth into this world. It is then that we are sown with an outward material or natural body, and within with the germ of a spiritual one, and which, like our physical part, is gradually developed as we advance in life. While in our probationary state here we are, by the affections we cherish and the life we lead, impressing on our spiritual bodies the image they will bear hereafter. For as each seed transmits to the plant that springs from it its own quality and species, so those who are here sowing righteousness and goodness are forming to themselves bodies of spiritual life and beauty, and those who are sowing the seeds of evil and wickedness the forms of spiritual death and ugliness. "They that have done good will come forth to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation," and when at last the soul bursts its walls of clay, when it breaks the fetters which chained it to the earth, then man, clothed in his spiritual body, ascends into the eternal world, reflecting, as in a mirror, his own true character. "For we know," as the Apostle declares, "that if our earthly house of this tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

Muir and Paterson, Printers, Edinburgh.

A Lecture on Consistency.

By Robert Dale Owen.

AUSTIN & Co., 17, JOHNSON'S COURT, FLEE, London STREET, E.C.
PRICE TWOPENCE.

Lecture on Consistency.

As we gradually awake from the unconscious sleep of infancy, to a perception of the appearances and occurrences of this busy earth, we find ourselves existing in a world of multiform scenes and of varied interest. And as our senses throw off the lethargy that envelopes their infant growth, so does the horizon of our observation expand. Every day brings new objects to our curious view, and every hour adds another item to the sum of our experience. We approach our finger to the dazzling candle, and we learn that its bright flame burns. Gradually we discover the sources of pleasure, and the causes of pain. We are taught that exercise braces our nerves, and that temperance establishes our health; that idleness destroys the mind, and excess the body. We feel the placid influence of kindly emotions, and we see the blighting influence of ungoverned passions. Amid the conflicting phenomena of human life—in each passing event, and under every change that comes over us—we seek happiness; sometimes, when experience has been our teacher, to find it; sometimes, alas! at the bidding of imagination, to find it not.

There is in man, and in youth especially, a restless spirit of curiosity; an unsatisfied thirst after novelty; an irrepressible desire to see, to hear, to feel, to know—to discover whatever is hidden, and to approach whatever is distant. Its movements first start us in the path of knowledge; and its gratification is our reward, as we proceed.

Much has this spirit of inquiry done for man. Without it he would be but as a passive mass, scarcely roused to exertion but by the immediate pressure of his wants; and, these satisfied, ready to sink back again into uninterested listlessness. That stirring spirit whets his senses, quickens his perceptions, spurs his industry, nerves his enterprize, and strengthens his perseverance. It leads him through every clime, into every country: to the mountain summit, where snows are eternal, and across the arid desert, where life is extinct

It would fain lead him beyond the mountain and the desert; ay! even in despite of his limited senses, beyond our earth and her phenomena. But it is hard to pass the limits of knowledge which these senses prescribe.

We can, indeed, watch the balloon as it rises above the lofty summer cloud, and see it disappear in the blue

ether. We can rise *with* that balloon, until we look down on the storm, and see the lightning springing beneath us. But to the earth from whence it had risen the floating ball returns, and brings back with it the travellers to their sublunary home.

We can look on the distant stars, or on the nearer moon; but, even with the best aids which modern science supplies to our vision, how little do we see! how little can we learn! We can indeed discover that these stars and that moon exist. But if they be worlds with phenomena analagous to those that surround us here, for us, at least, their imagined phenomena have no existence. If living and moving beings inhabit these sparkling globes, for us they neither live, nor move, nor have a being. If we speak of these inhabitants, we speak of nonentities, in the attempt to describe which language becomes utterly insignificant. Few and imperfect, then, are the impressions we receive, uncertain and scanty the knowledge we acquire, of existences out of this world. Our own material earth, as we see it, and hear it, and feel it around us, is that portion of matter which alone distinctly exists to our human perceptions and human experience. On it we walk; on it we live. The familiar phenomena that hourly strike our senses are of this world. The beings whose welfare claims our care, and whose fates arouse our sensibilities, are all of this material world alone.

Still, that restless, unsatisfied spirit of thirsty curiosity will not be confined, even to earth. It has passed to other regions; and brought us back information true or false concerning them.

Men have said that there exists somewhere in space, far beyond the limits of man's vision, and without the sphere of man's perceptions, a certain—place, must I call it? I know not Our earthly language is but ill adapted to give names to spiritual residences. But, since we of the earth can speak the earth's language only, we will call it—a place, named heaven.

Even tradition ventures no conjecture as to the extent of this location, nor furnishes any distinct account of the particular phenomena it exhibits. I believe it is usually imagined to contain a stupendous throne, surrounded by bright clouds, and diffusing on all sides a light of exceeding brilliancy. In the space around this throne, myriads—I was about to say, of human beings; but here again our mundane language is at fault. The existences which are imagined around that throne of brightness, are not human beings. Many of them are indeed said to be the same which once lived and acted upon earth under that name, and are imagined to possess forms of surpassing beauty: but these forms not of material figure or corporeal dimensions; they have, therefore, no material existence, and cannot, by the most ventured stretch of analogy, be termed human beings. But, whatever the name under which we choose to imagine them, myriads of existences are said to surround that throne. Each of these existences, we are told, retains a sense of identity with some individual man or woman who formerly lived on this earth. They have one occupation only. It is that of pronouncing praises and thanksgivings, and of executing songs and hymns, accompanying their voices on golden harps. Thus, we are informed, they shall exist throughout eternity.

Men have said also, that on this throne, whence the light proceeds which illuminates the space called heaven, an immaterial being has his residence. They tell us that to this omnipotent existence the thanksgivings and hymns of the inhabitants of heaven are addressed; as well in order to increase that being's glory, as because he is well pleased to receive such praise.

It is said that the occupation itself is to the immaterial spirits, who were formerly human beings, a source of unceasing enjoyment, infinite in degree and endless in duration. It is asserted, that "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived," the unclouded and eternal felicity of that distant abode. All earthly enjoyments, we are told, are but as worthless vanity compared to the bliss of one moment thus spent in heaven.

But there is also another unearthly location of which, it is said, human beings have obtained some particulars. It is situated within view of heaven, wherever that may be; and is separated from the heavenly kingdom by a great gulf which is fixed between these two residences. It has been called hell, and is usually imagined to contain a lake of prodigious extent. This lake is on fire; it is filled with brimstone, which burns without ceasing, and emits a smoke as of a great furnace. It is said to contain, in its burning waters, millions on millions of wretched existences, a great proportion of whom were once human beings. These are tormented in the flame, and are not even allowed a drop of water to cool their tongues. They will continue throughout eternity to be so tormented; and, though changed in their nature no less than the inhabitants of heaven, they also retain a consciousness of their former state of existence upon earth.

Both heaven and hell, notwithstanding our indefinite conceptions of their form and extent, are, I believe, imagined to have gates. We are told that the keys of the gates of hell are in the hands of the creator of the universe, and those of the gates of heaven in the hands of St. Peter, a man who was born about two thousand years ago. I presume that the inmates of both places are supposed to enter them through these gates.

Other particulars regarding heaven and hell I might add, on the authority of those who profess to be accurately informed; but the accounts appear to me somewhat contradictory, and very indistinct. In what manner or at what time the bodies—or as some have it, the living principles—of those who die on earth, are supposed to be conveyed to their future abodes, I cannot clearly explain to you; for the documents relating to

this subject are not very explicit. It is, so far as I can learn, generally imagined, either that these bodies or living principles are conveyed thither immediately after death, or else he asleep for some thousand years, until a day when the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll, and the stars shall fall on the earth, like untimely figs cast from some fig-tree that is shaken of a mighty wind; that then, on that day, these bodies or living principles shall be awoke from their long slumbers by the sounding of seven trumpets, and shall stand before the throne that is raised in the midst of heaven, to be judged from books in which have been regularly recorded for the last six thousand years all the actions of mankind, whether they have been good or whether they have been evil.

Many glowing pictures have been drawn of the joys of heaven, and many frightful descriptions given of the torments of hell. I can still recollect the vividness of perception which characterised my infant conceptions of both places—the thousand questions I used to ask about them, and the mingled sensations of delight and horror which the replies to my questions produced within me.

Mrs. Hemans has beautifully expressed, in the following lines, the vague ideas which a child first conceives of heaven, and the indefinite, but the enthusiastic and exciting answers, that are usually made to it.

"I heat thee speak of the better land,
Thou call'st its children a happy band;
Mother! oh where is that radiant shore?
Shall we not seek it, and weep no more?—
Is it where the flower of the orange blows,
And the fire-flies dance through myrtle boughs?"
—"Not there, not there, my child!"

"Is it where the feathery palm-trees rise,
And the date grows ripe under sunny skies?—
Or 'midst the green islands of glittering seas,
Where fragrant forests perfume the breeze?
And strange, bright birds, on their starry wings,
Bear the rich hues of all glorious things?"
—" Not there, not there, my child!"

"Is it far away, in some region old,
Where the rivers wander o'er sands of gold?—
Where the burning rays of the ruby shine,
And the diamond lights up the secret mine,
And the pearl gleams forth from the coral strand?
Is it there, sweet mother, that better land?"
—" Not there, not there, my child!

'Eye hath not seen it, my gentle boy!
Ear hath not heard its deep sounds of joy;
Dreams cannot picture a world so fair;
Sorrow and death cannot enter there;
Time doth not breathe on its fadeless bloom,
For beyond the clouds and beyond the tomb,
—" It is there, it is there, my child!"

It is a less pleasing task to lay before you the descriptions which are presented to us of the region of endless misery. I select for that purpose the following from the pen of a much respected orthodox religionist, the Rev. Mr. Edwards, as given in his "Discourses on the Eternity of Hell Torments."

"Be entreated," says he, "to consider attentively how great and awful a thing eternity is. Although you cannot comprehend it the more by considering it, yet you may be made more sensible that it is not a thing to be

disregarded. Do but consider what it is to suffer extreme pain for ever and ever; to suffer it day and night, from one day to another, from one year to another, from one age to another, from one thousand ages to another, and so adding age to age, and thousands to thousands, in pain, in wailing and lamenting, groaning and shrieking, and gnashing your teeth; with your souls full of dreadful grief and amazement, with your bodies and every member of them full of racking torture; without any possibility of getting ease; without any possibility of moving God to pity your cries; without any possibility of hiding yourselves from him; without any possibility of diverting your thoughts from your pain; without any possibility of obtaining any manner of mitigation, or help, or change for the better. How dismal will it be, when you are under these racking torments, to know assuredly that you never, never shall be delivered from them; to have no hope—when you shall wish that you might be turned into nothing, but shall have no hope of it; when you shall wish that you might be turned into a toad, or a serpent, but shall nave no hope of it; when you shall rejoice if you might but have any relief, after you shall have endured these torments millions of ages, but shall have no hope of it when, after you have worn out the age of the sun, moon, and stars, in your dolorous groans and lamentations, without rest, day or night, or one minute's ease, yet you shall have no hope of being delivered; when, after you have worn out a thousand more such ages, yet you shall have no hope, but shall know that you are not one whit nearer to the end of your torments; that still there are the same groans, the same shrieks, the same doleful cries incessantly to be made by you, and that the smoke of your torment shall still ascend for ever and ever; and that your souls, which shall have been agitated by the wrath of God all this while, shall still exist to bear more wrath; your bodies, which shall have been burning all this time in these glowing flames, yet shall not have been consumed, but will remain through an eternity; yet which shall not have been at all shortened by what shall have been past I"

I have thus endeavoured to furnish you with a sketch of the most commonly received opinions regarding heaven and hell; an impartial sketch, so far as I can judge; and though not very luminous nor definite, yet as much so, perhaps, as the nature of the subject—if indeed we can talk of the *nature* of that which is *super-natural*—as luminous, perhaps, and definite as the nature of such a subject and the character of human language permit.

But besides the sketch of the places themselves, we are furnished, by those who conceive themselves well-informed in such matters, with a statement of the means by which we, the present occupants of the earth, can become inhabitants of heaven, or inmates of hell.

The conditions of admission to these two places, it is said, are contained in a book called the Bible. The legally appointed expounders of that book inform us, that to obtain a place in heaven it is necessary to believe all that the Bible relates, to perform the spiritual exercises it dictates, and to obey the precepts it enjoins. They inform us also, that a failure to comply with these conditions will cause us to re-exist for ever in hell.

This is one side of the great—I may say, the engrossing question, of religion and it is the side which has hitherto been taken up by a consider are portion of the civilized world.

Others, however, there are,—and the number is on the increase—who do not believe in the descriptions I have given you; and who cannot see any reason to conclude, that a belief in the Bible, or the performance of any spiritual ceremonies whatever, can influence, alter, or in any way determine for us a future state of existence in unseen regions. On the contrary, they are of opinion, that while we remain here on earth, we can correctly know and understand those things only which appertain to the earth, and can make no useful, practical discoveries out of our own planet.

Now, I am not about to discuss this question. It is not my present intention to inquire whether we can make and have made such superhuman discoveries, or whether we have not made and cannot make them.

But permit me earnestly to request your serious, undivided attention to the proposition I am about to state to you.

Either we have information regarding these two residences, heaven and hell, or we have not. This is as self-evident as any mathematical truism.

What follows? Either that we ought to occupy ourselves in ascertaining these terms of admission and in complying with them, or we ought not. It is of exceeding importance that we should well consider what this alternative involves.

And, first, let us inquire what proportion of our lives should be devoted to examine and fulfil these terms of admission, *on the supposition* that we can ascertain what they are. To discover this it may be expedient that we seek to understand, if we can, eternity means, seeing that the state of being in question is said to be eternal.

It has been calculated that the distance from hence to the sun is nearly one hundred millions of miles; and the distance to Sirius, the nearest of the fixed stars, more than five hundred thousand times greater. The distance to the more remote among the fixed stars has never been calculated. But conceive, if it be possible, how immense the distance from our earth to the remotest star that telescope ever aided us to discover. Then imagine a circle drawn at that inconceivable distance all round our earth, and suppose a globe of sand of such stupendous dimensions that its circumference should fill up that mighty circle. Imagine each grain of that sand

one million times less than the smallest animalcule which microscope ever made visible. How utterly beyond the power of imagination must be the number of these grains that should go to make up the whole enormous mass! And now imagine that one of these imperceptible grains were detached from that mass at the close of each million of centuries. How long, think you, would it require ere the whole immeasurable globe was thus dissolved, grain by grain? Do not your human senses refuse even to imagine the period? Do you not feel that you are approaching a region of imagination that belongs not to man? If I asked you how many moments that period may contain, might I not seem to ask it in derision?

And yet each single moment it contains is millions on millions of times longer, compared to the period itself, than is the period compared to eternity. Let such a globe be formed, and thus lessen by one grain each million of centuries, until, grain by grain, it pass away. Let another of equal dimensions replace it, in like manner to lessen and to disappear. Then another, and another, until thousands have been added to thousands, and millions to millions, in the stupendous succession. Then take the sum of these immeasurable periods, and deduct it from eternity.

Have you obtained a tenth, a thousandth, a millionth part? Have you obtained the smallest expressible fraction? Have ye shortened eternity even by one fleeting instant? Would ye be, even by one single moment, nearer the end of eternity, if these unimagined periods were come and past, than you are at this day?

Now, it is this period of eternity which, we are told, is to be spent in heaven or hell. If terms of admission to both places have, in very truth, been tendered to us, our compliance or noncompliance with these terms shall affect our well-being *through this period of eternity*.

I recur, then, to my question, "What proportion of our time may reasonably be devoted to the fulfilment of these terms, if they have been so tendered? and what proportion to the remainder of our business?" In other words, "How much of each day or week should be employed for heaven, and how much for earth?"

How much? Suppose you had two bags, one containing a cent, and the other a million of dollars: what proportion of your time might be reasonably devoted to the care of the cent, and what proportion to that of the million of dollars? Would ye spend for that paltry cent *six* days out of the seven, or *one* day out of the seven, or one hour of a single day? You would not; you know too well the relative value of moneys.

Have ye ever accurately calculated the relative value of a life one hundred years long, and a life throughout eternity? If you have, and if you sincerely believe in orthodox supernaturals, you have come to the conclusion that one minute per week is incalculably too much to spend for this world, and six days, twenty-three hours, and fifty-nine minutes per week too little to spend for the next.

Observe, then, I pray you, what this question about unseen regions involves. Not the occupation of one day in seven, but of YOUR LIVES. Not the rational direction of a portion of your money, a portion of your talents, a portion of your influence, but of ALL. This the most orthodox and zealous among religious ministers themselves openly declare.

Allow me to repeat the alternative to which I have already called your attention. Either we *can* know nothing of heaven, and can gain admittance to it by our own exertions, or we *can not*.

Do we know it, and can we gain admission? Then ought the world to be one vast temple; its occupation one great religious ceremony; its desires one engrossing wish for eternal happiness.

Do we know nothing either of the place itself, or of the means whereby we may reach it? Then has blood been shed, and treasure expended, and precious time consumed—for a dream. Then are we paying yearly twenty millions—for a dream. Then is good temper forfeited, good fellowship marred, union broken, kindness destroyed, honesty persecuted, and hypocrisy extolled, all—all—for a dream.

I speak not now as the advocate, nor as the opponent, either of religion or of scepticism; I speak but in favour of consistency.

Tell me not that nature is too weak to mortify even its strongest desires at the voice of religion. Have ye never heard of the Indian Fakir? never read of those martyr devotees who, with a consistency that might shame the lukewarm religionist of Christendom, will endure to be swung for years in that torrid clime before a slow fire—who will crawl, on hands and knees, around a mighty empire; or roll their naked bodies in the dust, over hill and plain, across from the shores of the Indus to the banks of the sacred Ganges—who will continue for life in one unnatural, unvaried posture, till they lose all power to change it; or swing, suspended by human flesh-hooks, until crucified nature sinks under the infliction? Powerful and enduring, even in his follies, is man! Wherefore should we deem a life spent in religious exercises and pious penances impossible to him?

I speak, then, in favour of consistency. I would have him who professes religion to be religious, not in word only, but in daily practice. I would have him consider what religion is, what it requires of him, and whether he conforms to its requisitions. I would have him conform to them, be they what they may. I would have men to be what they say they are. I would have them draw the line at once, boldly, distinctly; I would have them take sides, courageously, consistently.

If servants of God there be upon earth, ministers promoted by his nominations to the offices they hold,

guides appointed by him to light us, with the gospel lamp, on the way to heaven—if such favoured mortals there be, with genuine credentials from the Almighty, I would have them act like the Almighty's servants. Why permit us to insult their Master by tendering to him a seventh only of our time, twenty millions only of our property, and devoting the rest to the service of Mammon? Let them claim, as they ought to claim, the sovereignty of the land. Let the Christian party in politics be, in their hands, the Aaron's rod, swallowing up all the rest. Let them set aside worldly constitutions, temporal laws, secular governors; and let them stand forward, bold in the strength of their holy mission, to engage, in its support, every hand and every heart throughout the land. Theirs should be our property, for God's use; theirs our time, for God's service; theirs our talents, in God's cause; theirs our obedience, according to God's command. Let them establish their saintly rule over land and sea, forest and mountain, even to earth's remotest confines. They have spoken of church and state; let them speak of the church alone. She it is that should command our submission and dictate our rights; because she only can secure our everlasting happiness. Once, in the zenith of her power—in those days when England's proud Henry knelt before Becket's tomb, and bared his body to the ecclesiastical scourge—in those pious days the wealth that flowed into her coffers outweighed the treasures of kings, and the reverence she obtained for her priestly decrees was beyond the reverence paid to the mightiest of the earth. Let her servants again claim all, and more than all, they ever then possessed. If they be what they profess to be, and what we permit them to call themselves—the elected of God—it is theirs of right; it is all theirs, most justly, most consistently. If they save one soul—one only soul—from the undying torments of hell, they have produced more of happiness to the human race—millions of times told, than the riches of this earth can repay, or the power of all her potentates confer. In gratitude, then, no less than in justice, earth's treasures and powers should be theirs alone.

"Will ye tell me that those who men call reverend are not the servants of God? that an Immaterial Spirit never adopted them to be his confidants—never disclosed to them the secrets of his government—never appointed them the expounders of his laws, and the apologists of his conduct? Will ye tell me that mortals cannot find out the doings of any unseen, unsearchable spirit? that human knowledge cannot extend beyond "the bourn from whence no traveller returns," to paint to us, brightly or darkly, a future, eternal destiny? Will ye tell me all this?

And what of your country, if ye speak truth? What of the clerical influence that pervades, and the religious fear that rules it? What of persecutings for scepticism and heartburnings for heterodoxy? Is that influence, that fear, are those persecutings, those heartburnings, all uncalled for?—all uncaused, save by imagination alone? But what of all the sights and sounds that fill your city on this, the first day of the week?—the measured toll that calls to the house of worship; the gaily-decked throng that answers to the call; the stately edifice that opens to receive them; the silken-cloaked orator that ascends the consecrated pulpit; the prayers he offers up, the doctrines he expounds, the reverence he awakens, the salary he receives? What shall we say of all these? Does the church-going bell but sound to proclaim the credulity of man? is the gay throng decked out only to assist at idol-worship? are those stately edifices all reared to imagination? and these fluent orators, are they but the teachers of idle illusion, and the receivers of thousands a year for the inculcation of vanities? What of our mammoth tract-house, with its steam-presses and its thousand hands? Is it all but the stereotyping of fables? the waste of public money? the abuse of public confidence? Will ye tell me all this?

There are those who begin to whisper such heresy very unceremoniously, very audibly. If they speak truth, my friends, alas for the credulity, or, yet more, for the supineness, of our country! When will she awake to distinguish the mental fetters that are forged on her children's minds? when assume courage to shake off the system that sits, like an incubus, on the best efforts of her genius? when see fit to arrest the increase of those spiritual locusts, that swarm in clouds throughout our Christian land, shutting out the free light of heaven even while they devour the fair produce of earth?

Again let me remind you, that I speak not now as asserting, save hypothetically. I do but say, that religion is all or nothing; either that which deserves the devotion of our lives, or that which merits not a moment's consideration; that the clergy are either the heavenly-appointed servants of God, or the self-constituted deceivers of mankind. If God's servants, then, entitled to dominion on the earth beneath, and honour even in heaven above; if deceivers, then—be they honest or dishonest—still idle consumers of unearned wealth, and salaried opponents of truth and knowledge.

Observe, that I do but remind you that there is no consistent halting between two opinions; no conscientious serving of two masters; no compounding between faith and scepticism. We know that the throne of God exists above the clouds—or we know it not; we have discovered the conditions under which we may obtain a place among the myriads around that throne—or we have not discovered them. We are religionists, or we are sceptics.

Were I a religionist—did I truly, firmly, *consistently* believe, as millions say they do, that the knowledge and the practice of religion in this life influences destiny in another—the spirit of truth be my witness, religion should be to me *every thing*. I would cast aside earthly enjoyments as dross, earthly cares as follies, and earthly

thoughts and feelings as less than vanity. Religion should be my first waking thought, and my last image when sleep sunk me in unconsciousness. I would labour in her cause alone. I would not labour for the meat that perisheth, nor for treasure on earth, where moth and rust corrupt, and thieves break through to steal; but only for a crown of glory in heavenly regions, where treasures and happiness are alike beyond the reach of time and chance. I would take thought for the morrow of eternity alone. I would esteem one soul gained to heaven worth a life of torture. There should be neither worldly prudence nor calculating circumspection in my engrossing zeal. Earthly consequences should never stay my hand nor seal my lips. I would speak to the imagination, awaken the feelings, stir up the passions, arouse the fancy. I would kindle the hot enthusiasm of youth, till it blazed with holy fervour, consuming by its scorching influence all human feelings, and human reserves, and human interests; and if reason melted away before the burning power, and the convulsions of conversion were succeeded by the ravings of insanity, that should not, for a moment, arrest my course. Believing that it is better to enter into life insane, than, having the soundest reason, to be cast into hell-fire, in a world changed to one great lunatic asylum I would see but the nursery of heaven. Earth, the mortals it contains, its joys and its griefs, should occupy no moment of my thoughts. The society of those I loved as my own soul should be to me valueless and vain, and the dearest pledges of their friendship worthless as a passing shadow; for these are but the affairs of a portion of eternity so small, that no human language can express its infinite littleness.

I would strive to look but on eternity and on the immortal souls around me, soon to be everlastingly tortured or everlastingly happy. I would deem all who thought of this world—who sought to increase mere temporal happiness, who laboured to obtain temporal goods, who bestowed even a passing thought on the purest, dearest of temporal pleasures—I would deem all such poor madmen. I would go forth to the world and preach to it, in season and out of season; and my text should be: "*What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"*

As a sceptic, my feelings and practices would be the reverse of all this. Doubting the accuracy of all predictions regarding our fate beyond the grave; convinced that we do not yet know, and utterly sceptical as to whether we ever shall know, any thing about it; perceiving not how we can influence our situation in any other world by any belief or religious exercises in this,—I would take a warm interest in the temporal happiness of mankind. I would consider the improvement of man's condition and the increase of his enjoyments here, as objects *in themselves* worthy the best exertions of the philosopher and the philanthropist. It should satisfy me if I felt myself useful to my fellow, creatures, and at peace with myself. I would labour for food, even though it perisheth, and for raiment, even though the lilies of the field neither toil nor spin. I would not imitate the fowls of the air who sow not, nor reap, nor gather into barns. I would take thought for the necessaries and comforts of life; because I should distrust the promise that a Being who feeds the sparrows of heaven and clothes the lilies of the valley, will feed and clothe me also if I but live in faith, and neglect all to follow his kingdom. I would test the virtue and vice of actions, not by their imagined efficacy in procuring salvation hereafter, but by their present evident daily effects on the minds and bodies of my fellow-creatures. That which injures the mind or the body, or which disturbs the tranquility of the heart, I should judge to be wrong, whether the sacred, books of the Jew or the Christian, the Mahometan or the Hindoo confirmed or condemned the judgment. That which brings calm enjoyment to the senses, and peace to the bosom, I should decide to be right, without first waiting to inquire if the name of Jehovah, or of Allah, or of Bramah, or any other name, had been employed to sanction or to denounce the decision. For me there should exist no artificial authoritative standard. I would imagine no after-reckoning beyond the grave, to falsify or confuse my temporal calculations. To the earth and its inhabitants my duties should be confined. With them I would associate, their plans I would discuss, their wishes and feelings I would endeavour to ascertain. But for spirits of the air, I would address them neither in public nor in private; nor would I ever discuss their plans or imagine their pleasure. To improve the earthly condition of my fellow-beings, to merit their esteem, and to obtain their affection, should be the extent of my ambition. I would look to the happiness I enjoyed in such a condition as to the end of my being on this side the grave; and for a future eternal destiny, I would take no thought for it; because, however engrossingly it would occupy my time and talents, if I could know and modify it, I should not perceive the utility of endeavouring to remove a veil beyond which all is darkness, or to influence an unknown destiny which is in other hands than mine.

In either case, as religionist or as sceptic, I should be consistent. I would not profess one thing and practise another—nor speak of spiritualities with my lips, while my heart was far from them. What I called myself, that I would be. St. John should never accuse me, as he did the church of Laodicea, that I was neither cold nor hot. The thoughtless alone, or the hypocrite, is lukewarm; and it ever has been and ever should be the endeavour of each honest man to avoid equally thoughtlessness and hypocrisy.

Such be our endeavour, my friends! Freely let us inquire, patiently examine, honestly judge, and consistently stand to our judgment. Let no man find reason to accuse us of negligence or indecision. Let no man find cause to say, that, whether in enlightened truth or in honest error, we are not conscientiously consistent.

Let our rights know no bounds but the equally inviolable rights of our fellows. Within these just and

peaceful limits, let us dare all things. While there is no doctrine so extravagant that we treat its expression with contempt, let there be none so sacred that we approach its examination with apprehension.

Let us draw the veil from before those things which men call holy. Truth can bear the light, and error must learn to bear it Let us look *within* the veil. They say that the words of Omniscience are recorded there. They tell us that man's life and death are there both placed before him. Thither they direct us for a divine rule of life; thither for an infallible standard of right and wrong; thither for the decrees of unerring truth and the statutes of omniscient wisdom. Let us enter, then, even to the holiest of holies. By the light of reason let us read; it is our privilege as sentient beings. Mysteries that are illegible by that light were never made for man. That which it concerns men to believe, concerns them first to know and understand. Useful truth needs not the aid of mystery, and useless error ought not to obtain it.

Free be our inquiries, then, and zealous as free. Let us not rest satisfied until we have sought and found our rule of life—in religious precepts and spiritual decrees, if reason discover it there—in earthly deeds of kindness, and human principles of justice, if these be the more fitting rule for beings of earthly origin and human organization.

Among those who agree in spirit, let not words become a source of dissension. If works of gentle mercy and acts of unspotted integrity must needs be called religion, religion let them be called. The heartless and the dishonourable will then be the only infidel.

And, among those who *dis*agree, not in word alone, but in very deed, let there still be charity to others' opinions, and CONSISTENCY to their own.

The Iliad and Odyssey of India.
By Edwin Arnold, M.A., F.R.G.S.,
Of University College, Oxford, and Formerly Principal of Poona Sanskrit College, and Fellow of the University of Bombay.
(Reprinted, by permission, from the "Daily Telegraph")
Trübner and Co. London 1875.

The Iliad and Odyssey of India.

***The History of India from the Earliest Ages*. By J. Talboys Wheeler. Vol. I. *The Vedic Period and the Maha-Bharata*. (London: Trübner & Co., 57 and 59, Ludgate Hill.)**

***The Rámaáan of Válmiki*. Translated into English Verse by Ralph T. H. Griffith, M A., Principal of the Benares College. In Five Volumes. (London: Trübner & Co., 57 and 59, Ludgate Hill.)**

THERE exist two great, two colossal, two unparalleled epic poems in the sacred language of India which were not known to Europe, even by name, till Sir William Jones announced their existence; and which, since his time, have been made public only by fragments, by specimens bearing to those vast treasures of Sanskrit literature such small proportion as cabinet samples of ore have to the riches of a silver mine. Yet these most remarkable poems contain all the history of ancient India, so far as it can be recovered, together with such inexhaustible details of its political, social, and religious life, that the antique Hindoo world really stands epitomized in them. The Old Testament is not more interwoven with the Jewish race, nor the New Testament with the civilization of Christendom, nor the Koran with the records and destinies of Islam, than these two Sanskrit poems with that unchanging and teeming population which Her Majesty rules as Empress of Hindostan. The stories, songs, and ballads, the histories and genealogies, the nursery tales and religious discourses, the art, the learning, the philosophy, the creeds, the moralities, the modes of thought, the very phrases, sayings, turns of expression, and daily ideas of the Hindoo people are taken from these poems. Their children and their wives are named out of them; so are their cities, temples, streets, and cattle. They have constituted the library, the newspaper, and the Bible, generation after generation, to all the succeeding and countless millions of Indian people; and it replaces patriotism with that race and stands in stead of nationality to possess these two precious and inexhaustible books, and to drink from them as from mighty and overflowing rivers. The value ascribed in Hindostan to these two little-known epics has transcended all literary standards established here. They are personified, worshipped, and cited from as something divine. To read or even listen to them is .thought by the devout Hindoo sufficiently meritorious to bring prosperity to his household hero and happiness in the next world; they are held also to give wealth to the poor, health to the sick, wisdom to the ignorant; and the recitation of certain parvas and shlokes in them can fill the household of the barren, it is believed, with children. A concluding passage of the great poem says:

"The reading of this Mahá-Bhárata destroys all sin and produces virtue; so much so, that the pronunciation of a single shloka is sufficient to wipe away much guilt. Tills Mahá-Bhárata contains the history

of the gods, of the Rishis in heaven and those on earth, of the Gandharvas and the Rákshasas. It also contains the life and actions of the one God, holy, immutable, and true, who is Krishna, who is the creator and the ruler of this universe,—who is seeking the welfare of his creation by means of his incomparable and indestructible power; whose actions are celebrated by all sages; who has bound human beings in a chain, of which one end is life and the other death; on whom the Rishis meditate, and a knowledge of whom imparts unalloyed happiness to their hearts, and for whose gratification and favour all the daily devotions are performed by all worshippers. If a man reads the Mahá-Bhárata and has faith in its doctrines, he is free from all sin, and ascends to heaven after his death."

Yet these national poems—the Mahabharat and the Ramayana, the literary palladia of India—remain unknown to Europe, and have never been translated by command of the English Government, as beyond question they should have been. Nothing, in truth, can quite excuse the indifference shown in this default: it is an instance of the want of sympathy in the otherwise grand and admirable administration of British India: but. It is a serious instance, for the task was of necessity one unlikely to be performed—if not impossible of performance—except by the encouragement and with the resources of a powerful Government. The treasures of a foreign literature may safely be left to private learning when they appear of manageable dimensions; but these poems, as we have said, are enormous, overwhelming, colossal. They go beyond the grasp of any single mind, it would be thought, however gifted, to exhaust. The Mahabharat contains some two hundred thousand verses; the Ramayana, about fifty thousand. They are poetical encyclopaedias in fact, and the British Government might surely have explored and surveyed them like a territory of its Râj, ordaining their careful translation by some judiciously chosen committee of scholars, Sanskritists and poets, as a work of actual administrative duty. This would have formed a monument well worthy of the English name, and the world of science and literature would have been justly grateful; while nothing could have better developed the knowledge of India in England, or reflected greater light upon that mutual origin which is the best hope of future times. All this has not been performed officially; but two men of generous self-devotion and boundless industry have set themselves to the forgotten duty, and their labours have found in the enterprise and liberality of the honourable publishing firm of Messrs. Trübner and Co. the means of seeing light. In justice to this house, which has done so much for the cause of Oriental scholarship, and in order to draw the attention of the Government and the public to the new literary riches that now he unlocked, we intend in this and a following paper to touch in outline upon the two poems which quite deserve the name we have given them of "The Iliad and Odyssey of India."

The Ramayana of Valmiki, answering most to the Odyssey, has just been completed by the single-handed toil of Mr. Ralph Griffith, Principal of the Benares College. The last volume of this amazing piece of faithful labour has just reached our hands, and when it is remembered that the whole of that enormous epic has been thus at last translated by a single English scholar—amid the constant duties, too of a most responsible official position, and under the trying rays of the Indian sun—we must pause here to offer to Mr. Griffith the tribute of a sincere admiration. Apart from the poetical and scholastic merits of the prodigious work—which we shall hereafter consider—we thank him in the name of the British people for taking away the old reproach from our rule in India by transferring—canto by canto, to the number of no less than one hundred and thirty—this second great epic poem of the Hindoos into the language of the Rulers of Hindostan. Such a triumph is at once a masterpiece of intellectual perseverance and an honour to Anglo-Indian scholarship; while, we repeat, that to have undertaken the production of so veritable an *opus magnum* reflects much credit upon the publishers who have shared in the task.

We shall return to this marvellous poem, now at last given to the English people, and shall show how, by its study, they may better understand their Indian fellow-subjects. As for the Mahábhárata, even more vast than the Ramayana, it would seem, as has been said, hopeless to expect that any single mind could address itself to the translation of that almost endless epic. A bare transcript into curt and literal prose would occupy about fifteen ordinary octavo volumes, without a note or comment. But, wonderful to relate, this, too, has been achieved, or nearly so, by a scholar unknown, yet well deserving fame and public gratitude. When Mr. Talboys Wheeler was recently compiling the first volume of his excellent "History of India," a digest of the Mahabharata and Ramayana formed a necessary introduction to the work. While patiently toiling through the summaries and existing extracts of the enormous poem, Mr. Wheeler sent to the Calcutta Library for a translation indexed there as "The Bhagavat-Gita," a mere episode in the epic. The librarian forwarded back a huge MS., much embrowned by age, worm-eaten and faded, indifferently written, and forming about nine thick volumes folio. To the joy of the historian, this turned out to be not merely the interlude whose title was affixed, but the bulk of the Mahábhárata itself, in English, good, true, and terse: and from that MS. thus casually unearthed, Mr. Talboys Wheeler was able to enrich his first volume with the admirable digest of the Mahábhárata, from which we shall mainly quote. No one knows whose patient and untiring brain and pen produced and bequeathed this splendid secret treasure. There is some reason to believe it was the work of Professor H. H. Wilson, whose command of Sanskrit lore was equalled by his wonderful powers of application and enthusiasm for such toil.

But this is conjecture only, and we grieve that we cannot pronounce with certainty the name which so well deserves to be coupled with that of Mr. Ralph Griffith as redeeming the British Râj from the discredit of conquering India, and yet leaving unconquered the two noblest and largest regions of her literature. Thanks to this nameless scholar, whose gentle soul, it may be trusted, reaps unimagined reward elsewhere, "full of the stately repose and the lordly delight of the dead," we possess now a very full conspectus in Mr. Wheeler's History of the Mahábhárata, and in the fair copy which has been made from the old yellow MS. an accurate and almost complete translation. What was wanting in this vast labour, the Baboo Chunder Ghose—an accomplished Sanskritist—translated orally to Mr. Wheeler from the Aryan text; and thus the digest and extracts were fully made which we shall now briefly notice.

The "great war of Bharat" has its first scenes in Hastinapur, an ancient and vanished city, formerly situated about sixty miles north-east of the modern Delhi. The Ganges has washed away even the ruins of this, the metropolis of King Bharat's dominions. The poem opens with a "sacrifice of snakes," but this is a prelude connected merely by a curious legend with the real beginning. That beginning is reached when the five sons of "King Pandu the pale" and the five sons of "King Dhritarashtra the blind," both of them descendants of Bharat, are being brought up together in the palace. The first were called Pandavas, the last Kauravas and their life-long feud is the main subject of the epic. Yudhishthira, Bhíma, Arjuna, Nakula, and Sahadeva are the Pandava Princes. Duryodhana is chief of the Kauravas. They are instructed by one master, Drona, a Brahman, in the arts of war and peace, and learn to manage and brand cattle, hunt wild animals, and tame horses. There is a striking picture in the early portion of an Aryan tournament, wherein the young cousins display their skill, "highly arrayed, amid vast crowds," and Arjuna especially distinguishes himself. Clad in golden mail, he shows amazing feats with sword and bow. He shoots twenty-one arrows into the hollow of a buffalo horn while his chariot whirls along; he throws the "chakra," or sharp quoit, without once missing his victim; and, after winning the prizes, kneels respectfully at the feet of his instructor to receive his crown. The cousins, after this, march out to fight with a neighbouring king, and the Pandavas, who are always the favoured family in the poem, win most of the credit, so that Yudhishthira is elected from among them *Yuvaraj*, or heir apparent. This incenses Duryodhana, who, by appealing to his father, Dhritarashtra, procures a division of the kingdom, the Pandavas being sent to Vacanavat, now Allahabad. All this part of the story refers obviously to the advances gradually made by the Aryan conquerors of India, into the jungles peopled by aborigines. Forced to quit their new city, the Pandavas hear of the marvellous beauty of Draupadí, whose *Swayamvara*, or "choice of a suitor," is about to be celebratea at Kampilya. This again furnishes a strange and glittering picture of the old times; vast masses of holiday people, with Rajahs, elephants, troops, jugglers, dancing women, and showmen, are gathered in a gay encampment round the pavilion of the King Drupada, whose lovely daughter is to take for her husband (on the well-understood condition that she approves of him) the fortunate archer who can strike the eye of a golden fish, whirling round upon the top of a tall pole, with an arrow shot from an enormously strong bow. The Princess, adorned with radiant gems, holds a garland of flowers in her hand for the victorious suitor, but none of the Rajahs can bend the bow. Arjuna, disguised as a Brahman, performs the feat with ease, and his youth and grace win the heart of Draupadí more completely than his skill. The Princess henceforth follows the fortunes of the brothers, and, by a strange ancient custom, lives with them in common. The Pandavas, now allied to the King Drupada and become strong, are so much dreaded by the Kauravas that they are invited back again, for safety's sake, to Hastinapura, and settle near it in the city of Indraprastha, now Delhi. The reign of Yudhishthira and his brothers is very prosperous there; "every subject was pious; there were no liars, thieves, or cheats; no droughts, floods, or locusts; no conflagrations nor invaders, nor parrots to eat up the grain."

The Pandava King, having subdued all enemies, now performs the *Rajasuya*, or ceremony of supremacy, and here again occur wonderfully interesting pictures. Duryodhana comes thither, and his jealousy is inflamed by the magnificence of the rite. Among other curious incidents is one which seems to show that glass was already known. A pavilion is paved with "black crystal," which the Kaurava Prince mistakes for water, and "draws up his garments lest he should be wetted." But now approaches a turning point in the epic. Furious at the wealth and fortune of his cousins, Duryodhana invites them to Hastinapura to join in a great gambling festival. The passion for play was as strong apparently with these antique Hindoos as that for fighting or for love; "No true Kshatriya must ever decline a challenge to combat or to dice." The brothers go to the entertainment which is to ruin their prosperity, for Sakuni, the most skilful and lucky gambler, has loaded the "coupon," so as to win every throw. Says the poet:

Then Yudhishthira and Sakuni sat down to play, and whatever Yudhishthira laid as stakes, Duryodhana laid something of equal value; but Yudhishthira lost every game. He first lost a very beautiful pearl; next a thousand "bags each containing a thousand pieces of gold; next a piece of gold so pure that it was as soft as wax; next a chariot set with jewels, and hung all round with golden bells; next a thousand war" elephants with golden howdahs set with diamonds; next a lakh of slaves all dressed in good garments; next a lakh of beautiful slave girls, adorned from head to foot with golden ornaments; next all the remainder of his goods; next all his

cattle; and then the whole of his Raj, excepting only the lands which had been granted to the Bráhmans.

After this tremendous run of ill-luck, he madly stakes Draupadí the beautiful, and loses her. The Princess is dragged away by the hair, and Duryodhana mockingly bids her come and sit upon his knee, for which Bhíma the Pandava swears that he will some day break his thigh-bone, a vow which is duly kept. But the blind old King rebukes this fierce elation of the winner, restores Draupadí, and declares that they must throw another main to decide who shall leave Hastinapura. The cheating Sakuni cogs the dice again, and the Pandavas must now go away into the forest, and let no man know them by name for thirteen years. They depart, Draupadí unbinding her long black hair, and vowing never to fasten it again till the hands of Bhíma, the strong man among the Pandavas, are red with the punishment of the Kauravas. "Then he shall tie my tresses up again, when his fingers are dripping with Duhsusana's blood."

We pass over the long episodes of their adventures in the jungle till the time when the Pandavas emerge, and, still disguised, take up their residence in King Virata's city. Here the vicissitudes of Draupadí as a handmaid of the Queen, of Bhíma as the palace wrestler, of Arjuna disguised as a eunuch, and of Nakula, Sahadeva, and Yudhishthira, acting as herdsmen and attendants, are most absorbing and dramatic. The virtue of Draupadí, assailed by a Prince of the State, is terribly defended by the giant Bhíma; and when the Kauravas, suspecting the presence in the place of their cousins, attack Virata, Arjuna drives the chariot of the Heir Apparent, and victoriously repulses them with his awful bow *gandíva*. Subjoined is the curious passage relating to the punishment of Draupadí"s insulter:

When Bhíma had thus promised to chastise Kíchaka, Draupadí was filled with joy, and agreed to act according to his words; and when the night was over she returned to the apartments of the women, and did her duty as she was accustomed. Now it so happened that after a while Kfchaka paid another visit to his sister the Ráni; and he began, as his custom was, to set himself off in the presence of Draupadí, and he said to Draupadí, "Raja Viráta cannot interfere with me, for all his affairs are in my hands; if, therefore, you refuse any longer to become my wife, I shall carry you away by my own power, and the Raja will say no more to me to-day than he did yesterday. But if you will accept me as a husband, and enter my house, I will do you no harm; and I will give you a hundred pieces of gold every day, and a hundred slaves and slave girls to wait upon you and "a chariot, drawn by mules to be always at your command And Draupadí answered: "How can I refuse such generosity? but I yield on one condition only. I know that you admit many friends into the apartments of your women, and if my consent should be known unto them, it may bring both you and me to shame Moreover, I have five invisible Gandharvas who watch over me; and should they discover this matter they will slay you." So it was agreed between them that at midnight Draupadí should grant a meeting to Kíchaka in the dancing-room.

Kíchaka then left the palace, and went to his own house, and his heart was filled with delight; but he was so impatient to meet Draupadí that the remaining half of the day appeared to him like half a year; and when it was night he arrayed himself in new garments, and perfumed himself with the choicest odours, and he was more replendent than he had ever been before, in the same way that a lamp becomes most brilliant just before it goes out. Meanwhile Draupadí had gone to Bhíma, and told him all that she had done, and Bhíma said that he would slay Kíchaka in such a fashion that no man should discover who had done it. So when the hour of midnight arrived, Kíchaka went in all joy and expectation to the dancing-room, and, seeing in the darkness that somebody was there, he thought it Draupadí, and put out his hand to take hold of her; but at that moment Bhíma arose from the gloom in great wrath and seized him by the hair of his head, and would have dragged him to the ground, but his locks were oiled, and he slipped through the fingers of Bhíma. Now Kíchaka was a warrior of great valour and exceeding strength, and he so fell upon Bníma that they struggled mightily together, and they fought with their clenched fists, and tore each other with their nails, and strove to throw each other to the ground. And Bhíma was brought to the earth; but he put forth all his strength, and seizing hold of Kíchaka, he whirled him swiftly round his head, and dashed him against the ground and he put his knee upon the breast of Kíchaka, and kneaded him as a baker kneads bread, and pommelled him until the soul of Kíchaka departed out of his body, and Bhíma broke every one of his bones into the smallest pieces, and formed his body into a mere ball of flesh. Bhíma then lighted a lamp, and brought in Draupadí, and showed her all that he had clone, saying, "This will I do unto any man that offends you." And Draupadí rejoiced greatly, for she saw that she had been fully avenged.

Then Bhíma departed out of the palace and went to the cook-room, and fell asleep; but Draupadí went and called the watchmen of the palace, saying, "Kíchaka forced me to grant him a meeting in the dancing-room, notwithstanding all my warnings that the invisible Gandharvas would slay him; and behold, when he came to me, the Gandharvas, who are my defenders, fell upon him and slew him, and his dead body is lying there." So the watchmen lighted a lamp and went in," and they beheld the dead body of Kíchaka like a ball of flesh, and they said one to the other, "Surely, no man hath done this. It must be the Gandharvas." And as soon as it was morning there was a great uproar amongst the people, and the whole city was in commotion, for it was said that the mighty Kíchaka, who commanded all the soldiers of the Raja, had been put to death by the Gandharvas, out

of his love for a woman. And the brothers of Kíchaka hastened to the spot, and saw the dead body, and desired to take it away to the place of burning; and when they saw all the women of the palace gathered together. Their eves fell upon Draupadí, and they said one to the other: "This is the woman on whose account our brother has been murdered—we cannot kill her, because it is not proper to kill a woman. Let us then burn her with the dead body of Kíchaka, and since he died out of love for her, let him espouse her in the world of Ghosts "

They then went into the presence of the Raja, saying, "We wish to burn the waiting maid, who caused the death of Kíchaka, along with the corpse of our brother." And the Raja was in awe of his wife's brethren, and dared not forbid them; for it is an old proverb that the brother-in-law is master of the house. So they seized Draupadí by force, and bound her with cords, and threw her upon the bier of Kíchaka, and went out of the city to burn her alive, together with the dead body. And Draupadí, seeing that her life was in mortal peril, shrieked and screamed in piteous tones, and the air was filled with her cries. All this while Bhíma was lying asleep in the cook-room, when he was awakened by the cry of Draupadí; and he rose up and hastened out of the palace to follow her to the burning ground; and he went to the city wall and threw himself from the ramparts, for he would not go through the city gate lest he should be known.

Then Bhíma drew his hair over his face, so that no man could discover him, and tore up a large tree by the roots, and carried it on his shoulders as a club, and went with all speed to the place of burning. And as he came near. Draupadí saw him, and knew who he was; and when the brethren of Kíchaka beheld Bhíma approaching them, they were seized with trembling, and said, "This is the Gandharva; let us fly and leave this woman, who is the cause of all our sorrows." Thus saying, they left Draupadí and the dead body of Kíchaka, and fled towards the city, and Bhíma returned to Draupadí and released her; and they went back to the city by different ways, so that no one might know that the Raja's cook was the terrible Gandharva.

After all these evidences of prowess and the help afforded in the battle, the King of Virata discovers the princely rank of the Pandavas, and gives his daughter in marriage to the son of Arjuna. A great council is then held to consider the question of declaring war on the Kauravas, at which the speeches are quite Homeric, the god Krishna taking part. The decision is to prepare for war, but to send an embassy first. Meantime Duryodhana and Arjuna have a singular contest to obtain the aid of Krishna, whom both of them seek out. This celestial hero is asleep when they arrive, and the proud Kaurava, as Lord of Indraprastha, sits down at his head—Arjuna more reverently takes a place at his feet. Krishna, awaking, offers to give his vast army to one of them, and himself as councillor to the other; and Arjuna gladly allows Duryodhana to take the army, which turns out much the worse bargain. The embassy, meantime, is badly received; but it is determined to reply by a counter message, while warlike preparations continue. There is a great deal of useless negotiation, against which Draupadí protests, like another Constance, saying, "War, war! no peace! peace is to me a war!" Krishna consoles her with the words, "Weep not! the time has nearly come when the Kauravas will be slain, both great and small, and their wives will mourn as you have been mourning." The ferocity of the Chief of the Kauravas prevails over the wise counsels of the blind old king and the warnings of Krishna, so that the fatal conflict must now begin upon the plain of Kurukshetra.

All is henceforth martial and stormy in the "parvas" that ensue. The two enormous hosts march to the field, Generalissimos are selected, and defiances of the most violent and abusive sort exchanged. Yet there are traces of a singular civilization in the rules which the leaders draw up to be observed in the war. Thus, no stratagems are to be used; the fighting men are to fraternize, if they will, after each combat; none may slay the flier, the unarmed, the charioteer, or the beater of the drum; horsemen are not to attack footmen, and nobody is to fling a spear till the preliminary challenges are finished; nor may any third man interfere when two combatants are engaged. These curious regulations—which would certainly much embarrass Moltke—are, sooth to say, not very strictly observed, and, no doubt, were inserted at a later age in the body of the poem by its Brahman editors. Those same interpolators have overloaded the account of the eighteen days of terrific battle which follow with many episodes and interruptions, some very eloquent and philosophic; indeed, the whole *Bhagavad-Gita* comes in hereabouts as a religious interlude. Essays on laws, morals, and the sciences are grafted, with lavish indifference to the continuous flow of the narrative, upon its most important portions; but there is enough of solid and tremendous fighting, notwithstanding, to pale the crimson pages of the Iliad itself. The field glitters, indeed, with Kings and Princes in panoply of gold and jewels, who engage in mighty and varied combats till the earth swims in blood, and the heavens themselves are obscured with dust and flying weapons. One by one the Kaurava chiefs are slain, and Bhíma, the Giant, at last meets in arms Duhsusana, the Kaurava Prince who had dragged Draupadí by the hair. He strikes him down with the terrible mace of iron, after which he cuts off his head, and drinks of his blood, saying, "Never have I tasted a draught so delicious as this. So furious now becomes the war that even the just and mild Arjuna commits two breaches of Aryan chivalry, killing an enemy while engaged with a third man, and shooting Karna dead while he is extricating his chariot-wheel and without a weapon. At last none are left of the Kauravas except Duryodhana, who retires from the field and hides in a chamber under a table. The Pandavas find him out, and heap such reproaches on him

that the surly warrior comes forth at length, and agrees to fight with Bhíma. The duel proves of a tremendous nature, and is decided by an act of treachery; for Arjuna, standing by, reminds Bhíma by a gesture of his oath to break the thigh of Duryodhana, because he had bidden Draupadí sit on his knee. The giant takes the hint, and strikes a foul blow, which cripples the Kaurava hero, and he falls helpless to earth. After this the Pandava Princes are declared victorious, and Yudhishthira is proclaimed King.

The great poem now softens its martial music into a pathetic strain. The dead have to be burned, and the living reconciled to their new lords; while afterwards King Yudhishthira is installed in high state with "chámaras, golden umbrellas, elephants, and singing." He is enthroned towards the East, and touches rice, flowers, earth, gold, silver, and jewels, in token of owning all the products of his realm. Being thus firmly seated on his throne with his cousins round him, the Rajah prepares to celebrate the most magnificent of ancient Hindoo rites, the *Aswamedha* or Sacrifice of the Horse. It is difficult to raise the thoughts of a modern and Western public to the solemnity, majesty, and marvel of this antique Oriental rite, as viewed by Hindoos. The monarch who was powerful enough to perform it chose a horse of pure white colour, "like the moon," with a saffron tail, and a black right ear; or the animal might be all black, without a speck of colour. This steed, wearing a gold plate on its forehead, with the royal name inscribed, was turned loose, and during a whole year the king's army was bound to follow its wanderings. Whithersoever it went the ruler of the invaded territory must either pay homage to the King, and join him with his warriors, or accept battle; but whether conquered or peacefully submitting, all these Princes must follow the horse, and at the end of the year assist at the sacrifice of the consecrated animal. Moreover, during the whole year the King must restrain all passion, live a perfectly purified life, and sleep on the bare ground. The white horse could not be loosened until the night of the full moon in *Choitro*, which answers to the latter half of March and the first half of April—in fact, at Easter-time; and it may be observed here that this is not the only strange coincidence in the sacrifice. It was thus an adventure of romantic conquest mingled with deep religion and arrogant ostentation, and the entire description of the *Aswamedha* is most interesting. The horse is found, adorned with the golden plate, and turned loose, wandering into distant regions, where the army of Arjuna, for it was he who led Yudhishthira's forces, goes through twelve amazing ad- ventures. They come, for instance, to a land of Amazons, all of wonderful beauty, wearing armour of pearls and gold, and equally fatal either to love or to fight with. These dazzling enemies, however, finally submit, as also the Rajah of the rich city of Babhru-váhand, which possessed wails of solid silver, and was lighted with precious jewels for lamps. The serpent people, in the same way, who live beneath the earth in the city of Vasuki, yields, after combat, to Arjuna. A hundred thousand million snakemen dwelt there, with wives of consummate loveliness, possessing in their realm gems which would restore dead men to life, as well as a fountain of perpetual youth. Finally, Arjuna's host marches back in great glory, and with a vast train of vanquished monarchs, to the city of Hastinapur, where all the subject Kings have audience of Yudhishthira, and the immense preparations begin for the sacrifice of the snow-white horse. This is a passage which, although not perhaps of equal antiquity with much of the epic, may be quoted, for its strange minuteness of ritual and old-world interest.

A golden throne was set up in a high place for Maharaja Dhritarashtra, and beneath that was another throne for Raja Yudhishthira; and thrones of gold and sandal-wood were arranged for all the other lianas and chieftains according to their several qualities and dignities; and the Maharaja and all the Rajas and chieftains took their seats upon the thrones. And all the wives and other ladies of the Rajas came to the assembly and were arranged and seated on their own side, each one in the place appointed for her. And when all assembled were seated, Raja Yudhishthira and Draupadí bathed themselves; and the space of ground required for the sacrifice was duly measured out, and a golden plough was brought, and two bullocks were harnessed to the plough Then Raja Yudhishthira rose up, and with his own hand drove the bullocks and ploughed that space; and Draupadí followed the Raja and carried a parcel of all the different grains which were grown in the Râj-Bharata, and sprinkled the grains as fast as the Raja ploughed. And the Br. Ihmans sat along with the ladies, and whilst the Raja ploughed, both the Bráhmans and the ladies offered up prayers in his behalf with a loud voice. The space of ground was then covered with four hundred golden bricks, and the sage Vyása, accompanied by Vasishtha and Nárada and other Rishis, seated themselves on the golden pavement. The Raja then commanded that eight pillars should be set up round that golden pavement, and a roof covered with gold was set over the pavement, and a banner was fixed on the top of each pillar. Then eight large pits were dug, in order that the *homa* of milk, curds, and clarified butter might be prepared therein, and eight large sacrificial ladles were furnished for casting the *homa* on the sacrificial fire, and large cloths of skin were sown together, on which was' placed a portion of every vegetable which is food lor man and a portion of every medicinal herb which was produced in that Râj, and the whole was put into the *homa*, and Vyása was appointed to be President of all the Bráhmans, who were to obey his orders as to the performance of the *homa*. And all the most famous Rishis were present at that sacrifice, and they selected the most distinguished persons to sit side by side of the place where the *homa* was performed. And Raja Yudhishthira sat with a deer's horn in his hand, and Vyása desired him to command that

sixty-four of the principal Rajas and Rishis in the assembly should go with their wives to the banks of the Ganges, and that both they and their wives should fill pitchers with the Ganges water, and bring it to the place of the sacrifice. And Krishna, and Arjuna, and Bhíma, with a great party of Rajas and Rishis, each one accompanied by his wife, proceeded to the banks of the Ganges, all with pitchers on their heads; and along with them went a company of musicians with drums and trumpets and other musical instruments, and many dancing girls likewise danced before them And when those who had gone to the banks of the Ganges for water had filled all their pitchers, they took the pitchers on their heads and returned to the place of the sacrifice, preceded by the musicians and singers and the dancing girls. Then Raja Yudhishthira commanded that splendid dresses should be brought for all those who had carried the water, and he caused both the Rajas and their wives to be dressed therewith, and he put a chain of choice jewels on each of their necks, and put a betel nut into each of their mouths, and he ordered fires to be lighted in the pits that were dug for the *homa*, and the various ingredients to be presented to the fire. Then the Raja's brethren and kinsmen brought loads of gold and jewels and clothes, together with many elephants, horses, and cows, and gave to each Brahman in such quantities that they were all fully satisfied and contented.

After this, a throne made of sandal-wood, covered with gold, was brought for Raja Yudhishthira. And the Raja sat thereon, and those around him took off his clothes, and all those persons who had brought water from the Ganges took up their pitchers and poured the water over the Raja's head. The horse was then brought, and the remainder of the water with which the Raja had been bathed was poured upon the horse's head. Then Nâkula opened the mouth of the horse and said: "The horse is speaking!" and those around him cried out: "What does the horse say?" Nákula replied: "The horse says: 'In other yagas wherein a horse is sacrificed, he goes to Swarga, which is the heaven of Indra; but I shall go far above Swarga.'" Then the horse was washed, and the scimitar was brought, and Daumya put the scimitar into the hands of Bhíma, and bade him slay the horse. And Bhíma lifted up the scimitar to give the horse a blow, when Daumya said: "O Bhíma, have patience a moment while I try the horse." So Daumya took hold of the horse's ear and pressed it, when suddenly milk ran out to the astonishment of all present. Daumya then said to Bhíma: "I see that the horse is pure, and I am certain this sacrifice is acceptable and will be accepted. Now strike!" So Bhíma struck a blow and cut off the head of the horse, and no sooner was the head severed from the body than it mounted towards the sky and soared out of sight, and the body fell down upon the spot. Then Krishna and the other Rajas and the Rishis came up and opened the horse's belly. And when they divided it a light came out of it, and Krishna said: "O Raja Yudhishthira, I have never beheld so clean and pure a horse, and I am now assured that this sacrifice of yours has reached the heaven of Vishnu."

After Bhíma had opened the belly of the horse, the flesh began to smell of camphor, and Daumya took out the camphor-like flesh with the sacrificial ladles, and cast it upon the fire and made *homa* of it, and said: "Indra, take this flesh, which has become camphor." At that moment Indra, with a crowd of gods, entered the assembly. All present then paid their respects to Indra, who came up to Vyasa and took the remainder of the flesh, and gave a portion of it to each of the gods, and the smoke that rose from that fire was all perfumed.

Then Krishna arose and embraced Raja Yudhishthira, and gave him joy of his sacrifice, and said, "Be the sacrifice prosperous; for no one has ever performed the like, and the fame of it will last as long as the world endures." Raja Yudhishthira replied: "All that has come to me has been entirely by your favour." Then Krishna, with all the Rajas and principal Rishis, poured pitchers of water over Yudhishthira and Draupadí, and bathed them. Then all that remained of the medicinal herbs that had been brought to make the *homa* was reduced to powder, and a ball of it was given to each of the persons present to eat; and by so doing Raja Yudhishthira gave to each one a share of the merit of that *aswamcdha* and last of all Raja Yudhishthira partook of it himself. Then all the musical instruments struck up a symphony of rejoicing for the close of the yaga: and Kunti, with all her maidens and dependents, manifested every sign of joy, and bestowed great quantities of goods in gratitude to the gods who had enabled her son to perform so great a yaga, and had accepted the sacrifice. And all the materials for the *homa* were collected into one place, and the Bráhmans uttered blessings over them and threw them all at once into the fire. And when the Raja had finished bestowing his largesses upon the Bráhmans, he turned to the Rajas and gave to each a thousand horses of the first quality and a hundred war elephants and one crore of gold coin, and to each of the Rajas' wives he gave everything that was necessary for a bride on her wedding night, including gold and precious jewels and splendid clothes. Yudhishthira then gave to each of the sons and kinsmen and friends of Krishna twice as much as he had given to the Rajas; and the next day Krishna took leave and set off for Dwaraka, and all the other Rajas took leave in like manner, and set off for their respective countries.

After all these stately celebrations, it might be expected that the great poem would conclude with the established glories of the ancient dynasty. But, if the martial part of the colossal epic is "Kshatriyau," and the religious episodes "Brahmanic,' the conclusion breathes the spirit of Buddhism. Yudhishthira sits grandly on the throne, but earthly greatness does not content the soul of man, nor can riches render weary hearts happy. A

wonderful scene, which reads like a rebuke from the dead addressed to the living upon the madness of all war, occurs in this part of the poem. The Pandavas and the old King Dhritarashtra being together by the banks of the Ganges, the great saint Vyasa undertakes to bring back to them all the dead, slain in their fraternal conflict. The spectacle is at once terrible and tender. "They all went," says the Mahábhárat:

And the day passed away so slowly that it seemed like a whole year to them, and at last the sun went down, and they all bathed in the river by command of Vyása, and said their prayers, and Raja Yudhishthira and his brethren were on the side of Vyása, and Maharaja Dhritaraslitra stood before them, and everybody else stood where places could be found. Vyása then went into the water, and prayed and bathed; and he then came out and stood by Dhritaráshtra, and called upon the names of each of the persons who had been slain, one by one. At that moment the river began to foam and boil, and a great noise was heard rising out of the waters, as though all the slain men were once again alive, and as though they and their elephants and their Hones were bursting into loud cries, and all the drums and trumpets and other instruments of music of both armies were striking up together. The whole assembly were astonished at this mighty tempest, and some were smitten with a terrible fear, when suddenly they saw Bhishma and Drona in full armour seated in their chariots and ascending out of the waters, and all their armies arrayed as they were on the first day of the Mahá-Bhárata. Next came forth Abhimanyu, the heroic son of Arjuna, and the five sons of Draupadí, and the son of Bhíma with his army of Asuras. After these came Kama, and Duryodhana, and Sakuni, and Duhsasana, and the other sons of Dhritaráshtra, all in full parade, seated upon their chariots, together with many other warriors and Rajas who had been slain. All appeared in great glory and splendour, and more beautiful than when they were alive, and all came with their own horses and chariots, and banners, and arms, and every one was in perfect friendship with each other, for enmity had departed from among them, and each one was preceded by his bard and eulogists who sang his praises, and very many singing men and dancing girls appeared with them. Now, when these warriors had come out of the river, their widows, and orphans, and kinsfolk were overjoyed, and not a trace of grief remained among them; the widows went to their husbands, and the daughters to their fathers, and mothers to their sons, and sisters to their brothers, and all the fifteen years of sorrow which had passed since the war of the Mahá Bhárata were forgotten in the ecstacy of seeing each other again. Thus the night passed away in the fulness of joy, but when the morning had dawned all the dead mounted their chariots and horses and disappeared, and those who had gathered together to behold them prepared to depart. And Vyása the sage, said that the widows who wished to rejoin the dead husbands might do so; and all the widows went and bathed in the Ganges and came out of the water again, and kissed, one by one, the feet of Dhritarashtra, and then went and drowned themselves in the river; and through the prayers of Vyása they all went to the loved ones they wished, and obtained their several desires.

But this revealing of the invisible world deepens the discontent of the Princes, and when the sage Vyása tells them that their prosperity is at an end, they determine to leave their kingdom to younger Princes, and to set out with their faces towards Mount Meru, where is Indra's Heaven. If, haply, they may reach it living, there will be an end of this world's joys and sorrows, and "union with the Infinite" will be obtained. We shall imitate, in our last quotations, the shloke or *anushtup* verse of sixteen syllables, in which the original "Mahábhárata" is mainly composed—

With Draupadí and the Princes the King went from the city gate,
The high-souled sons of Pandu and the famous Princess following them
For life eternal longing, and worldly things all abandoning.
To many lands they wandered, and hill and wilderness traversed they.
In the front walked Yudhishthira, and next him masterful Bhíma came.
After Bhíma the mild Arjuna, and Nakula and Sahadeva then,
And sixth came sweetest Draupadí, dark browed and with loveliest lotus-eyes,
And last came Yudhishthira's dog.

Far they travel together till in the distance is seen rising immense Himavat, and the highest peak of this range, Mount Moru itself, where God Indra dwells. But at this point Draupadí sinks exhausted. She had been faultless in love, but too much attached to things of earth, and her soul accordingly failed in its final task. Then Sahadeva and Nakula fall dying, and Arjuna also; the poet relating at each calamity what earthly imperfections caused thus their want of power to reach the holy mount. Bhíma dies last, guilty of want of tenderness towards his enemies, and none of the princely company now survives but Yudhishthira, the King. He, followed by the dog, strides on towards the abode of the gods, not looking behind him; but, with sad eyes and declining strength, ever pressing towards the place of rest And here occurs one of the noblest religious apologues not only of this great epic, but, we venture to think, of any creed—a beautiful fable of faithful love, which may be

contrasted, to the advantage of the Hindoo teaching, with any scriptural representation of Death, and of Love, "which stronger is than Death." There is always something selfish in the anxiety of orthodox people to save their own souls, and our best religious language is not free from this taint of pious egotism. The parva of the Mahabharata which contains Yudhishthira's approach to Indra's paradise teaches, on the contrary, that deeper and better lesson—

The gate of heaven opens to none alone.
Save thou one soul, and it shall save thine own.

The good Pandava King has passed all dangers safely, and stands secure, but alone, upon the summit of the holy hill. Suddenly a strain of celestial melody rings through the golden air, and Indra appears in his chariot. "Ascend," the God cries; "my Heaven awaits thee;" but the King replies:

Oh, mighty Indra I yonder there he joyless all my brothers true;
I cannot enter Heaven and leave those dear lives fallen away from me,
And Draupadí, the sweet-faced one, a king's child, fair and virtuous,
If I go she must enter too. Oh, Indra, have pity on those I loved.

INDRA.

In Heaven, Monarch, thou wilt find thy brothers; they all have safely come;
They all are there, with Draupadí; tarry not, then, thou son of Bharat.
Arrived thy kinsmen are and Queen; but so as the dead come have entered they.
Their soiled and fleshly garments doffed; but thou shalt enter living, oh King!

YUDHISHTHIRA.

And this dog, too, O Indra, here! 'tis a true beast that has followed me
All the long journey, faithfully; indeed, Lord! I have compassion on it.

INDRA.

Eternity and friendship with the holy Gods and felicity
In my high Heaven hast thou this day attained; leave, therefore, the brute to die.

YUDHISHTHIRA.

The best men do some evil, but the worst love that which loveth them.
If thy Heaven doth cost so dear a price as my dog's pain, let it lack me.

INDRA.

On earth, wherever a dog shall come, unholy are purest sacrifices.
Leave what is low and base to die; Heaven now will be enough for thee,

Thou cam'st here, leaving Draupadí—thy brethren all thou cam'st leaving too.
Stay'st thou, then, at Heaven's door, for a hound? Nay, Monarch, mount and ride quickly.

YUDHISHTHIRA.

When on yon earth our dead die, neither love nor hate again they feel.
Neither can ever help them there, else never there had I quitted them.
Worst of the four great crimes of life is treason done to faithful love.
This brute hath faithfully followed me; I will to hell if he goeth, Lord!

But the dog was all the while Yama, the God of Death, disguised; and that grim Deity, as he resumes his proper form, praises the gentle-hearted King, and leads the way into Paradise. Yet another trial, however, awaits his perfect virtue, for on entering the jewelled gates of Indra's abode, Yudhishthira beholds the Kauravas, but not his own kinsmen, there; and believing himself deceived, turns away and strides downwards to the gate of Narak, the Brahman hell. Outside its dismal portals he is assailed by noisome odours and horrible sights, but he hears the voice of Draupadí inside, and beats fiercely for entrance. As the ghastly porch opens, the foul and murky air suddenly clears, the evil noises turn to exquisite music, hell becomes a dissolving vision—*maya*—an illusion, which gives place to the real and glorious Heaven of the high Gods; and Yudhishthira, thrice-tried and found perfect, obtains immortal bliss for himself and for all those dear to him.

Such is the barest outline of this mighty and ancient poem, which has had far more rapt listeners than ever the "Iliad" or "Odyssey" could boast—which may claim a grander scheme and higher aims than either, and which in many a beautiful and sonorous passage does not yield in music or invention or majesty to the flow of Homer's own Greek. Outside the mam story and its many episodes the gigantic work contains, as an ocean embraces islands, the separate compositions of the Bhagavad-Gita, with the legends of Krishna and the three famous stories of Nala and Damayanti, Devayani and Vayati, and—though this was interpolated—Chandrahasna and Bikya. The Mahabharata is, in truth, an ocean of poetry, whose coast-line we have merely indicated, yet we have accomplished our purpose in praising the industry which has summarized it in Mr. Talboys Wheeler's admirable first volume; the spirit which has aided him in Messrs. Trübner's well-known interest in Oriental learning; and the devotion, above all, of that nameless scholar whose toil has sounded tor us the depths of this almost boundless sea. We have dipped but a cup or two from its musical wavelets of love alternating with mighty rolling billows of tempestuous passion, and sinking back again into ripples of restful peace and the calm of the dark waters at night. It was our desire, while doing justice to a recent notable work, to convey some slight idea to the English public of this vast antique epic, which to the present hour feeds with by-gone but immortal melody the hearts of all the Indian people. If we have effected this, our purpose is accomplished. In another paper, and on a future occasion, we hope to notice the remarkable translation which Mr. Ralph Griffith, of the Benares College, has achieved from the Sanskrit of that sister-poem of the Mahábhárata—the voluminous Rámáyana.

Stephes Austin and Sons, Printers, Hertford.

"Quotations." "Other up the Fragments."

"To bring together a variety of the innumerable and diversified relics of bygone days is a laudable and an

agreeable task, as they present a view of the manners, the tastes, and the feelings of our predecessors."
"The matters here contained are not ephemeral. Time will not take from them, but give to them value."
First Series.
R. Lucas and Son Nelson Bridge-Street. 1880.
Sold by all Booksellers.

"Bacon was one of the first to give a depth of wound to the prejudice of an undue admiration for past times. Since which prejudice has taken an opposite direction. We disdain our masters; and having in our voyage towards the pole, as it were, arrived at the farthest degree of latitude, we think ourselves wiser (better informed we certainly are) than those who first had the sagacity to point us out the way. The age perhaps is deficient in strength. That we have not so sound a regard for true liberty as our fathers in the reigns of James, Charles, William, Anne, and George the First, is certain. Fortunate is it for us that 'our fathers lived before us.' For, had they not erected the constitution, we assuredly could never have erected it for ourselves; we, who can do almost all things except frame a plain practical Act of Parliament without blemish or spot. Happy will be the time when truths—moral, political, religious, and philosophic—are taught in our schools; and when the poor as well as the rich may walk hand in hand beneath the bowers of intelligence."

"Multitudes of persons can see neither excellence nor utility in the study of old books; and yet, if it be true that ambition wears better than love, learning of this kind will probably last longer than either. *Lovers* of books are *readers* of books, retaining the best of the best, and the curiosities of the most curious. To the gentler sort of these adversaries the courteous words of Jonathan Oldbuck may be used—'We acknowledge that the charms whereon we doat are not so obvious to the eyes of youth as those of a fair lady; but you will grow wiser and see more justly when you come to wear spectacles.' But to those who bring nothing to the attack besides coarseness and mockery, the ability of judging on the subject may be altogether denied them, and the broad brocard of the blunt and witty Erasmus may be applied—'Keep off, swine; we breathe not our per fumes for thee!'"

Contents.

"Quotations."

"GATHER UP THE FRAGMENTS."

"What hath been bringeth what shall be and is—
Worse, better—last for first, and first for last."

The Quoting of Books and other Writings.

DR. BENTLEY would not even allow that a book was worthy to be read that could not be quoted.

The learned John Selden some centuries since advised that "in quoting books, quote such authors as are usually" read; others, you may read for your own satisfaction, "but not name them." Selden's own conduct was

at variance with his dictum; for in his own works he freely quotes from *all sources*—many of them the most recondite, and certainly not such as "ARE USUALLY READ."
(S. W. Singer, F.S.A., 1855.)

Libels.

THOUGH some make slight of libels, yet you may see by them how the wind sits: as take a straw and throw it up into the air, you shall see by that which way the wind is, which you shall not do by casting up a stone; more solid things do net show the complection of the times so well as ballads and libels.
(Selden, 1650.)

To speak truth of the living may be a libel if censorious, because we prevent a man from regaining what he has lost—a part of his reputation; and we thereby perpetually punish him for a crime committed, which is contrary to justice. But to speak truth of the dead cannot bear that interpreta- tion, because they cannot recover what they have lost, and it may be of use to the living to hold them forth as examples.
(Lord Dillon.)

When we speak of libel we must not be misunderstood; nor when we speak of liability to the penalty of the laws. The word "libel" designates a punishable offence, and in the sense we use the speaking of that which is false; the so speaking with an evil purpose—the purpose of bringing honorable men into disrepute, and just and legitimate authority into contempt. But (hut which we speak is truth—not falsehood; it is not asserted with an evil purpose, but to avert such purposes—not to bring into contempt lawful authority, but to restore the careful exercise of authority, Constructively however our words may be charged as libel, and that for this reason—That our laws having provided for bringing every public grievance, and consequently every official malversation, to judicial issue, the case has not been contemplated or provided for of the desperate remedies which individuals may be put to in the failure of those Constitutional Remedies regarded by our forefathers as their own birthright, and as the essential condition of freedom in every state. In every declining state the *law has ceased to operate against* PUBLIC *delinquents, but retains its terrors against those who dare to charge* THEM *with deliquency*.
(Urquhart.)

Town and Country.

ABOUT the year 1650 Cowley wrote:—

"Let cities boast that they provide
For life the ornament of pride;
But 'tis the country and the field
That furnish it with staff and shield."

Again he says:—

"God the first garden made, and the first city Cain."

Thus forestalling Cowper in his oft quoted line—

"God made the country, and man made the town."

Cowley's aversion to cities is thus expressed in prose:—"What should a man of truth and honesty do at Rome? He can neither understand nor speak the language of the place. A naked man may swim in the sea, hut it is not the ray to catch fish there; they are likelier to devour him than he them, if he bring no nets and use no deceits." He raided at Chertsey in Surrey, and thus gives his experience, after his "meadwos were eaten up every night by cattle put a by his neighbors:"—

"I thought when I went first to dwell in the country that without doubt I should have met there with the simplicity of the old poetical age; I thought to have found no inhabitants there but such as the shepherds of Sir Philip Sydney in Arcadia, or of Monsieur d'Urfe on the banks of Lignon; and began to consider with my myself which way I might recommend no less to posterity the happiness and innocence of the men of Chertsey; but to

confess the truth I perceived quickly by infallible demonstrations that I was still in Old England, and not in Arcadia or La Forèt; that if I could not content myself with anything less than exact fidelity in human conversation, I had almost as good go back and seek for it in the Court, or the Exchange, or Westminister Hall."

Cowley's love of solitude shows itself on every occasion; in his Advancement of Experimental Philosophy he says:—"They shall not unite above two at a time at one table, nothing being more vain and unprofitable than numerous meetings of acquaintances."
(Anon.)

Parliamentary Usurpation.

ONE by one the barriers to the spread of centralisation have been practically abandoned; although they retain their legal existence, we affect to consider them obsolete. Institutions which had withstood the King and his Barons now yielded to the Third Estate. The endeavor to establish the entire ascendency of Parliament in England, and of their own estate in Parliament succeeded. The local liberties, though not annulled, have been suffered to become obsolete and forgotten. The sacrifice has been made. How has it profited the Churl that made it. While local administration remained to him pauperism was unknown. Each Hundred maintained its poor, and was adequate to that great duty. The instances of death from want were so rare, that when they happened they produced in the minds of all, not their barren and useless pity for the fate of the unknown wanderer, but a deep sense of a criminal and an inhuman neglect on the part of that Hundred, where, from the finding of the corpse the death might be supposed to have happened. Such an event was always a matter of judicial inquiry; and if the death appeared to the jurors to have been really the effect of want, they made their presentment as in cases of murder, and the Hundred was mulcted in the murder fine. These were their only poorlaws! How far the happiness and prosperity of the Churl have been since promoted by that I transfer of power which relieves him of his proper burden of solicitude for the welfare of the State, let the poorlaw act, corn laws, chartism, riots, repeal, and the whole aspect of this empire in 1843 make answer. (Chisolm Anstey.)

Municipal Institutions.

OUR municipal institutions are the most valuable that we possess—the most favorable to public freedom and to popular sympathy. Municipal institutions are older than the church—they are older than the aristocracy—they are older than the monarchy itself. They existed in the time of our Saxon ancestors, when every man belonged to a tithing, and every tithing belonged to a hundred, and every hundred belonged to a county; and they, in their own right, chose their own officers to entrust with the management of their affairs. The granting of charters was an innovation upon that inherent right, which gives to every municipality the power of self-government. The counties were bribed, and county members accepted the bribe. The boroughs stood out more manfully; they have always been the fortresses of freedom.
(William Fox—House of Commons, 1856. Police Bill.)

"Ministerial Responsibility."

WHEN the responsibility of Ministers was real—when a corrupt, a mischievous, or a stupid Minister ran the chance of losing his head, or of forfeiting his rank, his politicial chances, and perhaps his country, it was less dangerous to entrust him with the Crown's prerogative of making war and peace. At present the Ministers (called the Ministers of the Crown) are really (in all except the foreign policy) the agents of the House of Commons. In home affairs this responsibility is carried out with tolerable efficacy when the members of the House of Commons are vigilant and firm. But the contrary is true of the acts of Government m foreign affair?. These do not admit of revision; they are completed before Parliament knows of them except by dim rumor, so that in those large and important acts which ought to bear the impress of the national will—those acts which ought not to be left to the caprice of any individual, the House of Commons has really less power than it had a hundred-and-fifty years ago.
(Anon. 1857.)

"Thou almost persuadest Me."

IN November, 1821, a gentleman, who had discovered among the papers of his deceased wife a beautiful prayer composed by her with reference to Lord Byron's scepticism, transmitted to him at Pisa, where he was then living with the Countess Guiccioli, and writing Don Juan. One cannot be surprised to hear such a man so situated endeavoring to defend his unbelief by such trite and nonsensical arguments:as are to be found in the following answer to Mr Sheppard's letter:—

"Pisa, 8th December, 1821. D.ar Sir—I have received your letter. I need not say that the extract which it contains has affected me, because it would imply a want of all feeling to have read it with indifference. Though I am not quite sure that it was intended by the writer for me; yet the date, the place where it was written, with some other circumstances which you mention, render the allusion probable. But, for whomsoever it was meant, I have read it with all the pleasure which can arise from so melancholy a topic. I say pleasure, because your brief and simple picture of the life and demeanour of the excellent person, whom I trust you will again meet, cannot be contemplated without the admiration due to her virtues and her pure and unpretending piety. Her last moments were particularly striking; and I do not know that, in the course of reading the story of mankind, and still less in my observation of the existing portion, I ever met with anything so unostentatiously beautiful.

"Indisputably the firm believers in the Gospel have a great advantage over all others, for this simple reason: That, if true, they will have their reward hereafter; and, if there be no hereafter, they can be but with the infidel in his eternal sleep, having bad the assistance of an exalted hope through life, without subsequent disappointment, since (at the worst for them) 'out of nothing, nothing can arise'—not even sorrow. But a man's creed does not depend upon himself: who can say—I will believe this, that, or the other? and least of all that which he can least comprehend? I have however observed that those who have begun life with extreme faith have in the end greatly narrowed it—as Chillingworth, Clarke (who ended an Arian), Boyle, and Gibbon (once a Catholic), and some others; while, on the other hand, nothing is more common than for the early sceptic to end in a firm belief, like Maupertius and Henry Kirke White.

"But my business is to acknowledge your letter, and not to make a dissertation. I am obliged to you for your good wishes, and more than obliged by the extract from the papers of the beloved object whose qualities you have so well described in a few words. I can assure you that all the fame which ever cheered humanity into higher notions of its own importance would never weigh in my mind against the pure and pious interest which a virtuous being may be pleased to take in my welfare. In this point of view I would not exchange the prayer of the deceased in my behalf for the united story of Homer, Cæsar, and Napoleon, could such be accumulated upon a living head. Do me at least the justice to suppose that 'video meliora proboque however the 'deteriora sequor ' may have been applied to my conduct.—BYRON."

Interesting, unhappy Byron! How does this letter, written in some calm reflecting hour, amidst that sensual, degrading life you were then leading, unfold to us a prospect of better things!

"He died! he died of what? of wretchedness—
A wandering, weary, worn, and wretched thing."
(Anon.)!

Lord Byron.

Is it not so, great Locke? and greater Bacon?
Great Socrates? and Thou Diviner still,
Whose lot it is to be mistaken,
And Thy pure creed made sanction of all ill?
Redeeming worlds to be by bigots shaken,
How was Thy toil rewarded?

As it is necessary in these times to avoid ambiguity, I say, that I mean by "Diviner still," CHRIST. If ever God was man—or man God, He was *both*. I never arraigned His creed, but the use or abuse made of it. Mr Canning one day quoted Christianity to sanction Negro Slavery, and Mr Wilberforce had little to say in reply. And was Christ crucified that black men might be scourged?

Hobbes (the philosopher of Malmesbury) who, doubting of his own soul, paid that compliment to the souls of other people as to decline their visits, of which he had some apprehension.
(Byron.)

How Muscovy became converted into "Holy Russia."

VLADIMIR the Goth's rude greatness, and the rumors of his great warlike exploits awakened the attention of the neighboring religions. Four of them hastened to contend for his conversion; but Vladimir rejected Mahometanism, because it interdicted wine, which, he said, was indispensable to Russians, and was their delight; Catholicism offered to him, by the Germans, he disliked, because of its Pope an earthly deity, which appeared an unexampled thing; and Judaism, because it had no country, and because he thought it neither

rational to take advice from wanderers punished by heaven, nor tempting to participate in their punishment. At the same time his attention was fixed by the Greek religion, which his ancestor Olga had followed, and which had recently been preached to him by a philosopher of Byzantium. He summoned his Council, took the opinion of his boyards, and of the elders of the people, and deputed ten of them to examine those religions in distant lands, even in their native temples.

The envoys of the Grand Prince meanwhile—plain, downright men—went forth and returned. Mahometanism and Catholicism they had seen only in poor and barbarous provinces, while they witnessed the Greek religion in its magnificent metropolis and adorned with all its pomp. They did not hesitate. Instantly convinced, Vladimir marched to conquer priests and relics at Cherson: having done this, he, by his threats, extorted from the Greek empire a princess, whom he married, and became a Christian.

Playing the tyrant to Heaven as he did to earth, his pagan divinities—those divinities which he had formed entirely of gold and fattened [?] with Christian blood, he now stripped for the sake of Christ, like disgraced favorites. He went still further—he ordered them to be dragged to execution at the tails of horses; they were loaded with blows by his guards, and were thrown into the Dneiper.

The Prince who thus treated the gods of Russia was not more forbearing towards the men. He commanded them to become Christians on a certain day and hour; he commanded, and whole tribes were pushed on like flocks, and collected on the banks of rivers, to receive the Greek baptism. One crowd succeeded to another, and to each of these, in mass, was given the name of a saint. He next carried to excess the virtues of Christianity as he had formerly carried the vices of paganism: he wasted the revenues of the state in alms, in pious foundations, and in public repasts, to imitate the lovefeasts of the primitive Christians. He no longer dared to shed the blood of criminals, nor even of the enemies of the country.
(General Count Philip de Segur.)

Magna Charta and Freetrade.

THE protectionist parly put themselves forward as aristocratic! When there was an aristocracy in England, interference with traffic was a high crime and misdemeanor. When the Barons assembled in mail in the field of Runymede, and brought before them the perjured usurper of the day, they took care to bind him ere they let him go free to respect the common rights of men in reference to the exchange of commodities, stipulating that "All merchants" shall have safety and security to go out of England, and to "come into England, and to stop and travel in England," both by land and water, to buy and sell without the imposition of tariffs, according to the antient customs."

This was one of the items of that Charter which for centuries half-yearly was solemnly rehearsed in every church, and the sense and fervor maintained for the protection of the rights so secured by the denunciation of the pains and penalties of excommunication against whoever should infringe it.
(Anon. 1857.)

Russian Gold, Lord Palmerston.

IT has been thought and said that Russian gold has found its way into this House. I do not mean to accuse the noble lord of having received the Russian gold, but the idea has gone abroad that Russian Gold has found its way into this House. The noble lord cannot but be aware that charges involving criminality of a serious nature have been put forth against him; in print too—not alone in the daily and weekly press, but in pamphlets and works, some of which I now hold in my hand; not the production of obscure and unknown individuals, but respectable gentlemen, having filled high offices—secretaries of embassy, proteges and employees of the noble lord himself. Mr Urquhart and Mr Parish have brought forward these accusations and supported them by documentary evidence. God forbid that I should say that they are true; but they are uncontradieted—they have gone forth to the country; and why is it that the noble lord has not instituted legal proceedings against these gentlemen? I think it right to state that the country expected that he would have taken such a course as a means of self-justification. Why have not the parties who bring forward such charges been prosecuted for libel?
(T. Attwood, House of Commons, 1839.)

Pope Leo the Tenth.

POPE LEO the Tenth was one of the most learned and polished princes of his or any age; and it was his excessive proneness to the encouragement of his favorite pursuits which induced him to act with singular imprudence in the matter of indulgences. Wherever manuscripts were to be had, they were purchased by Leo; wherever learned men were to be found, they were invited to his court with a splendid profusion; he has the immortal honor of being the first to encourage and patronise the Greek language in Italy. The names of the

illustrious De Medici, Pontiff at the Reformation, and that of his virtuous and pious successor, Hadrian the Sixth, will live as long as learning is estimated and sound philosophy duly appreciated. Such a tribute does Leo the Tenth demand—such a tribute is not denied him by Luther; and one thing is clear, that, arguing from human principles, had Luther been Leo the Tenth, and Leo the Monk of Wittemberg, the Reformation would most probably have been now to commence.
(Anon. Protestant.)

Irish Peasantry.—Land Tenure.

VAST tracts of land are kept vacant by the will of landlords and others which poor men would gladly cultivate, and from which they would get an independent livelihood. How selfish a use can be made of this power may be judged from the following Irish illustration.

"It is well known that much waste land has been brought under culture for several years past. This had been effected chiefly by *allowing* cottiers to take a portion of the mountain side; and when they had tilled it for a few years, and partially reclaimed it, calling on them *either to give it up to the landlord or pay a rent*.

"In some cases they probably retained it; but in others they gave it up and commenced anew; not unfrequently ending near the top of the mountain, at the bottom of which they commenced many years before. Thus cultivation crept up the mountain-sides or encroached on the secluded valleys heretofore untilled. *This mode of reclamation required no capital on the part of the landlord*. The cottier or tenant was the sale agent. *He obtained a bare subsistence by severe labor, and rarely effected any improvement in his own condition."*—Jonathan Pirn, 1848.

The excellent writer from whom I quote, does not venture to hint, nor does it seem to occur to him, that it is an essential iniquity for one man thus to appropriate the labor of another. Here is land kept in waste because no farmer will pay rent for it. It is wild and unreclaimed; but Cromwell or William or some other conquering warrior in antient times gave it to a predecessor of the present lord of the manor, and through his legal power it is kept barren. But a poor cottier gladly accepts the toil of cultivating it free from rent; he turns it from a wilderness into a fertile field without any aid from him whom the power of the sword and the dogma of law have pronounced to be its lord. No sooner is the barren land made fruitful than the lord steps in, *to reap where he did not sow*. The laborer, if left to himself in the wilderness, would soon become rich: but this is not to be endured—the landlord takes care that he shall rarely have more than "bare subsistence." And these are Irish peasants so much calumniated for idleness.!

The rich need exceedingly to learn home truths obvious to common men; our judges also and our Parliaments need to enforce them: such as—That God made the solid land for something else than to pay rent; and that the tenant who improves the soil, and not the landlord, has a right to every tittle of the increased value.
(Prof. Newman.)

Education of the Poor.

DR. PARR preached two sermons at Norwich on the Education of the Poor and on the Truth and Usefulness of Christianity. These two sermons are not only an era in Parr's life, but form an epoch in the history of education; they do honor to him as the advocate of the poor, and as a pioneer on the great work of general instruction—to his moral sensibilities and insight into human character—and to the foresight of that progress which intellect was making, and which demands in our days a repeal of every law which obstructs the access of the meanest individual to true and vital religion.
(Dr. Johnstone.)

Gleanings.

PLATO predicted that if a perfectly righteous man ever appeared on earth he would be scourged, tortured, bound, deprived of his sight, and after having suffered all possible injuries nailed to a post.

Subtract from a great man all that he owes to opportunity and all that he owes to chance, all that he has gained by the wisdom of his friends and by the folly of his enemies, and the giant will often be left a pigmy.

Mary Queen of Scots said that she feared John Knox's prayers more than an army of ten thousand. Did not Felix and Drusilla tremble in the presence of the prisoner Paul?

Lord Chatham declared that "not a shot shall be fired in Europe without my permission."

Whatever remains of worth amongst men in political life is evoked by the sight of men in humbler stations doing what they are conscious they ought themselves to do.

Lord Liverpool (1818) said that the Russians must be made to feel that we had a Parliament and a Public, to which we are responsible.

It is no use talking to me. I know no more of diplomatic matters than—a member of the House of Commons. Speak to Lord Aberdeen; if he agrees I am ready to concur. Thus confessed Earl Derby, many years Premier!

Disraeli's career has been a wonder, and his life a sneer. He has raised himself as a chimneysweep does—his feet against one wall, his back against the other. The one wall was Lord Palmerston, the other of two successive kinds of masonry—the first Sir Robert Peel, the second Lord Derby.

Cheerfulness is an unfailing characteristic of true believers. Cheerlessness is often the precursor of spiritual death, and should therefore be guarded against. It is the parent of scepticism and infidelity. Faith and joy are twin sisters that never part.

The real man is one who always finds excuses for others, but never excuses himself.

The girls! May they add charity to beauty, subtract envy from friendship, multiply genial affections, divide time by industry and recreation, reduce scandal to its lowest denomination, and raise virtue to its highest power.

If you want to see what men will do in the way of conformity take an European hat for your subject of meditation. There are 22,000,000 of people at this moment, each wearing one of these hats to please the rest.

Opinion is a medium between knowledge and ignorance.

'Pray, of what did your brother die?' said the Marquis Spinola to Sir Horace Vere. 'He died, sir,' replied he, 'of having nothing to do.' ' Alas, sir,' said Spinola, ' that is enough to kill any general of us all.'

A teacher was asked the reason of his success in teaching and retaining young men.—' Putting my arms around them.'

"Knowledge is proud that she hath learned so much,
Wisdom is humble that she knows no mors."

"God made the Country."

AGRICULTURE—the most important duly of man, since it is the keystone of the social fabric—opens the most extensive field for the contemplation of experimental and moral philosophy. It is the basis of the wealth and power of nations, inasmuch as the soil is emphatically the country, and the possessors and cultivators of it emphatically the people. They form the groundwork upon which the manufacturer, the merchant, the mechanic, and the artisan of every denomination, and every other class in the community, build their fortunes.

In a moral point of view the life of the agriculturist is the most pure and holy of any class of men; pure, because it is the most healthful, and vice can hardly find time to contaminate it; and holy, because it brings the Deity perpetually before his view, giving him thereby the most exalted notions of supreme power, and the most fascinating and endearing view of universal benignity. The agriculturist views the Deity in his works; he contemplates the divine economy in the arrangement of the seasons; and he hails nature immediately presiding over every other object that strikes his eyes; he witnesses many of her great and beauteous operation?, and her reproductive faculties; his heart insensibly expands from his minute acquaintance with multifarious objects, all in themselves original; whilst that degree of retirement in which he is placed from the bustling haunts of mankind keeps alive in his breast his natural affections, unblunted by an extensive and perpetual intercourse with man in a more enlarged, and therefore in a more corrupt, state of society.
(Lord Dillon.)

"Man made the Town."

THE MANUFACTURER—pent up in a wretched abode, working perpetually upon productions which spring not immediately from the lap of nature—has only to contemplate his own ingenuity and activity; he is surrounded and stimulated often by the worst passions; and if he has a religious turn the most gloomy and irritating fanaticism invades his heart; his body is daily enfeebled, his mind narrowed and distorted.

The breeze seldom refreshes or fans the manufacturer's impoverished blood; to excite sensations, to create emotions, he must have recourse to artificial means. Thus he is either steeped in licentiousness, or shrivelled up in horrid fanaticism, exhibited in the contortions of a contracted countenance. His Deity is not the benign God of nature, but a fantastic idol, the creature of a distempered body and a disturbed imagination—a god of vengeance and of terrors. And be cause he daily views, wretchedness, woe, disease, decrepitude and envy, and malice, and meanness, and all the doleful contingencies and odious passions of our condition around hi[*unclear:* d] he concludes that the same sentiments of disgust and hatr[*unclear:* e] must canker the affections of the Deity, and that he hall created beings only to degrade them first and to punish them afterwards.
(Dillon.)

The Contrast.

HEREIN is the awful contrast in the condition of these two classes of men—both useful, both born with the same capacity for happiness and dignity; for dignity is not quality to be severed from any description of men, however humble their fortunes may be. Do we not admire it eve in brutes? Why should it ever be excluded from any class of men?
(Dillon.)

Freedom of Commerce—The East and the West.

FREETRADE, Direct Taxation, Collection of Taxes by the Municipal Bodies were the custom of antient Greece and Rome; and the three combined form the Ottoman Empire and is religiously sanctioned by the Koran. The contrast of the customs duties under the Arabian law with the laws of Europe is great. The former are only *five* per cent for *tributaries, four* for *Mussulmen,* and *three* for *foreigner* who are regarded as *guests;* while in England trade is cow sidered as free if a duty be levied only for the sake of revenue, even though that duty amount to *six hundred par cent*.

The wide discrepancy that exists between the freetrade notions of political economists and the practical freetrade of he East cannot better be shown than by conducting the Eastern merchant into England, and setting him to carry on his traffic here by the same rule of substantial and palpable exchange of value for value.

Suppose him then preparing for his journey to England, He looks over a list of goods in request in England, and fixes on silks; he looks over some samples from England, and their prices; be sees that there is some reeled in the Piedmontese manner in Turkey equal to silk bearing the highest price in England; he makes his venture in this.

His silk warehoused in London, he inquires where the silk manufacturers are, and wishes to proceed thither to sell his goods; but he soon finds himself entangled in a web of routine, habits, prejudices, conflicting interests, and interested misrepresentations. He is instructed in the mysteries of the subdivision of labor; he finds that brokers and speculators possess the threads of communication, and in a hundred ways thwart all his attempts of free agency. He is informed that no Turkey silk such as his is esteemed in the market, that only the coarse has been in demand for ribands, etc.; indeed, that, instead of his silk fetching a higher price than the country-reeled, he would be very lucky if he got even that price. The poor distracted and alarmed man concludes a disadvantageous bargain.

He goes down to the manufacturing districts to select goods for the Turkey market. While making his assortment of cotton, for which every facility is afforded him, in which he is as much delighted by the intelligence and frankness of the manufacturers as he was shocked with the selfishness of the brokers, he is naturally led to speak of his unfortunate speculation in silk. He exhibits some specimens; the manufacturers are struck with them, admire them, declare them equal to anything from Italy. On tracing the after circulation of his own silk he finds that, as Piedmontese, it had realised a high price.

He now begins to doubt the advantages of the principle of division of labor in mercantile concerns, however applicable to manufacturers, and wonders much how English industry can flourish under such a system.

However the purchases he has made in cottons bring him back to Turkey with an equal capital to that with which he left it. On the value, say £5000, he pays to the Turkish government as duty (or for permission to dispose of his wares) £150; after all charges he makes twenty-five per cent, or £1250, and determines to return to England.

He had seen tobacco of inferior quality selling at enormous prices; he determines then to invest his original capital in tobacco, and to reserve his profits for expenses, resolved this time not to abandon his profits to middlemen, but to carry samples of his tobacco to the retail traders, or to dispose of it at the public market as in Turkey.

He arrives in the docks with £5000 value; the same value of English goods had been charged in Turkey £150. He is now informed that he cannot dispose of his tobacco unless he pays £30,000 to the customs.

He has the mortification of seeing his tobacco bought from him for *sixpence per pound*, charged *three shillings duty;* (and therefore costing the broker or speculator but *three shillings and sixpence*,) and selling in the shops in London at *ten, twelve,* and *sixteen shillings* per pound.

Is it to be expected that this man will spare our commercial system in comparing it with that of Turkey? Can the Turkish Government be expected to listen even with patience, to our disinterested suggestions of moderation and amelioration, when for equal value to be disposed of in English and Turkish markets, on the same terms and with equal facilities, he requires the employment of £5150 for the disposal of the English value, and £35,000 for the disposal of (he Turkish. In oilier words for £100 of English manufactures, (Turkish produce,) England exacts £(300!

This is not, it will be understood, the method any merchant would pursue, still it is the course that

commerce has to follow. The obstacles which render it impossible for the same met chant to complete the exchange as in Turkey are of course overcome, but certainly at a considerable sacrifice. My object is merely to show in the strongest contrast the operation of the two systems.
(Urquhart, 1834.)

Eastern Commercial Simplicity.

THE extreme simplicity of commerce, *from the absence of all legislation on the subject*, is visible in the establishment of a merchant: no books, save one of common entry, are kept; no credits (the ports of the Levant are not alluded to) are given; no bills discounted, no bonds nor even receipts, the transactions being all for ready money; no fictitious capital is created; no risk or loss from bankruptcy to incur, A merchant whose capital may exceed twenty thousand pounds will very possibly be without a clerk; and a small box, which he places on his carpet and leans his elbow on, incloses at once his bank and counting house.

A Tunisian Envoy jays of our commercial system.—"I admire. I am filled with astonishment at the individual instruction and intelligence spread through every class of the population—at the perfection of your industry—at your useful works and scientific inventions—at the discipline of your troops—at the subordination of your civil officers, and at the strict execution of your laws; but—*cannot you raise your revenue without embarrassing your commerce?"*

Was Sevastopol Taken?

LORD CLARENDON was asked "if the Russian Ambassador was applied to by the British Government for permission to withdraw Her Majesty's troops from the Crimea?" His Lordship must "decline to answer your question," was the answer.

In the protocol of 4th April, 1856, will be found:—

"The Eanl of Clarendon remarks, that in order to hasten the evacuation of the Crimea, it would be advantageous that the vessels of the allied powers should have the power of freely entering the harbor of Sevastopol; the facility, in the opinion of the first Plenipotentiary of Great Britain, would accelerate the embarkation of men and material by several weeks."

The Plenipotentiaries of Russia reply that they "will take the orders of their Court in this respect."

In the Protocol of 8th April:—

"The Plenipotentiaries of Russia announce that they have received orders to declare, in reply to the request that had been made to them on the subject, the port of Sevastopol will be opened to the vessels of the Allied Powers, in order to accelerate the embarkation of their troops and of their material."
(Bluebook on Crimea.)

It is clear therefore that "the Russian Ambassador was applied to by the British Government for permission to withdraw Her Majesty's forces from the Crimea," after the expenditure of £200,000,000, and the sacrifice of 100,000 men in attempting to take the place.

Subserviency of England to Russia.

ON the 12th October, 1814. Lord Castlereagh wrote to the Emperor Alexander a private letter remonstrating against the extravagance of his pretensions as regards Poland.

From the Notes to the Facsimile of the Declaration against Russia in 1807, we take the following:—

"From this letter we learn that the wars from 1803 to 1815, *which we believed to have been forced upon us by the act of France*, and to have been carried on by us in self-defence by various powers, were undertaken '*at the instance of Russia*,' and solely for Russian interests. The resources of England had been employed to obtain—

"The dismemberment of Sweden,

"The dismemberment of Denmark,

"The dismemberment of Turkey,

"The dismemberment of Persia; for the aggrandlsement of Russia.

"These confessions are made in the course of an appeal to the Emperor, not to *abandon* his purpose of extension westward—that is, to incorporate Poland—but to *modify* the operation at a particular moment, so as to spare the English Government the embarrassment of exposures in Parliament."

This is founded on Lord Castlereagh's letter to the Emperor, from which the following extracts are made:—

"I might also appeal to past experience, were it necessary, to relieve myself and my Government from any *suspicion of a policy adverse to the views and interests of Russia*.

"Your Imperial Majesty will recollect that we are only now emerging from a long course of *painful policy*

with respect to Norway, undertaken at your Imperial Majesty's *instance*, a order to secure to you the support of Sweden throughout he war, and *to consolidate your possession of* Finland by retaining for that power an *adequate indemnity in another Direction*.

"To this object our resources throughout THE CONTEST, and our *conquests from Denmark*, were steadily directed and successfully applied, under circumstances not a little arduous to such a Government as ours.

"Your Imperial Majesty will trace the same friendly spirit in the aid lately afforded by his Majesty's Ministers at the Porte to the conclusion of a peace with the Turks [threat of war against the Turks—"aid? "], which involved in it a *large accession of territory to your empire*.

"I may refer to a still more recent instance on the side of Persia, which your Imperial Majesty has *condescended* more than once to acknowledge, where a peace has been signed securing to your Imperial Majesty *important and extensive acquisitions in consequence of the active intervention of the Kings Ambassador, acting under express instructions from Home*. [These instructions were "to practise deceptions on the Persian Government."—Sir J. M'Neill.]

"If I have referred to these transactions it is only from an anxiety that your Imperial Majesty may not misinterpret my motives. If I now find myself compelled in this *the fourth instance of Russian aggrandisement within a few years*, by a sense of public duty to Europe, and especially to your Imperial Majesty, to press for a *modification*—not an ABANDONMENT—of your Imperial Majesty's pretensions to extend your Empire further westward (Poland) &c."

A comparison of this systematic letter with the outspoken language of Talleyrand is indeed odious.

The Czar and the Diplomatists.

ON the 1st October, Talleyrand received a visit from Alexmder the First of Russia, and from the Czar's manner of ice sting him, he saw that he was about to assume a part. After inquiries respecting the state of France, Alexander said:—

A. Now let us speak of our affairs; we must finish them here.

T. That depends on your Majesty. They will end promptly and happily, if your Majesty carry into them the same nobleness and greatness of tone as in those of France

A. But everyone must suit his convenience.

T. And each maintain his rights.

A. *I shall keep what I occupy*.

T. Your Majesty will desire to retain only what is legitimately yours. . . .

A. Rather war than renounce what I occupy.

. . . . . .

On the 25th October the Czar sought another interview with Prince Talleyrand.

A. At Paris you were in favor of a Kingdom of Poland; how does it happen that you have changed?

T. My opinion, sire, is still the same. At Paris, what was in question was the re-establishment of the whole of Poland; I desired then, as I desire now, its Independence; but now what is in question is something quite different; the question is reduced to a question of boundaries, which may put Austria and Prussia in safety.

A. They ought not to be uneasy. As to the rest I have two hundred thousand men in the Duchy of Warsaw, turn me out if you can. . . . I thought that France owed me something. You always speak of principles: Your *public law is nothing to me;* I do not know what it is. What store do you think I set on your parchments and your treaties.

The remedy for the aggressive conduct of Russia and Prussia could only be the alliance of England and Austria with France. Prince Talleyrand offered this alliance, but it was long before Lord Casdereagh could reconcile himself to a proceeding so contrary to English prejudices. At last however, being roused by an indignity offered to the King of Saxony by the Russian Government in the name of England, he yielded to the arguments of the French Plenipotentiary, who thus describes the conversation:—

C. A Convention? It is then an alliance which you propose?

T. This Convention may very well be made without an alliance; but it shall be an alliance if you wish it. For my part I have no repugnance to it.

C. But an alliance supposes a war to which it may lead, and we ought to do everything to avoid war.

T. I think with yon; we must do everything short of *sacrificing honor, justice, and the future of Europe*.

C. War would be seen amongst us with an evil eye.

T. The war would be popular with you, if you were to give it a grand aim—an aim truly European,

C. What would this aim be?

T. The re-establishment of Poland."

We have now got the history of the secret treaty of England, France, and Austria against Russia of the 3rd

January, 1815. We now learn at once what Talleyrand was, and what a single man could do.

Russia parried the blow by *letting Napoleon loose from Elba*. After the gunpowder had been burnt at Waterloo, in which battle *not a Russian soldier teas engaged*, Russia took measures for the security of her own future ambition by causing the Allies to remit four millions of the French Indemnity on condition of excluding Prince Talleyrand from the French Foreign Office.
(Anon.)

National and Personal Villany.

"WHEN anything had to be gained by villany Englishmen were not a whit behind the foremost of the Russians." Thus spoke Sir George Sinclair. There is this difference however, that the villany of the Russians is for their country's profit—the villany of the English for their own profit. Oude afforded various kinds of pickings to various individuals; but it was anything but for the profit of England that Oude should be distracted and unhappy, dismembered and annexed.

Constitutions.

THE constitution of every country is that which is unwritten; for the first enacted laws only mark the incipient abbreviations. When these accumulate, come reforms having reference to special wrongs. Constitutions cannot be propagated like trees by slips, nor like lettuces by seed. You may make drawings of a machine and construct another like it, but you cannot so fashion men. You may run metal into a mould, but you cannot cast a nation. It would be wiser, less foolish, and as judicious to substitute the language of one country for another, and as practicable too, as to replace the customs of the one by the constitution of another. Spain has been crushed by having foreign constitutions forced upon her. A Spanish lady, having heard the conversation of some Spanish "politicians," remarked after they had gone—" I do not see why we should do for a nation what it would be absurd to do in a family—for nations are only many families. If things went wrong in this house, I should have to put them in order—not to copy what next door had been done for some other purpose. What is good is good for itself, and I am a fool if I have to borrow it."

English Constitution.

BY the constitution of England the government is vested in the Crown to be exercised with the advice of the Privy Council. The Cabinet Council is unknown to the Constitution, and is a glaring usurpation to render Ministers irresponsible. No Minister could justify under its powers, and no court of law recognise its acts. Individual ministers are separately responsible.
(Westmacott.)

I always regarded with distrust extemporised constitutions. Time and a good providence made constitutions and empires. Self-satisfied and arrogant men thought they could strike out a constitution at a heat that would secure the happiness of millions of their fellow-creatures, but Providence baffled the designs of these small minds.
(Lord Ellenborough.)

Who are the Centralist's?

IT is unfortunate that the theorists of Radical Reform have so largely played the game of Absolutism. It is hard to say whether Jeremy Bentham or the Emperor Joseph the Second, the French Revolutionists or Louis the Fourteenth were the greater Centralisers. Socratcs and Plato held, in common with Bentham, that a nation ought to be governed by a set of *functionaries*, and that all the rest had nothing to do but *pay tribute and obey*. In the cultivated ranks those who are not stupefied by the opium of Bentham are too often made giddy by the champagne of Plato. But, disguise it as one will, *selfishness* and *materialism* is the result.

The higher science of politics, which rises above Politicial Economy, is never really able to direct the channels of employment; its more important function is—*To impart moral character—sanction moral relations*—and *claim the performance of relative duties*, in all the *existing* and *tolerated* forms of social life. And in this consists the Organisation of States.
(Prof. Newman.)

Life Education.

MUCH good may be done by the improvement of Schools, if people would leave their sons longer at them;

but this is of secondary importance to the education gained in life itself at an age when a manly mind and manly energy are brought to topics of real interest. The Americans can rise from the lowest condition to the head of the republic; so little necessary in the nature of things is our slavelike degradation of the poor.

In old days, every Statute of Parliament was read aloud to the people assembled in the *monthly* Shiremote, that all the laws might be known to those who had to obey them. What a school of life was that! Ten times over worth all the much pervaded schools of modern days! Of course the Acts of Parliament were then short and intelligible, and dealt in principles; they were *written for common men, not for lawyers*.

But without more leisure free institutions remain mere shadows or screens; and a magnificent national literature will not save the mass of the people from barbarism.
(Professor Newman.)

Man.

MAN as God has made him is the most perfect of God's works. I do not believe that God requires that a man be just without giving him the faculty of being so. "Why, even of yourselves know ye not that which is just," says Christ. Man is above his own conception. Men as they actually exist are to be found in their habits, their passions, and their recollections. The other part, which is the man himself, is as if it did not exist.
(Urquhart.)

Gleanings.

The gambler is invariably a bad husband, a bad father, a bad son, a bad brother, and a bad friend. Let his play be ever so fair, as it is called, the demon of selfishness and avarice besets him as a hurtful disease, and he is from that moment a useless pest upon earth, a curse to himself, his country, and his connections.

When Aristides was hearing a complaint, the plaintiff stilted the injuries which his opponent had committed against Aristides. "Mention the wrongs which you have received," replied the equitable judge; "I sit here as judge, and the lawsuit is yours, not mine."

The claim of the poor to be employed and maintained is an indefeasible right, growing out of every state of society where the soil is private property.

The fairest productions of human wit after a few perusals, like gathered flowers, wither in our hands and lose their fragrancy; but the unfading plan's of our Liturgy become as we are more accustomed to them still more and more beautiful; their bloom appears to be daily heightened, fresh odors are emitted and new sweets are extracted from them. He who has once tasted their excellencies will desire to taste them again, and he who tastes them oftenest will relish them best.

Speaking of the writers in newspapers, Burke said "we know of no public to which we are accountable, because it is a vague name; and a sort of fictitious tribunal before which we can never be acquitted."

France spewed out Rousseau, and England (whither he had flown) licked up the vomit.

A church without a steeple is an anomaly in building; it is a violation of propriety.

It was formerly usual with Justices of Assize to hold their meetings in the open streets. Our nearer ancestors improved upon this practice so far as to remove the Courts to an inn, of which *amerlioration* the following account is given:—"The Justices of the Peace for the county of Middlesex were accustomed to meet at a common inn, very inconveniently, being annoyed with carriers and many other sorts of people." As late as 1830 the Quarter Sessions and Small Debt Courts were held in inns in country towns.

The Duke of Wellington stated that England had never done anything great except by insubordination.

M. Theirs wrote that "Urquhart is the historian of the future."

The Purple Blood of "Holy Russia."

PETER THE GREAT was succeeded by his grandson Peter the Second, son of Alexis, offspring of his first marriage. Ill's two daughters, Anna and Elizabeth, were illegitimate, Peter having had another wife and Catherine another husband at the time of their birth.

Peter the Second was succeeded by Anne, second daughter of Ivan the Third, elder brother of Peter the Great, her elder sister being passed over.

On the death of Anno the infant grandson of this elder sister, was proclaimed by the title of Ivan the Fourth. The revolution of Lestocq, 6 December 1741, consigned Ivan the Fourth to a dungeon at the age of fifteen months; from which he was only liberated in 1764, when Catherine the Second put him to death exactly two years and one day after the murder of her own husband.

Ivan was deposed to make way for Elizabeth, the youngest daughter of Peter the Great; the son of the eldest daughter, afterwards Peter the Third, being passed by. It is therefore evident that hereditary right was held of

very little account; the cabinet appointed the sovereign at their discretion.

Elizabeth was raised to the throne in December 1741. On 18 November 1742, Peter, being fourteen years of age, and having publicly adopted the Russo-Greek religion, was proclaimed Grandduke, Imperial Highness, and successor to the throne; to which, if he had any claim at all, he had a title prior to that of the reigning empress.

The gross debaucheries of Elizabeth, who could scarcely be got to attend to the necessary routine of business, were well suited to the requirements of a cabinet not yet strong enough to impose a yoke upon a sovereign of capacity. Means were taken to prevent Peter from acquiring the habits or the knowledge fitted for his station. A wife was however sought for him, who combined the depravity of Elizabeth with the talents necessary for an intelligent instrument. The Princess Sophia of Anhalt Zerbst repaired to Saint Petersburg in 1747, and was married to Peter, having been baptised in the Russian church as Catherine-Alexievna.

The marriage appearing likely to be unfruitful, a lover was provided for Catherine, and Soltikoff became the father of the future Emperor Paul. No sooner was the child born than Soltikoff was sent out of Russia, first as envoy-extra-ordinary to Stockholm to announce the birth of the young prince, and then as minister-plenipotentiary to Hamburg. This was in 1754. Three or four years afterwards (for dates differ) Catherine was delivered of a daughter, who lived only fifteen months, and whose paternity was attributed to Poniatowsky, afterwards king of Poland.

On the 5th of January 1762, Peter the Third was pro-claimed emperor. On the 9th of July he was dethroned by his wife. On the 17th of July he was put to death.

Catherine, a German descended from a Holstein family, and therefore a foreigner, with a son known to be spurious, with talents for government rare in either sex, and with habits such as are forbidden in every other court in Europe, was exactly the instrument which the Russian cabinet required to consolidate their power. She died a natural death on the 17th of November 1796, being, as is believed, the last Russian sovereign who has done so.

The Russian royal family are thus bred, trained, and slaughtered like horses or hounds. Such is the family which is now doubly allied to England—directly through the descendants not of Romanoff but Soltikoff, and indirectly through the usurping King of Denmark.

In the design of universal empire it is a vast step to ally in one family—Denmark, that is, the Sound; Greece assaulting the Dardanelles; Sweden, whose royal family bids fair to be shortly extinct; England, the neighbor of Russia and as yet her necessary prop; and Russia herself, who is to utilise all these acquisitions.

Russia has nothing to fear from the Church or the Parliament or the Press of England, and very little from her People. The one obstacle in her path has been the patriotism and courage of the QUEEN. This obstacle for the next reign appears to have been converted into a weapon by the marriage of the Prince of Wales to the sister of the future Czarina.

(Anon. 1864.)

"Let us make a Free Queen."

THE SIGN MANUAL ACT is passed on the grounds that it does not signify who signs Military Commissions. If it does not signify, why is the Bill introduced? The Bill was entitled Officers' Commission Bill. The selection of that title has been the result of considerable care, and shows the purpose of concealment. The interference with the Prerogative is kept out of view. Not a member of either house ever asked whether the proposal came from the Queen. Not a member of either house ever asked whether it came from the Horso Guards. They did not even venture to ask whether the Queen or the Commander-in-Chief had knowledge of this Bill.

Why these questions were not publicly put is explained 'by the substitution amongst political men of what is called "Reason of State" for sense, honor, and patriotism. "Reasons of State" means the purpose of destroying the Laws and Institutions for the benefit of the persons who possess what is called "power," or who aspire to possessing it.

Up to the present hour the Queen has refused the Sign-Manual to the Declaration of Paris which deprived England of her material strength. *The Sign-Manual must therefore he made to appear to be, and to be in effect of no value*.

The Ministers of the King were the servants of the King, hut the Ministers of our Queen are not so; being imposed on her by the House, they are her masters. She has no means of communicating with her Parliament but through them, nor indeed with her people. Those who have in vain petitioned against this Bill during its progress through both Houses are now petitioning the Queen to refuse her assent to it; but those petitions can only reach her through the very persons whose conduct they denounce.

VICTORIA, be it remembered, is the first English Sovereign whose dependence upon the *Parliamentary-appointed Ministers* is thus absolute. Because she is the first who was deprived of a permanent Private Secretary belonging to neither party; this being arranged between the leaders of the two factions on her

accession, and therefore when too inexperienced to understand the meaning of it. Her husband was afterwards supposed to fulfil that office for her. Now that he is no more, the words Private Secretary has been again heard of, but in a very different sense, namely, as being appointed by Lord Palmerston.

It has therefore become the duty of both houses of Parliament *to protect the Queen from her Ministers*. Unless they do so, the station of Sovereign of these realms becomes a slavery more bitter and more degrading than has ever yet fallen to the lot of human being.

The Queen, it must be recollected, is a human being, and not an autonomon. She has, in the highest sense, to participate in the performance of every administrative function. These take their being in and are constituted solely by the operation of her will. And yet she is debarred—absolutely debarred—from every faculty enjoyed by and every duty enjoined on every co-existent individual throughout the Empire. She is to have the benefits of the counsel of no fellow-creature. She is debarred from the entertaining of any opinion. There is no coolie transported to the west—there is no slave working in a sugar-pluntahon, in such a predicament.

The person thus circumstanced is one of exquisite sensibility, extensive knowledge, indomitable industry, and inflicted—as it must be said under the circumstances—with a conscientious sense of the importance of her duties, and the most affectionate regard for the welfare of her people. *Standing amidst the surrounding corruption a phenomenon.*

The contemplation of this position to those of a finer temper, and approaching her near enough to observe it, has unfortunately not the effect of nerving them for an effort to obtain freedom for their QUEEN. It merely frightens them from the subject; for not having framed the purpose of making a FREE QUEEN, they resign themselves to accepting things as they are, as the only alternative to the other course—Revolution.

If you had a Revolution, you would only have to come back to what is now proposed to you to prevent a Revolution. You would have to respect the personality of a President. A Congress legislating on the Sign-Manual is capable of extinguishing a Republic as well as a Monarchy.

By destroying the East India Company the rights of the people and the princes of India are extinguished. Those sovereigns have been mediatised by converting them into subjects of Queen Victoria. Meanwhile that Sovereign has been reduced below their level; for allowing them palaces and revenues, they are remitted from functions, whilst is required from our Queen a nominal and lying participation in the acts to which she is constrained, and the nominal conferring by her of the offices of trust upon individuals whom *she knows and abhors*.

"Let us make a free Queen!"
(Anon. 1862.)

Maria-Theresa an I Poland.

THE Empress in 1772 wrote as follows on the partition of Tolaud:—

"The Empress-Queen to Prince Kaunitz—When all my lands were invaded, and when I did not even know where I could in quiet give birth to my child, then I firmly relied on my own good right and on the help of God. But in this present affair, when public law is clearly against us—when against us also are all justice and sound reason, I must own that never in my whole life before did I feel so anxious, and that I am ashamed to let myself be seen. Let the Prince consider what an example we shall be giving to the whole world, if for a wretched piece of Poland or Wallachia we give up our honor and fair fame. I fairly perceive that I stand alone, and am no longer in vigor; therefore I let things, but not without the greatest grief, go their own way."

To the draft of the first Partition Treaty the following was appended:—

"Placet: Because so many great and learned men will have it so; but long after I am dead and gone people will see what will happen from having broken through everything that has hitherto been held holy and just.—MAKIA-THERESA."

On this, her contemporary King of Spain uttered the following words:—" From the Czar of Muscovy, from the King of Prussia, such an act is not surprising; but I did not expect such blindness and such perfidy from the Empress-Queen."

The Sultan and Kossuth.

WHEN Kossuth took refuge on Ottoman soil, two powerful empires demanded his surrender. Abdul Medjid was in council when informed that such a demand was about to be made. He rose from the divan and uttered these unpremeditated words:—

"Shall I, who am master of the empire, be denied the right of refuge, which I cannot refuse to the meanest of my subjects in the case even of a cnlprit? Sooner let the empire perish!"

This was after Kossuth had written:—"Should Russia not believe we are to be conquered so easily, we are

ready, rather than come under Austrian rule, to fling ourselves with all our force, which is not insignificant, on Turkey and Wallachia, and set the East in a blaze."

Freetrade and Direct Taxation.

NOW I tell you that that which is interesting to you is, that *taxes shall fall upon property*, and that *commerce shall be free*. Whoever has spoken to you of freetrade without proposing other sources of revenue is a man that speaks that which is dishonest; you cannot repeal taxes upon commerce unless you place taxes upon property; and the object of my political life is that which I have now expressed, namely, to bring the higher classes to sec that they themselves must bear the burden, and the lower that their only refuge is the emancipation of their own industry from undue burden of taxation.

I reassert—making it still more distinct that you may comprehend it—that the cause of your complications in England—the cause of your political dissensions—the cause of the absence of social affections—the cause of all confusion and of the absence of political wisdom and unity, arises solely from this—That taxes are no longer collected upon property, but have been confided to the collectors of customs and excise.

The antient habits of England were different. In England formerly *every Borough imposed its own taxes*, and connected in one body of united discipline the sovereign of the state with his lowest subject. Until that condition is restored there will be no peace and no prosperity for England.
(D. Urqahart, M.P. for Stafford 1841.)

Cromwell and the Jews.

PERHAPS the attention of Cromwell to the Old Testament influenced him in bringing back the Jews to England. The consequence was that the Asiatic Jews sent to England Rabbi Jacob Ben Azahel and others to inquire whether Cromwell was not the Messiah who had been long expected, and whether he was not descended from a Jewish family. Cromwell saw that this opinion was not likely to suit the saints of the day, and dismissed the Jews hastily.

The lawyers were for receiving them with civil privileges, the citizens indifferent, the clergy hostile, and the wily usurper with great dexterity preserved his own autocracy by professing that his conscienoe was troubled with the question, and that he must seek the Lord to know what it was best for him to do. He died soon afterwards, and it is not unlikely that he would have done nothing more to serve them. (Ellis.")

Local Self government.

A MOMENT'S consideration will show you that there can be no comparison between the settling of local rates and the settling of general rates; and yet both is the business of the borough. The one is its business by itself within its own boundaries; the other is its business with the rest of the *boroughs in Parliament assembled*. That general business was not more difficult than the local one when it was under-stood by all and determined by common consent; and while that business of the borough was maintained—and it was maintained during a long course of centuries—the business of England was managed with great success, maintained in extreme simplicity; contentions for the crown even did net lead to any change of principle or law; the victories gained upon our fields—our many and sanguinary battlefields—never enabled a class or a king, a doctrine or a principle, to prevail over the laws of England; the armies disbanded as soon as they were victorious—no loans ever contracted to maintain them—no debt incurred to disband them. And throughout these vicissitudes that fundamentol right of the constitution was maintained, which is in fact the constitution of England—*That none should be bound to pay unless they gave their consent*.

Such was the fruit of managing your own public affairs in the borough. I do not use the word "none" as applied individually but collectively. I mean by "none" no "commune" (a Norman term for "borough"—the "commons" means the "boroughs").

The doctrine of the connection of taxation and representation has been perverted by substituting the *individual* for the *corporate* body. This lies at the bottom of all that reforming mania which has corrupted instead of restoring the State, and debased instead of instructing the individuals who compose it.

None were bound to pay except those who had consented. That cannot be individually—it is absurd and impracticable; but how clear does the meaning and the law come out when applied to the communes; that is, the estates—the parts of the realm—the integers of which the kingdom was the multiple.

The boroughs could not be called upon to furnish aids to the crown unless they had themselves specifically consented; and to obtain this the king summoned their representatives to parliament. Those representatives went *charged with the decision of the community*. It was not pledges they gave upon abstract propositions; it was not pledges which were exacted to vote in this way or that upon some theoretical proposition.

The knights of the shire or the burgesses carried the verdict of the community upon some matter of fact; its decision upon some matter of business—a war, a treaty, or any other cause of expenditure, or its claim for redress of grievance. The last was the condition of the aid. It was so because they knew the remedy.

This was the business of the community then; and so long as they attended to that business, no theoretical discussion could arise, for the affairs of state were well managed.
(D. Urquhart, M.P. for Stafford 1848.)

"I am holier than thou"

It is not too much to say of many socalled religious works that their tenor is frequently such as is calculated to excite and warm the feelings and imagination at the expense of ' reason; that they tend to raise a degree of presumption and assurance in the breast of the reader as to his spiritual condition inconsistent with that profound humility which is the foundation of our religion; that, instead of improving his conduct in his intercourse with his fellow-creatures, their tendency is to incline him to an uncharitable, not to say arrogant, comparison of himself with others, and to exclaim with the self-sufficient Pharisee, "God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are!" or with the proud hypocrite described by the prophet Isaiah, who saith, "Stand by thyself, come not near mo, for I am holier than thou! "That they indispose him to listen with the deep attention which the words demand to the direction of the Apostle "to work his salvation with fear and trembling;" that by the use of familiar phrases and the affected application of scriptural terms, they degrade in many instances the awful subject of which they treat. . . .

While the conflict of feeling and opinion goes on the mind becomes a chaos of confused notions respecting the divine truths, a hypocritical profession of the Christian faith is quickly engendered; scepticism soon follows; and the end is a total rejection of the subject—a gradual lapse into infidelity—and at last a settled deism.
(Anon. 1827.)

The Doctor and his Patient.

Three faces wears the doctor: when first sought
An angels; and a god's the cure half wrought;
But when, that cure complete, he seeks his fee,
The devil looks less terrible than he.

THIS epigram of Codrus is illustrated by a conversation which passed between Dr Bouvart and a French Marquis whom he had attended during a long and severe indisposition. As he entered the chamber on a certain occasion he was thus addressed by his patient—

"Good day to you, Monsieur Bonvart; I feel quite in spirits, and think my fever has loft me."

"I am sure of it," replied the doctor; "the very first expression you used convinces me of it."

"Pray explain yourself."

"Nothing more easy. In the first days of your illness, when your life was in danger, I was your ' dearest friend;' as you began to get better, I was your 'good Bouvart;' and now I am 'Monsieur Bouvart;' depend upon it you are quite recovered."

Bouvart's observation was grounded on a knowledge of human nature; every day's experience shows that "accipedum dolet" should be the medical man's motto, particularly the more laborious branches of the profession, whose remuneration comes when the impressions of fear, hope, and gratitude are almost effaced, and who are thus often paid with indifference, hesitation, reluctance, and reproach. (Wadd.)

Restoration of Gibraltar to Spain.

VAIN as ever would it be to endeavor to make our many-headed multitude comprehend a truth that was plain enough to a certainly "truly British Minister" of a preceding age, namely, That Gibraltar is of no use to any power, except as a means of invading Spain. It does not command the strait of Gibraltar any more than the castle commands the strait of Dover.

If any Englishman wish to know the effect produced upon every Spaniard by our tenure of Gibraltar he has only to imagine the castle and works of Dover in the hands of the French. It would not give France the command of the channel; but it would give her the command of the metropolis. True it is that Spain had become inferior to England at sea before the latter had obtained possession of Gibraltar; but by the Declaration

of Paris England has *lost the command of the sea*. There is nothing now to prevent the French from retaining Dover should they once seize it.

It is admitted, even by Lord Palmerston, that it is desirable in any dispute with France to have the friendship of Spain. Napoleon, when asked why he did not take Gibraltar, replied that its possession by England secured her the undying hatred of Spain.

The restoration of Gibraltar as an act of justice without conditions would in like manner insure Spain's sincere gratitude, as pointed out by far wiser men than Mr Congreve, able though he be on that point; and therein he only follows the footsteps of him of the ' Pillars of Hercules' (Urquhart.)

This restoration would be equivalent at least to a force of twenty thousand men, and it would save the annual expense of keeping up Gibraltar. It would not be an act of aggression against France, since it would be only restoring to Spain her own territory; or, as the French would say, her natural boundaries.

Gibraltar was ceded, it is true, by the treaty of Utrecht; but that does not cover the vice of the original capture. It was captured in the name of Charles the Third, and fraudulently transferred to Great Britain. Chatham sought in vain a favorable opportunity of redeeming the national honor by giving it up, but "public opinion" was too strong for him.
(Anon. 1862.)

Gleanings.

A tradesman in a country town told the curate that he meant to make a "scholar" of his boy—" I mean to give him a year's Latin."

No amusements are more easily attainable, and attended with more solid satisfaction than the amusements of literature.

Sir W. Temple said that the two common thrones to which most men offer up the application of their thoughts and lives are profit and pleasure; and by their devotions to either of these they are vulgarly distinguished into two sects, and called either busy or idle men. Whether these terms differ in meaning or only in sound I know may be disputed with appearance enough, since the covetous man takes as much pleasure in his gains as the voluptuous does in his luxury.

It is difficult to be attached to the common objects of human pursuits without feeling sordid cares and troublesome passions. But in the pursuit of learning all is liberal, noble, generous.

Gibbon states that not more than one in one hundred of the male population can be engaged in the profession of arms without wearing out the country.

What religion is a passenger found on board an English ship? Religion! they have nothing of the kind there; they only drink and swear.

The vulgar have ever elevated quacks above physicians, and given to fortunetellers and fanatics an influence over their minds which not even selfinterest, much less reason, can overcome.

The cross is a symbolic form far anterior to Christianity; and the two principal pagodas—those of Benares and Mathura—are built in the form of crosses. It was an emblem of universal nature—of that world to whose four quarters its diverging radii pointed.

Dr Lawrence states it as a fact that Charles James Fox recommended us to *beg* peace humbly from the French, by preambling that we had unjustly treated them in commencing the war; and "if they forgave us this time we would never do so again."

French vanity is proverbial. They despised tactics at Agincourt—climate at Moscow—bravery at Waterloo.

I harangued (said Cobbett) the electors of Dunfermline on the necessity of driving out of the door or tossing out of the window any candidate who, offering himself as their representative, should have the audacity to tell them that it was beneath him to pledge himself to do that which they wanted him to do for them.

Unequal connections commonly end in mutual disgust.

Never esteem men merely on account of their riches or their station. Respect goodness, find it where you may. Honor talent whenever you behold it unassociated with vice; but honor it most when accompanied with exertion, and especially when exerted in the cause of truth and justice; and above all things hold it in honor when it steps forward to protect defenceless innocence against the attacks of powerful guilt.

The parable of Dives and Lazarus lays no blame upon the rich man for the enjoyment of his riches, only for his unfeelingness.

How the People became taxed: Land Tenure.

THE illegal alienation of the Crown estates, partly by sale and partly by gift, is a scandalous chapter in English history. Against it the Parliament again and again protested, and often effected a resumption of the

estates. Richard the First, after selling some of them and using the purchase-money, took back the lands himself, alleging that the sale had been essentially beyond his power.

Howeyer, after the abbey-lands had been distributed among the aristocracy by Henry the Eighth, *Parliament was dumb*, so many having eaten the sop; and the alienation of Crown lands went on, until at last the *whole taxation* of the country (which ought now, as originally, to have been defrayed by *rent* of land) was shifted off on to *trade* and *industry*. The landholders passed laws to exempt themselves from feudal service, so as to hold their *rents for nothing*, and presented the king with a *tax on beer!*

It is strange to add that the commercial part of the community was so far from resisting or resenting this great financial revolution (which was really a gigantic fraud on the nation, and peculiarly on the towns) that they practically aided it, owing to their great desire to see land converted into a purely commercial article.

No sooner' has a man become wealthy in trade than he desires to become master of a landed estate by purchase.

But the old law did not allow a nobleman or baronet to sell his estate; for it was a fraud on his successors to take in *ready money the value of the land for ever!*

The conspiracy went on against the law for two or three centuries between impoverished landholders, wealthy merchants, and cunning attorneys; whose combined force, aided be the decision of judges, overturned the old feudal theory and worked into the English mind the *commercial idea of land*, something to be bought and sold freely in the market.

The barons' courts were suppressed by those of the king; the barons' soldiers were thought less trustworthy than an army raised by the king's own functionaries, and paid by money from the *Parliamentary taxes*.

Thenceforward the crown left off caring that a large num- ber of men serviceable for war should be sustained on ever estate; Henry the Seventh's parliaments aided the king policy of breaking entails: commercial notions of land prevailed, and in process of time landholders claimed a right to their estates as if no one else had a right in them.

To eject the population in mass is a very modern enormity It is thought peculiarly Irish; yet nowhere perhaps was? done more boldly, more causelessly, and more heartlessly than from the Sutherland estates of northern Scotland early in 1808. Between the years 1811 and 1820, 15,000 person were driven off the lands of the Marchioness of Stafford alone; all their villages were pulled down or burnt, and their fields turned into a pasturage. A like process was carried on about the same time by seven or eight neighboring lords, The human inhabitants were thus ejected in order that sheer might, take their place—*because some one had persuaded there great landholders that sheep would* PAY BETTER *than hum beings!*

We read how William the Conqueror burnt villages at ejected the people by hundreds in order to make a hunting ground in the New Forest. This deed, which has bee execrated by all who relate it, seemed an extreme of tyranny yet our courts of law and our parliaments allow the same thing to be done by smaller tyrants. And the public sits by and mourns to think that people deal so unkindly with that which is their *own*.

Here is the fundamental error—the crude and monstrous assumption that the land which God has given to our nation is or can be the private property of Anyone. It is a usurpation exactly similar to that of slavery. The slavemaster calls himself slaveowner, and pleads that he has purchased the slave, and that the law has pronounced slaves to be chattels.

We reply that the law is immoral and unjust, and that to one could sell what was not his own, and that no number of such sales can destroy the rights of man.

All this applies to land. The land was not regarded as private property by our old law; it is not to this day treated by the law on the same footing as moveables; and there ate many other persons who have rights in a piece of land besides him who gets rent from it. The lord of the manor has his dues, but this does not annihilate the claims of others. For land is not only a surface that pays rent, but a surface to five upon; and the law ought to have cared, and ought still to care, for those who need the land for life as much as for those who have inherited or bought a title to certain fruits from it.

Economists have accepted as *fact* the commercial doctrine of land. Their science is not to blame for it; but some of them, as individuals, are to blame for having so much sympathy with the rich and so little with the poor, as not to see the iniquity of such a state of things; but rather to panegyrise English industry as living under glorious advantages; where the laborer on the soil has no tenure in it—no direct and visible interest in its culture—no security that he may not be driven off from it in order to swell the rental of on who calls himself its owner.

(Prof. Newman.)

Colonial Land.

THE colonial land is avowedly a State possession. To grant it a away to individuals from favor is now at

length repudiated as a public profligacy; but *to sell* is thought to be a part of prudent statesmanship. What? To sell for the immeperpetual source of revenue in future centuries? This is a strange economy. But on first hearing it might be imagined this generation at any rate benefits by it if future ones suffer. By no means. The land is necessarily sold at a price so trifling that the colonies never pay their own expenses. Naturally it is impossible to *forestal* the value of land, although we know that it will increase hereafter with thee growth of population. Our practice of selling it alienates to individuals for ever, and for an insignificant sum pain down, the permanent heritage of great nations that are to be.

How much better are individuals in providing for their greatrandchildren! The holder of town land, when he greats a building lease, anxiously secures upon it shall be the property of his heits; and to this most unreasonable demand builders inumerable are found to agree cheerfully.

Yet the *State*, which calls itself "mother country," exercises no such foresight for the future welfare of the colonies when it might be done so easily. If, instead of selling the land for ever, they sold it for 100 years only, securing to the occupant an exclusive and unquestioned right to all house! and fixtures, which could be valued separately from the land, but securing the land itself to the State, no one could murmur at the arrangement.

"Heaven upon Earth."

THEY who have been accustomed to the woods in those parts of the temperate climates which border upon the tropics well know the fact that—what with being awoke by the rich piping of birds of every note and tunc, the inhaling of the serene cool air of the most delightful atmosphere on earth, with nature reposing around in stillness of beauty—there is an exhilarating sensation experienced which language cannot describe. It is as though the soul and body had at the moment reached perfect happiness, and no wish of earth or heaven was left ungratified. It is as if sin and sorrow were only a name, and the soul was pure of transgression.

There is no enjoyment on earth can surpass this feeling. Rising thus, it is not extraordinary that the temper should remain affected by it—that everything throughout the beautiful day which follows such a dawn so witnessed should cheer and gratify—that homely fare should be eaten with a zest at breakfast, and soul and body be happy. Those who rouse from soft beds in carpeted rooms, and in varying climes, know little of this most exquisite of earthly sensations.
(Captain Andrews.)

Disorganisation of "Civilised" Society.

BETWEEN moral beings all the intercourse of life ought to tend towards moral union, by which the lowest dealings are elevated. It is the specific duty of the Ruler to promote moral unions, and with a view to them, to sanction permanent relations in various ways.

Of these, that with which all civilisation begins is *marriage*. To be without this is to be lower than the lowest savages now known; yet, marvellous to say, this (with the kinsman-ship rising out of it) is fast becoming the only permanent relation in cultivated England—so grievously disorganised are we—so deplorably has the temporal power forgot its moral mission.

All know that the sanctity of marriage depends upon its permanence; and the same is true of all other relations. But nearly all these are apt to be dissolved by change of place; hence a flitting population loses internal coherence, The masses which meet externally in large towns have lost all *organisation;* they have no fixed moral unions with any part of the community except the narrowest ties of famify life.

Nearly the same is true of all ranks in large towns; hence a selfishness which barely extends beyond the family circle is a prevalent type of character: and this is a precursor of dissolution in society, which is relapsing into a disorganisation similar to that of primitive barbarism.
(Prof. Newman.)

Laws and Customs.

THE laws and customs of a country show clearly what was the manner of living and the occupation of the original inhabitants of it.

Thus where we find that the eldest sons succeed to the whole or greatest part of the estate, we may be sure that we see traces of feudal notions of a military life and a monarchical government, in which a prince is better served by one powerful vassal than by several weak ones. [Primogeniture.]

When the children succeed equally, it is a mark of a state having been addicted to husbandry, and inclined to a popular equal government. [Gavelkind.]

And where the youngest succeeds we may take it for granted that the people formerly lived a pastoral and wandering life, in which it is natural for the eldest to be provided for and disposed of the first, and the youngest

to take what is left—a manner of life which requires and admits of little or no regular government. [Borough English.]
(Brierly.)

Delusion of Ironplaled Ships.

THE inutility of floating hemp and timber is demonstrated across the Atlantic [Civil War in America]. The 'Times' now seizes the occasion to din into the ears of the nation that their maritime supremacy is gone from another cause than the giving up the Right of Search by the Government (not by the Queen), namely, *nonsheathing*.

I have for years been uttering these two propositions:—

- *In no serious tear will line-of-battle ships he again employed*.

This is now understood not, to enlighten, but to bewilder.

- *Seaflghts will be determined by Hansom-cabs afloat*.

This is not yet understood—it will be understood in time. It is redhot shot sent from invisible points that will drive the line-of-battle ships from the ocean.

This change in maritime warfare is all in our favor; while the discovery of the inutility of timber, pitch, and canvass would, for a rational being, blow away the solitary pretext for the giving up the Right of Search and Privateering—namely, that "in line-of-battle ships resides our maritime strength."
(Urquhart, 1862.)

The Days of the Week.

THE Roman calendar presents us with the Dies Solis, Lunæ, Martis, Mercurii, Jovis, Veneris, and Saturni. It is worthy of observation that these planets, to which *all the nations* of the earth dedicated their days of the week, had Celtic names and were Celtic gods. The Celtic name for day was *Di*, and the Sanscrit name *Divos*; and the name for Sunday *Die-sul*, the last syllable denoting the Sun, from which the Romans had their Sol, and not, as they absurdly imagined, from the word *solus*, alone; for surely a body accompanied by a number of planets, as they well knew, could not be called alone. The second was from the word *Lun*, the Moon, from which the Latins made *Luna*. The third day of the Celts was *Die-meurs* or *Di-mers*, whence came the Mamers and Mars of the Subines and Osci. The fourth day was *Di-mercher*, the Mercury of the Gauls. The fifth clay was *Die-Jou*, whence the Romans got their Dies-Jovis, Di-Jou-Pater. Their sixth day was *Di-Guener* or *Di-Wener*, whence the Dies Veneris. And lastly, their *Di-Sadorn* was the Dies Saturni.

The Romans thus received and retained this truly antient Celtic arrangement of days. Had it been of their own institution they had doubtlessly assigned the *first* day to the great Jupiter, the "Hominum Pater atque Deorum." It is an extraordinary coincidence that the days of the week in *all* languages are derived from the names of the planets, and retain the same order, the Sun giving name to the *first* day.
(Higgins.)

The Story of the Greased Cartridges.

THE Brahmin carried the story of the greased cartridges to his comrades, and it was soon known to every Sepoy at the depot. A shudder ran through the lines. Each man to "whom the story was told caught the great fear from his neighbor, and trembled at the thought of the pollution that lay before him. The contamination was to be brought to his very lips; it was not merely to be touched—it was to be eaten and absorbed into his very being. It was so very terrible a thing, that if the most malignant enemies of the British government had sat in conclave for years, and brought an excess of devilish ingenuity to bear upon the invention of a scheme framed with the design of alarming the Sepoy mind from one end of India to the other, they could not have devised a he better suited to the purpose. But now the English themselves had placed in the hands of their enemies not a fiction, but a fact of tremendous significance, to be turned against them as a deadly instrument of destruction. It was the very thing that had been so long sought, and up to this time sought in vain. It required no explanation. It needed no ingenious gloss to make the full force of the thing itself patient to the multitude. It was not a suggestion—an infer-once—a probability, but demonstrative fact, so complete in its naked truth that no exaggeration could have helped it. Like the case of the leathern headdresses which had con- vulsed Southern India half a century before [Velore mutiny] it appealed to the strongest feelings both of the Mahometan and Hindoo; but though similar in kind, it was incomparably more offensive in degree, more insulting, more appalling, more disgusting,
(Kaye.)

Two Pictures in One Frame—Organ of Public Opinion.

PUBLIC OPINION must have been somewhat puzzled on the 28th September I860, to know how to shape its conversation for the day, after reading the following 'identity of contraries' The 'Times,' like the proverbial showman, may well say, "Whichever you like," etc.

This immense mass (the Russian Empire) is the product of acquisition and attraction perpetually going on. Towards the West, conquest and diplomacy have been employed; towards the East, conquest and *civilisation*.

Say what we will or prophesy as we may, it is not to he denied that all the progress of Russia in the East is mainly that progress which, as we have found, is almost inevitably forced upon a *superior race* in contact with semisavagos or *barbarians*.—Times, Sept. 28, 1860.

It is not a paradox to say that if Russia became *more enlightened* she would become less powerful. Something of the barbarian element is required in a conquering race. To make the people a perfect instrument in the hands of their ruler, they must be partly *fanatics* or partly *slaves*.

The conquests of more *civilised* nations may be more rapid, but they are less durable.

The brave, stolid, passive, superstitious Russian has been the true unit of that power which has created the empire. Make him a reasoning, independent, or capricious thinker, and the power is gone.—Times, Sept. 28, 1860.

The Turkish empire was formed in a comparatively *short* period by an overwhelming torrent of armed fanatics, and it represents at this day only an aggregate of regions on which the descendants of the conquerors are encamped.—Times, Sept. 28, 1860.

Libraries in Constantinople.

THERE are *thirty five* public libraries at Constantinople—one at every imperial mosque. They are built with taste and elegance, and contain from one thousand to five thousand volumes, bound neatly in red, green, or black morocco. Excepting on Tuesdays and Fridays these libraries remain open to the public at all times of the year. Each library is under the care of three or four librarians (Hafiz Kutub), who spend the day here, and receive most politely whoever enters.; Everybody is permitted to use what book he pleases to make I extracts or even copy the whole book, provided it is done I in the library. At each of these libraries a very exact catalogue of the books is kept, containing the title and subject of every volume. The Sultan's library contains about fifteen thousand volumes.

This was in 1828, when a free library was unknown in England, or perhaps throughout western or "civilised" Europe.

A popular M.P. on the People and their Idol

To Mr Crawshay—With regard to the Prime Minister (Lord Palmerston) he knows the ignorance and the foibles of the people, and suits himself to them. That his is an *impostor* is evident enough, but to expose him does nothing. He is to the middle classes what Feargus O'Connor was to the working classes, and I wish them joy of him.—John Bright, Rochdale, 25 September 1855.

To Mr Bright—You observe with respect to the Prime Minister, "That he is an impostor is evident enough, but to expose him does nothing." May I beg of you to ask yourself the question how far such a description may not be justly applied to a Member of Parliament who can hold such language?—George Crawshay, Gateshead, 2 October 1855.

To Mr Crawshay—To expose the Minister is nothing so long as the people are a prey to the delusions through which he practises upon them. He is the proper ruler of a nation arrogant and intoxicated; and so long as the present temper of the people is maintained they have the government they most deserve.—John Bright, 3 October 1855.

Savingsbanks—Clubs.

AT present nothing so keeps down our lowest laborers as the want of investments for their savings. To employ these the wellmeant institution of Savingsbanks has been devised; which must necessarily prove less efficient in proportion as the scale of operation enlarges.

My inquiry is not whether individuals should use it in the defect of anything better; perhaps they ought: but my inquiry is whether the Government should establish and support the system.

The [first question is—Whence is the means of paying interest to be got except by taxing the people?

The answer which will be given is—That the money paid into the savingsbanks may be invested in

purchasing shares in the National Debt; consequently, if the debt be estimated at £750,000,000 no difficulty is encountered as long as the total accumulated in the savingsbanks is less than this sum. The Government does but pay to the depositors the yearly interest which otherwise some other parties would have received.

It is true that the deposits of the banks are paid over to the commissioners for reducing the debt; and as long as the sum is under £100,000,000 the public will perhaps remain blind that there is a powerful agent for artificially buying up the value of government securities, and riveting this noxious system more firmly than ever on the nation.

Parliament has agreed to allow to these banks £3 16s. per cent, yearly. A State which is now so hopelessly in debt that it will make no vigorous effort for relief to plunge itself into a voluntary guarantee of £3 16s. per cent, for whatever sums the industrious classes may choose to intrust it with seems like an infatuation. What else is it but to volunteer to become a borrower of *any* number of additional millions, with the further embarrassment of being liable to pay to the depositors any sums at call? If a panic arose which caused a run on these banks the government must of necessity refuse payment.

Many years ago a system was in operation which was called the "Sinkingfund," intended to lessen the national debt. This was at last destroyed by Parliament on finding that it had simply caused a new loss of £11,000,000!

There is a feeling of misgiving as to the modern Commissioners for Reducing the National Debt, to whom the money of the savingsbanks is intrusted. Of course they do as they are bid—that is not the point; but possibly when this matter some years hence is closely looked into it may appear that the savingsbanks have cost the nation a second £11,000,000!

The whole idea is preposterous and ruinous of the State finding investments for individuals. It is an idea which never could have been conceived except where the vastness of *Centralisation* and the entanglement of an *artificial system of revenue* darken men's view of natural tendencies.

People seem to forget that the annual taxes must be paid out of annual skill and industry, and that Parliament has no fertile farm where sovereigns will grow into guineas of themselves. If a law of "commandite" was passed I cannot but think it would be a most wholesome thing to enact, That within five years' time the whole money of the savingsbanks be repaid to the depositors, and the *system totally destroyed*.

If our operatives were once accustomed to invest their savings in their masters' trade—nay, or even in other trades by the side of it—there is no reason why everyone who was moral and prudent and enjoyed good health should not by the ago of thirty be a little capitalist.

All wellbeing tends to its own increase: better education, better habits, more knowledge, sounder sense, would all grow together. Moreover when the workman began to receive visible gains from capital they would rapidly leave off their grudge against capitalists, and the feud of the orders would come to an end.

The Ciubs might survive, but be directed to far better ends, especially if they elected rich men to be their treasurers, and admitted all persons of the same locality without reference to trade or station. But in all these matters they must fight their own battles and win their own happiness. They repudiate advice as dictation; other orders therefore must be satisfied with securing that there be nothing in the public enactments to perpetuate the wilfulness and misery of this class.
(Professor F. W. Newman.)

Gleanings.

Major Cartwright said that the abominable stupidity and waste of time in teadrinking is enough to give one a surfeit of town life.

Sir Gervase Clifton, of Allwoodby, Yorkshire, who died in 1666, outdid "bluff Hall" in the number of his wives; for whereas the king had wedded three Kates, two Nans, and one dear Jane, this baronet had three honorables, three right-worshipfuls, and one well-beloved wife.

The Earl of Morion introduced the gibbetaxe into Scotland, and suffered by it himself in 1581. From this machine the French guillotine seems to have been copied.

Many selfrighteous people have no ostensible enjoyments; their pleasures are private, comfortable, and gross,

The celebrated Duke of Marlborough could not write English; but he was outdone by another famous general but wretched scholar, Sir Robert Shirley, who confessed in a letter that he had "not the pen of Sissero" (Cicero).

A dinner was served to James the First by the East India Company 1609-10, in "fine *china* dishes, which were freely permitted to be carried away by all persons."

For the clergy to be popular, they have only to be eloquent in their sermons, correct in their morals, philanthropic in sentiments, meek in their manners, and charitable in their actions.

Contrary to what you now do, purify your hearts, rectify your dispositions, make clean all within; give alms from right motives; and behold, take notice, all things are clean unto you.

Piety is only beneficial when it is rational; rational piety is the only mode of professing genuine Christianity.

Temporal enjoyments are not prohibited, if they are accompanied with innocence and charity.

The same qualifications nowadays (said Burke, 1773) make a good member of parliament that formerly made a good monk—Praise the Minister, read the lesson he sets you, *taliter qualiter*, and let the State take care of itself.

I know the weight of public opinion in England (said a Russian ambassador), and I have seen it change in a few days.

"A Heap of Sand:" Centralisation.

IN politics the difficulty often is not to find the true remedy, but to induce the patient to swallow it. It seems clear enough what is the primary cause of the nation becoming as a heap of sand, namely, the *loss of local patriotism*, which has followed on the *decay of local liberties* by the development of *centralisation*.

Every town and every county ought to have the feelings of a little state—*as it once had*, History for many centuries shows that this is quite consistent with the existence of a central power—a Crown and Parliament—for all purposes *truly national;* and if the action of the central power were strictly limited to such things the provinces would more than ever have abundant room for high ambition.

Of all this we still have in the modern world an example in the United States. Hungary also is a magnificent instance of the patriotism, energy, and national wellbeing which a sound system of local selfgovernment keeps up under every possible disadvantage: isolation from the rest of Europe, mixture of heterogeneous races, and the perpetual plotting of the court against the welfare and freedom of the land.

This is a sufficient defence against the reproach of vainly longing after "antiquated institutions," when we point to the energetic local authorities of past centuries.
(Newman.)

Decay of Local Patriotism.

THIS disease rises out of the fact that Parliament, instead of being supported and aided by the Provincial Legislatures, has practically *swallowed them up*—has so drained their powers that the wealthy, cultivated, and ambitious disdain a seat in them, and the lower people despise the Provincial Franchise.

The introducing of *private bills* into Parliament is an invasion which has destroyed the dignity and independence of the Provinces.

To illustrate this, consider what would be the process of a bill for making a railroad if the Provinces had their due powers. A short petition might first be laid before the Lords or Commons, asking leave to make a railroad say from London to Birmingham. If no objectfon were urged to the *principle*, the proposal would be laid before every County and Town legislature concerned in the rail, with this preliminary approval to back it; and the *details* of the road would be settled by the separate legislatures. After all was completed by them, the entire scheme would be laid before Parliament and receive the final confirmation.

Thus the function of Parliament in the matter would be one of broad and grand supervision of a truly imperial kind; and its acts might be short and clear. The time of the supreme legislature would not then be frittered away in details, but would be devoted to great principles and to receiving appeals, or to a mature consideration of foreign affairs,

On the other hand, the power of the Local Legislatures would be so large as to suit the ambition of able and accomplished men.
(Newman.)

"To be a Citizen."

A GREEK or Roman statesman would look with horror and despair at our unorganised masses of men; and to him it would seem as an axiom that they ought to be made either *slaves* or *citizens*. With us they have the freedom of a citizen without his attachments—the ignorance of a slave without his constraints.

To become a citizen is a very different thing from giving a vote periodically for a member of parliament or for a president of a republic. Universal suffrage has left France £1850] as disorganised as ever—more disorganised by far than England, because *centralisation* is there far more complete and stringent.

"To be a citizen" ought to be a thing felt in everyday life—as much in Birmingham as in London, as once in Rhodes or Athens. And this might be done without revolution—without commotion—without introducing

novel or untried principles—without lowering any prerogative or dignity of the Crown—without lessening the honor of Parliament; *by merely reverting to the old law of the land*.

if the inherent powers of provincial towns were not over- ruled by "private bills" at Westminster—if those statutes were merely rescinded which have encroached on their legitimate spheres of action, they would have full power over their own finance—their own police—their own militia, under such restrictions only as the *general* safety demanded.

A. *local patriotism* is ready to rise as in old days; and the example of the United States assures us that this is quite consistent with a warm attachment to the general union of the whole nation, and with loyalty towards its central object.

In such a state of things, towns would have their universities, as so many towns of Germany have. Their magistrates and local ministry would have a far more arduous and honorable task than now is possible. Their schools of professional men and courts of law need not be, as now, eclipsed by the metropolis. The peoble would be knit together in daily relations as citizens, and would be expected to hear, discuss, and judge in regular monthly sittings.

The provision for the poor, the establishment of industrial schools, the administration of charities end of all the public endowments, and numerous kindred matters, would come before *all the citizens* for their consideration or for their active service.

If law is centralised it always lingers behind men's wants; custom also is artificially hindered from growing into law; so that the civilised state appears to be less sagacious than it was of old, and moralises in wonder at the wisdom of its ancestors. The Central Legislature, having undertaken the hopeless task of enacting details suitable for all parts of a varied country and vast population, so overlays its laws that to know or understand them is simply impossible for the community and but partially possible to professional students of law. The same centralisation hinders special parts of the country from making free experiments for the benefit of the poor.

(Newman.)

Town Land Tenure.

THE land on which a town is built ought never to be held in masses by a small number of persons. In theory it ought (in general) to be all the property of the town-community; and when sold to an individual for the purpose of building, the town should always reserve to itself the power of resumption at any time on repaying the original price and remunerating the houseowner for his house. In this way no individual would enrich himself at the public expense by the increasing demand for land; and whenever it was desirable to throw open any part of the town, it would he done without artificial cost.

Every town should have its own domain for public purposes, both of recreation and of training in the art of war and peace. It should have a right (within certain limits) of pur-purchasing country lands to colonise its poor upon. Such colonies should never be formed in large masses; for it is an unwholesome condition of society to have many of one occupation or of one rank thrown by themselves.

To send people to the antipodes at a vast expense is a device to save statesmen the effort of reorganising our decayed policy. But the poor never can be sent fast enough, and the difficulties will only increase until we raise up in strength the *local institutions* which ought to use foresight against them.

(Professor Newman.)

Small Freeholds.

IF small freeholds were more frequent—if for every farmer of three hundred acres there were freeholders of fifty acres each, all the little villages would be more prosperous; every smith, carpenter, wheelwright, and miscellaneous dealer would feel the difference; and far more varied elements would be afforded for conducting common affairs.

(Professor Newman.)

Petitioning Parliament.

THE right of petitioning Parliament was once much valued; it has become nearly useless, because Parliament is too much occupied to attend to any ordinary grievance. But in no case could that privilege be half so valuable to the poor as the right of petitioning *their own local legislature*.

Many of their petitions might be absurd. But all such occasions would lead to discussion; and they would learn sound principles by it. At the same time their real grievances would come to light, however entangled with their erroneous theories concerning the proper remedies; and the whole mass of the people would soon

learn a new patriotism on finding their relation to the State to be a reality.
(Professor Newman.)

"Not at Home".

IT will not surprise anybody who can estimate probabilities to learn that the polite Romans, like ourselves, when it was not agreeable to them to receive visits, directed their servants to say "not at home." But it may be amusing to see a direct confirmation of the fact from an antient author. This is found in a very neat and goodhumored epigram of Martial:

So may I thrive, my Decius, as 'tis true,
Whole days and nights I'd gladly pass with you;
But two long miles divide, which, told again,
Amount to four, when I return in vain.
Oft you are out, or, if not, DENIED,
By causes or by studies occupied.
Two miles to see you willingly I trudge,
But four miles to miss you, I confess I grudge.

When Scipio Nasica called on the poet Ennius he was told by the maid that Ennius was "not at home;" but Nasica heard him speak. After a few days Ennius visited the abode of Nasica and inquired for him. The latter called out, "I am not at home." Then Ennius said, "Do you think I do not know your voice?" Nasica replied, "What an impudent man! I inquired for him the other day, and believed his maid when she said he was not at home; and now he will not believe me when I tell him so myself!"

Mathematical Publican: "Good in everything".

THE MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY, which for about forty years past has held its weekly meetings at the Society's rooms in Crispin-street, Spitalfields, London, and has enrolled among; its members many eminent men, owes its origin to Mr Joseph Middleton. In the early part of his life he had been by profession a mariner. Subsequently he relinquished the sea- and kept a publichouse called the Monmouth Head, in Mon-mouth-street, Spitalfields, which is now the site of Hanbury's brewery.

Middleton still retained a strong attachment to the pursuits-of his youth, and to the mathematical sciences on which navigation is founded; and was also actuated in a high degree by a desire to communicate knowledge to people in general. For this purpose, in 1717, he formed a society of his neighbors, consisting chiefly of silk weavers, who assembled at a room in his house in Monmouth-street on Saturday evenings, whom he taught *gratuitously* the various branches of the mathematics. The whole expense to the members was *four-pence* a night each, which was laid out in refreshments. Absentees were fined one penny a night: this little fund was expended in the purchase of *books*.

Mr Icum,. late schoolmaster at Watford, was accustomed, whenever he came to London, to attend at the meetings of the society; now [1828] arrived at maturity, and, as another Nestor, to relate to the comparatively young members the recollection of his youth when first taken to the society by his father; and he gloried that he had been in the habit of frequenting it for upwards of seventy years.

Middleton's intimate acquaintance with all the branches of mathematical and astronomical science on which navigation is founded, appears from a large manuscript in folio, which is still preserved in the library of the Mathematical Society, and which, amongst other things, contains various maps and charts.

One of the rules of the institution, which had so humble an origin, observed for upwards of eighty years, was that one hour during the time of meeting should be devoted to silent study, and no one was allowed, under the penalty of a fine, to open his lips until the sand in the hourglass had run down.

The leading principles of the institution, as laid down by Middleton, were—economy, social intercourse, and mutual communication of knowledge. These, under modifications adapted to the times and the more opulent circumstances of the members, have been uniformly acted upon; and to these the society owed much of its prosperity.

Agreeably to the original custom many of the members usually remain after the formal weekly sitting, and spend the Evening together in conversation on subjects connected with

On the back of the title page of the catalogue of books and apparatus is the following sentence "By the constitution of this society it is the duty of every member, if he be asked my mathematical or philosophical

question by another member, to instruct him in the plainest and easiest manner he is

I Such have been the results of the exertions of an obscure individual, and his memory ought to be preserved as an encouragement and useful "stimulus to similar meritorious efforts.
(James Mitchell, 1828)

"Civilisation:" A Picture."

WE pause to contrast our civilisation towards the Chinese at Canton with our civilisation towards the Russians at Odesse Strange that the excuse for not bombarding an *enemy's* town namely, that it conta ned chiefly *private* property—should stand us in so little stead when it is the town of a confiding *friend* and *ally* which is in question. What sort of civilisation is it that *spares enemies*, but *murders friends?*

Let the respectable Englishman who does such things to others now suppose, if he can, war-steamers to commence bombarding London as we did Canton. Let him imagine the terrible din, the roar, the bursting of shells, the smashing of round shot, the whistling of rifle-bullets on all sides. He I dares not go out of his house, and is walking to-and-fro, not knowing what to do, when crash comes a shell into his I diningroom, exploding and blowing one side of the room into the street, tearing one or two of his children piecemeal close to him, and hurling his wife against the opposite wall—a disfigured mass of bones, brains, and blood. He rushes horrorstrieken into the streets, and everywhere he sees the same sights. The cupola of Saint Paul is riddled with shot; the Monument down; his beloved Bank sacked by ticket-of-leave men; Westminster Abbey a wreck and a ruin; Buckingham and Saint James Palaces shattered and destroyed; Exeter Hall and the Theatres all in a blaze; crowds of people hurrying down Cheapside, along the Strand, through Piccadilly—hither, thither, anywhere, everywhere, purposeless and lost, wringing their hands, bewailing children and relatives, or utter ruin, and howling forth their despair; houses falling; railway-stations choked with struggling fugitives; the city an infernal chaos, as though all the demons of hell had broken loose upon it and were reeking direst vengeance in an orgie of blood, smoke, flame, and confusion. . . .

The *humanity* which spared Odessa and its trade, at the *cost of all the English and French blood afterwards shed before Sevastopol* [100,000 men, £200,00;),000 money] has its just and fitting complement in the craven cruelty which has been shown by Admiral Sir Michael Seymour (made a K.C.B. by Lord Palmerston for not hurting the Russians in the Baltic) in bombarding the city of Canton, with its miilion and a half of defenceless inhabitants!

Queen Victoria has indeed been reduced to a cipher by her *Moire du Palais* if her socalled servants can dare to assume and to exercise her highest prerogative—that of making war—and can commit with impunity such atrocious acts in her majesty's name. If the Peace Society and all just men are in earnest we shall see them join heart and hand in endeavoring to punish the most monstrous and dastardly crime which the historian has ever been called upon to record.
(Anon. 1857.)

Judgment, not Opinion: A true Re-presentative.

I DID not content myself with theory; I had recourse to practice. On every case that arose I returned to my constituents, and called for a public expression of their judgment, according to which I should vote. When they said to me, "We elected you, and we trust in you," I answered, "I will not be trusted in; I am your servant, and it is your duty to form your judgment yourselves upon each particular case."

I made no distinction between elector and nonelector: I looked to the borough. I was not slow to tell them that their *opinion* was of no worth, but that it had to be made of worth by substituting for it *judgment*, of which the sign is *unanimity*. They were ready enough to perceive that this was the method of reforming not Parliament but England.
(Urquhart, M.P. for Stafford.)

The Philosopher, Novelist, Divine, Diplomatist.

ALL evils lead to and terminate in good.—Dr Priestley.

From these poisonous elements (Henry the Eighth) did, Heaven, by a beautiful moral alchemy that merits our [admiration not less than our gratitude, extract that inestimable elixir—Reformed Christianity.—Smith.

It is an attribute of God's inscrutable providence that the crimes of men are made to work out the accomplishment of His purposes.—Bishop Wilberforce.

How can we hope for a blessing on a work so conducted as the Reformation in England under Henry the Eighth? If we had nothing else to look to, is not *Pauperism* a just punishment—that blot which alone would prove that the precepts of Christ had long been forgotten? It had its rise from the confiscation of the

monasteries. Not that I uphold the monks; but if they were bad, was that a reason for giving their lands—granted by the nation for the support of the Church with a charge of onethird for the poor (for infirm, orphans, widows, hospitals, etc.)—as a bribe to private individuals? There is no such .thing in the Pagan or Mahometan East as the ablebodied starving man (in the time of plenty) of England, Ireland, or America; and with it no such thing as the atheism of this country.—Urquhart.

Paradise of Quacks.

MR WADD says that England has been called a paradise of quacks. Oar ancestors were a nostrum-loving race, from the king to the cottager; and the history of panaceas and specifics, in the form of elixirs, pills, powders, and waters, would form a large volume of humiliating memorials of the credulity of the public, who could swallow them, and the infatuation of the physician who could prescribe them. Who could believe that a philosopher would eat two hundred pounds of' soup?—a bishop drink a butt of tar-water?—or that in a course of chemical neutralisation Meyer should swallow twelve hundred poundsweight of crabs' eyes?

A glance at any newspaper—however insignificant or in whatever village published, high or low church, conservative or liberal—will show that our ancestors did not exceed in this respect their successors in this "enlightened age" of public opinion.

Figs—Sycophant.

THE history of the fig comprises a very extended period of time: by some the tree is considered to have been known to the inhabitants of the East even before the various species of com. Mention of it is frequently made in the Scriptures; it was highly esteemed by the Jews and by most of the eastern nations, among which it was evidently regarded as an important if not a primary article of food.

It is a curious fact, not perhaps generally known, that our word *sycophant* has been derived from two Greek words the simple meaning of which conveys no idea of the modern acceptation of the word. *S u k o p h a n t e s* is derived from *S u k o n* 'a fig,' and *p h a i n o* 'I show,' 'make appear,' or 'manifest;' and in Athens it was applied to persons ('informers') who gave information of the clandestine exportation of figs. It is inferred from this fact that the Athenians considered figs as a fruit of such great importance as to cause the prohibition of their export from Attica.

Evils of Government Banks.

BY what authority does Government say that one man shall trade in money, and another not? To think of superseding the practice of country banking by substituting branch banks from the Bank of England in their stead, besides being an iniqnitously innovating infringement upon the already legal rights of country bankers generally, is what every rational individual throughout the whole country ought instantly to lift his voice against: being likely moreover to create a most dangerous and unconstitutional engine of *arbitrary power*, so enormously great and liable to abuse in the bands of a weak or wicked ministry as might easily destroy the nation's best liberties, together with the personal properties and independence of every private individual. (Crutwell.)

The Bank of England is unfitted by its constitution and the principles of its action to perform the general banking business of the country. If the principles were unobjectionable, that vigilant, minute, never-relaxing attention which is indispensable in the banking business, rarely can be met with in delegated functionaries, whether directors or managers—a circumstance which must render branch banks at places remote from the Bank of England eminently hazardous. The directors of the Bank of England will lend only for a stated period and in a particular manner; and they require repayment on a fixed day of the whole sum. Other bankers will lend for a longer or shorter period, upon one kind of security or another, to be regulated by circumstances; and they will take back the sum lent at once or at various times, in whole or in part, according to the convenience of the borrower.

The Bank of England by discounting large sums affords facilities to the powerful to enter upon speculations. By refusing to discount small sums it debars the struggling men of little means of its advantages. It refuses all accommodation to those who can perfect their operations only by long-continued persevering efforts.

The proceedings of the Bank of England tend to destroy all the results of experience and judgment in regard to the employment of labor—to cause capital to be drawn from industry in the country to be employed upon industry in great towns and foreign states—to wrest it from those occupations wherein the returns are remote, the employment of labor regular and long continued, and fortunes are slowly made and rarely lost, to be employed in speculative undertakings. They disturb the institutions of industry, and introduce disorder into the

vocations of all below the first class, whose pursuits depend on the temporary or permanent application of other capital than their own.
(Burgess.)

Gleanings.

It is no doubt a great consolation to the people of England that their chains have been forged by their own representatives, and riveted on them by the authority of statutes.

Punishment is an active ruler; it is the true manager of public affairs; it is the dispenser of laws; and wise men call it the sponsor of all orders for the discharge of their several duties.

A free people may be sometimes betrayed; but no people will betray themselves and sacrifice their liberty unless they fall into a sate of universal corruption: and when they are once fallen into such a state they will be sure to lose what they no longer enjoy.

For a generation manifestly called upon to witness the most solemn and terrible changes, the deadliest sin is thoughtlessness—the most noxious food is prejudice—the most fatal disease is party spirit.

What can mean the liberty of a people that has raised over itself men who can commit any crime by that people's power, and yet without their will? What is done today against the stranger may be done tomorrow against themselves. The freeman becomes a slave because he has been a culprit. Retribution may overtake, but a world's hate and a just God's vengeance must follow.

The excise was introduced in spite of Parliament, in the time of the civil wars, but only continued from month to month. Charles the First charges the Parliament with imposing insupportable taxes and odious excises upon their fellow-subjects. Excises are innovations of so modern a date that the very name is not to be found in our early law books.

The innocency of the heart is absolutely necessary to preserve the freedom of the mind.

When (says Dr Jonathan Edwards) I am violently beset with temptation, or cannot get rid of evil thoughts, I resolve to do something in arithmetic or geometry, or some ether study which necessarily engages all my thoughts, and unavoidably keeps them from wandering.

"Hole-and-corner" arguments (said Bismarck), when supported by a majority of European bayonets, usually gained the day.

Civilisers and Savages: The two Captains

IT was not until many months after our successful settleme had been made at Port Nicholson (Wellington) by Colon Wakefield that the Colonial Minister determined on mak[*unclear:* ing] a settlement at Auckland on behalf of the British government for which purpose Captain Hobson was sent in a man-of-[*unclear:* v] to negotiate with the native chiefs resident upon that c[*unclear:* o.] for the grant or sale of lands for this object.

On the arrival of Captain Hobson a large assembly Newzealand chiefs took place, and the question was debat for three days with much earnestness in the presence of [*unclear:* a] captain of the British man-of-war, in which ship Cap[*unclear:* tain] Hobson had gone as a passenger.

The Newzealand chiefs expressed a perfect willingness receive the English settlers and to trade with them; but only difficulty raised and insisted upon was that they fear the English would wish to bring soldiers to Newzealand, [*unclear:* a] then, they said, they should be sure to quarrel and fight.

A treaty accordingly was made, and *signed by all pres[unclear: s]* amongst whom the captain of the man-of-war was also quested to sign it, which he did; and on the following [*unclear:* a] sailed for Sydney with despatches to the governor of to settlement from Captain Hobson, stating that he had [*unclear:* s]ceeded in forming a settlement at Auckland, but *reques the governor to send the man-of-war back immediately wi[unclear: th] company of soldiers,* in direct violation of the engagement had entered into on the previous day.

The governor of Sydney communicated the purport these despatches to the captain of the man-of-war, and [*unclear:* f] posed to send the soldiers to Newzealand in his sh[*unclear:* all] but he was so indignant at this gross breach of faith, that absolutely refused to take them, having been a party to [*unclear:* t] solemn treaty and engagement—" that no soldiers should sent to Newzealand."

Thus the very first act of Lord John Russell's govern was a breach of faith with the native chiefs and people Newzealand.
(Major Palmer, 186[*unclear:* 6]

Power and Rights of the People in olden time.

IN the Rolls of Parliament of the time of Edward the Third the following occurs:—

"The gentlemen who are at this Parliament for the Communes have well understood the estate of our lord

the king, and the great need he has to be aided by the people. Wherefore the said gentlemen who are here for the Commune pray of my lord duke and the other lords who are here that it may please him to summon another Parliament at a certain day to be agreed upon; and in the meantime each one will betake himself to his country, and they promise loyally on the legeance which they owe to our lord the king that they will be at all the pains they can, each towards his country, to have aid good and convenient."

Even Mr Cobden, when he had a serious financial proposition to make, proposed not to "go forward," but to "go back." The term of retrocession he chose was only 1835. It would be preferable to "go back" to a period when there was no national debt, no excise, and scarcely any customs duties—when parliamentary majorities could not bind the minority—and when no representative could vote for a tax unless it was sanctioned by the presentment of the Community which sent him to parliament.

To show how ineffectual a "reformed" parliament is in controlling an extravagant Cabinet the following figures are curious:—

The amount expended on army, navy, and ordnance in 1830 (unreformed parliament) was £13,914,776; in 1861 (reformed parliament) it was £29,523,748 The annual vote of supply for the civil service in 1830 was £2,031,897; in 1861 it was £7,848,069.

The motto inscribed on the banner of Lord Grey's Ministry in 1830 was "Reform—Retrenchment—Nonintervention." We have more than *doulled our expenditure, and interfered in every country in the world*.

(Anon. 1866,)

Large and Small Communities.

THE freedom which we have attained has great Economic advantages, but so many Moral disadvantages as might make one hesitate in choosing it if any alternative was open for our choice.

What is it that often makes the population of an old village pleasant to us? It is because every man has a character to lose. All have been known to all from youth. There may be a few persons bad beyond cure; yet even towards them long knowledge produces a kindly feeling, which keeps then from the worst extremes. At any rate no one can fall into evil courses nor into distress without its being known and observed; and common men are more virtuous when then sins are watched. Such is the state of a community which grows entirely *from within* and *rather slowly*.

But a modern town is largely peopled by immigrants, unknown to one another and to the old inhabitants. Just as a country loses patriotism and organic union when new settlers-come in from different quarters so rapidly as to outnumber the natives; so to sustain the true corporate spirit of a modern rapidly formed town is hardly possible. Men come to it—not to live there—not because they were born there—not because they like the place, *but to get money there*. Hence they have seldom the same attachment to the people, whom in fact they do not know.

(Professor F. W. Newman.)

An American View of England.

THE foreign policy of England, though ambitious and lavis[*unclear:* h] of money, has not often been generous or just. It has a principal regard to the interest of trade, checked however by the aristocratic bias of the ambassador, which usually puts him in sympathy with the continental courts.

It sanctioned the partition of Poland—it betrayed Geno[*unclear:* a,] Sicily, Greece, Turkey, Rome, and Hungary.

The nation always resists the immoral action of their government. They think humanely on the affairs of France of Turkey, of Poland, of Hungary, of Schleswig-Holstein though overborne by the statecraft of the rulers at last.

England is the best of actual nations, but she too is in the stream of fate—one victim more in a common catastrophe.

(Emerson, 1856.)

Parliamentary Reform: What is it?

[*unclear:* A] the mere representation is a matter in itself of the most vereign indifference, except to those who may get votes at they may *sell them*—or to those who desire to gain [*unclear:* p]portance by having theories to promulgate—or to the [*unclear:* a]akminded, who, feeling that things are mismanaged, con[*unclear:* -it] themselves with a generality.

Any reform of Parliament that does not include the restora[*unclear:* tion] of the old rule of the

That every member must present during the sitting of the House must clearly be no form at all, but a fraud only.

The office of Re-presentative of the people was in our English constitution a *service* and a *burden*.

Having become a means of *distinction* and *advancement*, [*unclear:* pa]rliament, instead of being a *check on malversation*, has come its *instrument*.

It is not the less so, but the more so, the wider the basis extended. Every new borough added and every extension [*unclear:* a] existing boroughs is simply the expansion of bribery, [*unclear:* aud.] and perjury.

This is stopped from the moment that *attendance of members* is rendered *compulsory;* for then the service and the [*unclear:* bur]den would be re imposed.

Any reform to be effectual must reconvert the House from Club into a Re-presentative and Legislative Assembly, rich will confine the Government to its *executive* functions, [*unclear:* I] prevent its spending money by *buying simple majorities*.

(Urquhart, 1866.)

"What shall we do?"

YOU ask me to furnish you something for your proposed [*unclear:* set]ting. There is before you the contemporary history of our country.

You know that you have a Queen who dismissed the foreign Minister (Lord Palmerston), charging him with [*unclear:* fals]ehood practised on her in reference to transactions with reign powers.

You know that no one said a word either on the side of [*unclear:* a] Queen or on the side of the minister. That no one cared either for the veracity of the one or the other as to the public business in regard to which the imputation of falsehood had arisen.

You know that that Foreign Minister, after such an ignominious dismissal, became Prime Minister through the co-operation of his political opponents.

You know that that minister then sent the army of the Queen to be lost in a peninsula of Tartary [Crimea].

You know that he then abrogated the Right of Search,

If these acts do not suffice to fill you with indignation and alarm, and drive you to the resolve to do what may be done to retrieve your own character, and to revive your country, it would be presumptuous in me to attempt by words of mine to induce you to do so; for that would be equivalent to proposing for myself to make the blind see and the dead live.

(Anon. 1862.)

Local Developments.

To recognise little states in our towns and counties would be but the first step of organisation. All healthy organisation has and needs a power of internal growth. The larger cities are already resolved into townships and into wards; the counties into hundreds; but with numbers so great as London, and many trades so peculiar, numerous exceptive arrangements would arise.

If each town had full power to tax itself for public purposes, a thousand civilising ameliorations would be introduced. If local institutions had been kept up in energy the unhealthy buildings which now exist could never have arisen, nor many other urban evils.

The stilted meeting of a moderate number of people in a *Wardmote* would make their faces familiar to one another, and give to the richer orders a distinct acquaintance with a definite portion of the community. This is with us the more urgently important, because (unhappily) religion has ceased to be a bond to our nation. In fact a congregation that meets in a large town church finds little in it to develop mutual acquaintance.

Far different would be the result of meeting for discussion of practical business in a wardmote. Out of this would rise numerous other relations. In antient Greece or Rome to be fellow-tribesmen or fellow-clansmen was a bond of union besides the closer tic of clientship. The last is the bond in which our domestic servants ought to be joined to us.

(Professor Newman.)

Acceptances: "Kites."

EXCESS of paper will produce excess of trading, and both will end badly. The issues of paper-money were carried on to a monstrous extent by acceptances. I know three men in one connection, and live in another (not as partners), who contrived to get out, and keep out, nearly halfmillion of their bills; and it appears that they only wanted a little more time to make the large business profitable in which they embarked and supported. They have all failed but one, and have put upwards of three hundred persons out of employment. Such things as these were carried on to a monstrous extent.

(Drummond, 1826.)

Ticket-of-Leave Politicians.

THE certainty of impunity for great political offences is one of the most unhealthy symptoms in the conduct of affairs. Every transgressor is sure, from long experience, that he plays a winning game. However vicious may be his acts, he knows that a temporary unpopularity is the worst he has to dread. A few months' tabooing is the utmost retribution inflicted for even moral depravity; and degradation or severe punishment for the offender is never thought of. But a year and a half has elapsed since a prominent public man was chased from office for conduct the most disingenuous, and for imposture attempted on the parliament and the country.

While we write the journals are calmly discussing his return to office and elevation to the peerage. We nowhere meet with such a remark as that "the mental obliquity of this statesman disqualifies him from being intrusted with the direction of affairs." Exposed as he has been, he is nevertheless to be readmitted to office, the nation recklessly taking the risk of his future misdeeds.

We have found this plan signally fail with offenders against the common law; and the admission of the ticket-of- leave system into political life will, it may safely be predicted, prove a most unfortunate innovation. With *good* men it is always expedient to keep alive a belief in the certainty of punishment for offences; but when work is done with such tools as it is the pleasure of this country to employ, the withdrawal of this belief is an invitation to betray us. The only remaining power over them is the dread of chastisement.
(Dobson Collet, 1857.)

National Deb': Lease.

THIS is a mortgage laid upon an in tangible sort of property—upon Taxes. If taxes are to be mortgaged, some limit needs to be set, both as to the total amount to which we may dare to burden following generations, and as to the length of time. To undertake *eternal payments is a monstrous absurdity*. If all our loans had been contracted with the condition that interest should in no case be paid for longer than a hundred years, they would have been obtained cither on the same or on very nearly the fame terms; and our debt would be of a very manageable amount.

It is an excellent rule established in many of the American States—*That no interest or payments shall be guaranteed on any loan for more than* THIRTY YEARS. Hereby each generation is made to bear the burden of its own affairs.
(Professor Newman.)

Who and What should be taxed?

WHAT is it that is taxed and why, when a State has abandoned and lost its own natural possession—the LAND? The State is the organisation which is to hold together society on principles of Justice and Right. Giving great and precious advantages, it demands honor and pecuniary support: honor from *all*—property from those who have any *surplus*.

The State is not intended as an engine of oppression to the weak; it cannot (wilfully and knowingly) tax those families which barely can feed themselves. Hence no taxes can be intended to fall on *sinews, bone,* and *breath*, as such; but on PROPERTY, as such.

The moment this is conceded it follows that the more property a man has to spare, the more fit a subject for taxation he is, and the higher the percentage which may justly be taken from his surplus. I cannot understand the tone assumed by some writers on this subject, who call it robbery and spoliation to tax greater wealth at a greater percentage. My belief is that this is intrinsically just, and would tend to remove the odium attached to great wealth by the vulgar.
(Professor Newman.)

Indirect and Direct Taxation.

INDIRECT Taxation is most valuable when taken on luxuries which have become habitual, such as tea and tobacco. The increase of steamers endangers an increase of demoralisation through smuggling. All taxpaying is apt to be a struggle of fraud against power. Indirect taxation is then the worst, because it unites economic to peculiarly great moral evils.

In Direct Taxation there is a premium held out to deception; but at the worst the deception is a single act—it is not a trade or state of living, A man pays £5, £10, or £20 less 'than he ought: there the evil ends. But smuggling becomes a mode of life, or pervades the whole life, and needs an enormous additional apparatus to

control it. An army and navy of revenue service lines our coast to prevent smuggling.

It is to be remembered how many systems of taxation there are, each needing a separate machinery. To collect ten per cent costs no more than to collect one per cent; hence, if revenue could be raised by direct taxation alone, customhouse and other officers could be dispensed with.
(Professor Ntwman.)

The English Government has always tried to make the Irish body fit the coat, instead of making the coat fit the body.

One true word spoken in season may arrest the course of events, and rouse the flame of patriotism, though it has slumbered for generations.—Gentz.

Blessed is the man who believes he has an idea by which he may aid his fellow-creatures.—Goethe.

End of First Series.

R. LUCAS & SON, Printers, *Evening Mail* Office, Nelson.

The Canterbury Gilpin; The Capture and Flight of the Moa.
A Poem.
PARTS I. & II.
Where Browning's Pass 'mid snow divides An Alp on either hand, The royal brood from which he sprang Roamed free o'er all the land.
Wellington: James Hughes, Steam Printer, Lambton Quay. 1880.

Preface.

LEST some of my readers should never get to the end of the following verses, I will, shortly as I can, tell them what it is that forms the burden of my song, and its history.

All know that there once lived in New Zealand a very large bird, the bones of which are of frequent occurrence in the bogs and swamps of the country. We speak of this bird as the Moa, though why it should be so called is not very clear. No white man, and perhaps no Maori, has ever seen one alive. Some suppose that the Moa became extinct a very long time ago; others as sagely aver that they may not be all dead yet. There has been a considerable variety of opinion upon this subject. Of late years frequent reports have been circulated—the wish being father to the thought—that live Moas have been seen in various parts of the South Island; and in one case it was widely published, in the press of the Colony, that two living examples of the famous bird had actually been secured. Fortunately for the Moas perhaps, but unfortunately for the accuracy of my poem, these never reached their destination, which was said to be Christchurch.

I have imagined that one of the Moas did actually reach town, and that the various incidents connected with its arrival and subsequent hasty departure did take place. Having once given the rein to imagination, it was but natural to suppose that such an acquisition to science, such confirmation of the opinions of some, should be displayed in public, and equally so, if I thought myself fit for the undertaking, was it, that my story should be told in verse.

I have not placed the whole of my story before the reader, but hope to do so at some future date.
THE AUTHOR.

Introduction.

COME, I have matter for your ear,
I have a tale to tell,
A song to sing, a race to ride,
And would acquit me well.

Speak of my effort what you may,
But read it all the same,—
Read it, 'tis written to be read,
Laughed at, and read again.

'Tis true that you may not approve
Of all that you may read;
Yet I would claim attention,
Though the reader shakes his head.

For I would please, ev'n tho' I touch
A sore place now and then;
And I would spare, or lightly touch,
Where I give only pain.

Man errs in giving pain, if he
Can not with ready hand
Pour in the balm that soothes again,
Meetly to the demand.

We err at all times, when we leave
A canker at the heart
Of those of whom we address. My aim
Is that in peace we part.

A skilful surgeon with free hand
Strikes deep the lancet, where
He knows disturbing tumors lie,
And lays the fester bare.

But with the lightest of light hands,
He binds again the wound;
And if he pained he pleases more
When this is safely bound.

I have a case upon my hands,—
A patient 'neath my care,
And must use strongest remedies,
This patient to repair.

Around me if I look, I see
What pleases me but ill;
Yet though I scotch the venomed snake,
I scarce may hope to kill.

If I believed such skill were mine,
I should not hesitate
My page with horrors for to fill,
And these again rebate.

Thus might the fabric rise again,
In health and strength throughout;
But much I fear effectual cure
Hangs on the side of doubt.

I hoped my purpose to effect,
No actors being seen
Conspicuously upon the stage.
This proved an idle dream.

So, long with reverie I held
Communion, to decide
What should be done; and no one else
Gave council me to guide.

At length the present and the past
Rose mentally in view;
And there stood figures, not my choice—
So here they figure too.

I saw what I would here narrate,
And lies with me the blame;
If blame there be, it needs must lie
With those I shall not name.

Yet think not with remorseless scourge
That I lash everywhere,
Or to destruction, for I strike
Alone where vice lies bare.

Sooner would I throw down my pen,
And in dismay look on,
Than that one soul should justly say
I meditated wrong.

So much for my intent. I know
That I shall not escape
The charge of being personal,
And writing this in hate.

And truly I would here confess,
I would not choose my friends
To figure here; those that are not,
I owe them no amends.

I do these no injustice, since I
think I make it plain
My tale is but a fable, and
Need not apply to them.

Yet there may be who do insist
They see their portrait drawn;
And, in reply, I'm bound to say,
"Thou art the very man."

The Canterbury Gilpin.

First Part.

decorative feature

THE prowess of the snorting steed,
And skilful charioteer,
Since Troy besieged has been a theme,
The muses have held dear.

Dear to the muse, and dear to man,
The horse race leads the way
In all our sports, since man and horse
Combine in the display.

Pedestrian sports of every kind
Must take a second place;
These lack the double charm that gives
Excitement to the race.

And hence through all the range of time,
Whenever sports are sung,
Equestrian games, if there at all,
Come first the lyre to tune.

Though honour's his whose pen portrays
The athlete's strength and speed,
His subject rises if he mounts
His hero on a steed.

So doubtless they that saw so thought,
When first the untamed horse,
Some savage rode across the Steppe,
Scarce guiding well its course.

So think we in the present day,
When horse and horseman's trained
To such perfection, that it seems
No more can be attained.

The highest of our honours we
Must with the steed divide;
And if a hero would be great,
That hero, he must ride.

In modern times when high-trained bloods
The Derby do contest,
Rider and horse, with equal pride,
Stand ranged within the list.

The thousands upon thousands there,
All babelous yet intent,
Decide beforehand, right or wrong,
How ends the great event.

A signal given. And no more
May one his neighbour see;
And eyes there are that watch the course
With fierce intensity,

Noting the varying chance that first
May this or that horse place;
While hope or fear, in many breasts,
Rides yet a keener race.

And now the horse and rider keen
Are one in this; they aim
To keep the vantage they have got,
Or vantage ground to gain.

Like drifting clouds before a gale,
Around the course they fly;
Or like an eagle on the wing
That cleaves the nether sky;

While sways the crowd as if impelled,
Like waves, beneath the blast,
That break upon a rocky beach,
Yet cannot sink to rest.

The race must end, and then, O then!
Surges excitement's tide!
'Tis run, and lost, and won, and quick
The news spreads far and wide.

Whether in chariot we would ride,
With Nestor's skilful son;
Or from a vantage ground behold
The latest Derby won;

Alike we join a noted race.
How many he between,
Sung and unsung, I may not tell,
Since such is not my theme.

These for a trophy strive; much more
Must horse and rider strain
To reach the goal, when life's the prize,
They struggle to retain.

For then no longer 'tis in sport;
The race is changed in kind,
Not only is the prize in front,
The penalty's behind.

Such fearful rides must form a theme
For every country's muse—
A living foe, the flames, the flood,
From these we pick and choose.

And scarce a poet's page we turn,
But that we find the ride
Of some great hero is the point
Where centres all his pride.

John Gilpin rode a noble race,
Though 'twas in fable sung;
And all have read of Tarn's famed ride
Across the "Brig O'Doon."

And later still, we all have rode
With brave young Lochinvar;
These, and Mazeppa's dreadful ride
A few examples are.

And yet another famous race
Is waiting to be sung,—
A race in some respects unique,
That lately hath been run,—

This race began in Christchurch town,
The reader will not doubt;
Though where it ended has not been
So easy to make out.

He who knows best is reticent
When friends do him implore;
And if a friend should say "I know,"
But holds his tongue the more.

Yet it leaked out, as those things will,
Which fondly we would hide,
Though where and how, for reasons grave,
We will not now decide.

A Gilpin might my hero prove,
I hoped, that hope was vain;
Too surely must I cast my verse
In quite another strain,

Since more Mazeppa-like my tale,
Save that we lack the maid;
Nor did our hero back return
With fierce revengeful blade.

Yet from the wild the steed untamed,
Like Byron's far famed horse,
Was brought, and showed in limb and frame,
Fleetness, endurance, force.

Amid the mountains of the west,
Far from the dun brown plain,
The Alpy giants upward soar,
And send afar their fame.

These constant winter mantles white
With ever deepening snow,
Relieved but by the avalanche,
Or silent glacier's flow.

Ages untold those heights have stood,
And watched the Ocean eat
Or yield again the lower lands,
That mantle round their feet.

Calmly they watched old Neptune thus
Waging remorseless war,
Unthinking that his stolen spear
Should yet repulse his car.

The winds from Neptune's steaming brow
Waft to the low-lands rain;
But solid ice now piles the slopes
Of all the mountain chain.

The glacier ever swelling still
To greater length attains;
With carried Titan loads once more
It reinstates the plains.

And fiery Vulcan still maintained
The never ending store
Of stony wreck, which, east and west,
Drove the retreating shore.

Yet who shall wage a ceaseless war,
Nor suffer from its rage?
The mountains stand, yet paid the price
Of the great glacier age.

We reap the benefit, and till
The hot-contested plain;
And looking westward, we may thank
The mountains for our gain.

(Heaven grant this gain may be assured
To those who till the soil,
That their just rights may be maintained,
Whose hands are hard with toil).

The arsenals, that yielded forth
Munitions for the fray,
Show what the struggle was, and is,
In places to this day.

Yet still where once the rigid rocks
Were by the ice-mass worn
Lies many a vale with verdure bless'd,
Which trees and shrubs adorn.

A mountain torrent, rushing o'er
Its rugged stony bed,
Leaves, first on this side then on that,
Green glades with flowers o'erspread.

The mountain spurs, now dark with wood,
Do shelter and divide
The level ground, which, thus embayed,
Strange forms of life doth hide.

In every vale—and many they—
These fairy glades abound,
And thence they lead to wider fields
Where freer scope is found.

But still the watch-towers pierce the air,
As in the days of yore;
And still the glaciers slowly glide,
And avalanches roar.

This was the native region of
The steed our hero rode;
But not a sire of his had seen
A bridle or been shod.

Where Browning's Pass 'mid snow divides
An Alp on either hand,
The royal brood from which he sprang
Roamed free o'er all the land.

And still, as fable tells he did,
He might have eaten air
In freedom, but in evil hour
He fell into a snare.

Yet, with a soul above deceit,
Suspicion was not his,
The shackles, bound upon his legs,
Half pleased, were half a quiz.

The smile upon his captor's face
That broadened to a grin,
Indexed alone an honest heart,
As it was read by him.

From hence, the wonder of the age
Was straight conveyed to town,
A princely Moa in the flesh,
A bird of great renown.

Now Rumor runs and Fable rides—
What steed so fleet as they?
And far and wide electric wires
The startling news convey.

'Twas said a mountain had brought forth;
Only one truth was said,
That S-, the famous Nimrod, had
A princely capture made.

And soon the news was brought to town,
Which slumbering peaceful lay:—
"The latest wonder of the world
Will be in town to-day,

To-morrow at the latest;" and
(As fire takes the town),
Echo the tale repeated, till
By all the news was known.

Uprose the town in raptures, and
Many a busy brain
So turned the shapeless story o'er,
That it told fresh again.

And so the captor and the prize
Still in importance grew,
Till some began to wonder if
The tale was really true.

* * *

Amid tall trees, a spacious pile
The country's treasures hides;
Treasures of time, whose use for us
A Savant great decides.

The noisy news, spread o'er the town,
Soon reached the Savant here;
He shook his head, he stroked his beard,
And stood 'twixt hope and fear.

But credence pressed him, till at last
He hailed the news as true;
And soon he acted. His clear head
Saw quickly what to do.

The fleetest horse that Christchurch held
Was soon at his command.
Give, said he to his messenger,
Whatever they demand.

And so was sold the wingless bird,
That hath a world-wide fame;
To Science known but by its bones,
But yet well known by name.

Just when yon snowclad pyramid
Seemed to devour the sun,
The long expected then arrived,
Two Moas? No! but one.

A fair round sum was given to
Its captors to divide.
It passed to other hands, a prize
He gloried to describe.

Long had this subject vexed the wise,
Were Moas still extant;
With such a proof before his eyes,
Could more the sceptic want?

Some senseless ass describes the last
In agonizing throe,
While murdered by a savage horde,
Ten thousand years ago.

Yet here is proof that wiser brains
Construed and read aright,
That Moas lived to present times
On plain and mountain height.

Of such were thousands in the land,
Since last these isles arose,
'Mid fiery strife, from Ocean's bed,
Upheaved 'mid earthquake throes.

Back to the misty Miocene,
Along the page of time,
We read the history of the race
Which we Dinornis name.

When chilly death grasped every height,
Ere the wide plain was seen,
Despite the rigour of the clime,
They braved the Pliocene.

E're Man, their last relentless foe,
Had barbed his shaft with stone,
This feathered race had seen its prime,
Its youth had come and gone.

Now Maori hunted, o'er the hills
Fell old and young the same.
Hunger spared not the germs of life,
The nest it yielded them.

Craft with a thousand subtle schemes
Led persecution on.
There came a day, long past it seems,
The race no more was known.

The fastness of the desert wild
The savage had not dared,
To future times, but all unknown,
A remnant yet had spared.

And now another race of men
Appeared upon the scene;
And Savants groping through the past
Saw dimly what had been.

But facts too oft took colour from
A brain-disordered sight
And so opinion grouped itself,
Around two points of light.

Two schools maintained a common plea,
But differed on this fact:—
Fell the last Moa only now,
Or fifty centuries back.

And other pleas that rose from this
Did complicate the strife;
Nor cooled its ardour, till it looked
Like war, war to the knife.

So shifts and so returns the field,
To where the fight began;
And now the Moa is discussed,
Now Palaeolithic Man.

Blows stoutly dealt on either side
Made printer's devils groan,
And puzzled many an honest wight
Who shared the fight at home.

Exhaustion brought a treacherous lull;
No truce was in the calm;
Each watched his foeman's weakest point,
And did the victory claim.

And now the hour of triumph's come;
Contention's bone is here;
The prize has fallen to the truth,
For truth has naught to fear.

By what strange chance should it be thus?
Or what kind fortune threw
The prize within the fittest hands
Of all the knowing few?

This first of living Moas seen
By savant or by hind,
Though taken as their average type,
Would not have shamed his kind.

Proudly, not sixteen hands but feet,
His head rose in the air;
His limbs were lithe, yet wondrous strength
Was plainly seated there.

His levelled back and arching neck
Shewed grace in every line;
His head was beauty in itself,
His eye a diamond mine.

No gaudy plumage needed he
To drape his majesty;
So nature, ever true to taste,
Clothed him in sober gray.

No gauds or ornaments enhance
What's noble in itself;
When nature smiled, for other forms
She kept her bright-hued wealth.

See, as befits those sinewy legs,
What armature is there,
Laid on with the profoundest skill,
That comes of subtle care.

Set free and in his native wild,
O what a sight to see!
Though nature gave not wings for flight,
Few birds so swift as he.

Who at a bound might reach his back,
An athlete must be trained;
A Moa horse! no saddle-flap
His plumage yet had stained.

O such a horse, and who shall ride?
Or who shall worthy be?
Or who shall dare? let him who dares,
Well to his trappings see.

To ride a moa like a horse,
Well, the idea charms;
I hail the fields of pure romance,
And here my fancy warms.

Fiction outstrips the truth; Ah, no!
This notion was not mine,
And I must yet contented write
The truth in every line.

Delighted since, at last, he had,
A living moa found;
Sudden a thought possessed the Sage,
That he would ride 'it round,

That folk might see the noble bird
For which their money went;
And so a special riding rig
Was from the saddler's sent

The day arrived, the hour was near,
And crowds assemble round
The portal of the wide Domain,
Where this strange steed stood bound.

And Christchurch had a holiday
To witness the event;
From all the bells, o'er all the town,
So norous joy was sent.

Her Sages met not to debate,
Nor to have honour done,
But this to do, to honour him
Who had their chief become.

The heroes of the Sumner Cave
Were foremost in the throng;
They bore the brunt of all the strife,
And set right what was wrong.

When dared a filching nondescript
To steel a march on them,
With dignity they did assert
Their so-called rights again.

And now they held a blazing shield
Unspotted to the light,
And if a fly dared light thereon,
They slew the parasite.

Beneath the roof, where doth the pride
Of former ages lie;
They have assembled, here was brought
The Moa. Ask not why.

Yet if thou never hast beheld
The relics of this kind
That Glenmark yielded here set up;
See these, and pleasure find.

And now the living Moa stood
Amid his kindred's bones,
While his huge frame was close compared,
Adding insult to wrongs.

(Man arrogantly doth conclude,
That he alone respects
The relics of his kind when dead;
But mercy this suspects.)

Of Didiformis, first a leg,
Was 'gainst his own compared;
And the due ratio of its size
Was by the Sage declared.

See how, he cried, the South hath erred,
And how withouten fail
My theory holds, long since I saw
What now these facts entail.

Then Owen's monograph was spread,
And soon he pointed where
The due proportion was defined,
With an exactness rare.

The multiple, diameter,
And length are not the same;
And, by this rule, 'tis needful that
This gets another name.

Then cried the Sage, "with wider scope
This law applied to man
Might point distinctions, where we group
The huge and small the same.

Well could I love to think myself
Of species quite distinct
From yonder dwarf, whose gainless form
Shows the misshapen imp."

Affinity and homologue,
With many kindred terms,
Are freely used as this great man
Upon his subject warms.

The smile of those around repayed
His anxious care to please;
But are our pleasures always such
As give our neighbours ease.

Then for a contrast Gracilis
And Gravis were arrayed;
Palapteryx ingens then was next
Against our bird displayed.

Next Elephantopus for strength,
And Maximus for size
(Nor saw they that a watery flood
Swam in the Moa's eyes.

Our freedom lost, yet if caressed
We slavery might bear;
But disregard of all we feel
Makes ev'n the meekest dare.

A tyrant does not always use
The obvious forms of power;
Sneering he smiles, nor thinks his smile
Brings the avenging hour.

We were not born but to be free,
And each restraint that chains
The free impulse that springs of right,
Adds misery to our pains.

Nature will not allow a man
To yield his right for ever;
Nor can he crush his free-born soul
That still its bonds would sever.

Not on our fellow man alone
We tyranny deplore;
The Moa felt this in his heart,
And so his eyes ran o'er.

Yet for himself not all his grief,
But what his eyes had seen,
(The sacrilege upon his kind)
Yet more afflicted him.

Then they in triumph led him forth
For wonder and display;
And loud and long the people cheered
The bird in trappings gay.

A feathered biped for a steed
The Savant had bestrode,
And sixteen stone of flesh and blood
Were sure sufficient load.

At length the gates were open flung,
And issued forth the pair;
The lion-hearted rider's pride
The sages round did share.

But the poor bird was in a plight,
Guarded lest he should run,
And hobbled too that safely so
The journey might be done.

First the procession did
proceed The city streets about;
And that the show was wondrous rare
There could be little doubt.

Up Cashel street, Colombo street,
With slow and stately pace,
A royal ride; the rider smiled
With condescending grace.

Below, the pavements overflowed As pressed
the crowd along;
From window high and balcony,
Beauty with smiles looked on.

Peeled yet again the bells, and throats
Ten thousand rent the air,
And proudly thus our hero rode,
To halt in Market square.

END OF FIRST PART.

Second Part.

decorative feature

RISE with the morn,—the early morn
Of a December day,
And climb that bold and rugged height,
That overlooks the bay.

Look backward, and beneath thee lies
The shipping at thy feet;
The Port, a snug romantic town,
There terraces the steep.

Away, beyond the rolling hills
(The wreck of former fires),
Lend to "The Bays," which they enclose,
Whate'er romance requires.

Far to the east, the slumbering main,
Unshadowed by a cloud,
Begins to sparkle as the lark's
Clear song is heard aloud.

Turn to the westward. From afar
Grey mountains greet the eye;
While o'er the fertile boundless plain,
A generous fog does lie.

Far to the north, the unseen sun
Just tips, with rosy light,
The rugged bold Kaikoura chain,
That first throws off the night.

Now, quivering on the furthest line
Which distant ocean leaves,
The god of day in glory leaps
From mid'st the tumbling waves.

Shoots his clear rays o'er the expanse
Of Pegasus' wide bay;
Catches the mountains of the west,
That flash beneath his ray.

Now, as the sun invades the sky,
Stirred by his generous warmth,
In broken clouds the fog, dispersed,
Melts 'neath his gathering strength.

Now keep thy perch, and view the scene
Without a shadow's stain;
Withhold thy praise, no praise can paint
The Canterbury Plain.

Nor I; and if my reader hath
So very luckless been,
Then haste thee to the vantage whence
This paradise is seen.

For thou may'st tell of glorious alp,
Chill with an epoch's snow;
Or castled crags that watch the Rhine,
'Neath thy romance may glow;

And thou may'st vaunt the champaign fields,
That Frenchmen do delight,
But hast reserved for thine eye
A yet more glorious sight.

Beneath the eye the distant plain,
On the horizon lost,
Lies bounded by the Southern Alps,
And by the reeking coast.

Nearer and nearer in the view,
And more and more distinct,
Hamlet and hut embossed by trees
Do town and country link.

Fields, waving now with richest
green, Unbounded promise give,
And these with flocks and herds
display How well the farmers live.

Now thickens 'neath the nearer view
The groves which taste set there;
Studding the plain are country seats,
Wealth built with wealth to spare.

Now gardens gay and cornfields rich
Please and bewitch the eyes;
While gracing the suburban towns,
The spires of churches rise.

The Avon and the Heathcote glide
Like shining serpents on;
Now east, now west, unseen or seen,
Past many a happy home.

As one within their estuary,
They mingle without war,
And thence their flashing waters roll
Across the Sumner bar.

Fair of itself, this glowing scene
Might long the eye detain;
And every spot, that holds the eye,
Might share of rapture claim.

From morn till noon thou there might'st sit,
And skim the landscape o'er—
But no, thy glance already set
Forgets to wander more.

Now, if thy tongue hath eloquence,
Rocks shall record thy speech.
Ah! thou art silent, but thine eye
Thy ecstasies doth teach.

That's Christchchurch, and need I say more,
Christchurch is widely known.
Trees, houses, gardens, palaces,
All blend to form the town,

Beset with rural towns, as is
Some landscape known to fame,
By less yet charming views embossed
Upon the golden frame.

'Tis noon, and heed'st thou not the ray,
Hot beaming on the hill.
There thou might'st sit till close of day,
And yet not gaze thy fill.

O beauteous queen of the vast plains,
That round thy outskirts wide,
Stretch to the mountains of the west,
And to the rolling tide!

O grand conception of thy sires,
Who did thy site reclaim
From mud and mire, from bog and swamp,
And gave thy sounding name!

They planted seedlings in thy streets,
And clothed thy Avon's banks
With willowy shade, and thus have earned
The lovers' grateful thanks.

City, whose streets whichever way,—
Must with a garden end;
Whose fountain-wells, from far below,
Cool crystal waters send.

City of squares, thy wide domain,
All blushing fair with flowers,
Deserves all praise as they deserve
Who tend thy fairy bowers.

If Nature here but little gave,
True taste with art combined
Has made for thee a paradise,
The grief of all the blind!

Thy youth and beauty here are seen.
Like poppy flowers are these!
Most tempting fruits in ripeness hang
On not forbidden trees.

But Wisdom lords it o'er the scene.
We mark those sober halls,
Within whose precincts no gay words
Re-echo from the walls.

Cathedral City! here would I
In quiet choose to live,
And watch thy towers that slowly rise,
From whence reproach cries "give."

O Christchurch! glory of the South,
And worthy to remain
The great emporium into which
Is poured the yellow grain.

Since that great day when through thee rode
Victoria's second son,
Wonders indeed thou hast beheld,—
Like this day sawest thou none.

Nor had'st thou ever yet a morn,
That breaking smiled like this,
Nor yet a noon so richly charged
With every form of bliss.

The tools of labour everywhere
Aside neglected lie;
The bee itself keeps holiday,
Disporting through the sky.

The sunshine playeth in thy streets,
The wind toys with thy trees;
Thy sons and daughters shout for joy,
Bright heavens laugh at these.

The gay and joyous, here they come
Their holiday to keep;
The wicked and the worldly shun
Their foul or dark retreat.

Thy children's children with them bear
Wherewith to weave a crown;
'They bend their steps to Market Square,
And still they crowding come.

Here he, in all but regal state,
Who ne're saw fortune's frown,
Yet further favours did await
To swell his great renown.

Now sober sage philosophers,
For which this town is famed,
With bright-illumed address, stood forth,
Which they had jointly framed.

And there was one the phalanx led,
And who the missive bore;
The plumage of the Tui speaks
The garments which he wore.

Approaching there the middle space,
In view of all around,
Before the Moa-riding Sage
They bowed them to the ground.

Expectant silence hung o'er all,
Attention bowed the Sage,
The parchment-roll one moment took,
Its string to disengage.

Up rising all with head erect,
They thus a paean sang;
In powerful tones, clear and distinct,
Around the square it rang.

They sang the labours of their friend,
And blazoned his reward,
A name which far posterity
Would reverently regard.

Thus, "We, who circle round the sun
Of science that doth shine,
The light of this yet sends it rays.
To many a distant clime;

"And who as satellites reflect
A secondary ray,
Would here in public, at this time,
Desire to convey

"Our sense of what we do believe,
All men already know;
And by our platitudes we would
Our estimation show.

"The orb of day's a satellite
To a yet greater sun;
But thou in thy peculiar sphere
Art second unto none.

"Rivals indeed there may have been,
Who for a moment shone,
But 'neath thy glory so they fade,
They scarce are looked upon.

"Thy triumphs since we all have shared,
So be our fate like thine;
We never harboured any doubt,
But trusted still to time.

"We still believed when thou foretold.
The time for doubt is past.
Thou sitst on the prophetic beast
Discovered at last.

"Now let the sceptic go and burn
His hypothetic stuff;
We always had, and now the world
Has had of his enough.

"And now, we here with pride would point
To thy career that's gone,
And paint that future which thou art
Just entering upon.

"You found us many years ago
Secluded and unknown,
Possessed of qualities that make
A people wise and strong.

"With'raw material that proved
Too oft of little use,
Thy schemes for future benefit
Met sometimes with abuse.

"And ever ready at all times,
False prophets raised the cry,
Thou only did'st pollute the spring,
Or thou did'st drain it dry.

"And, this when thou but deeper sank
For more abundant store,
And if of this thou claimed'st thy share,
Thy merits claim yet more.

"Now flows the fountain strong and clear,
And near the muddy wells
Of false report, both North and South,
Delusion only dwells.

"And thou, with ample honours bless'd,
Forget'st what thou hast done;
Abeyance seizes on the past,
Thine eye's on what's to come.

"We and a grateful people raise
This our triumphant strain;
We honour thee, and future time
Our verdict shall sustain.

"Thou only, of this mighty throng,
Art honoured so to ride;
So wear thine honours. May thy foes
Shame and confusion hide.

"Thy name adown the centuries '
As household-words' shall be;
And thy remembrance yet shall live
With all posterity.

"We, by direction, on behalf
Of all assembled here,
Present thee with the people's gift,
Whose interests you hold dear."

Their duty done. Then borne away
(As crowds are often swayed)
By eloquence, the wild impulse
No mortal man had stayed.

Broke from the dense excited crowd
A shout that breathed their soul,
First like a thunder-clap at hand,
Then faint as distant roll.

The murmer hushed, all eyes beset
The centre figure there,
Our hero—his hot joy proved more
Than silent he could bear.

* * *

O happy, honoured, much loved man,
Enjoy while yet you may.
Thy cup of nectar's full! enjoy
The honours of the day.

Heed not yon lowering thundercloud,
It cannot fall on thee,
But drain thy cup, it hath no dregs,
It holds no misery.

Why should it? Hath not hitherto
Fair breezes set thy sail;
And thy expectancy hath
seen Fruition without fail.

So, if a morning bright and clear
Gives promise for the day,
Hope should be thine, and thou may'st still
Rejoicing keep thy way.

Ah! life hath many turnings short,
Beyond which and unseen
A blacker prospect opens out,
Than what the past hath been.

And many a sunny morning-sky
With clouds has been o'ercast
Long 'ere 'twas noon, betokening
The coming stormy blast.

And I have seen all heaven ablaze
Beneath the tropic sun,
And darkness blotting out the light
Before the dread cyclone.

But, since no shadow falls on thee,
Still give the hour to joy;
Thou hast no cares to fling away,
Enjoy thyself, enjoy.

* * *

While to his brethren in reply
The rider still held forth,
It happened, (how was then unknown,
And I but state the truth).

Freed from his fetters stood the bird,
And in that moment free
His frame was nerved, and his bright eye
Glowed with intensity.

He saw again his mountain home
Rise up before his sight;
And, stirred by hope of freedom won,
He gathered all his might.

His rider quickly realised
His was an awkward plight,
And speedily he aid
besought, So that he might alight.

But suddenly a mighty rush,
And pell mell all around
Philosophers were strewed about,
Upon the dusty ground.

Like thistle-down among tall grass,
They stoutly did resist
The furious bird, and sought to save
Our hero at their best.

But terror, rising like a flood,
And self, proved far too strong
For their resolve, and so they lie
Confusedly piled or prone.

Ye gods! what sad misfortune now
Swells the big womb of fate?
What dread calamities arise
Upon the wings of hate?

What eye of evil on us now
Throws its malignant glance,
Making our highest joys collide
With this accurs'd mischancc?

A moment hath sufficed to change
Bright hope to black despair,
And blanche the face when almost yet
The set smile lingers there.

Who could foresee this fated hour,
Which late did smile so fair?
Quicker the lightning through the night,
Leaves not a blackness there.

In grief, O Christchurch, now behold
Thy mighty overthrown,
Thy talent in its aggregate,
As senseless masses groan.

A huge collapse of moving flesh
Piled in confusion lies;
Each, brave, behind his neighbour's bulk
To hide his body tries.

I had a simile that would
Just here have suited well,
But decency pronounces it
Too horrible to tell.

Thus suddenly this rapid change,
In less time than 'tis read.
A plague of terror seizes all.
The stoutest heart is dead.

A moment more, then horrid yells
And shouts of murder rose;
Ye powers! from what? must I say men
From men we must suppose.

On sped the bird, and what so fleet!
I might in vain essay
The lightning's flash, a hyperbole,
As is the sunlit ray.

The Derby winner; that's too slow.
Well, then, what can be done?
There's nothing left, and, so I say,
He ran as Moas run.

O'er fallen foes, but what of that,
He spurned them with his feet,
And at a bound he strode along,
And cleared the fallen heap.

Horror of horrors yet await
The great illustrious———;
Fate, or his own mismanagement,
Had bound him doubly fast.

Shall words suffice for his dismay?
Apollo answers, no!
In vain to Dante I appeal,
He can no equal show.

Say, what is terror in the night
To one who waits his doom?
And counts the moments as they fly,
Lest morn should come too soon.

Say, if this wretch hath heap on heap
Piled higher human woe,
Yet with a craven heart must keep
Appointment with the foe?

Not yet enough—"all hell in arms"
Must shrink in horror back,
The livid hue that paints' his cheek
Hath deepened to a black.

With wild contortions, struggled there
The giant figure, borne
Light as a babe on such a back;
Yet Fate but smiled in scorn.

O what a prize, in such an hour,
Hath he who still must own,
If life her lease begin anew,
He'd do as he had done.

But ah! frail man, 'tis but a few
This high estate can reach,
Which even for a fallen foe
A sympathy should teach.

Yet so it is; but such is life;
And, far too surely, there
Are but a few whose honest heart
Them scatheless thus would bear.

And yet, O God, why should it be,
That death so seldom comes
Without repentance? while in life
We all are chosen ones.

Yet still the tide of life rolls on,
No man knows how or where;
Each in his own heart best can judge,
What conscience sayeth there.

But we return. The Moa fled,
Disdained to cross the bridge,
But sprang across the Avon's tide,
As 'twere a two foot hedge.

Waked from the stupor of surprise,
With a tremendous roar.
The frantic multitude gave chase;
In vain, in vain they bore

Down on the bridge, where crushed in heaps
With rear still pressing on;
Ensued a tumult which the like
Had Christchurch never known.

Heedless of all, the flightless bird,
Meanwhile a winged horse,
Steady, but with a frightful speed,
Unwavering held its course.

Dwellers on Papanui Road
Had never seen the like;
The women screamed, the men did stare,
The boys yelled with delight.

To Carleton then the bird sped on,
Where stockmen do abound;
And many a well-trained hack and whip,
Did there the bird surround.

Tumultuous shouts and horrid din
Behind, still urged him on;
Yet due respect seemed to be paid
His giant-limbs so strong.

So plied they fast the good cow-hide,
And shouted one and all;
But louder roared the frightened Sage,
On whom the blows did fall.

O what a plight! methinks I hear
The writhing victim's yell,
As the long serpentine-like
lash A biting fury fell.

"Mercy! in Heaven's name," he cried,
"Is this the aid you give?
I am not rich, but take my all,
Save me, for I would live."

Who in the desert wilderness
Has felt his life decay,
A thirsty madness, he alone
Can picture his dismay.

But now the bird has passed his foes,
And left them all behind,
Their utmost speed was nothing to
"The eater of the wind."

Houses and gardens, trees and fields
In circles seemed to team;
And to the rider's giddy brain,
Seemed mad as round they spun.

And now, as Speed with steady hand
Still urged the Moa on,
Obstruction everywhere gave place,
And thus was freedom won.

Hast thou beheld the reflux tide
Thrown back from either shore,
When doth a steamer, at full speed,
A confined space explore?

Or, hast thou seen an avalanche
Descending from on high,
And, with a scarce diminished speed,
Through waving forests fly?

When southern gales heap up the tide
That toils through the French Pass,
Hast thou then seen it chafe and roar,
Right onward to the grass?

But here, repelled with sullen roar,
Thrown back it boils among
The rocky crags that pile the shore,
While high it's spray is flung.

So yields, so roars, the live gorse-fence,
As back the cloven air's
Impetuous rush stirs all that's loose,
And high its wreckage bears.

Fate seemed averse. The rider's head
Sank drooping to his breast;
But, suddenly, he seized a straw,
A feeble hope at best.

It mattered little that 'twas vain,
It not the less was dear
(In darkness light's contrasted ray
Yet brighter doth appear.)

His consolation and his hope,
The railway gates in view,
O fatal chance! wide open stood,
The fugitives passed through;

And, thundering o'er the open plain,
A steady course did keep;
While from their path, on either side,
Fled far the frightened sheep.

The Sage, in this his trial come,
Unaided and alone,
Had safety only in himself.
To succour him were none.

He seized the Moa by the neck,
And sought its course to turn;
But here he found his strength was matched
As well had he foreborne.

* * *

Now think of all thy greatness,
And now upon thy fate;
Think how thy friends in secret laugh,
And how thy foes in hate.

Think what, with justice from thy hand,
The worthy might have been;
But look not on that grinning ghost,
For thou that face hast seen.

Scan all thy years of honour past,
And pluck the fruit that's there;
I pray thee look not on thy last,
If thou would'st not despair.

Take council with thyself not now,
All counsel is in vain;
Repulse that mockery of regret;
Nor think that thought again.

Wish that thine eyes were blind; but no!
It is thy mind that sees;
What is't that rides upon the wind?
What demons say are these?

Scorn and contempt come from the South;
Hate fills the northern air;
Here, justice hovers o'er thy head;
Full in thy face despair.

And, madly though thou yet art borne
With unremitting speed,
The fearful images unchanged
Are hovering o'er thy head.

A thousand forms come flocking in,
As time and distance gain;
And not an imp can cast one glance
That may relieve thy pain.

No witch-dance this, nor there "Auld Nick"
As piper at their head;
But stern and gloomy, silent all,
Through the thin air they glide.

* * *

And now, the once far distant hills
Are swelling to the view;
Attempt one desperate effort more,
Else bid all hope adieu.

Yet, as before his struggle's vain,
And this last effort past,
Both hands within a feathery mane
With desperate clutch held fast.

But what avail to tell you more,
Since none but one can tell
The horrors of his further ride,
Or on his fears to dwell.

How he the gods invoked for aid,
And yet no aid was found;
And how his misery lessened not,
From plain to hilly ground.

He sensless now had quite become,
With horror and dismay;
Whither he went he could not tell,
And shall I dare to say.

END OF SECOND PART.

James Hughes, Steam Printer. Etc., Lambtom Quay.

Rules of the Otago Trades

Labour Council.

(Established 1881.)

1.—NAME AND CONSTITUTION.

That this Association shall be called "THE OTAGO TRADES AND LABOR COUNCIL," and shall consist of

delegates from any trade, body, or society, who shall constitute the working members. Honorary members shall be admissible on payment of half-a-guinea per annum, and may attend and address meetings of the Council, but shall not be allowed to vote.

2.—OBJECTS.

The objects of the Council shall be:—

- To better the condition of the working classes; to assist each other in maintaining the eight hours' principle; and to give moral assistance in cases of dispute in all trades and other bodies of working men who may join the Council.
- To obviate as far as possible the necessity for "strikes," by a careful and patient investigation of subjects in dispute between employers and employes; and by undertaking, in conjunction with the parties interested, the settlement by arbitration of disputes.
- To use every legitimate means to obtain a a proper representation of labor in the Legislature of the Colony.

3.—REPRESENTATION.

That representatives be elected from, and by, each society or union according to numbers, as follows:—For every society, one representative; if numbering over twenty-five financial members, two representatives; over fifty members, three representatives; and any society or union shall be entitled to send an extra representative for every additional fifty financial members. One-third of the members of the Council to form a quorum.

4.—ADMISSION.

Any society or union desirous of belonging to this Council shall first signify the fact, in writing, to the Secretary, who shall report the matter to the Council. If no objection be taken, and the conditions of initiation be fulfilled, the admission of such society or union shall be ordered and confirmed. Any society or union affiliating between the months of January and July, or July and January, shall pay the amount due as if they had been admitted at the beginning of the half-year; and every society so affiliated shall agree to, and abide by, the actions and decisions of this Council in all matters or questions requiring its intervention and judgment.

5.—SUSTENTATION FUND.

The Sustentation Fund of this Council shall be maintained by the societies or unions affiliated paying the sum of sixpence per quarter for every member. Any society or union joining this Council after the first clay of January, 1882, shall pay an entrance-fee of sixpence per member. All subscriptions to be paid quarterly in advance.

6.—NOMINATION OF DELEGATES.

Delegates appointed to this Council shall present their credentials (bearing the signatures of the chairman and secretary of their society or union), upon which they shall be received as members and their names enrolled on the books of the Council.

7.—MEETINGS.

The Council shall hold meetings on the third Wednesday in each month, and shall commence business at half-past seven o'clock in the evening. Special meetings may be summoned (on application to the Secretary) by any society or union in connection with the Council, should the cause be deemed of sufficient moment.

8.—ORDER OF PROCEEDINGS.

- Reading and adoption of minutes.
- Reading of correspondence.
- Reports of committees.
- Questions.
- Orders of the meeting, and motions of which notice has been given.

Business of consequence, not specially provided for, may (by permission of the Chairman) be submitted at any stage of the proceedings.

No member shall speak more than once on the same motion, except in explanation or by permission of the Chairman. The mover of the motion only shall have the right of reply, after which the chairman shall put the question. A motion and amendment having been proposed, no second amendment shall be entertained until either the original motion or the first amendment has been disposed of.

9.—Management of Council.

The management of this Council shall be entrusted to certain officers, comprising a President, Vice-President, Treasurer, Secretary, and two Trustees, who shall be elected every half-year, by open voting or ballot, as may be decided upon; and these officers shall respectively hold office until relieved by the installation of their successors. A Doorkeeper shall also be appointed at the half-yearly meetings.

10.—Duties of Office-bearers.

President.—The duties of the President shall he to preside at all meetings of the Council, to preserve order and decorum, and to exert authority in conducting the business of the Council. He shall have the same right of speaking and voting on any question under discussion as any other delegate, and shall have a casting vote in addition to his deliberative vote.

Vice President.—The Vice-President shall assist in maintaining order and attention in the Council; and in the absence of the President shall take the chair, invested with the powers of the President

Treasurer.—The Treasurer shall receive all moneys from the Secretary, giving receipts for the same in a book kept for that purpose; pay all accounts passed by the Council, signed by the Trustees, and countersigned by himself; and any balance above the sum of £5 shall be deposited by him in the bank within forty-eight hours of receipt thereof. He shall keep a proper cash-book, showing all receipts and expenditure of the funds of the Council. For these services he shall receive such remuneration as may be decided upon by the Council.

Secretary.—The Secretary shall conduct all correspondence, call all meetings of the Council required, and take minutes of the same; prepare a business paper for all meetings; receive all moneys, and hand over the same to the Treasurer within forty-eight hours of receipt thereof; keep proper accounts of all funds of the Council; prepare, and submit a half-yearly report and balance-sheet in July and an annual report and balance-sheet in January, both being properly audited and signed by the auditors, showing the receipts and expenditure, names and number of societies, and number of financial members in such societies, and forward a copy of the same to each society or union; keep all books considered necessary, and transact all general business of the Council. For his services he shall receive such remuneration as may be decided upon by the Council.

Auditors.—Two Auditors shall be appointed annually to examine the books of the Council, in conjunction with the Secretary and Treasurer.

11.—Pecuniary Aid.

In consideration and disposal of trade matters on the part of any society or union, such society or union, before taking any action likely to lead to a "strike," shall first consult the Council, who shall exercise discretionary power in recommending to the other societies or unions the propriety of contributing pecuniary assistance; but the Council shall not be expected to directly collect money or pay out of their own fund the expenses incurred in any difficulty. Should the case be urgent and the circumstances satisfactory the Council will endeavor to meet the views of the applicants in a favorable manner.

12.—Deputations and Conferences.

Should an important subject require the appointment of a deputation, the Council may select the members thereof from the delegates or other approved persons. Should a conference be requested to discuss or arbitrate upon any cause, the Council may nominate an equal proportion of members (representing trades or callings) to confer and arrange for the mutual benefits of employers and employes. Report of proceedings in these respects must be ratified by the Council to become valid. All deputations appointed by this Council to be paid for the loss of time incurred thereon.

13.—Notices of Motion.

Delegates to give notice of their intention to propose any motion, so that members of the Council generally shall have a reasonable opportunity of learn-the character and purport of the same.

14.—Reports.

A statement of the business and proceedings of the Council shall be published at least once in every twelve months, and copies supplied to every trade or calling represented.

15.—Alteration of Rules.

Any member of the Council desiring to alter, amend, or to add to any of these Rules shall give one month's clear notice in writing of his intention, when the question shall be taken into consideration at any regular or special meeting of the Council.

16.—Bye-Laws.

The Council shall, at any general or special meeting, be empowered to make such Bye-laws as may be considered necessary for the general welfare.

C. J. Thorn, President.
W. C. Quin, Secretary.

Life Insurance: Does it Pay as an Investment? Wellington: James Hughes, Steam Printer, Etc., Lambton Quay. 1882.

To the Public.

THE author's object in presenting this pamphlet to the public is obvious, feeling assured that the subject is an interesting one to thousands of persons who have been and are daily becoming victims to the so-called benevolence of Life Insurance Companies; and if he has failed to do justice to the cause he has taken up he hopes the indulgent reader will remember that the question is a very important one, and not to be considered lightly. As an instance of its magnitude, it may be stated that one institution alone—the Australian Mutual Provident Society—has amassed so large a sum as £3,500,000, most of which has been subscribed by the industrial classes.

The trading spirit of the age is so great that these vast lottery companies have become an institution in the land, having grown up amongst an unsuspecting people under the garb of benevolence. Where the benevolence comes in the author leaves to a discriminating public to carefully consider in the following pages.
J. Hughes.

Life Insurance—does it Pay as an Investment?

PERHAPS no question of greater importance to the

Importance of the Question.

bulk of the population in this and other colonies, or one which more nearly affects their worldly prosperity, could be asked than that which forms the heading of this pamphlet. And it would be difficult to find a question of equal moment with regard to which there is such a wide diversity of opinion, even among those who are fully qualified, both by education and ability, to judge for themselves on such a matter. Year after year, in the columns of the daily press and in pamphlet form, the public are entreated to avail themselves of the opportunities held out to them by the various Life Insurance Companies; but notwithstanding the numerous arguments, good, bad, and indifferent, pressed into the service of the latter, there can be no doubt that a very large proportion of the general public are anything but favourably inclined towards the system of life insurance. To give publicity to the reasons which have induced many to form this adverse opinion, and to show, to the best of his ability, how far they are borne out by facts, is the object of the writer of these pages. He is not interested in the slightest degree in the prosperity of any life insurance company in existence; nor has he any intention of taking steps to become so. His object is simply to draw the attention of the public to a question of the very greatest importance to many of them, and to which they have not as yet received a satisfactory answer—" Life Insurance—Does it pay as an investment?"

What Life Insurance claims to be.

First of all let us see what is claimed for the system by those most interested in its further pro motion and prosperity. Professedly it is neither more nor less than a wide-spread scheme of benevo lence—an universal

panacea for "all the ills (almost) that flesh is heir to,"—a system which enables those who will accept of its benevolence to bear calmly the every day trials and misfortunes of life, confident in the assurance that those near and dear to then: are securely provided for in the event of their decease. And its advocates do not stop even at this. If we are to believe them a participation in this system of life insurance is an incentive to thrift a sacred duty, a pledge of affection, and a kind of written testimony to the piety of all those whose inclinations or hopes may induce them to become partakers of this scheme of benevolence.

Eagerness of Insurance Companies to increase their business.

If—the word is used advisedly—the system of life insurance be all that is claimed for it by its advocates; if it really is based on true benevolent principles, one would think that it would only have to be made known to be accepted willingly by everyone. Such, however, is apparently not by any means the case; and there is something extremely incongruous, not to say ludicrous (allowing the scheme to be one of benevolence), in the eagerness displayed by Life Insurance Companies to increase their business. Almost every one has heard the anecdote (false or true it is worth re-telling) of the American traveller who was so pestered by insurance agents while in London that he sought a refuge at the top of the Monument, and who, on emerging on the railed platform, was accosted by a benevolent looking gentleman with, a solicitation to take note of the advantages offered by Table III. The satirist who first invented the anecdote (if it was invented was scarcely going beyond the mark in his cari- cature of the persistency displayed by a certain class of insurance agents. Even in this colony it is scarcely, possible to invest half a dozen times in postage stamps at one of the country post offices without undergoing a somewhat similar experience. If any mortal is

Activity of Insurance Agents.

entitled to lay claim to ubiquity, that mortal is surely to be discovered in the guise of an insurance agent Their activity in the pursuit of business (horrid word to use in reference to a scheme of benevolencel), is only equalled by the unblushing effrontery which they display in urging the claims of the company which they represent. No statement of the necessities of the individual whose "life" they are anxious to secure is sufficient to restrain their importunity; no ugly experience in the annals of life insurance which cannot be smoothed away by these specious touters. Ask them to *explain* the intricate

Unwillingness of Agents to explain the details of life insurance.

system by which the millions of capital are built up; evince but the slightest desire to become acquainted with the number of policy holders who have contributed to build up this vast pile of gold, but who have received none of it in return; and the insurance agent becomes, metaphorically speaking, a cuttlefish, and escapes the awkward enquiries by enveloping himself in a cloud of hackneyed utterances regarding the *extreme benevolence* of the company which he has the honour (?) to represent.

The fact that the pecuniary circumstances of the individual, whose life they are endeavouring to secure, are not such as to warrant his entering into such a contract as that indicated, has no effect in checking these touters' ardour. In the palace or the workshop they are to be found equally at home, holding out the fear of death in one hand and their scheme of benevolence in the other, and only bent on securing the life which will entitle them to draw

Qualifications of an insurer from the Companies' point of view.

their share of the profit made upon it. No person apparently is entitled to refuse the advances of the "Friend of the Family" so long as he is able to pay the first charge made upon him for the latter's benevolence, and is in such a state of health as to render it pretty certain that this benevolence will not be called upon in the immediate future.

One-sided manner in which Life Insurance Companies press their claims on the public.

Here, it may be remarked, is one of the proofs of the disinterested benevolence of the life insurance companies. While they and their agents make use of the King of Terrors as a means of increasing their business by trading on the fears of the public;! while they lay immense stress on the fact that once a person is insured, his relatives are certain of getting the amount of his insurance money in the event of his demise, even if only one premium has been paid, they do not consider it necessary to impress upon the individual the fact that they intend to take every possible precaution to prevent his becoming a claim upon them. The medical examination is spoken of as a mere matter of form; the enquiries instituted as to the health of the individual's family serve as a basis for a few jocular or complimentary remarks; and the unfortunate recipient of this scheme of benevolence pays his money, enters into a compact to pay a certain sum of money every year, and retires in blissful ignorance of the fact that the chances are ten to one against his ever getting anything in return for his money.

If (the writer uses the word advisedly once more) life insurance is all that it is represented to be, why should those interested in it be afraid to show the reverse side of the medal? Why should not the individual whose "life" it is sought to obtain, be made acquainted with the losses which may await him as well as with the profits. In taking any serious step in life, no matter in what direction that step may lead, people have a right to learn both the advantages and disadvantages which may accrue to them from taking that step. But in the case of life

insurance this is exactly what those interested in it have most to fear, their assertions to the con- trary notwithstanding; and therefore it is that we find insurance companies and their touters overstepping the limits of truth on the one hand while they are not above acting a he on the other. Here

Instances of above.

is an instance of the one-sided manner in which these companies appeal to the public, taken from a pamphlet entitled "Be Wise in Time," published in 1878 for the Government Life Insurance Department of New Zealand:—"Let us suppose for illustration, that a farm could be purchased on similar conditions as to the amount of annual payment, that A buys a farm and B an insurance, each equaling in value say £1000; the payments of each person amounting yearly to £24. After the first payment both die. The heirs of A own property valued at £1000, on which there is still a debt of £976. The heirs of B receive £1000 in cash. It is a splendid condition of this latter form of investment that death cancels all obligation to continue payments. If we suppose the payments to have continued over a longer period of time, ten years, for instance, then there would still have been the sum of £750 due on the farm, and the payment already made would not have been sufficient to secure it from forced sale and loss of the entire sum invested." This reads very comfortably from the insurance agents' point of view, but look at the reverse side of the medal. The chances of an insurer dying one year after the issue of his policy, except by accident or the visitation of God, are so small as to be almost infinitesimal; and the insurance companies know this *or they would not issue the policy*. On the other hand illness, depression in business, or many other causes might arise which would render it impossible for B to continue his premiums. Supposing this to occur after a lapse of 10 years from the issue of the policy, B would have paid £240 as premiums. He might allow the policy to run on until the overdue premiums had swallowed up the bonus additions, and then, if still unable to continue the payment, he would lose the whole of his money, or he might surrender his policy to the Company and get in return—about £96! This is but one instance out of many of the one-sided manner in which the working of life insurance is placed before the public. And yet we are told that the system is a spontaneous outcome of benevolence—a more than fatherly solicitude for the future welfare of those dependant upon us. If this be questioned, let the sceptical refer to a pamphlet entitled "Will it Pay?" published in 1878 for the Government Life Insurance Department of New Zealand, in which the reader is beseeched on the score of piety, duty, affection, common-sense, and a host of other heartrending grounds, to accept the benevolent offices of that department, which on the opening page figures under the attractive guise of "A Friend of the Family."

The "Friend the Family" [*unclear:* cposed].

The Government ideal of this well-known character is a very attractive one, though somewhat suggestive of the heavy father who used to figure on the stage in the early days of the British Drama. A closer acquaintance with him, however, discloses some very serious blemishes in his character, and proves that he is not by any means so disinterested in his offers of assistance as he would have us believe. To drop metaphor, however, which by the way is scarcely a suitable cloak in which to drape a business transaction such as life insurance, (and that it is a business transaction, and a very unprofitable one to the public, will be shown later on), it must be apparent to all that there must be some motive at the bottom of the benevolent solicitude for our welfare exhibited by the various Life Insurance Companies; and it requires no very great amount of perspicuity

[*unclear:* need the active of surance companies].

to discover what that motive is.

It is simply the desire to make money. "The Friend of the Family," in common with the rest of the human species, is possessed with the greed for filthy lucre, and is not above the meanness of endeavouring to obtain it by playing on the weaknesses and fears of the members of the family whose welfare he is supposed to have in view. Here again for the purpose of illustration, the writer must refer the public to the pamphlet previously mentioned, by which it will be seen that he does not make this statement without having some grounds for his assertion. There, under the headings, "A social necessity," "A moral and social duty," "Take care of the children," &c., the public are regaled with the usual mixture of maudlin sentiment and stale platitudes which seems to form the stock-in-trade of the majority of life insurance agents and their employers.

If there is one class more than another which is

Persons most sought after by Insurance Companies.

sedulously interviewed on the subject of life insurance it is that which is composed of persons in the humbler walks of life—those whose incomes are no more than sufficient to cover their expenses from one year's end to another. These apparently are looked upon with especial favor by the "Friend of the Family," who positively yearns to make them the recipients of his benevolence; and these it is to whom the writer specially wishes to address himself. One of the most peculiar features in the system of life insurance is the anxiety displayed by the various companies and their agents to extend their business amongst this class of persons. Whether the assumption,

Reason for this anxiety.

too often correct, that the majority of this class will sooner or later, through stress of circumstances, allow their policies to lapse has anything to do with this extraordinary ebullition of philanthrophy on their behalf, the writer is unable to say; but he has

Insurers' loss the Companies' gain.

no doubt whatever that their inability to continue their premiums adds considerably to the profits of the companies. If a return could be obtained of the social status of all those persons who have allowed their policies to lapse in the Government Life Insurance Department and the Australian Mutual Provident Society, and who have thereby helped to swell the enormous capital of those institutions, the writer is convinced that by far the largest proportion of the return would be found to consist of persons in this class. And yet we still find the "Friend of the Family" urging his claims upon their notice in preference to their wealthier neighbours!

Life Insurance not' within reach of the working classes.

Howevet desirable it may be that the members of the labouring classes should make some provision for those dependant upon them in case of their decease, it is still patent to all who will give the time and attention necessary to the study of life insurance that the system is one which is not, properly speaking, within their reach. Those whose incomes are barely sufficient to meet the every day expenses of life, are certainly not in a position to enter into such a risky speculation as life insurance. With the majority of them it simply means losing the substance to grasp at the shadow. With the working man ready money is almost a *sine qua non* in the carrying on of his household expenses, &c. Every shilling taken, for whatever purpose, from his weekly earnings makes itself felt. Properly speaking he has no surplus income, and if at any time he is able to put away a few shillings or pounds, it is only laid by as a reserve which may be called upon in case of the advent of the proverbial "rainy day."

Advantages of Friendly Societies over Life Insurance Companies.

Perhaps few persons, outside the social circle which includes the great bulk of the labouring classes, are aware of the heavy tax which a policy of insurance imposes upon a member of this class. The writer is acquainted with frequent instances of working men having resorted to the suicidal policy of borrowing small sums of money, often at usurious interest, in order to enable them to continue the payment of their premiums. As a safeguard against adverse circumstances, individual ill-health, or family sickness, the advantages offered by life insurance companies bear no comparison to those afforded by the various friendly societies which have been established throughout the world. Should the bread-winner of a family be stricken down by illness, and incapacitated from earning the pittance which enables him to support a wife and family, the life insurance companies offer him no relief. Like a modern prototype of the Merchant of Venice they still demand their pound of flesh; in sickness or in health, in prosperous or adverse circumstances, the unfortunate partaker in their scheme of benevolence (?) must still pay the demand made upon him, or forfeit the greater portion of the sum which he has already sacrificed to their insatiable greed. How often has one of these poor sons of toil, stretched upon a bed of sickness, seen all the hard earnings of many a weary year slipping from his grasp, while he felt himself powerless to prevent the inevitable catastrophe? Ask the insurance companies and their touters. They and they alone can tell the? applicant *who* it was that built up that enormous pile of capital; *how* much anguish and distress that vast sum of gold represents.

Now look at the advantages offered by some of the

Instances of working of Friendly Societies.

Friendly Societies—friendly in the best sense of the word. No legion of touters to sing *their* praises; no untruthful pamphlets and one-sided statements to mislead those whose benefit they claim to seek: no parade of the vast sums *stolen* (no other word is sufficiently strong), from the pockets of those whom they profess to befriend. "Deeds, not words," should assuredly be their motto, and well would they deserve it. The writer will simply cite one or two of the rules of a branch of the Ancient Order of Foresters in England, in whose work he was interested some years ago. Every member by payment of 6d. per week was entitled to the following benefits:—In case of sickness, doctor and medecine free; 10s. per week for the first six months of his illness; 7s. 6d. for the ensuing six months; and 5s. for the remainder of the time during which he was incapacitated from work. In addition to this if a member died his relations received £10 as burial expenses; if his wife died he received £8 for a like purpose; and if he were willing to pay a sum of 3s. for his wife and 2s. each for his children *annually* to the society, they also received medical attendance and medecine free of all charge. How much more to the benefit of the struggling artizan is a society like this than a life insurance company? Let the labouring classes decide.

[*unclear:* novel friendly society].

A few more words (before the writer brings forward the statistics which are necessary to obtain an answer to the question which forms the title of this pamphlet), to direct attention to a novel kind of friendly society which obtains now in many of the centres of labour in Great Britian. One case with which the writer was acquainted will serve to illustrate the system. The workmen (300 in number,) at Messrs.—&—'s manufactory at

Sheffield, entered into an agreement to pay a sum of 6d. per week into a general fund. In return for this they received the following advantages:—In case of sickness a member received 10s. weekly for a period of six months, 7s. 6d. weekly for a further period of three months, and 5s. weekly for the remainder of the time during which he was incapacitated from work. In the event of the subscriber's death his wife, or nearest relation, received £8 as burial expenses; if the subscriber's wife died he received for a similar purpose; doctor's attendance and medecine were in each case given free of charge. At the end of the year, after deducting *actual* expenses (the secretary and treasurer's remuneration was 6d. annually for each member; auditor's fee 5s.) and reserving a small amount as a reserve fund, the balance was divided equally among all the subscribers; and not unfrequently amounted to over 75% of the money paid in. Here is another contrast (a still greater one) to the system of the life insurance companies. Not only was each member guaranteed this assistance in case of necessity, but at the termination of the year he received in *hard cash* the greater bulk of the money which he had paid to secure it. Then look at the difference in the expenses of management! On the one hand we have a society composed

Expenses of management in Life Insurance Companies.

mainly of uneducated men, inspired only with the desire to benefit one another, carrying out a good work at a cost of a trifle over 2½% on the net income and *waking it pay;* on the other we have two vast companies (the Australian Mutual Provident Society and the Government Life Insurance Department of New Zealand) carrying on a gigantic system of speculation at a respective cost of 15% and 20% of their total incomes. In the first instance the members of the society were not above looking after their own interests and doing their own work: in the other the members are content to allow a host of superfluous "Jacks in Office" to fatten on the outcome of their credulity, and are perfectly willing to take for granted any statements made by those whose interest it is to delude them. What thinking man, a member of the working classes, would hesitate to choose between a society such as the writer has instancetad Sheffield and a Life Insurance Company—the immediate and permanent assistance offered by the one, and the illusive advantages put forward under the false cloak of benevolence by the other? Of course it will be said that in the former case the individual was not guaranteed in case of death anything like the sum at his command in the latter; but the chances of an insurer, especially one whose lot is cast in the humbler walks of life, becoming a claim upon an insurance company are so few, and the risks of losing what he has paid so many, that they cannot be held to counterbalance the advantages offered by a Friendly Society.

[*unclear:* lances 10 to against insurer getting anything our his money.]

The writer said in a previous paragraph that the chances of an insurer becoming a claim upon either of the Companies referred to previously were ten to one against him. That this is no exaggeration, anyone who will peruse the last reports of those societies will see for himself. Take the Report of the Government Insurance Commissioner for the past year, prepared for presentation to the General Assembly, and turn to the table headed, "Policies Discontinued." From it it will be seen that out of a total of 839 policies discontinued during the year there were only 78 terminated by death, while no fewer

[*unclear:* distance of this from the cast Government Insurance Commisonersreport.]

than 636 *were allowed to lapse*. Of the remainder, I terminated by maturity, 12 by expiry, 3 by cancellation, and the remaining 100 were surrendered. Thus out of 830 persons, who at some period in the past took out policies in the department referred to, 636 lost every penny they had paid on their policies, while another 100 received only 40% of the amount paid in—the remaining 60% being retained by "The Friend of the Family" *as a specimen of his benevolence*.

[*unclear:* instances from the C.M.P. Society's last report.]

Here is another instance taken from the last report of the Australian Mutual Provident Society. The number of new polices issued last year by that society was 6551, but the net increase to its business was represented by only 3822 policies, owing to the fact that the terminating policies numbered no fewer than 2729! *Out of this number there were claims upon the society under 261 policies only*. But what about the other 2468 *terminating* policies? The report, curiously enough, is silent upon that head; and *perhaps wisely so*.

What has been written so far should at least serve to point out the folly of taking out a policy before one is certain of being able to continue the payment of the premiums. Had the 636 persons in the Government Life Insurance Department of New Zealand, and the 2468 persons in the Australian Mutual Provident Society, whose policies lapsed during the past financial year, invested their savings in a savings bank they would not now be bemoaning the loss of their money; and had those who surrendered their policies done likewise they would not only have received the whole of their money back, but would have received a certain, amount of interest as well, instead of being mulcted of 60% of the capital. The advocates of life insurance will probably here step in with the remark that had these persons done as is suggested they would have reaped no benefit beyond their savings in the event of their death having taken place during the period over which their transactions with the bank extended. This is of course nothing but the truth, but as has been previously pointed

out, the insurance companies take such precautions to guard against the acceptance of an unsafe life that the remote chance (accidents excepted) of a person's relatives benefitting through his insurance, are entirely overweighed by the personal and immediate advantages to be obtained by investing in a savings bank.

The writer has, he considers, pretty conclusively

Losses which may befall the insurer.

substantiated his statement as to the chances which an insurer has of obtaining anything from the society in which he takes out a policy. It is only neccesary now to illustrate the *losses* which may fall to his share should he persist in becoming a partaker of this scheme of benevolence (?) It is always a difficult matter to obtain authentic information bearing upon this point, because it is naturally a sore subject with those whose experience is able to supply it; and few men care to proclaim their folly even for the benefit of their fellowmen. Fortunately, however, the writer has in his possession a copy of a letter, published not long since on this very subject, which contains a number of instances the truth of which is vouched for by the writer. This at least is certain, *they have never been disputed*. Here are a few of them:—

"A B insured his life 20 years since, aged 37,

Instances of above.

for £500. He has paid £15 3s. each year during that time; he still lives, but money being scarce he would be glad to be relieved from further payments. Now, had he paid this amount yearly into one of the societies established in Wellington for the purpose of accumulating small savings, and which have been so successful, he could now have laid his hands on fully £700, which would produce him £56 per annum. He asks the Australian Mutual Provident Society what they will return him for the money he has given them? They answer, £260 or £270; this shows a positive loss of £430. Has not this been a losing game? Another case, C D, aged 49, insured his life for £500, eight years since. He has paid £22 8s. yearly to this society. He is alive, but it would suit his circumstances to cease paying the amount. Had he paid the amount into one of the societies referred to, they would now give him about £235, which would produce £20 a-year for him, but the Australian Mutual Provident Society offer to return him only £116. Here is a loss of £120, not a trifle in these times. Another case, E F insured his life 15 years since for £600, then 65 years old. He has paid £54 6s. each year during that time to the Australian Mutual Provident Society. Had this sum been paid into one of these investment societies, he would now be entitled to draw out £1500, which would bring in £120 per annum, but instead of that, willing or unwilling, able or unable, he must go on paying the £54 6s. if he lives another 10 years. E F is now very old, and the payment is kept up with great difficulty, and he feels that he has paid more than enough for the amount he is insured for. He asks the Society what they will give him *now*

It is easily seen how the Australian Mutual Provident Society made their £3,500,000.

for what he has paid in? They answer £455 Here is a positive loss of £1045. This is a splendid investment for E F (over the left), and must elicit the question, can such be? I am aware that, at the rate of interest the society's funds are invested, the sum paid yearly would not produce to the society much over £1200; but I will assume that as the amount earned by the society; then allow 15 per cent, for expenses which would reduce the amount by £180; this will leave £1020 in the hands of the Society as the net results of E F's yearly payments. So by offering £445 for the surrender of this policy the Society makes a net profit out of this transaction of £565. Just one case more: G H insured his life in the Government office for £900. After paying £40 a year for five years, or a total amount of £200, his circumstances prevented him from keeping up the payments, his life remained insured for about two years while the surrender value was running out, but after that the policy lapsed, and the £200 was a total loss."

Surely, as the writer of the letter from which the above extracts are taken says, if such things as these can happen to members of a life insurance company they should pause before they get entangled in its web—a veritable spider's web to multitudes. All i of these persons whose losses are instanced above *might* have got prizes in the lottery, but they *did* not; and the annual reports of the several life insurance companies prove incontestably that the great bulk of the insured *do* not. What more need be said?

Much might be written respecting the working

Advice to members of the Working Classes.

details of life insurance—the vexed question of exorbitant premiums, bonuses, expenses of management, &c.—but the writer has no intention of entering upon this debateable ground at present. His object in taking up his pen was not to analyse the system of life insurance in detail, but to direct attention to its results; to prove that at least *one* statement put forward by those interested in it (viz, that it is profitable as an investment), is absolutely without foundation in fact. Let the members of that class in whose interest these lines are written weigh this matter well before taking heed to the statements put forward by life insurance companies and their agents. Let them ascertain the motive of this scheme of benevolence (?), this Mutual Provi- dent System which enriches the few at the expense of the many. Let them discover, if they can, why this benevolence, of which we hear so much and see so little, does not prompt these companies to enquire whether the insurer is not losing his

substance in the endeavour to grasp the shadow. Do

The dark side of Life Insurance.

they ever make these enquiries i No, taking advantage of his inexperience, playing upon his fears, and dazzling him with the prospect of advantages which in many instances they must know to be utterly beyond his reach, they strip him of the little that might have made home comfortable; and when he has exhausted his resources to meet this drain upon him, beggared his present to provide for others' future, and can pay no more, they accept the surrender of his policy and return him 40% of the money he has paid to them, or magnanimously allow him a paid-uppolicy (payable at his death) for a trifle over the sum which they have had the use of for years past and may possibly have for years to come.

Such is one of the pictures, a by no means uncommon one, visible to those who can read between the lines of a Life Insurance Company's report. Many will no doubt cavil at it, stigmatize it as untruthful or at least overdrawn. The writer knows' that it is neither; that there are darker pages still in the annals of life insurance; that this same system of universal benevolence has been the source of untold hardships and misery to thousands, and will be so still to thousands more. It is of little moment to point to those who have benefitted by the system, seeing that it has been at the expense of their fellow

The test of [*unclear:* true benevolence.]

creatures. If the greatest good to the greatest number is to be the test of these companies—and what scheme of true benevolence does not aim at attaining this—then this system of life insurance should be abolished, or so remodelled as to allow of its being practicable to carry out the benevolence which is claimed for it, but which at present is only conspicuous—from its absence.

James Hughes, Steam Printer, &c., Lambton-quay, Wellington.

New Zealand Government Life Insurance. Ordinary Branch.

Guide and Tables.

Published by Authority.

Wellington. By Authority: George Didsbory, Government Printer. 1877.

New Zealand Government Insurance Department. Ordinary Branch.

Head Office: Government Buildings, Wellington.

Deputy Commissioner: J. Woodward.

Actuary: C. Godfrey Knight.

Chief Medical Officer: Alexander Johnston, M.D.

Agencies—Ordinary Branch:

Forms of application and full particulars can be obtained from any of the above Agents, but Premiums can only be received by the respective Local Postmasters, distinguished by the Letters P M before the name of the Agency, or by the Chief Agents at Dunedin, Christchurch, Wellington, and Auckland.

New Zealand. Government Life Insurance.

1. THE GOVERNMENT LIFE INSURANCE DEPARTMENT issues all desirable forms of Policies.

2. THE PAYMENT OF EVERY POLICY IS GUARANTEED BY THE COLONY.

3. DIVISION OF PROFITS.—The surplus or profit is ordered by Law to be divided among Policy-holders *only*, and is to be ascertained every fifth year. The first investigation, with a view to division of profits, is to be made as at 30th June, 1880. The first quinquennial investigation, recently completed, shows a surplus of over £12,000.

4. THE PREMIUMS combine two benefits. They are as low as is consistent with the safety of the Office, and they entitle the Policy-holder to a full share in the profits, who thus secures *from the first* the advantage of a participating policy from 15 to 30 per cent, greater than those of the same kind granted by Private Companies for the same premium.

5. PAYMENT OF PREMIUMS.—The payments may be made during whole term of life, or during a limited period only; at an invariable annual, half-yearly, or quarterly premium, or by a single premium. The rates for any description of Life Insurance not given in the published Tables may be obtained at the Head Office in Wellington.

6. LIBERAL CONDITIONS as to travelling, residence, &c.:—

- Policy-holders may travel without license or payment of extra premium, or they may reside in any part of the world, except within 25 degrees of the equator, without license or payment of extra premium.
- Policy-holders may change their occupation without license or payment of extra premium.
- Death by suicide (except within twelve months of the date of the policy), by duelling, or by the hands of Justice, does not void any policy.
- No policy becomes void by any act of the Insured, so far as regards the interest of any third persons, provided such act is done without their knowledge, and that they pay the additional premium required, if any, as soon as such act comes to their knowledge.

7. ALL POLICIES, after five years' duration, are indisputable and unchallengeable on any grounds whatever connected with the statements on which the Assurance was based, except fraud, provided the age of the Insured has been admitted.

8. ALL POLICIES, after five years' duration, are freed from all conditions, except the payment of premium, provided the age of the Insured has been admitted, and he has attained thirty years of age, and has resided continuously within the ordinary limits from the date of the policy. Holders of such policies can travel or reside in any part of the world, without license of payment of extra premium.

9. PROOF OF AGE.—Age will be admitted at any time on a policy on production of either a certificate of birth or baptism; or, failing these, the best proof that can be procured, such as, for instance, an entry in a family Bible, or a statutory declaration from a relation or friend, stating belief as to age, and grounds of such belief.

10. ALL POLICIES ARE NON-FORFEITABLE after three years to the full extent of their value, under a special regulation providing for the continuance in force of every policy for the original amount, so long as the surrender value of the policy, as defined by the regulation, is not less than the premiums in arrear, together with interest at six per cent, per annum, thus giving to every policy-holder a full equivalent for every premium paid. Such policies may be revived even within twelve months after exhaustion of surrender value on proof of unimpaired health, and payment of arrears and fine.

11. SURRENDERS.—Policy-holders, after having paid three full annual premiums, are guaranteed a cash surrender value of about 40 per cent, of the paid-up premiums, provided that no premiums are in arrear, and that the surrender value is not less than £5; but if for any reason the premiums have not been paid when due, a policy free of future premiums will be granted, on application, for such an amount (generally greater than the paid-up premiums) as the surrender value at date of lapse will purchase, provided that such policy is not less than £50, and that application is made within three months.

TABLE OF SURRENDER VALUES OF POLICIES EFFECTED AT ORDINARY RATES UNDER TABLE I.

IF POLICY AT TIME OF SURRENDER HAS BEEN IN FORCE Age at Commencement of Assurance. Annual Premium for £100 payable at Death. Three Years. Five Years. Ten Years. Cash Surrender Value. Total Premiums Paid. Paid-up Policy granted for Surrender Value. Cash Surrender Value. Total Premiums Paid. Paid-up Policy granted for Surrender Value. Cash Surrender Value. Total Premiums Paid. Paid-up Policy granted for Surrender Value. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. 25 1 15 9 1 17 8 5 7 3 5 18 9 3 4 11 8 18 9 9 17 4 7 1 1 17 17 6 19 11 6 30 2 0 10 2 6 1 6 2 6 6 12 10 3 19 5 10 4 2 11 0 3 8 12 8 20 8 4 21 16 6 35 2 7 2 2 16 11 7 1 6 7 9 7 4 18 2 11 15 10 12 8 1 10 13 6 23 11 8 2.4 9 0 40 2 15 2 3 11 6 8 5 6 8 10 5 6 2 10 13 15 14 1 5 13 0 9 27 11 8 27 0 8 45 3 5 11 4 8 1 9 17 9 9 10 0 7 9 4 16 9 7 15 9 8 15 10 1 32 19 2 29 2 8 50 4 0 2 5 5 1 12 0 6 10 5 7 8 17 3 20 0 10 16 13 2 18 2 11 40 1 8 31 0 11 55 4 19 5 6 4 5 14 18 3 11 1 0 10 8 10 24 17 1 17 17 2 20 19 9 49 14 2 32 18 4

The following Example, taken from the preceding Table, illustrates the practical working of clauses 10 and 11:—A person, aged 30 (col. 1), insured for £1,000, paying an annual premium of £20 8s. 4d. (col. 2), whose policy has been in force for three years, would be entitled to a surrender value, in cash, amounting to £23 0s. 10d. (col. 3); or, if he failed to pay the next premium, the surrender value would be applied by the office to keep the policy in force for a period of twelve months, during which time the policy can be revived as stated in the preceding clause, No. 10; or, if death occurred, the sum assured would be paid, less arrears and interest; or, if notice is given within three months from date of lapse, he could receive a policy free of all future premiums of £66 8s. 4d., being an amount exceeding the premiums he has paid.

12. LOANS.—Policy-holders can borrow on the security of their policies to the extent of 90 per cent, of the cash surrender value, provided the loan exceeds £5. (For cash surrender value, see columns 3, 6, and 9 of preceding Table.) The loan agreement between policy-holders and the Department is prepared free of cost, and interest is at present charged at the rate of £7 per cent, per annum, payable half-yearly. Loans can be repaid at

any time without previous notice. No loans can be granted on settlement policies under section 16 of "The Government Insurance and Annuities Act, 1874."

13. REVIVAL OF LAPSED POLICIES.—Thirty days of grace are allowed on all Renewal Premiums, and no policy is absolutely forfeited for non-payment of premium unless the premium remains unpaid for twelve months, or the surrender value (if any) has been exhausted for a year. Such policies may be renewed, provided the premiums in arrear and a fine are paid, and the Insured is in unimpaired health.

14. POLICIES PROTECTED FROM BANKRUPTCY.—An Assurance policy effected by the Insured, *bonâ fide* on his own life, is protected from bankruptcy or insolvency laws to a certain amount, which increases with its duration. Thus, after it has endured for two years, it is protected to the extent of £200;

This protection applies only in favour of the personal representatives of the Insured.

15. MARRIED WOMEN MAY EFFECT POLICIES, dispose of the sum assured by will, as if single, and their policies are protected from the debts of their husbands, according to duration, to amounts similar to those stated in clause 14.

16. SETTLEMENT POLICIES.—Policies effected for the benefit of the wife and children of the Insured under section 16 of "The Government Insurance Act, 1874," are from the date of issue absolutely protected from the claims of creditors to the extent of £2,000, provided that the premiums are payable during life, or any period not less than seven years: but such policies cannot be surrendered for cash.

17. A POLICY-HOLDER may at any time nominate his wife, mother, child, brother, sister, or niece to receive the sum assured payable at his death, provided it does not exceed £200.

18. PROBATE, &C., DISPENSED WITH.—When a claim under a policy does not exceed £200, the Commissioner may dispense with the production of probate or letters of administration, thus saving great expense to the representatives of the Insured.

19. A POLICY-HOLDER may at any time direct that, instead of the sum assured being paid at his death, it shall be converted into an annuity payable to a nominee.

20. EXEMPTION FROM STAMP DUTY.—Annuities, policies, powers of attorney authorizing the receipt of moneys, and receipts for moneys payable under the Act, are exempted from stamp duty.

21. NO POLICY or Medical Fees charged. Assurances are granted on a single life to the extent of £3,000.

22. NOTICES OF ASSIGNMENT are received and registered at the Head Office only. On this subject, attention is requested to the provisions of "The Government Insurance and Annuities Act, 1874."

23. CLAIMS AT DEATH.—Claims are payable by the Regulations one mt nth after proof of death; but in practice they are paid in full as soon as death is proved and the representatives of the deceased are able to discharge the policy.

NOTE.—Printed copies of "The Government Insurance and Annuities Act, 1874," and of the Regulations issued thereunder, also of the Annual Reports and Accounts of the Department, together with Forms of Application and full particulars, may be obtained at any Money Order Post Office in the Colony.

Table I.—*Premiums payable during whole of Life, to secure* £100, *payable at Death only*.

Age next Birthday. Annual. Half-yearly. Quarterly. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. 25 1 15 9 0 18 1 0 9 1 26 1 16 8 0 18 7 0 9 4 27 1 17 8 0 19 1 0 9 7 28 1 18 8 0 19 7 0 9 11 29 1 19 9 1 0 2 0 10 2 *30 2 0 10 1 0 9 0 10 6 31 2 2 0 1 1 4 0 10 9 33 2 3 2 1 1 11 0 11 1 33 2 4 5 1 2 7 0 11 4 34 2 5 9 1 3 3 0 11 8 35 2 7 2 1 3 11 0 12 1 36 2 8 7 1 4 8 0 12 5 37 2 10 1 1 5 5 0 12 10 38 2 11 8 1 6 3 0 13 3 39 2 13 4 1 7 1 0 13 8 40 2 15 2 1 8 1 0 14 1 41 2 17 1 1 9 1 0 14 7 42 2 19 1 1 10 1 0 15 1 43 3 1 3 1 11 2 0 15 8 44 3 3 6 1 12 4 0 16 4 45 3 5 11 1 13 7 0 16 11 46 3 8 6 1 14 11 0 17 7 47 3 11 2 1 16 4 0 18 3 48 3 14 0 1 17 9 0 19 0 49 3 17 0 1 19 3 0 19 10 50 4 0 2 2 0 11 1 0 8 51 4 3 6 2 2 8 1 1 6 52 4 7 1 2 4 6 1 2 6 53 4 10 11 2 6 5 1 3 6 54 4 15 0 2 8 7 1 4 7 55 4 19 4 2 10 9 1 5 8 56 5 4 0 13 2 1 6 11 57 5 9 0 2 15 10 1 8 3 58 5 14 5 2 18 7 1 9 8 59 6 0 3 3 1 8 1 11 3 60 6 6 7 3 4 11 1 12 11 EXAMPLES. * A person aged 30 may secure £1,000 at Death by a yearly payment during life of £20 8s. 4d This premium, if paid to Private Offices, would only secure a Policy for about £850 instead of £1,000.

Table II.—*Single or Annual Premiums for a Specified Period, to secure* £100, *to be paid at Death only*.

Age next Birthday. Annual Premium limited to Single Premium. Age next Birthday. Twenty Payments. Fifteen Payments. Ten Payments. Five Payments. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. 25 2 11 1 3 1 5 4 2 9 7 8 4 33 17 10 25 26 2 12 1 3 2 7 4 4 3 7 10 11 34 9 6 26 27 2 13 2 3 3 9 4 5 10 7 13 8 35 2 2 27 28 2 14 2 3 5 0 4 7 6 7 16 6 35 14 4 28 29 2 15 3 3 6 3 4 9 2 7 19 5 36 7 7 29 *30 2 16 4 3 7 7 4 10 10 8 2 5 37 0 4 30 31 2 17 6 3 8 11 4 12 7 8 5 5 37 14 1 31 33 2 18 8 3 10 3 4 14 4 8 8 6 38 7 3 32 33 2 19 11 3 11 8 4 16 2 8 11 8 39 1 2 33 34 3 1 3 3 13 1 4 18 1 8 14 10 39 15 10 34 35 3 2 7 3 14 7 5 0 0 8 18 2 40 11 1 35 30 3 3 11 3 16 2 5 2 0 9 1 7 41 5 8 36 37 3 5 4 3 17 9 5 4 0 9 5 0 42 0 9 37 38 3 6 9 3 19 5 5 6 1 9 8 7 42 16 4 38 39 3 8 4 4 1 2 5 8 4 9 12 4 43 13 9 39 40 3 10 0 4 3 0 5 10 7 9 16 2 44 10 1 40 41 3 11 9 4 4 11 5 12 11 10 0 2 45 7 10 41 42 3 13 6 4 6 10 5 15 5 10 4 3 46 5 6 42 43 3 15 5 4 8 11 5 18 0 10 8 6 47 4 4 43 44 3 17 5 4 11 1 6 0 8 10 12 11 48 2 9 44 45 3 19 7 4 13 5 6 3 5 10 17 6 49 2 3 45 46 4 1 11 4 15 10 6 6 4 11 2 3 50 2 6 46 47 4 4 3 4 18 4 6 9 4 11 7 1 51 2 4 47 48 4 6 8 5 0 11 6 12 5 11 11 11 52 2 11 48 49 4 9 4 5 3 7 6 15 7 11 16 11 53 3 11 49 50 4 12 1 5 6 5 6 18 10 12 2 0 54 5 2 50 51 4 14 11 5 9 4 7 2 2 12 7 2 55 6 4 51 52 4 18 0 5 12 6 7 5 8 12 12 7 50 8 2 52 53 5 1 4 5 15 10 7 9 5 12 18 2 57 10 7 53 54 5 4 10 5 19 5 7 13 4 13 3 11 58 13 4 54 55 5 8 8 6 3 2 7 17 5 13 9 10 59 17 3 55 56 5 12 8 6 7 2 8 1 8 13 16 0 61 0 0 56 57 5 17 1 6 11 4 8 6 3 14 2 5 62 4 6 57 58 6 1 11 6 15 11 8 11 2 14 9 3 63 10 6 58 59 6 7 3 7 0 11 8 16 0 14 16 5 64 16 4 59 60 6 12 11 7 6 4 9 2 3 15 4 2 66 3 11 60 EXAMPLE. * A person aged 30 may secure £1,000 by Twenty payments of £28 3s. 4d., by Ten payments of £45 8s. 4d., or by a Single Payment of £370 3s. 4d.

Table II—.*Half-Tearlt Premiums for a specified period, to secure* £100, *to be paid at Death only*.

Age next Birthday. For 20 Years. For 15 Years. For 10 Years. For 5 Years. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. 25 1 6 0 1 11 3 2 2 2 3 16 4 26 1 6 6 1 11 10 2 3 0 3 17 8 27 1 7 0 1 12 5 2 3 10 3 19 1 28 1 7 6 1 13 1 2 4 8 4 0 7 29 1 8 1 1 13 9 2 5 6 4 2 1 *3o 1 8 8 1 14 5 2 6 4 4 3 8 31 1 9 3 1 15 1 2 7 3 4 5 3 33 1 9 10 1 15 9 2 8 2 4 6 11 33 1 10 6 1 16 6 2 9 2 4 8 7 34 1 11 2 1 17 3 2 10 2 4 10 3 35 1 11 10 1 18 0 2 11 2 4 12 0 36 1 12 6 1 18 10 2 12 2 4 13 10 37 1 13 3 1 19 8 2 13 2 4 15 8 38 1 14 0 2 0 6 2 14 3 4 17 7 39 1 14 10 2 1 5 2 15 5 4 19 6 40 1 15 8 2 2 4 2 16 7 5 1 7 41 1 16 6 2 3 4 2 17 10 5 3 8 43 1 17 5 2 4 4 2 19 1 5 5 10 43 1 18 5 2 5 5 3 0 6 5 8 1 44 1 19 6 2 6 6 3 1 10 5 10 5 45 2 0 7 2 7 9 3 3 3 5 12 11 46 2 1 9 2 9 0 3 4 9 5 15 5 47 2 3 0 2 10 3 3 6 4 5 18 0 48 2 4 3 2 11 7 3 8 0 0 0 7 49 2 5 7 2 13 0 3 9 8 6 3 3 50 2 7 0 2 14 5 3 11 4 6 6 0 51 2 8 6 2 10 0 3 13 1 6 8 10 53 2 10 1 2 17 7 3 14 11 6 11 9 53 2 11 10 2 19 4 3 16 10 6 14 9 54 2 13 7 3 1 2 3 18 11 6 17 10 55 2 15 7 3 3 2 4 1 1 7 1 0 56 2 17 8 3 5 3 4 3 4 7 4 4 57 3 0 0 3 7 5 4 5 9 7 7 10 58 3 2 6 3 9 10 4 8 4 7 11 7 59 3 5 3 3 12 5 4 11 1 7 15 6 60 3 8 3 3 15 2 4 14 2 7 19 8 EXAMPLE. * A person aged 30 may secure £1,000 to his widow and family at his death by paying £14 6s. 8d. Half-yearly for 20 years, or by paying £23 3s. 4d. Half-yearly for 10 years.

Table II.—*Quarterly Premiums for a specified period, to secure* £100, *to be paid at Death only*.

Age next Birthday. For 20 Years. For 15 Years. For 10 Years. For 5 Years. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. 25 0 13 1 0 15 9 1 1 4 1 18 9 26 0 13 4 0 16 1 1 1 9 1 19 5 27 0 13 7 0 16 4 1 2 2 2 0 2 28 0 13 10 0 16 8 1 2 7 2 0 11 29 0 14 2 0 17 0 1 3 1 2 1 8 *30 0 14 5 0 17 4 1 3 6 2 2 6 31 0 14 9 0 17 9 1 3 11 2 3 4 32 0 15 1 0 18 1 1 4 4 2 4 2 33 0 15 5 0 18 5 1 4 10 2 5 0 34 0 15 9 0 18 10 1 5 4 2 5 10 35 0 16 1 0 19 2 1 5 10 2 6 9 36 0 16 5 0 19 7 1 6 5 2 7 8 37 0 16 9 1 0 0 1 6 11 2 8 8 38 0 17 2 1 0 5 1 7 5 2 9 8 39 0 17 7 1 0 11 1 8 0 2 10 8 40 0 18 0 1 1 5 1 8 8 2 11 8 41 0 18 5 1 1 11 1 9 4 2 12 9 42 0 18 11 1 2 5 1 9 11 2 13 11 43 0 19 5 1 3 0 1 10 7 2 15 1 44 0 19 11 1 3 6 1 11 4 2 16 4 45 1 0 6 1 4 1 1 12 1 2 17 7 46 1 1 2 1 4 9 1 12 10 2 18 10 47 1 1 9 1 5 5 1 13 8 3 0 2 48 1 2 4 1 6 1 1 14 6 3 1 7 49 1 3 1 1 6 10 1 15 4 3 3 0 50 1 3 9 1 7 7 1 16 2 3 4 4 51 1 4 6 1 8 4 1 17 1 3 5 9 52 1 5 4 1 9 2 1 18 0 3 7 3 53 1 6 3 1 10 1 1 19 0 3 8 10 54 1 7 2 1 11 1 2 0 1 3 10 6 55 1 8 2 1 12 1 2 1 2 3 12 2 56 1 9 2 1 13 1 2 2 4 3 13 11 57 1 10 4 1 14 2 2 3 7 3 15 8 58 1 11 8 1 15 5 2 4 11 3 17 8 59 1 13 1 1 16 9 2 6 4 3 19 9 60 1 14 7 1 18 2 2 7 11 4 1 11 EXAMPLE. * A person aged 30 may secure £1,000, payable at his death, by payment of £7 4s. 2d. Quarterly for 20 years, or by payment of £11 15s. Quarterly for 10 years.

Table III.—*Endowment Assurance.—Annual Premiums to secure* £100, *payable as indicated, or at Death, if prior*.

Age next Birthday. In 10 Years. In 15 Years. In 20 Years. In 25 Years. In 30 Years. In 35 Years. Age next Birthday. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. 25 9 1 5 5 15 3 4 3 3 3 5 1 2 13 9 2 6 6 25 26 9 1 8 5 15 6 4 3 7 3 5 5 2 14 2 2 7 0 26 27 9 1 11 5 15 10 4 3 11 3 5 9 2 14 7 2 7 6 27 28 9 2 2 5 10 1 4 4 3 3 6 2 2 15 1 2 8 1 28 29 9 2 5 5 16 5 4 4 7 3 6 7 2 15 7 2 8 8 39 *30 9 2 8 5 16 8 4 4 11 3 7 0 2 16 1 2 9 3 30 31 9 2 11 5 16 11 4 5 3 3 7 5 2 16 8 2 9 11 31 32 9 3 2 5 17 3 4 5 8 3 7 11 2 17 3 2 10 8 33 33 9 3 5 5 17 7 4 6 1 3 8 5 2 17 11 2 11 5 33 34 9 3 9 5 17 11 4 6 6 3 9 0 2 18 7 2 12 3 34 35 9 4 1 5 18 4 4 7 0 3 9 7 2 19 4 2 13 2 35 36 9 4 5 5 18 9 4 7 7 3 10 3 3 0 2 2 14 2 36 37 9 4 9 5 19 2 4 8 2 3 11 0 3 1 1 2 15 3 37 38 9 5 1 5 19 8 4 8 9 3 11 9 3 2 0 2 16 5 38 39 9 5 5 6 0 2 4 9 5 3 12 7 3 3 0 2 17 8 39 40 9 5 9 6 0 9 4 10 2 3 13 6 3 4 2 2 19 0 40 41 9 6 3 6 1 4 4 10 11 3 14 6 3 5 5 41 42 9 6 10 6 2 1 4 11 10 3 15 8 3 6 9 42 43 9 7 5 6 2 10 4 12 10 3 16 11 3 8 4 43 44 9 8 2 6 3 9 4 13 11 3 18 4 3 10 0 44 45 9 8 11 6 4 9 4 15 2 3 19 10 3 11 9 45 46 9 9 9 6 5 10 4 16 7 4 1 6 46 47 9 10 8 6 7 0 4 18 1 4 3 3 47 48 9 11 7 6 8 2 4 19 8 4 5 2 48 49 9 12 7 6 9 6 5 1 4 4 7 3 49 50 9 13 8 6 10 11 5 3 2 4 9 7 50 51 9 14 10 6 12 7 5 5 2 51 52 9 16 2 6 14 4 5 7 5 52 53 9 17 9 6 16 4 5 9 11 53 54 9 19 5 6 18 7 5 12 8 54 55 10 1 3 7 1 0 5 15 8 55 56 10 3 4 7 3 8 56 57 10 5 8 7 6 7 57 58 10 8 3 7 9 11 58 59 10 11 3 7 13 8 59 60 10 14 9 7 18 0 60 EXAMPLE. * A person aged 30 may secure £1,000, payable to himself if he survives 30 years, or to his family if he dies before the expiration of 30 years, by Thirty payments of £28 0s. 10d.

Table III.—*Endowment Insurance.—half-Tearlt Premiums to secure* £100, *payable as indicated, or at Death, if prior*.

Age next Birthday. In 10 Years. In 15 Years. In 20 Years. In 25 Years. In 30 Years. In 35 Years. Age next Birthday. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. s. d. £ s. d. 25 4 13 9 2 19 0 2 2 6 1 13 2 1 7 4 1 3 7 25 26 4 13 10 2 19 2 2 2 8 1 13 4 1 7 0 1 3 10 26 27 4 14 0 2 19 4 2 2 10 1 13 6 1 7 9 1 4 1 27 28 4 14 2 2 19 6 2 3 0 1 13 8 1 8 0 1 4 5 28 29 4 14 3 2 19 8 2 3 2 1 13 11 1 8 3 1 4 9 29 *30 4 14 5 2 19 9 2 3 4 1 14 1 1 8 6 1 5 0 30 31 4 14 7 2 19 11 2 3 6 1 14 4 1 8 9 1 5 4 31 32 4 14 8 3 0 1 2 3 8 1 14 7 1 9 1 1 5 9 32 33 4 14 9 3 0 3 2 3 11 1 14 10 1 9 5 1 6 2 33 34 4 14 11 3 0 5 2 4 2 1 15 1 1 9 9 1 6 7 34 35 4 15 2 3 0 7 2 4 5 1 15 5 1 10 2 1 7 0 35 36 4 15 4 3 0 10 2 4 8 1 15 9 1 10 7 1 7 6 36 37 4 15 0 3 1 1 2 5 0 1 16 2 1 11 1 1 8 1 37 38 4 15 8 3 1 4 2 5 4 1 16 7 1 11 7 1 8 8 38 39 4 15 10 3 1 7 2 5 8 1 17 0 1 12 1 1 9 4 39 40 4 16 0 3 1 10 2 6 0 1 17 5 1 12 8 1 10 0 40 41 4 16 3 3 2 2 2 6 5 1 17 11 1 13 4 41 42 4 16 7 3 2 7 2 6 11 1 18 6 1 14 1 42 43 4 16 11 3 3 0 2 7 5 1 19 2 1 14 10 43 44 4 17 3 3 3 5 2 8 0 1 19 11 1 15 8 1 13 6 44 45 4 17 8 3 3 11 2 8 8 2 0 8 1 16 7 1 14 8 45 46 4 18 1 3 4 6 2 9 4 2 1 7 46 47 4 18 7 3 5 1 2 10 1 2 2 6 47 48 4 19 1 3 5 9 2 10 11 2 3 6 48 49 4 19 8 3 6 5 2 11 10 2 4 6 49 50 5 0 3 3 7 2 2 12 9 2 5 9 50 51 5 0 10 3 8 1 2 13 10 51 52 5 1 7 3 9 0 2 15 0 52 53 5 2 4 3 10 0 2 16 3 53 54 5 3 3 3 11 2 2 17 8 54 55 5 4 3 3 12 6 2 19 3 55 56 5 5 4 3 13 11 56 57 5 6 7 3 15 5 57 58 5 8 0 3 17 1 58 59 5 9 7 3 19 1 59 60 5 11 5 4 1 5 60 EXAMPLE. * A person aged 30 may, by the payment of Seventy Half-yearly Premiums of £12 10s., secure £ 1,000 to his family in the event of his dying at any time within 35 years, but which sum shall be payable to himself if he shall survive 35 years.

Table III.—*Endowment Insorance.—Quarterlt Premiums to secure* £100, *payable as indicated, or at Death, if prior*.

Are next Birthday. In 10 Years. In 15 Years. In 20 Years. In 25 Years. In 30 Years. In 35 Years. Age next Birthday. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. 25 2 7 8 1 9 11 1 1 6 0 16 9 0 13 9 0 11 11 25 26 2 7 9 1 10 0 1 1 7 0 16 10 0 13 10 0 12 0 26 27 2 7 10 1 10 1 1 1 8 0 16 11 0 13 11 0 12 1 27 28 2 7 11 1 10 2 1 1 9 0 17 0 0

14 1 0 12 3 28 29 2 8 0 1 10 3 1 1 10 0 17 1 0 14 3 0 12 4 29 30 2 8 1 1 10 4 1 1 11 0 17 3 0 14 4 0 12 7 30 31 2 8 2 1 10 5 1 2 0 0 17 4 0 14 6 0 12 10 31 32 2 8 3 1 10 0 1 2 1 0 17 6 0 14 8 0 13 0 32 33 2 8 4 1 10 7 1 2 2 0 17 7 0 14 11 0 13 2 33 34 2 8 5 1 10 8 1 2 3 0 17 9 0 15 1 0 13 5 34 35 2 8 6 1 10 9 1 2 5 0 17 11 0 15 3 0 13 8 35 36 2 8 7 1 10 10 1 2 7 0 18 1 0 15 5 0 13 11 36 37 2 8 8 1 10 11 1 2 9 0 18 3 0 15 8 0 14 2 37 38 2 8 9 1 11 1 1 2 11 0 18 5 0 15 11 0 14 5 38 39 2 8 10 1 11 2 1 3 1 0 18 8 0 16 2 0 14 9 39 40 2 8 11 1 11 4 1 3 4 0 18 11 0 16 5 0 15 2 40 41 2 9 0 1 11 6 1 3 6 0 19 2 0 16 9 41 42 2 9 2 1 11 8 1 3 8 0 19 6 0 17 2 42 43 2 9 4 1 11 11 1 3 11 0 19 10 0 17 7 43 44 2 9 6 1 12 2 1 4 3 1 0 2 0 18 0 44 45 2 9 8 1 12 5 1 4 7 1 0 7 0 18 5 45 46 2 9 11 1 12 8 1 4 11 1 1 0 46 47 2 10 2 1 13 0 1 5 4 1 1 6 47 48 2 10 5 1 13 4 1 5 9 1 2 0 48 49 2 10 8 1 13 8 1 6 2 1 2 6 49 50 2 11 0 1 14 1 1 6 8 1 3 1 50 51 2 11 4 1 14 6 1 7 2 51 52 2 11 8 1 15 0 1 7 10 52 53 2 12 1 1 15 0 1 8 6 53 54 2 12 7 1 16 1 1 9 2 54 55 2 13 1 1 16 9 1 10 0 55 56 2 13 8 1 17 6 56 57 2 14 3 1 18 3 57 58 2 15 0 1 19 2 58 59 2 15 10 2 0 2 59 60 2 16 9 2 1 4 60 EXAMPLE. * A person aged 30 may secure £1,000 to his children or other heirs in the event of his dying within 30 years, or to himself if he survives that period, by a Quarterly payment of £7 3s. 4d. for 30 years.

Table VII.—*Immediate Annuitt, payable by Quarterly Instalments, which will be granted for every* £100.

Age last Birthday. Males. Females. Age last Birthday. Males. Females. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. 40 6 10 11 6 3 3 58 9 6 5 8 10 7 41 6 12 7 6 4 9 59 9 11 9 8 15 5 42 6 14 5 6 6 4 43 6 16 4 6 8 0 60 9 17 7 9 0 7 44 6 18 6 6 9 9 61 10 3 11 9 6 3 *62 10 10 9 9 12 4 45 7 0 9 6 11 7 63 10 18 1 9 18 10 40 7 3 3 6 13 7 64 11 6 0 10 5 10 47 7 5 10 6 15 8 48 7 8 8 6 17 11 65 11 14 5 10 13 3 49 7 11 8 7 0 3 66 12 3 4 11 1 2 67 12 12 10 11 9 8 50 7 14 9 7 2 9 68 13 2 11 11 18 8 51 7 18 0 7 5 6 69 13 13 6 12 8 5 52 8 1 5 7 8 4 53 8 5 0 7 11 5 70 14 4 8 12 18 10 54 8 8 9 7 14 9 71 14 16 7 13 10 1 72 15 9 3 14 2 3 55 8 12 9 7 18 3 73 16 3 0 14 15 6 56 8 17 0 8 2 1 74 16 18 0 15 9 10 57 9 1 6 8 6 2 75 17 14 6 16 5 6 Note.—The Quarterly Instalments of the above Annuities are payable on the 1st day of January, April, July, and October, commencing on the first quarterly day following the day of purchase, and ending with the last quarterly day preceding the death of the Annuitant. EXAMPLE. * A male aged 62 last Birthday may by an immediate payment of £1,000 secure an Annuity of £105 7s. 6d., payable by equal Quarterly instalments during the rest of his life.

The New Zealand Government Insurance department

Established 1870.
Head Office:
New Government Buildings, Wellington.
London Office:
7, Westminster Chameris, Victoria Street,
Westminster, S.W.
Front Cover

Mutual Life Association of Australasia.
Established 1869, and Incorporated by Act of Parliament.
Principal Office:
George & Wynyard Streets, Sydney.
Directors
THE HON. S. D. Gordon, M.L.C., CHAIRMAN.
THE HON. G. Wigram Allen, M.L.A., DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.
H. G. Alleyne, ESQ., M.D. S. Dickinson, ESQ.
THE HON. J. DAVIES, M.L.A. M. B. PELL, ESQ., B.A.
Bankers:
THE Bank of New South Wales.
The Bank of New Zealand.
Solicitors:

MESSRS. Mccarthy, Robertson, and Fisher.
Principal Medical Officer:
H. N. Maclaurin, Esq., M.D.,
187 MACQUARIE STREET.
Secretary:
J. C. Remington.
A. W. Beard. Printer. 811 George Street. Sydney.
NEW ZEALAND BRANCH. HEAD OFFICE, AUCKLAND. Local Director: GEORGE BURGOYNE OWEN; Esq, (Messrs. Owen and Graham.) Principal Medical Officer: CHARLES FIELD GOLDSBRO', Esq., M.D. General Agent for New Zealand: WILLIAM T. J. BELL. Vvith Sub-Agencies in all the Principal Towns. VICTORIA BRANCH. 78 COLLINS STREET WEST, MELBOURNE. Principal Medical Officer: WILLIAM GARRARD, Esq., M.R.C.S., Eng. General Agent for Victoria: W. H. JARRETT. With Sub-Agencies in all the Principal Towns. Special attention is directed to the following extracts from the "Married Women's Property Act" (Victoria). "A married woman may effect a policy of insurance upon her own life, or the life of her husband, for her separate use, and the same and all benefit thereof, if expressed on the face of it to be so effected, shall enure accordingly, and the contract in such policy shall be as valid as if made with An unmarried woman." "A policy of insurance effected by any married man on his own life and expressed on the fact; of it to be for the benefit of his wife, or his wife and children, or any of them, shall enure and be deemed a trust for the benefit of his wife, for her separate use and of his children, or any of them, according to the interest so expressed, and shall not, so long as any object of the trust remains, be subject to the control of the husband, or to his creditors, or form part of his estate."

Prospectus

The Benefits and Principles of Life Assurance being now widely known and appreciated, the design of this Prospectus is chiefly to point out the special advantages offered by the Mutual System in general, and by this Office in particular.

Proprietary Companies are established by Shareholders under whose direction their business is carried on, and for whose benefit a considerable portion of the Profits is reserved.

Mutual Societies have no Shareholders; each and every Member has a voice in the management, shares in the whole of the profits, and yet incurs no personal liability whatever. It needs no argument to prove the superiority of this system, and it is a fact that very few *Proprietary* Life Companies have been started of late years, while offices *purely Mutual* are almost daily springing up all over the world.

So much being said for the system, the following are the chief points with regard to the Mutual Life Association of Australasia upon which intending members are likely to seek information.

Establishment dates from the 1st July, 1869, and special care was taken by the founders (all members, and many of them still Directors of the Association), to profit by the previous experience of Life Companies in these Colonies, and to adopt the best features of the leading British Offices.

Incorporation. The progress of the Association soon became such as to require a special Act of Incorporation, which was granted by the Parliament of New South Wales, and became law in January, 1873. It secures to all members the fullest possible participation in the benefits of the Mutual system, and at the same time protects them from any personal liability. The whole of the Profits belong to the members, and will be allotted at Quinquennial Intervals to each according to his or her interest in the Association.

Indefeasible Assurance was the chief object for which the Association was established. Previously the Assured in other Companies were harassed by conditions more or less stringent as to Habits of Life, Residence, Travelling, Change of Occupation, Cause of Death, &c., as a breach of any of the rules on these points would invalidate the Policies. It is especially important in these Colonies, where residence and occupation are so frequently changed, that a Policy-holder should not at every step have to consult the Directors of his Company. All these hampering restrictions were swept away by the founders of this Office declaring the Policies "Indefeasible, except on the ground of wilful misstatements in the original documents." That this was a wise step is proved by the fact that the old conditions of Assurance are now almost obsolete, having been abolished *partly* by some and wholly by other Societies. But it is to be specially noted that the Mutual Life Association of Australasia was the first office in the Australian Colonies to adopt the liberal principles by which the assuring public are now profiting. This alone gives it a good claim to support.

Rates of Premium. The low scale on which these are calculated is another leading advantage of this Association. The Tables, quoted and explained hereinafter, speak for themselves, and bear favorable

comparison with those of other Offices.

Payment of Premiums. An important modification of the usual practice was introduced early in the history of this Office, and has proved itself most suitable to the convenience of the members. All Instalments fall due on the *First* day of January, April, July, and (*or*) October. Premiums are due Annually in advance, but are made payable half-yearly or quarterly, as the Assured may prefer, as per Examples quoted in the Tables of Rates.

Thirty Days Grace are allowed after above dates for payment of premiums, and should death occur within that time the claim would be paid. After the thirty days the Policy will not during the life of the Assured become absolutely void for one year, but may be reinstated, if the Directors approve, upon compliance with usual conditions.

Protection from Creditors is secured in New South Wales by clause 11 in the Association's Act of Incorporation, as follows:—

The property and interest of every member or of his personal representatives in any policy or contract made or entered into bona fide for the benefit of such number or his personal representatives or in the moneys payable under or in respect of such policy or contract (including every sum payable by way of bonus or profit) shall be exempt from liability to any law now or hereafter in force relating to Bankruptcy or Insolvency or to be seized or levied upon by the process of any Court whatever. Provided that no policy or contract for a life assurance or endowment shall be so protected nor any contributions made towards the same until it shall have endured for at least two years but that after an endurance of two years such protection shall be afforded to the extent of £200 of assurance or endowment and to the contributions made towards the same and after an endurance of five years to the extent of £500 and after an endurance of seven years to the extent of £1000 and after an endurance of ten years to the extent of £2000.

Minors, (with the consent of their parents, masters, or guardians) and married women are by this Act permitted to become members of the Association, and their Policies also are protected as above. Somewhat similar protection is afforded by the laws of most of the other Colonies.

Assignment of Policies. The Association supplies forms for giving *Notice* of Assignments, whether conditional or absolute, but for the protection of all concerned, the *Deed* of Assignment should, as a rule, be prepared by a Solicitor.

Claims under Policies are, as already stated, payable no matter where or from what cause death may happen. The amount already paid will be found quoted on another page of this book, and it is a curious fact that a very large proportion of this was handed to the widows of members who had met with death from violent causes, some of which would in many Offices have invalidated their Assurances and thereby left their families unprovided for, as in nearly all these cases the amount Assured was their only provision.

Promptitude in Settlement has always been a distinguishing characteristic of this Office. In terms of the contract, claims are payable Thirty days after proof of death, but as a rule the papers are submitted to the Directors immediately on receipt, and if in order the amount is paid at once without discount.

The Management of the Association is practically in the hands of the Members themselves, as they elect the six Directors from their own number.

They also choose two Auditors, who examine the Books, Accounts, Vouchers, and Securities at periodical intervals, and report thereon to the Board.

The Directors meet twice a week for despatch of business.

A General Meeting of the Members is held within sixty days after the 30th June in each year, when the Annual Report, Revenue Account, and Balance Sheet are submitted, and printed copies issued to every Member. It is requested that any Member not receiving these by the end of August at latest, will at once write to the local Agent or to the Principal Office.

Investment of Funds is a point upon which intending Assurers do not bestow sufficient attention. They are too often satisfied with a plausible statement of "business obtained," forgetting that this is the "Liabilities" side of the account, and if not balanced by sufficient "Assets," will prove a source of weakness rather than of strength. The aim of the Directors of the Mutual Life Association of Australasia in disposing of its funds is *first* Security, *then* A Good Rate of Interest. The last published Balance Sheet is given on another page, and it is worthy of note that no other office in these colonies shows so small an amount of "Outstanding Premiums," "Agents' Balances," and such like items *not* bearing interest; while it is claimed that all the Investments are, as a Life Company's always should be, "of a fairly realizable and available nature," and the rate of interest on the whole amount averaging a highly remunerative per centage.

Loans on Policies are granted to Members on favorable terms. The proportion of premiums paid which will be so lent varies of course according to age at entry, table, amount of policy, &c., but in some cases a duration of one year will be sufficient to constitute a policy an eligible security, while in most Offices no loans are granted on any Assurance less than two or three years in force.

Agencies are established at most of the principal towns in the Colonies, as per annexed list. At these, all

necessary forms, and full information on any points not mentioned herein can be obtained; and as Medical Officers have been appointed at each Agency, persons wishing to assure their lives can join this Association with the least possible trouble to themselves, and without any expense whatever until first payment of premium.

Explanation of the Tables. The various forms of Assurance provided for by the published Tables are as follows:—

Table A.—Premiums to be paid during Life to secure a sum payable at death. This is the cheapest and best form for the head of a family wishing to provide for those dependent on him, and who by his death would otherwise be left without support.

Under this Table, at age 35, the cost of every hundred pounds payable at death is only about one shilling per week.

Table B.—The same, but provided for by one premium, or by 3, 7, 14, or 21 payments; or by payments ceasing at 50, 55, 60, or 65 years of age.

This table is intended for persons who can afford somewhat higher premiums, with the advantage of only continuing them for a limited number of years. It compares with above as follows:—under Table A, at age 40, the Assured pays for £1000, rather more than £30 per annum during life: under B, by increasing the Premium to £45, he will cease to pay in 14 years, or by making it £56, will be relieved of all expense on reaching the age of 50.

A popular writer says—"A policy of Assurance costs little out of a good annual income, but how valuable such a policy becomes (when settled for the benefit of wife and children) at a time of wholesale losses; much more is this the case where the policy is fully paid up, having been taken out on the system of limited number of premiums. The fortune is gone, or there is little of it left, but here in the policy bought in the palmy days, protected from all claims, is the ample provision which is required for survivors, and which cannot be diverted from that use."

Table E.—Premiums to provide a sum payable to the member on attaining a certain age, or to his heirs in event of earlier death.

This form, ordinarily known as Endowment Assurance, is advantageous for young men who beginning life have none dependent on them, and desire, therefore, to lay up money for themselves.

It unites the advantages of both a Savings' Bank and Life Company, as the first payment of premium secures the sum Assured, in event of the member's death; while if he lives, it will be a provision for himself.

He can at age 23, by paying about thirteen pounds a year, be legally entitled to £500, payable to himself at 55, while in event of earlier death this would be a legacy, which he could dispose of by will as so much actual cash.

Table F is the same as Table A, but without profits, and is intended chiefly for policies taken out as collateral security.

Tables G and Gr are convenient forms for securing a sum to provide for the education of children, for a daughter's marriage portion, or for capital to start a son in business.

Should death occur before the stipulated age, the whole of the premiums are under Gr returned without any deduction, but under G they are forfeited to the Association.

Say a child is a little under 2 years old, by paying about Three Guineas per annum its father can secure;£100, payable at 21, and be entitled to a refund of all premiums should the child not reach that age. If he is willing to forfeit these, in event of death, to the Association the annual payments would be reduced to £2 17s. 10d. each.

Table K is well suited for partners in business, when a sum would have to be withdrawn from the joint capital on the death of either; or it may be chosen by husband and wife to secure an amount payable to the survivor.

To assure two persons of ages 30 and 40, under Table A, would cost £5 7s. 6d. per £100, but under K £3 19s. 1d. will entitle the survivor to that amount.

The author before quoted observes with regard to "Partnership Policies" that, "As a question of cheapness it will always be found more economical to pay the life premium necessary to provide capital in the event of the moneyed partner's death, than to give a share of the profits to a new incoming partner, or to pay interest and find security for capital lent. There is not likely to be any loss by a partnership assurance, and there may be a great gain. The money is taken in comparatively small sums from the earnings of each year, and is improved at compound interest. It is only in instances of very prolonged life that the payments will exceed the receipts, and in that case the excess may be fairly said to be a very cheap consideration for the protection afforded by the assurance."

These are the most popular forms, but all other classes of Life business, including Annuities (Immediate and Deferred) are undertaken by this Office, the rates for which, and for any ages not mentioned in the Tables can be ascertained on application.

It must be remembered that the published rates are the minimum quotations for lives which are in every way first class, as regards Health, Occupation, and Family History. Where there is a flaw in any of these, but the case is not wholly ineligible, it will be accepted at such an addition as the Directors, with the advice of their Medical Officer, consider fairly meets the extra risk involved.

Co-operation of Members is a point upon the necessity for which it is impossible to lay too much stress. It is one of the chief causes of the pre-eminent success of mutual institutions. It has often been the Directors' pleasant duty to acknowledge the valuable assistance rendered by some policy holders, and they would again remind all the members that if each, year by year, induces one friend to assure in the Mutual Life Association of Australasia, success greater than ever yet recorded will speedily be attained.

By order of the Board,
J. C. Remington, Secretary.

Sydney,

January, 1877.

decorative feature

Tables of Rates.

Table A. With Participation in Profits.

LIFE ASSURANCE. Annual Premiums to assure £100, payable at death. N.B.—The Age is that at next birthday. Age. Premium. Age. Premium. Age. Premium. Age. Premium. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. 20 1 14 4 32 2 8 2 44 3 9 11 55 5 11 5 1 1 15 3 3 2 9 6 5 3 12 2 6 5 15 5 2 1 16 2 4 2 11 0 6 3 14 8 7 6 1 8 3 1 17 3 5 2 12 7 7 3 17 4 8 6 7 5 4 1 18 4 6 2 14 3 8 4 0 4 9 6 13 2 25 1 10 6 7 2 16 0 9 4 3 9 60 6 19 0 6 2 0 8 8 2 17 11 50 4 7 6 1 7 4 4 7 2 2 0 9 2 19 10 1 4 11 8 2 7 10 6 8 2 3 3 40 3 1 10 2 4 16 2 3 7 17 1 0 2 4 6 1 3 3 9 3 5 0 11 4 8 4 6 30 2 5 8 2 3 5 8 4 5 5 11 5 8 12 6 1 2 6 11 1 8 3 7 9 EXAMPLE A person aged so may assure £1000. By Annual Premiums of .. .. £22 16 8 " Half-Yearly Instalments of .. .. 11 10 10 " Quarterly " 5 15 10

Table B. With Participation in Profits.

LIMITED PAYMENTS. Single Premium, or Annual Premiums for a limited term of years only, for the Assurance of £100, payable at death. N. B.—The age is that at next birthday. Age. B 1. B 3. B 7. B 14. B 21. Age. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. 20 28 1 9 10 0 5 4 16 0 2 17 4 2 5 0 20 1 28 12 9 10 4 4 4 17 11 2 18 6 2 6 0 1 2 29 4 5 10 8 6 4 19 11 2 19 10 2 7 0 2 3 29 16 7 10 12 11 5 2 0 3 1 2 2 8 1 3 4 30 9 3 10 17 5 5 4 3 3 2 6 2 9 3 4 5 31 2 5 11 2 2 5 6 8 3 4 0 2 10 5 5 6 31 15 10 11 7 0 5 9 1 3 5 6 2 11 8 6 7 32 9 11 11 12 1 5 11 8 3 7 2 2 13 0 7 8 33 3 11 11 17 5 5 14 4 3 8 9 2 14 4 8 9 33 17 3 12 2 4 5 16 9 3 10 3 2 15 7 9 30 34 9 6 12 6 9 5 18 11 3 11 7 2 16 8 30 1 35 1 11 12 11 3 6 1 0 3 13 0 2 17 10 1 2 35 14 10 12 15 10 6 3 4 3 14 5 2 19 0 2 3 36 8 6 13 0 9 0 5 8 3 16 0 3 0 3 3 4 37 3 0 13 5 11 6 8 3 3 17 8 3 1 7 4 5 37 18 1 13 11 5 6 11 0 3 19 10 3 3 1 5 6 38 13 9 13 17 1 6 13 10 4 1 3 3 4 7 6 7 39 9 10 14 2 11 6 16 10 4 3 2 3 6 1 7 8 40 6 4 14 8 11 6 19 11 4 5 1 3 7 8 8 9 41 3 2 14 15 3 7 3 2 4 7 1 3 9 4 9 40 42 0 0 15 1 7 7 6 4 4 9 1 3 11 0 40 1 42 16 1 15 7 7 7 9 4 4 10 11 3 12 7 1 2 43 12 0 15 13 6 7 12 3 4 12 8 3 14 2 2 3 44 8 0 15 19 3 7 15 1 4 14 5 3 15 10 3 4 45 4 8 16 5 3 7 18 0 4 16 3 3 17 6 4 5 46 1 11 16 11 6 8 0 11 4 18 1 3 19 4 5 6 47 0 2 16 18 0 8 4 0 5 0 2 4 1 4 6 7 47 19 5 17 4 10 8 7 3 5 2 5 4 3 6 7 8 49 0 0 17 12 0 8 10 10 5 4 11 4 5 11 8 9 50 2 6 18 0 0 8 14 11 5 7 10 4 8 9 9 50 51 6 6 18 8 8 8 19 4 5 11 2 4 11 10 50 1 52 12 2 18 18 3 9 4 4 5 14 11 4 15 4 1 2 53 18 3 19 7 11 9 9 5 5 18 10 4 19 0 2 3 55 4 8 19 17 10 9 14 8 6 3 0 5 3 0 3 4 56 11 8 20 7 10 10 0 2 6 7 4 5 7 2 4 5 57 19 4 20 18 3 10 6 2 6 12 1 5 11 10 5 6 59 7 6 21 7 0 10 13 5 6 17 1 5 16 9 6 7 60 16 4 22 0 5 10 19 10 7 2 6 6 2 2 7 8 62 5 0 22 12 5 11 7 2 7 8 1 6 7 11 8 9 63 12 4 23 4 4 11 14 2 7 13 6 6 13 8 9 60 64 17 9 23 15 7 12 0 10 7 18 8 6 19 4 60

Table B. (*Continued*.) With Participation in

Profits.

LIMITED PAYMENTS. Annual Premiums ceasing at age 50, 55, 60, or 65, to assure £100, payable at death. N.B.—The age is that at NEXT birthday. Age. B 50. B 55. B 60. B 65. Age. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. 20 1 18 10 1 17 0 1 16 0 1 15 9 20 1 2 0 2 1 18 1 1 17 2 1 16 8 1 2 2 1 6 1 19 3 1 18 4 1 17 8 2 3 2 2 10 2 0 7 1 19 6 1 18 8 3 4 2 4 5 2 2 0 2 0 9 1 19 9 4 5 2 6 3 2 3 6 2 2 0 2 0 11 5 6 2 8 3 2 5 2 2 3 2 2 2 2 6 7 2 10 5 2 6 10 2 4 5 2 3 5 7 8 2 12 10 2 8 6 2 5 9 2 4 9 8 9 2 15 7 2 10 4 2 7 3 2 6 2 9 30 2 18 5 2 12 3 2 8 11 2 7 8 30 1 3 1 6 2 14 4 2 10 8 2 9 1 1 2 3 4 11 2 16 7 2 12 7 2 10 7 2 3 3 8 7 2 19 0 2 14 7 2 12 2 3 4 3 12 6 3 1 7 2 16 7 2 13 10 4 5 3 10 9 3 4 4 2 18 10 2 15 7 5 6 4 1 3 3 7 7 3 1 3 2 17 5 6 7 4 6 1 3 11 3 3 3 10 2 19 4 7 8 4 12 10 3 15 5 3 6 6 3 1 3 8 9 5 1 5 4 0 1 3 9 4 3 3 5 9 40 5 12 0 4 5 3 3 12 4 3 5 10 40 1 6 4 6 4 10 11 3 15 11 3 8 5 1 2 6 18 10 4 17 3 3 19 10 3 11 2 2 3 7 15 1 5 5 5 4 4 3 3 14 2 3 4 5 15 2 4 9 2 3 17 6 4 5 6 6 7 4 14 5 4 0 10 5 6 6 19 8 5 0 2 4 4 4 6 7 7 14 4 5 7 5 4 9 8 7 8 8 10 10 5 15 11 4 13 4 8 9 6 7 2 4 19 0 9 50 7 0 8 5 6 0 50 1 7 16 5 5 14 11 1 2 8 14 6 6 6 5 2 3 9 14 8 6 19 5 3 4 7 13 5 4 5 8 9 5 5 6 9 7 6 6 7 10 6 7 7 8 11 7 2 8

Table E. With Participation in Profits.

ENDOWMENT ASSURANCE. Annual Premiums to assure £100, payable on attaining the age of 40, 45, or 50, or at previous death. N. B.—The age is that at next birthday. Age. E 40. E 45. E 50. Age. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. 20 4 7 5 3 7 0 2 14 3 20 1 4 13 3 3 10 7 2 16 10 1 2 4 19 9 3 14 8 2 19 6 2 3 5 7 2 3 19 3 3 2 6 3 4 5 15 6 4 1 0 3 5 9 4 5 6 5 0 4 9 4 3 9 3 5 6 6 15 11 4 15 5 3 11 1 6 7 7 8 6 5 2 1 3 17 3 7 8 8 3 4 5 9 8 4 1 10 8 9 9 0 8 5 18 0 4 6 9 9 30 10 1 2 0 7 3 4 11 11 30 1 11 6 4 6 17 11 4 17 8 1 2 12 17 10 7 10 3 5 4 3 2 3 14 18 7 8 4 8 5 11 6 3 4 17 13 0 9 1 11 5 19 10 4 5 21 9 5 10 2 7 6 9 4 5 0 11 8 1 7 0 2 6 7 12 19 11 7 12 10 7 8 15 1 0 8 7 6 8 9 17 15 10 9 5 0 9 40 21 12 6 10 5 11 40 1 11 11 3 1 2 13 2 10 2 3 15 3 5 3 4 17 17 7 4 5 21 13 7 & EXAMPLE. A person aged 21 can assure £300, payable to himself at 50, or to his heirs in the event of earlier death, by An annual premium of .. .. £8 10 6 Half-yearly instalments of .. .. 4 6 3 Quarterly " 2 2 6

Table E. (*Continued*.) With Participation in Profits.

ENDOWMENT ASSURANCE. Annual Premiums to assure £100, payable on attaining the age of 55, 60, or 65, or at previous death. N.B.—The age is that at next birthday. Age. E 55. E 60 E 65. Age. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. 20 2 5 11 2 0 2 1 16 4 20 1 2 7 8 2 1 7 1 17 6 1 2 2 9 8 2 3 1 1 18 9 2 3 2 11 10 2 4 9 2 0 1 3 4 2 14 2 2 6 0 2 1 6 4 5 2 16 7 2 8 4 2 3 0 5 6 2 10 4 2 10 4 2 4 7 6 7 3 2 2 2 12 6 2 6 3 7 8 3 5 3 2 14 8 0 8 0 8 9 3 8 6 2 17 0 2 9 9 9 30 3 11 9 2 19 4 2 11 6 30 1 3 15 5 3 1 9 2 13 4 1 2 3 19 4 3 4 5 2 15 4 2 3 4 3 9 3 7 4 2 17 5 3 4 4 8 7 3 10 7 2 19 9 4 5 4 14 0 3 14 0 3 2 3 5 6 5 0 0 3 17 10 3 5 0 6 7 5 6 8 4 2 0 3 7 10 7 8 5 14 2 4 6 6 3 11 0 8 9 0 2 7 4 11 6 3 14 4 9 40 6 12 1 4 16 11 3 17 10 40 1 7 2 9 5 2 8 4 1 7 1 2 7 15 0 5 9 0 4 5 6 2 3 8 9 2 5 16 1 4 9 10 3 4 9 6 1 6 4 1 4 14 6 4 5 10 6 4 6 13 2 4 19 8 5 6 11 11 2 7 3 7 5 5 6 6 7 13 2 5 7 15 8 5 12 0 7 8 15 2 8 8 10 0 5 19 5 8 9 17 16 11 9 7 2 6 8 0 9 50 21 13 2 10 8 0 6 17 11 50 1 11 13 8 7 9 5 1 2 13 5 9 8 2 8 2 3 15 6 11 8 18 1 3 4 18 1 8 9 16 3 4 5 21 18 4 10 18 2 5 6 12 4 10 6 7 13 18 4 7 8 16 1 1 8 9 18 17 4 9 60 22 14 10 60

Table F. Without Participation in Profits.

LIFE ASSURANCE. Annual Premiums to assure £100, payable at death. N.B.—The age is that at next birthday. Age. £ s. d. Age. £ s. d. 20 1 11 8 41 2 18 10 1 1 12 6 2 3 0 8 2 1 13 5 3 3 2 6 3 1 14 5 4 3 4 6 4 1 15 5 5 3 6 7 5 1 16 6 6 3 8 11 6 1 17 7 7 3 11 5 7 1 18 9 8 3 14 2 8 1 19 11 9 3 17 4 9 2 1 1 50 4 0 9 30 2 2 2 1 4 4 8 1 2 3 3 2 4 8 9 2 2 4 6 3 4 13 2 3 2 5 9 4 4 17 10 4 2 7 1 5 5 2 10 5 2 8 7 6 5 8 4 6 2 10 1 7 5 14 2 7 2 11 9 8 6 0 5 8 2 13 5 9 6 6 8 9 2 15 3 60 6 12 10 40 2 17 0

Table F. (*Continued*.)

SHORT PERIOD ASSURANCES. Annual Premiums to assure £100, payable at death, should that event happen within 1 year, 3, 5, 7, 10, or 15 years. N.B.—The age is that at next birthday. Age. 1 Year. 3 Years. 5 Years. 7 Years. 10 Years. 15 Years. £ d. £ d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. 20 0 19 10 1 0 1 1 0 4 1 0 8 1 1 6 1 3 4

1 1 0 5 1 0 8 1 0 11 1 1 3 1 1 11 1 3 9 2 1 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 8 1 2 1 1 2 4 1 4 2 3 1 1 9 1 2 1 1 2 5 1 2 10 1 3 2 1 1 9 4 1 2 5 1 2 9 1 3 1 1 3 7 1 3 11 1 5 5 5 1 3 2 1 3 7 1 4 0 1 4 7 1 5 1 1 6 2 6 1 3 11 1 4 4 1 4 11 1 5 6 1 6 0 1 7 0 7 1 4 8 1 5 1 1 5 8 1 6 4 1 6 10 1 7 11 8 1 5 6 1 5 11 1 6 7 1 7 4 1 7 11 1 8 11 9 1 6 4 1 6 10 1 7 6 1 8 4 1 8 11 1 9 10 30 1 7 2 1 7 8 1 8 5 1 9 5 1 9 11 1 10 9 1 1 9 0 1 9 7 1 10 4 1 10 7 1 11 0 1 11 9 2 1 9 11 1 10 6 1 11 8 1 11 9 1 12 2 1 12 11 3 1 10 10 1 11 6 1 12 4 1 12 11 1 13 4 1 14 2 4 1 11 9 1 12 6 1 13 4 1 14 3 1 14 8 1 15 7 5 1 12 3 1 13 7 1 14 4 1 15 7 1 16 0 1 37 1 6 1 13 8 1 15 1 1 15 5 1 16 11 1 17 4 1 18 7 7 1 14 8 1 16 1 1 16 6 1 17 4 1 18 10 2 0 2 8 1 15 8 1 17 2 1 17 8 1 18 8 2 0 3 2 1 10 9 1 16 9 1 18 4 1 18 11 1 19 11 2 1 8 2 3 7 40 1 17 10 1 19 5 2 0 1 2 1 4 2 3 2 2 5 4 1 1 18 11 2 0 6 2 1 3 2 2 8 2 4 8 2 7 2 2 1 19 11 2 1 7 2 2 4 2 3 1 2 6 2 2 9 1 3 2 2 0 2 2 8 2 3 6 2 4 6 2 7 8 2 11 0 4 2 3 1 2 3 10 2 4 9 2 5 11 2 9 2 2 12 11 5 2 4 2 2 5 1 2 6 0 2 7 4 2 10 7 2 14 9 6 2 5 4 2 7 3 2 8 2 2 8 10 2 12 1 2 16 4 7 2 6 7 2 8 6 2 9 6 2 10 5 2 13 9 2 17 11 8 2 8 0 2 10 0 2 10 11 2 12 0 2 15 4 2 19 9 9 2 9 7 2 11 8 2 12 8 2 13 11 2 17 2 3 1 9 50 2 11 4 2 14 6 2 15 1 2 16 1 2 19 3 3 3 11 1 2 13 3 2 16 6 2 17 8 2 19 3 3 2 5 3 7 3 2 2 15 5 2 18 9 2 19 11 3 1 9 3 4 9 3 10 10 3 2 17 11 3 1 4 3 2 7 3 4 7 3 7 8 3 14 9 4 3 0 10 3 4 4 3 5 7 3 7 9 3 10 8 3 19 2 r> 3 4 4 7 11 3 9 3 3 11 8 3 14 6 4 4 2 6 3 8 7 3 12 4 3 13 8 3 16 5 3 19 3 4 9 10 7 3 13 8 3 17 5 3 18 9 4 2 11 4 5 7 4 16 7 8 3 19 7 4 3 8 4 5 0 4 9 6 4 12 11 5 5 1 9 4 7 2 4 12 1 4 13 7 4 18 7 5 2 1 5 15 10 (60 4 15 8 5 1 3 5 2 10 5 8 1 5 13 4 6 8 0

Tables G & Gr.

ENDOWMENTS. WITHOUT PARTICIPATION IN PROFITS. Annual Premiums to secure £100, payable on attaining the age of 14 or 21 years. N.B.—The rates are for age NEXT birthday. Without return of Premiums in event of earlier death of the child. The whole Premiums paid returnable without deduction in event of death. Age. G 14. G 21. Age. GR 14. GR 21. £ s. d. £ d. £ s. d. £ s. d. 1 5 0 0 2 15 0 1 5 10 6 2 19 6 2 5 5 6 2 17 10 2 5 14 4 3 3 2 3 5 19 7 3 3 6 3 6 6 11 3 8 2 4 6 15 6 3 9 5 4 7 1 8 3 13 9 5 7 13 11 3 15 11 5 7 19 5 4 0 0 6 8 16 0 4 2 11 6 9 1 0 4 7 0 7 10 3 4 4 10 11 7 10 8 1 4 15 0 8 11 18 3 4 19 11 8 12 2 11 5 4 1 9 14 4 9 5 10 3 9 14 9 5 5 14 8 10 17 9 8 6 2 5 10 17 14 7 6 7 0 11 6 16 10 11 7 1 8 12 7 14 2 12 7 19 3 13 8 15 5 13 9 0 10 14 10 2 2 14 10 7 11 15 11 16 8 15 16 12 14 2 9 9 2

Table K. With Participation in Profits.

JOINT LIVES ASSURANCE. Annual Premiums to assure £100, payable within THIRTY days after proof of death of either A or B. N.B.—The ages are those at NEXT birthday. Age of A. Age of B. Age of A. 20 25 30 35 40 45 50 55 60 £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. £ s. d. 20 2 11 4 20 25 2 15 1 0 18 7 25 30 2 19 10 3 3 1 3 7 4 30 35 3 5 1 3 8 2 3 12 1 3 16 6 35 40 3 12 7 3 15 5 3 19 1 4 3 1 4 9 1 40 45 4 1 0 4 3 8 4 7 0 4 10 6 4 16 0 5 2 0 45 50 4 14 1 4 16 7 4 19 8 5 2 9 5 7 8 5 12 10 6 2 8 50 55 5 15 3 5 17 8 0 0 8 6 3 5 6 7 10 6 12 3 7 1 1 7 18 7 55 60 7 4 3 7 6 7 7 9 7 7 12 2 7 16 4 7 19 11 8 7 8 9 4 6 10 9 9 60

"Life Assurance for Men of Fortune."

From the "Insurance Agent."

[TABLE B.]

"A policy of Life Assurance provides money for *immediate* uses on the death of the assured. On the death of a gentleman of fortune there are often large demands for ready cash. His property may consist of houses, warehouses, land, mines, collieries, ships, shares, and yet when he dies there may be very little actual money at his credit. Money must be raised either by borrowing or selling, and both processes are likely to be costly and troublesome. If the nature of his investments is peculiar, if they are out of the ordinary run, then, even though lucrative to him, it may be actually impossible readily to raise money on them. The safest and most independent course is to take out a policy for a few thousands of pounds, and the difficulties all vanish. The ready money is provided for all urgent claims, and no trouble, no sacrifice of any kind is needed."

"The Self-Help of Life Assurance."[TABLE E.]

"It is a good thing for a man to be the architect of his own fortunes. Self-made men are distinguished by their self-reliance, and their success generally in all they give their attention to. By limited saving, and by

perseverance, with the use of the Endowment System, young men may acquire in the future that substantial position to which they aspire, but which without accumulated means they cannot possibly reach. No investment institution, or deposit bank, is comparable with the plan we have described. The payments are fixed obligations, not payments which may be made or not at will. Consequently the money is found for them. It is in some sort compulsory saving. Year after year the value swells, until at last the large sum comes into the hands of the fortunate owner.

"*And all the time that he is thus acquiring fortune for himself by his own industry and prudence, his family is provided against want in the sad event of his death. For should he die, the money at once becomes due and payable to them*."

Progress in Eighth Year, as Compared with Previous Twelve Months.

1875-76. 1876-77. Proposals..... 1056 £362,975 1696 £534,220 Policies 'Issued ... 748 £240,275 1066 £348,510 New Premiums ... £8,564 5 11 £12,314 3 11 Invested Funds ... £42,746 17 6 £61,501 15 4

Policies in Force at 30th June in Each of Years 1870 to 1877.

Year. Number. Sums Assured. Annual Premiums. 1870 261 £ 102,467 s. 17 d. 8 £ 2,904 s. 13 d. 8 1871 491 171,768 13 11 5,052 1 11 1872 725 241,606 9 4 7,595 11 7 1873 1012 329,656 9 4 10,916 9 6 1874 1327 426,821 9 4 14,173 6 2 1875 1712 545,528 7 6 18,536 1 9 1876 2292 728,909 15 8 25,077 15 11 1877 3113 997,982 2 8 34,481 11 5 CLAIMS PAID. The Total Amount up to 30th June, 1877, was nearly Twenty-five Thousand Pounds.

Balance Sheet, June 30, 1877:

Liabilities. Assets. £ s. d. £ s. d. Total funds per Revenue Account ... 61,501 15 4 Loans on Mortgage ... ... 7,485 0 0 Loans on Policies of the Association Outstanding Accounts ... ... 670 5 10 (within their surrender value) ... 1,671 0 0 Debentures ... ... 17,610 0 0 Agents' Balances ... ... 54 0 3 Outstanding Premiums ... ... 29 3 9 Outstanding Interest ... ... 906 17 5 Cash— On Deposit ... ... 33,500 0 0 On Current Account 687 19 9 34,187 19 9 Office Furniture (reduced valuation) 228 0 0 £62,172 1 2 £62,172 1 2 WE, the undersigned, hereby certify chat we have examined the above Accounts, and compared them with the Books. Vouchers, Mortgage Deeds, Debentures, and other Securities of the Mutual Life Association of Australasia, and that we find them all correct. J NO. D. EWENS, A. EDWARD HARPER, AUDITORS

Agencies.

Mutual Life Association OF AUSTRALASIA. Policies Indefeasible from date of issue. FIRST OFFICE IN THESE COLONIES TO FREE LIFE ASSURANCE FROM HARASSING RESTRICTIONS. Premiums at Lower Rates Than Most Offices. PRINCIPAL OFFICE: GEORGE & WYNYARD STREETS, SYDNEY. A. W. BEARD. PRINTER, 3" GEORGE STREET. SYDNEY